

Spring 2022

Exploring Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology Practitioners' Attitudes on Attire

Claire Harding

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd>



Part of the [Other Psychology Commons](#), [Social Psychology Commons](#), and the [Sports Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Harding, Claire, "Exploring Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology Practitioners' Attitudes on Attire" (2022). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2392.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/2392>

This thesis (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies, Jack N. Averitt College of at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

EXPLORING SPORT, EXERCISE, AND PERFORMANCE PSYCHOLOGY PRACTITIONERS' ATTITUDES ON ATTIRE

by

CLAIRE HARDING

(Under the Direction of Megan Byrd)

ABSTRACT

Research has revealed that attire has an influence on one's self-perceptions, self and socially prescribed adjective traits and behavior (Adam & Galinsky, 2012; Lubker et al., 2008; Peluchette & Karl, 2007). The present study aims to explore the influence of attire on perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of SEPP (sport, exercise, and performance psychology) practitioners during their applied work. Specifically, these factors were investigated through various demographic lenses such as gender, experience level, and age in order to describe the population. SEPP graduate students (n = 49) and early career professionals (n = 82) were asked to participate in a questionnaire, based on previous research, that was created by the author for this specific study to assess the above variables. The study is exploratory and descriptive in nature. Results revealed that participants' view of their attire was important in influencing their self and social perceptions. Specifically, attire influenced how professional, confident, and approachable participants felt. Participants agreed that the way they look is important to them and that dressing like their clients and colleagues helps them fit in. Open-ended question responses revealed the implications of attire on the experiences of SEPP practitioners during their applied work.

INDEX WORDS: Attire, Attitudes, Perceptions, Sport, Exercise, Performance, Psychology, Gender, Early career professionals, Graduate student trainees.

EXPLORING SPORT, EXERCISE, AND PERFORMANCE PSYCHOLOGY PRACTITIONERS'
ATTITUDES ON ATTIRE

by

CLAIRE HARDING

B.A., University of Texas at Arlington, 2019

M.S., Georgia Southern University, 2022

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Georgia Southern University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

WATERS COLLEGE OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS

© 2022

CLAIRE HARDING

All Rights Reserved

EXPLORING SPORT, EXERCISE, AND PERFORMANCE PSYCHOLOGY PRACTITIONERS'
ATTITUDES ON ATTIRE

by

CLAIRE HARDING

Major Professor:
Committee:

Megan Byrd
Brandonn Harris
Jenna Tomalski

Electronic Version Approved:
May 2022

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to my thesis chair, Dr. Megan Byrd, for your patience, guidance, and support. Your encouragement and shared interest in this topic helped keep me motivated through this long process. You have been the best mentor I could have asked for and I am so grateful for all the time we have spent working together! I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Brandonn Harris and Dr. Jenna Tomalski. I am so thankful to have had you both as additional mentors and I appreciate all the invaluable feedback and insight you both provided to me. I would like to express my gratitude to the fellow sport and exercise psychology master's students in my program. You all have been tremendous in supporting me throughout this journey and I am honored to have been surrounded by such an incredible group of people. Finally, I am beyond grateful for my sister and parents whose unwavering love and support keep me motivated and confident. Thank you for always believing in me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	2
LIST OF TABLES.....	4
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	5
2 METHODS.....	12
Participants.....	12
Instruments.....	12
Procedure.....	15
Analysis.....	16
3 RESULTS.....	20
4 DISCUSSION.....	29
 REFERENCES	 35
APPENDICES	
A LITERATURE REVIEW.....	38
B CREEKMORE CLOTHING INTEREST QUESTIONNAIRE.....	53
C SURVEY.....	55

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Demographic Characteristics.....	17
Table 2: Self and Social Perceptions.....	20
Table 3: Clothing Attitudes and Interests.....	21

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

As a highly perceptive species, significant attention has been given to the way humans look, specifically with the clothes individuals wear, how they wear them, and how they feel in them. Philosopher and early pioneer of American psychology, William James, consistently alluded to this thought and supported the idea that attire has an influence on our material self through his various works (James, 1980). Additional research within the field of the social psychology on attire has expanded on James' idea and revealed implications of attire for the self and for communicating with others. Attire has been determined to have two basic functions: (a) to modify the body, and (b) to provide nonverbal communication cues (Roach-Higgins & Eicher, 1992). Through this modification of attire, individuals may also experience changes in their own self-perceptions, moods, and thoughts. As for the latter function, attire serves as a method to send messages to others, such as displaying that you belong to a specific group or role and providing a basis for others to make inferences about you. These ideas that clothing serves as a messenger and influences perceptions of the self have been explored across various settings including workplace environments. Through conducting a literature review of the social psychology of dress, and its implications within workplace environments, the research addressing these two functions of dress has been skewed more towards investigating the external influences of dress and how specific clothing choices impact others' perceptions of you. This is particularly true when investigating specific work environments including healthcare, academia, and within SEPP (Gosling & Standen, Lubker et. al, 2005; 1998; Roach, 1997). Despite the research on self-perceptions based on attire being limited, previous research provides a foundation for future research in this area.

Within the general workplace, wearing different variations of attire (e.g., formal versus informal) has been found to result in distinct differences in the reported self-perceptions and attributes from participants (Peluchette & Karl, 2007). The participants, graduate students who had

worked at least 20 hours a week and had reported wearing the various types of workplace attire, were provided a survey that gauged their dress preference and self-perceptions associated. These researchers specifically found that individuals who dressed more formally reported feeling more authoritative, trustworthy, and competent, while their casually dressed counterparts felt friendlier. Participants also reported a higher sense of productivity and accomplishment when dressed formally, highlighting the effects of dress on perceived behaviors as well. Kwon (1994) expanded on this idea and investigated the potential gender differences between the self-perception differences of their subjects. Through exploring these differences, the impacts of gender norms and socialization were revealed. The researcher discovered that males believed that dressing properly for work would increase their occupational attributes (i.e., feelings of competence, intelligence, and professionalism), whereas females did not believe dress was related to occupational attributes. This finding aligns with a concept from objectification theory (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997) which explains that women tend to perceive and describe their body in terms of external appearance and function, including dress and body shape, rather than describing it with internal traits, such as feeling accomplished or successful. This theory further supports these findings from Kwon (1994) as women in the workforce are generally placed in or assume roles that take external appearance into more consideration due to gender stereotyping and have their accomplishments often minimized (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997).

As for specific workplace environments, there has been evidence of an impact of attire on how others perceive the self. Barnes and Rosenthal (1985) investigated the external characteristics of experimenters, including attire and attractiveness, and how it would effect subjects' performance on various cognitive tasks and their assessment of the experimenter. A significant effect was revealed in that the attractive and formally dressed experimenters were rated the most positively, highlighting the idea of the researchers that being well-dressed added to perceived attractiveness levels. However, there was no impact on the participants' performance on the cognitive task regardless of experimenter appearance. Continuing within academia, the impact of graduate

teaching assistant attire was also investigated, and results showed that the more professionally dressed the graduate teaching assistant, the more positive impression that was left on students (Roach, 1997). Further, that positive impression also led to an overall enhanced student perception of the graduate TA and their actual course performance, less misbehavior and more learning (Roach, 1997). Conversely, Chatelain (2015) did not find any significant effects of academics' attire on the students' perceptions of their social attributes of approachability and likeability. Self-perceptions were not investigated in this context, but a factor included in the above study, age, may be especially relevant to the present study. With the inclusion of graduate student trainees in SEPP in the present study, who are generally closer in age with their clients, exploring the influence of SEPP practitioner age on their perceptions, attitudes and experiences based on attire will also be investigated. This closeness in age to the client may bridge a gap between the practitioners and client's expectations of how the SEPP practitioner should be dressed due to a potential shared knowledge of clothing trends for their respective age group. This may make clothing decisions easier for the practitioner and induce confidence.

The effects of attire on perceptions made by the self and others within the healthcare field have also been examined. Specifically, Gosling and Standen (1998) investigated the aspects of non-verbal communication like attire, facial expression, and posture. These factors were assessed to see if they played a role in patients attributing the personality traits of "competence, trustworthiness, and ability to care to general practitioners" (Gosling & Standen, 1998, p. 188). In this study, patients in a waiting room were shown photos of either a male or female doctor dressed in various types of attire ranging from formal to casual (Gosling & Standen, 1998). Based on the participants' personality trait ratings of the photos, the researchers found that attire was only significant for the male doctors wearing a white lab coat (formal attire), and that the influence of female doctor's facial expression, smiling, completely superseded any impact attire had on subjects' perceptions of the doctor's personality traits. Gender differences were also investigated within a therapy setting, and the study examined the influence of a male therapist's attire and sitting arrangement on

subjects' perceptions of the therapist's attractiveness, expertise, and trustworthiness (Gass, 1984). Male undergraduate students rated the therapist as the most trustworthy and experienced when he was sitting behind a desk, while female subjects did not share that same perception. As for attire, the casually dressed therapist that was not sitting behind a desk was rated the most attractive for both male and female participants. It is important to note that this study did not specify what casual versus formal attire looked like, unlike previous studies previously discussed, which may impact applicability of these results. Finally, a self-perception and behavior study was conducted not explicitly in a healthcare setting but included an article of clothing that is commonly associated with healthcare professionals, a white lab coat. Adam and Galinsky (2012) investigated the idea of enclothed cognition, which states that attire has two ways it impacts the wearers psychological processes including (a) the wearing of a specific piece of clothing, and (b) placing a symbolic meaning on an article of clothing. These researchers found that by simply wearing a white lab coat, the participants performed better on an attention task than those who did not wear a white lab coat. Also, supporting the second part of enclothed cognition, the study revealed that participants who were told the white lab coat they were wearing is one a doctor would wear did better on a Stroop test than the participants who were told they were wearing a painter's coat.

As for the research on attire within SEPP settings, athlete perceptions of their SEPP practitioners based on attire has been investigated. The perceived effectiveness of performance enhancement consultants (PEC's) was examined using four characteristics including ethnicity, gender, build, and clothing (Lubker et. al, 2005). Researchers recruited student-athletes to assess their perceived effectiveness of the PECs based on the four factors and they found that the more easily adaptable characteristics, clothing, and build, were the most influential for student-athletes making the effectiveness assessments. This study also demonstrates applicability and external validity, as the PECs photos and the participant sample represented a more diverse population according to demographic variables. Another study within SEPP examined how the body mass index (BMI) and attire of female sport psychology consultants (SPCs) influenced undergraduate

student-athletes' perceptions of the SPC. Lovell et. al (2011) showed participants photos of variations of the same female SPC, differing her BMI and type of attire. Student-athletes were then asked to rate the effectiveness of the SPC and rank each photo of the SPC based on their preference to work with them. The researchers found that the SPCs dressed in sport attire were rated and ranked more highly than the SPCs in formal dress. These findings were consistent with Lubker et al. (2005) and Esters (2001) as the participants across all three studies supported the idea that clients seek services from SPC's or counselors that appear to look more alike to them, in this case having a thin build and being dressed athletically. SEPP practitioners' self-perceptions based on attire were assessed by Lubker and colleagues (2008) as they compared the athlete perceptions of effective SPCs and the self-perceptions of the SPC's themselves. Undergraduate student-athletes and SEPP practitioners with mental performance consulting experience that ranged from one to thirty years were recruited for this study and they were asked to complete the Characteristics of Effective Sport Psychology Consultants Inventory (CSEPCI; Lubker et al., 2008) to complete. This survey assessed how important the athletes and SPCs rated five factors that aim to measure SPC effectiveness, and similarities were revealed. Both SPCs and athletes rated positive interpersonal skills as the most important construct in gauging SPC effectiveness (Lubker et. al, 2008). Attire was rated moderately and highly important by both groups, revealing some support for the influence of attire on self-perceptions and effectiveness. Although for both groups, physical characteristics, such as attire, were rated as the least important factor compared to the other four factors in determining effectiveness of the SPC, it was still highly rated regardless of the rank order.

Through the findings of the previous studies, it appears that what an individual wears does have a significant influence on how they feel about themselves and on their respective behaviors (Johnson & Lennon, 2015). With the wide support of this idea, it may encourage individuals to let the control to fall back into their own hands and make clothing decisions that enhance their own psychological benefits. This is especially relevant in workplace environments where attire is the

base of many judgements and perceptions made about the self (Kwon, 1994). The results revealed by Kwon (1994) inspired the present study to include an investigation into the self-perceptions of attire based on demographic variables like gender, especially because SEPP practitioners operate in a male-dominated field. Within SEPP environments, the investigation into this influence of attire on perceptions has been briefly addressed (Lubker et. al, 2008), however the present study aims to gain a deeper understanding of the full implications that attire has on the practitioner. The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of attire on perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of SEPP practitioners during applied work. Demographic variables, such as gender identity, work experience, and age were also collected to describe this population. The study sought to answer three research questions: (1) How are self and social perceptions influenced by attire, (2) what are the attitudes and interests towards clothing, and (3) what are the experiences of SEPP practitioners regarding attire.

One of the goals of the present research is to further expand on this idea within a sport and performance-related context and explore how the behaviors and attitudes of individuals involved in these environments are influenced by attire. Specifically, the present study focused on investigating the perceptions and attitudes of sport, exercise, and performance psychology practitioners based on their attire and the potential influence of practitioners' demographic characteristics play a role as well. By taking a more critical and holistic examination into the implications of attire on self-perceptions, practitioners were able to share their voice and own experiences with their attire choices during athlete or client interactions. This line of research aimed to facilitate a conversation about perceptions and attire amongst SEPP professionals, offered support and understanding, and discover the paths needed to reach those psychological benefits and present their real selves while engaging in their consulting and observing sessions with confidence. The results of this study aimed to address the gap in literature regarding the perceptions, attitudes, and experiences based on attire, specifically within SEPP. The findings also provide a foundation for future attire research

within this domain and offer insight, guidance, and validation to the practitioner's providing these important mental performance services to their athletes and clients.

CHAPTER 2

METHODS

Design

The present study was exploratory and descriptive in nature. It was exploratory in that the research questions proposed aimed to investigate the influence of attire on perceptions, attitudes and experiences of SEPP practitioners and are novel in the field of SEPP.

Participants

The present sample was comprised of 131 participants: SEPP graduate students ($n = 49$, 37.4%) and early career professionals ($n = 82$, 62.6%). The participants mean age was 30.4 ($SD = 5.9$) ranging between 22 and 53 years old (18 did not disclose their age). Participants identified as female ($n = 75$; 57.3%), male ($n = 52$; 39.7%), genderqueer ($n = 1$; 0.8%), and nonbinary ($n = 1$; 0.8%); two participants preferred to not disclose their gender identity. In this sample, 81.7% ($n = 107$) of participants were White, 4.6% ($n = 6$) were Black or African American, and 6.1% ($n = 8$) were multiracial. Regarding Certified Mental Performance Consultant (CMPC) status, 24.4% ($n = 32$) reported that yes, they were certified, 55.0% ($n = 72$) were in progress of meeting certification requirements, and 20.6% ($n = 27$) reported having no intention of getting certified. Full demographic information can be found in Table 1.

Instruments

Data was collected using a Qualtrics (Provo, UT) survey and can be found in Tables 1, 2 and 3. The first part gathered demographic information, the second measured perceptions based on attire, the third measured clothing interests, and the fourth assessed the experiences of SEPP practitioners regarding attire. Each section is described below. The present survey was adapted from previous surveys, described forthcoming, and through a peer-review expert session. The research team collaborated during the peer-review expert session to discuss and decide on the components of the survey.

Demographics

Demographic data were collected with seventeen questions and can be found in Table 1 at the end of this chapter. The demographic questions included the following: age, race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, religious identity, current region of residence, region of training, education, training level, experience (time), client population (sport/profession). Three additional questions were adapted from the Characteristics of Effective Sport Psychology Consultants Inventory (CESPCI, Lubker et al., 2008) and included “What do your degrees specialize in?”, “Are you an AASP certified consultant?” (updated to reflect CMPC language), and “What level of athletes/performers do you primarily work with as a consultant?”

Self-Prescribed and Social-Prescribed Adjective Traits

The second part of the survey assessed self- and social- perceptions via endorsement of fourteen adjectives. The self-prescribed and social-prescribed adjective traits were measured using a 6-point Likert scale (1 = not at all, 6 = extremely). For self-prescribed traits, adjectives were assessed using the following question, “To what degree does attire influence your own feelings of...,” and, for social-prescribed, “To what degree does attire influence the way others perceive you as....” The list of fourteen adjective traits assessed and included in the present study’s questionnaire were adapted from a study by Peluchette and Karl (2007) and selected during the peer expert session. The five adjectives from Peluchette and Karl (2007) were chosen based on their content appropriateness and were trustworthy, professional, approachable, competent, and confident. The other nine include competence, capability, belonging, trustworthiness, self-respect, approachableness, professionalism, self-esteem, empowerment, confidence, morality, ethicality, sport contextual/specific intelligence, and attractiveness.

Clothing Interest and Attitudes

To investigate clothing interests, experiences, and the self-prescribed attitudes based on attire, the third section included eight adapted statements (out of 89) from the Creekmore Clothing Interest Questionnaire (Creekmore, 1971). The statements were answered on a 5-point Likert scale

(1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The statements were adapted in order to reflect the current lexicon and to relate them to a sport and performance context. For example, the original statement, “I feel more part of the group if I am dressed like my friends” was changed to “I feel more part of the team or sport if I am dressed like my clients and fellow colleagues.” The questionnaire has demonstrated construct validity based on significant agreement between factor and subscale scores as investigated by Gurel and Deemer (1975). Other statements included are eight statements that were chosen based on content appropriateness and are, “the way I look in my clothes is important to me.”, “I have something to wear for any occasion (SEPP related) that occurs.”, “I plan for and prepare clothes to wear (several days) in advance.”, “I wear clothes that everyone is wearing even though they may not look good on me.”, “I feel more part of the group (team/sport) if I am dressed like my colleagues/clients.”, “I have gone places and then wished after I got there that I had not gone because my clothes were not suitable.”, “I select clothes that are conservative in style.”, and “I find it difficult to buy clothes suitable for the temperature.”. The original Creekmore scale is included in the appendix in its entirety (see Appendix B).

Open-Ended Questions

The final section included open-ended questions for participants to consider when approaching SEPP situations and client interactions. The majority of questions were developed by the author and the research team during the peer expert session. One, “How does your mood influence your attire choices?”, was adapted from a study by Solomon and Schopler (1982). These questions included “What factors contribute to what you decide what to wear to athlete/performer/client consultation sessions? During practice observation versus game or performance observations?”, “Have you ever felt uncomfortable or judged based on what you were wearing to these athlete/performer/client interactions? If yes, please expand on what aspects you feel you were judged upon and by whom.”, “Do you discuss your attire choices with others? If yes, who?”, “Has anyone ever commented on your attire? If yes, please expand on the content of the comments and who said them.”, “What do you perceive as professional attire in SEPP settings?”,

“How does your own body image influence your attire choices?”, and “How does your mood influence your attire choices.

Procedure

The study received approval from the Institutional Review Board and then data collection began. Participants were recruited by posting on the SportPsy Listserv and through contacting SEPP graduate students and program directors directly via public email. The method of recruitment by posting the survey link via Qualtrics (Provo, UT) on the SportPsy Listserv aimed to reach the early career professionals as many SEPP professionals and students are subscribed to this list. To recruit the graduate student trainees, a list of graduate schools with their respective second year master's students or doctoral student's emails was created by referring to the Directory of Graduate Programs in Applied Sport Psychology (Burke et. al, 2018), searching graduate program websites, and then collecting public email addresses. Once the list of graduate students was created, the author then emailed the students individually and asked them to participate. If student emails were not publicly available, program directors were contacted and asked to share the questionnaire with their second-year master's students, and doctoral students, where applicable. Participants were eligible based on the following inclusion criteria: (1) early career professionals that are no more than 10 years post-graduation, (2) second-year masters students or doctoral students who are currently enrolled in a SEPP program, (3) have provided mental skills training services (professionally or in practicum or internship), and (4) have worked with athletes or other populations in a SEPP manner (i.e., creative arts performers, military personnel, first responders). Any persons under the age of 18, or who do not meet the inclusion criteria were excluded from participation. These inclusion criteria were included in the email and SportPsy listserv post. The online Qualtrics questionnaire took approximately 30 minutes to complete. Participant information was kept anonymous by compiling the data in an aggregate form to help protect participant identity. The questions asked were broad enough as though identifying individual participants

would be difficult. Once all data were generated using Qualtrics software, it was entered and further analyzed using Microsoft Excel (Version 2202).

Analysis

To examine research question one, “How are self and social perceptions influenced by attire?”, and two, “What are the attitudes and interests towards clothing?”, descriptive data were analyzed using measures of central tendency and frequencies. To analyze research question three, “What are the experiences of SEPP practitioners regarding attire?”, open-ended question responses were coded using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2012). The open-ended question responses were coded using this method to identify and organize the patterns of meaning and themes across the future data set (Braun & Clarke, 2012). Specifically, these themes were identified using a semantic approach in thematic analysis (TA) as it facilitates an explicit identification of what the participant meant in their response and avoids looking for anything beyond what the participant has written in response to the open-ended questions from the present study (Braun & Clarke, 2012). To begin this coding process, the primary investigator and second author individually read over the responses to each question, read over it again, and then engaged in member reflections via identifying the messages that stood out, overlapping ideas, and the general themes of each question. Once this process was complete by both members for each question, the researchers then came back together to compare their notes and collaborated to organize the patterns of meaning and general themes. The primary author then consulted with a critical friend who was asked to review the codes independently and then compare independently to the researcher’s theme to identify any potential biases or contrasting messages. The critical friend agreed with the themes identified and compared notes on categorization. Biases that came up while coding the qualitative data were addressed and acknowledged by the primary investigator via making researcher notes. The critical friend was used as a strategy to enhance confirmability, “the qualitative equivalent to objectivity” (Sparkes & Smith, 2014, as cited in Smith & Sparkes, 2019, p. 332). This strategy aligns with the semantic approach of TA in that it aims to explicitly interpret findings in a way that represents the

views and experiences of the participants rather than the biases of the researchers (Smith & Sparkes, 2019).

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics

<u>Background Variable</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Range</u>
Age	113		30.4	5.9	22-53
Race	131				
Asian or Asian American	5	3.8			
Black or African American	6	4.6			
Hispanic or Latino/Latina/Latinx	4	3.1			
White	107	81.7			
Indian Subcontinent	1	0.8			
Multiracial	8	6.1			
Ethnicity	92				
Mexican American/Hispanic	3	3.2			
Caucasian/White/Non-Hispanic/American	69	75.0			
French Canadian	2	2.2			
Jewish-American	2	2.2			
South Asian	3	3.2			
Israeli	1	1.1			
British/Canadian	2	2.2			
East Asian	1	1.1			
Irish & Native American	2	2.2			
Cuban	1	1.1			
Italian	2	2.2			
Colombian	1	1.1			
Asian-Indian American	1	1.1			
Jamaican	1	1.1			
Swedish	1	1.1			
Current Residence	131				
New England	3	2.3			
Middle Atlantic	13	9.9			
East North Central	19	14.5			
West North Central	2	1.5			
South Atlantic	34	26.0			
East South Central	7	5.3			
West South Central	13	9.9			
Mountain	14	10.7			
Pacific	16	12.2			

Outside U.S.	7	5.3
Training Location	111	
New England	9	8.1
Middle Atlantic	9	8.1
West North Central	5	4.5
South Atlantic	43	38.7
East South Central	9	8.1
West South Central	4	3.6
Mountain	16	12.2
Pacific	16	12.2
Sexual Orientation	131	
Straight	109	83.2
Gay	1	0.8
Lesbian	8	6.1
Bisexual	6	4.6
Pansexual	3	2.3
Queer	4	3.1
Gender Identity	131	
Female/Cisgender Female	75	57.3
Male/Cisgender Male	52	39.7
Genderqueer/Gender nonconforming	1	0.8
Nonbinary	1	0.8
Prefer not to disclose	2	1.5
Identify as Religious	130	
No	84	64.6
Yes	46	35.4
Religious Identity	46	
Christianity	25	54.3
Catholic	10	21.7
Judaism	5	10.9
Quakerism	1	2.2
Christian & Non-denominational	1	2.2
Buddhism	2	4.3
Mormon	2	4.3
Currently In College	131	
Yes	49	37.4
No	82	62.6
Degree In Progress	59	
Master's degree	25	42.4
Doctoral degree	25	42.4
Other- Not Specified	6	10.2
Non-Matriculating Student	1	1.7
Continuing Education	1	1.7

Non-degree Seeking	1	1.7
Highest Degree Earned	129	
Bachelor's Degree	18	14.0
Master's Degree	75	58.1
Doctoral Degree	36	27.9
Area(s) of Specialization	131	
Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology	88	67.2
Clinical Psychology	3	2.3
Sport Psychology and Counseling	32	24.4
Sport Psychology and Clinical Psychology	8	6.1
Years of SEPP experience	131	
0 - 1 years	18	13.7
2 - 3 years	35	26.7
3 - 4 years	18	13.7
4 - 6 years	19	14.5
6 - 8 years	14	10.7
8 - 10 years	13	10.0
> 10 years	14	10.7
CMPC Certified	131	
Yes	32	24.4
No, but in progress	72	55.0
No, and no intention to become certified	27	20.6
Primary Clientele	127	
Youth	0	0
High School	2	1.6
Collegiate	30	23.6
Professional	3	2.4
Olympic	1	0.8
Military	21	16.5
First Responders	0	0
Multiple populations	70	55.1
Individual/Team	131	
Individual	17	13.0
Team	18	13.7
Both	92	70.2
Tactical populations	3	2.3
N/A	1	0.8

Note. N = 131

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Self and Social Perceptions

Results demonstrated that participants' view of their attire was important in influencing both their self and social perceptions, providing insight to research question one. Specifically with self-perceptions, participants reported on a Likert scale of 1 “not at all” to 6 “extremely”, that attire influenced how confident ($M = 3.95$, $SD = 1.42$), approachable ($M = 4.29$, $SD = 1.33$), and professional ($M = 4.34$, $SD = 1.32$) they felt, the means for these adjectives were the highest compared to the others. Participants only slightly felt that attire had an impact on how moral ($M = 2.02$, $SD = 1.32$) or ethical ($M = 2.59$, $SD = 1.64$) they perceived themselves to be. When assessing the degree of how attire influences their social perceptions, it was found that overall, participants rated each adjective trait as having the same or more of an influence on their social perceptions than their self-perceptions, see Table 2 for all reported measures of central tendency for the self and social perceptions. This heightened influence was most prevalent for competence, capableness, and sport specific intelligence. Participants reported that attire moderately influenced how approachable ($M = 4.54$, $SD = 1.12$), professional ($M = 4.72$, $SD = 1.14$), belonging ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 1.32$), and self-respecting ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 1.23$) others perceived them to be.

Table 2
Self and Social Perceptions

Adjective Trait	Self-Prescribed		Social-Prescribed	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Competence	3.05	1.47	3.96	1.08
Capableness	2.89	1.42	3.88	1.09
Belongingness	3.89	1.38	4.14	1.32
Trustworthiness	3.21	1.51	3.88	1.22
Self respect	3.88	1.52	4.02	1.23
Approachableness	4.29	1.33	4.54	1.12
Professionalism	4.34	1.32	4.72	1.14
Self esteem	3.55	1.56	3.63	1.43
Empowerment	3.40	1.49	3.39	1.36
Confidence	3.95	1.42	3.95	1.26
Morality	2.02	1.32	2.63	1.48
Ethicalness	2.59	1.64	2.89	1.58
Sport Specific Intelligence	2.97	1.57	3.87	1.38
Attractiveness	3.55	1.39	3.84	1.34

Note: The adjective traits were rated on a Likert scale of 1 “not at all” to 6 “extremely”.

Clothing Interest and Attitudes

Measures of central tendency were also used to assess research question two which explored the attitudes and interests of SEPP practitioners towards attire. They were asked to rate their degree of agreement on a Likert scale of 1 “strongly disagree” to 5 “strongly agree”. Results showed that participants agreed the most with the statement, “I have something to wear for any SEPP related occasion that occurs” ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 0.99$). Results also revealed that participants feel that the way they look in their clothes is important ($M = 3.89$, $SD = 0.90$) and that they feel more part of the team if they are dressed like their colleagues and clients ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 1.08$). Participants disagreed the most with the statement, “I have gone to SEPP related places and then wished after I got there that I had not gone because my clothes were not suitable” ($M = 1.99$, $SD = 1.01$). See Table 3 for all reported measures of central tendency for each of the clothing attitudes questions.

Table 3
Clothing Attitudes and Interests

<u>Clothing Attires and Interest Questions</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
The way I look in my clothes is important to me.	3.89	0.90
I have something to wear for any SEPP related occasion that occurs.	3.93	0.99
I plan for and prepare clothes to wear several days in advance.	2.25	1.26
I wear clothes that everyone is wearing even though they may not look good on me.	2.18	1.00
I feel more part of the team or sport if I am dressed like my clients and colleagues.	3.82	1.08
I have gone to SEPP related places and then wished after I got there that I had not gone because my clothes were not suitable.	1.99	1.01
I select clothes that are conservative in style.	3.45	0.97
I find it difficult to buy clothes suitable for the temperature.	2.16	1.14

Note: The degree of agreement for each question was rated on a Likert scale of 1 “strongly disagree” to 5 “strongly agree”.

Open-Ended Responses

Thematic analysis was used to analyze the open-ended question responses. The frequency of “yes” and “no” responses was counted and reported for each question. Blank responses were coded as “nonresponses” and not included in the analysis. The responses coded as “yes” indicated that the participant had an experience related to the question and “no” responses indicated that the participant did not experience anything related to the question.

Body Image and Attire

For the first open ended question, “How does your own body image influence your attire choices?”, a total of 101 codes were identified as a “yes” response, 21 participants responded “no”, and there were nine nonresponses. Six major themes emerged, (a) fluctuation of body image, (b) body type, (c) purpose of attire, (d) gender differences of practitioner and client(s), (e) fit of attire, and (f) finding a middle ground. Quotes from participants that represent these themes included, “Definitely, I want to make sure that the clothes I wear make me look good and don’t draw attention to myself. It is also a confidence booster when I have an outfit that I’m proud of.”, and “I am often met with low self-esteem because of the weight I have gained post collegiate athletics so I wear looser fitting clothing in hopes that no one will be able to see how much weight I have actually put on.” The gender differences of practitioner and client(s) theme is exemplified by the following direct quote:

I think my body image particularly identifying as female has the most influence depending on if I am working in person with a male or female team. I think more intently at what I'm wearing if with a male team.

The variability of body image and the desired fit of clothing was represented by responses like these, “Yes, days I don't feel great in my body I may wear more loose wearing clothes versus days I am feeling really good I wear tighter or nicer looking clothes.”, and “Yes, simply to make sure clothes fit properly (not too baggy or too form fitting).” Participants reported an overall desire for well-fitting clothing.

Mood and Attire

Six themes emerged among the responses to the second question addressing the influence of mood on attire choices, (a) weather, (b) comfort, (c) colors, (d) effort, (e) dichotomy of mood, and (f) influence of attire on mood. Of the responses, 97 were coded as “yes”, 23 responded “no”, and 11 were coded as “nonresponses.” One participant described this influence as “dynamically interrelated.” The following quote that highlights the influence of the mood continuum included:

Greatly. If I am tired/grumpy/depressed, I am likely to just throw on whatever I see first. Whereas if I have more energy and feeling upbeat/happy, I may spend a little more time and energy picking an outfit for the day.

Further, respondents detailed the influence of the variability in their mood on attire, “Low mood often has me drawn towards drawer colors, baggier fit, more comfort whereas upbeat mood draws me to color, slimmer fit clothes”, and inversely how attire enhanced their mood, “I think I sometimes dress in certain ways to cheer myself up! So, it’s more like my attired influences my mood.” The response, “If it’s cold and I’m having an off day I’ll opt for cozier outerwear like a hoodie rather than more form fitting.”, represents the triadic relationship between weather, mood, and attire.

Comments Based on Attire

Participants were also asked to reflect on the comments made about their attire by individuals in their applied environments and to expand on the content of the messages. There were 98 responses coded as “yes”, 24 as “no” and nine as “nonresponse.” The eight themes to emerge included, (a) compliments, (b) professional attire, (c) unwanted comments, (d) variety in settings throughout the day, (e) representative of team/group, (f) gender differences, (g) relationship differences, and (h) self-critical thoughts. Participants reported receiving many compliments, for example, “Yes, most of the comments I have received are compliments about a specific item I’m wearing from the coaches, other support staff, or the athletes.” Specifically, “I like those shoes” and

"that's a nice jacket, I like the color.", and "Yes. I was told I look very professional which was nice to hear." Unfortunately, the opposite was also reported. For example:

Yes. I was in a tank top in a psychiatry and behavioral health virtual meeting last year because it was summer, we were remote, and my home office is on the 3rd floor. Afterwards I was verbally reprimanded by our Chief Psychologist who told me my colleagues would never take me seriously if I showed up to meetings in a tank top.

Additional unwanted comments include, "Negative experience. Coach commenting on my clothing in a suggestive manner, was wearing a sweater." Participants reported a wide variety of comments related to the population they work with, including, "I wear a suit when conducting important trainings to Soldiers. They appreciate it. I think if they have to wear a uniform, I should also dress professionally.", "Yes. I am often told by supervisors that I do not dress formally enough.

However, I am often complemented by soldiers they appreciate and enjoy my attire choices.", and "Yes, coaches and student-athletes I have worked with have commented on my attire before games when coaches are required to wear suits and I have joined them. It was from coaches and athletes and culturally appropriate for the sport." Other comments, verbal, "There have been compliments, and at the same time self-awareness kicks in in terms of the flip side.", and non-verbal, "Not to my face. I had suspicions that some of the male players on the team would make comments under their breath or when I wasn't around.", led to internalized beliefs about the self. Participants experienced being on the receiving end of many comments, positive and negative in nature.

Factors Contributing to Attire Choices

For question four, five themes emerged, (a) weather, setting, (b) client(s), (c) team/group culture, (d) expectations, and (e) fitting in for a total of 126 codes identified as "yes", zero as "no", and five as "nonresponse". Based on these responses, there are many factors that contribute to what SEPP practitioners decide to wear during their applied work. For example, quotes included, "It depends on the particular event or environment. More professional for performance and

competitions, athletic or sportswear for practices, business casual for individual consultations.”, “Location, type of consultation, content of the class, weather, team or individual attire.”, and:

I usually dress a bit more "professionally" in my first meetings with teams/clients, then become more casual as I build out the relationship. I also consider the culture of the team itself, age of the clients, whether I have team gear, and preferences of the department. I usually do not have much of a difference between practices and games, though I occasionally wear more athletic clothes (e.g., joggers) to practices and don't when attending games.

Participants also held differing opinions on fitting in via their attire, for example, “I wear what the coaches and other supporting staff wear”, and “I do not wear clothes that make me look like a coach or a team member because I’m not. I dress professional casual regardless.” The expectation theme is described through the use of dress codes:

Our company has a dress code (business casual while in the office) but within that I think comfort and then clean appearance are the two biggest factors. When we go out into the field, I also consider appropriateness to the environment (flats and slacks in the desert isn't practical and won't gain credibility with my particular audience).

The process of deciding what to wear in various SEPP settings can be complicated as displayed through the participants responses and the many factors that they mentioned they consider.

Feelings of Uncomfortableness and Judgement Based on Attire

For question five, participants were asked to reflect on if they have ever felt uncomfortable or judged based on their attire choices worn in applied environments, and 57 responses were coded as “no” and 13 were coded as “nonresponses.” Of the 61 “yes” coded responses, seven themes were identified, (a) overdressed versus underdressed, (b) weight and body type, (c) fitting in, (d) too much effort, (e) perceived power differences, (f) gender differences, and (g) verbal and non-verbal. The first theme is described through these quotes, “I may be judged by client parents in consultations for underdressing. I may be judged in team settings (by the athletes) for over dressing.”, “Yes, if I am overly dressed up or professional attire to an event where

everyone else is dressed down and casually then I feel uncomfortable and potentially judged.”, and one participant's experience highlights this discrepancy further:

Once wore a suit to a game and had staff ask if I was interviewing for a job despite other medical professionals wearing dress pants and jacket. Expectation may have been to wear athletic clothing like the team, coaches, and support staff.

The weight and body type theme was further supported with the following examples, “Yes just in the way that I don't look like my athletes, most of whom are fit and thin. Also, gender plays a role, because I get treated differently when I'm consulting boys rather than girls.”, and “Certainly felt judged at times when I was a bit heavier in weight.” Participants also revealed a difference in their experiences based on the client(s) and colleagues or bosses, “With collegiate female athletes I did not feel uncomfortable or judged. With high school and college-aged males I felt more self-conscious and aware of my clothing choices.”, and “Only when I had bosses who were a bit sketchy and toed the line of sexual harassment very closely. I've never felt judged by an athlete, mainly older and more conservative supervisors in the industry.” The comments made about practitioners and their attire unfortunately elicited feelings of uncomfortableness and judgement while they were providing their services.

Discussions About Attire Choices

Participants were also asked if they discussed their attire choices with others and 93 responses were coded as “yes”, 33 as “no”, and five as “nonresponses.” Three major themes emerged, (a) consulting individuals in the field, (b) reliance on women, and (c) influence social circles. Participants discussed their attire choices with those in their professional and personal lives, for example, “Yes, with everyone honestly. My family, my colleagues, and my friends as well.”, “Yes, our department discusses our approach.”, and:

I absolutely discuss my attire choices, and typically with anyone who asks. I usually explain that I am quite intentional about my clothing selections as I feel it is a helpful way of building rapport

with athletes (shoes in particular are a great conversation starter). I have discussed these choices with clients, peers, coaches, administrators, etc.”

Specifically, several participants, regardless of gender identity, reported consulting with the women in their lives regarding their attire choices, “Yes, other women in the field”, “Yes, my wife.”, “When I was in graduate school completing internship/practicum - yes. Discussed it with the other women in my cohort”, and “I’m terrible with colors, so I ask my girlfriend if colors match before I present sometimes.” Overall, participants reported having these discussions with colleagues, bosses, mentors, co-consultants, clients, friends, family, and partners.

Professional Attire in SEPP Settings

Finally, participants were prompted with the question of what they perceive as professional attire in SEPP settings. The majority of the sample was coded as “yes” responses (n = 127), with only four “nonresponses.” Nine themes emerged, (a) casual, (b) athletic wear, (c) business casual, (d) environment, (e) setting, (f) culture, (g) client, (h) weight, and (i) conservative. Participants deemed a wide range of attire choices as professional, for example, “Polo, joggers/slacks/jeans, nice shoes.”, “I perceive professional attire in SEPP to be upscale athleisure wear. I think nice joggers, leggings, team t-shirts, quarter zips, and sneakers are acceptable.”, “It depends. Big it depends. Ranges from athletic to professional.”, and “Tennis shoes, golf pants/khakis/dress pants. Things that are not jeans, sweatpants, or leggings. Polos or team jackets/sweatshirts or business casual attire.” Specific adjectives were frequently used to describe professional attire, such as, “Conservative athletic clothing.”, “Something conservative, clean and crisp looking, but not too overdressed”, and “Athletic casual, business casual, or business attire depending on the context.” Participants also noted the uniqueness of this field in this context, “Whatever helps the SEPP person fit into their environment.”, “Flexibility is key since SEPP settings can include anything from practices to games to individual sessions to formal team sessions”, and:

I think SEPP professional attire is a lot different than other professions, it's usually much more casual. I honestly would feel weird and judged if I were to show up to a practice setting in "business casual" attire. What I think of as professional is what the coaching staff/players wear and one step up. If they were wearing leggings or yoga pants and a team shirt, I would wear slacks or dark wash jeans and a team shirt.

The responses to the last open-ended question further exposed the loose definition of professional attire when working in SEPP settings due to the amorphous boundaries that exist within mental performance consulting.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to gain a deeper understanding of the influences of attire on SEPP practitioner's perceptions, attitudes, and experiences associated with their applied work. Attire was found to have an influence on both the self and social perceptions of practitioners based on their endorsement of various adjective traits. Attire influenced how professional, approachable, and confident participants felt within their setting. It was also revealed that social perceptions were consistently rated equally or higher in their degree of influence than self-perceptions for all the adjective traits assessed. Participants also revealed that they feel that the way they look in their clothes is important to them and that they have appropriate attire for any SEPP related situation. The experiences of SEPP practitioners based on their attire were explored through the open-ended questions and major themes emerged for each. Participants body image and mood influenced their attire choices and vice versa. Comments made to practitioners based on attire were also investigated, revealing both compliments and suggestive comments. Some of these comments and other experiences were brought up by participants when asked to reflect on times when they felt judged or uncomfortable based on their attire worn during applied work. When asked if they discuss attire choices with others, it was often reported that participants consulted with the women in their lives. The factors contributing to practitioner's attire choices included weather, setting, expectations and client(s). These factors also came into play when participants were asked to describe professional SEPP attire. A desire to define "professional" attire within SEPP was also revealed.

Overall, the findings suggest the presence that attire has on perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of SEPP practitioners. This is consistent with previous research on the social psychology of dress such that attire is important to them and that it has an influence on their perceptions (Johnson & Lennon, 2015; Peluchette & Karl, 2007). Specifically with perceptions,

there has been limited research conducted on those made about the self, however, the findings from this study have been similar to those from Kwon (1994) and Peluchette and Karl (2007). Both of those studies investigated the influence of attire on perceptions made about the self in the workplace. Peluchette and Karl (2007) also explored the impact of attire of endorsement of specific adjective traits. In that study, the traits authoritative, trustworthy, competent and friendly were rated as the most endorsed based on their attire choices. In relation to this study, the traits confident, professional, and approachable were rated the highest for both social and self-perceptions.

Another relevant finding is that participants rated each of the adjectives for the social perceptions question, “to what extent does attire influence the way that others perceive you as...?”, equally or higher than the self-perceptions question, “to what extent does attire influence your own feelings of...?” Both questions target the self, but it is interesting to note that the higher ranked responses were more associated with the social aspect of the self. Participants reported more of an impact on how attire influences how others perceive them. This finding is consistent with the idea that individuals believe their attire does impact the perceptions and impressions others make about them (Solomon & Schopler, 1982). It also parallels the narrow focus of previous literature on solely investigating how others perceive the self, based on attire, and the current study displays a continued relevance of being concerned with how others may perceive the self.

The attitudes and interests of clothing portion of the questionnaire was adapted mainly from Creekmore (1971). The responses to these Likert scale questions are consistent with some of the themes that emerged from the open-ended responses. For example, participants agreed with selecting clothes that are more conservative in nature when engaging in providing mental performance services. Similarly, conservative was a major theme and common adjective used when participants defined professional attire. As revealed through the open-ended questions, female participants reported receiving unwanted comments and advances despite attire choice. The difference in the attire worn while receiving a similar negative response demonstrates the

subjectivity of how attire is described, (e.g., conservative versus provocative), especially for women. This is consistent with previous research investigating the influence of “provocative” and “conservative” attire that women wore in the workplace in which regardless of either condition, the women were still rated as having low competence and intelligence (Gurung et al. 2018; Howelett et al. 2015). Additionally, although participants mostly disagreed with thinking it is difficult for them to find appropriate clothing for the weather and temperature, there was a major theme of weather as a determining factor in SEPP attire choices.

The open-ended responses provided valuable insight into the true day-to-day implications of attire. Themes emerged for both questions investigating the influence of body image and mood on attire choices. For example, on days where participants were in a low mood and had a negative body image, they reported opting for baggier, darker, and more comfortable clothing. On the other hand, when participants felt energized, in a high mood, and felt positive about their body image, they reported gravitating towards wearing brighter colors and putting in more effort to wear nicer clothes. These findings support previous research that suggests attire can enhance psychological benefits, such as mood, self-esteem, and body image (Adam & Galinsky, 2012; Kwon, 1994; Peluchette & Karl, 2007). The term “enclothed cognition” (Adam & Galinsky, 2012) is also supported by these results, which relates to the idea that the clothing individuals choose to wear influences their psychological processes in two ways: 1) by simply wearing clothes and 2) the symbolic meaning of the clothes. Overall, participants acknowledged the fluctuating nature of both mood and body image.

Regarding the question about the others’ comments made about practitioners’ attire, some responses mirrored the ideas of objectification theory, such as the trivialization of accomplishments and gender stereotyping (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997), specifically from the female-identified participants. Women reported receiving more judgmental and negative comments based on their attire, specifically from the men in their work environments, including being told their clothing was too tight, too distracting, and not professional enough to be taken seriously. A qualitative study that

examined workplace sexism and sexual harassment revealed a similar major theme of policing women's appearance in the workplace, which included descriptions of women being told their clothing was too distracting, and that the women appeared unprofessional, which further highlights different clothing expectations for men and women (Karami et al., 2019). Similar to objectification theory, participants more often reached out to the women in their lives about their attire choices, specifically wives, girlfriends, mothers, and female colleagues, which supports the role of gender stereotyping as there is a heavy reliance on women to make these attire choices for themselves and others. Another major theme that emerged was the effort to fit in with the team/sport/group and appear approachable. This major theme of wanting to fit in is related to findings with Lubker et al. (2005) and Esters (2001) in that clients seek services from SEPP practitioners and counselors who appear to look more alike to them. This knowledge about client preferences may be a direct influence on what practitioners decide to wear during their professional interactions. Finally, the study explored the idea behind what is perceived as professional attire in SEPP settings, and there were a wide range of attire choices deemed as professional. This variety in the responses highlights the unique nature of this field, demonstrating that what may not be considered professional in a general workplace environment, (e.g., athletic wear), is acceptable and often worn in a SEPP setting. This lack of objectivity in what is professional attire versus not is often coupled with feelings of uncertainty among SEPP practitioners, which can be difficult to manage as the attire expectations can be unclear across the variety of situations practitioners find themselves in.

Although this study provides insight into SEPP attitudes on attire choices, it is not without limitations and considerations. One limitation of this study involves the lack of a diverse representation regarding race, sexual orientation, and ethnicity. The majority of participants reported being white ($n = 107$), cisgender, and straight. Although this sample is not diverse in nature, it may be closely representative of the SEPP practitioner population. However, there was more representation from the type of training completed, CMPC status, primary clientele, and years of experience. Another limitation was that due to the exploratory and descriptive nature of this

study, the questionnaire used was not an empirically validated measure. The purpose of utilizing this questionnaire was to build a foundation for future research on the influence of attire on SEPP practitioners rather than statistically compare findings and draw conclusions. Additionally, limited previous literature on SEPP self-perceptions and attire choices may have limited the results as the scope of investigation and applicability is not vast.

Future directions for this study have been explored in hopes of addressing some of the limitations mentioned. It would be helpful to continue expanding on the present study within this field so that practitioners, mentors, graduate program directors, and other SEPP individuals can have a more objective guide into how these conversations on attire can be facilitated. These conversations could encourage practitioner's self-reflection to promote more research-based consideration and understanding of the implications of attire within the SEPP field. Additionally, future research could focus on the influences of attire within a particular demographic group. For example, investigating the experiences of only female-identified practitioners within SEPP, the impact of experience in the field, how the implementation of purposeful conversations on this topic in training and professional development settings may influence practitioners are of interest to explore. Future directions also include validating the questionnaire for this study for future use and expanding the qualitative portion to understand the experiences of practitioners based on specific characteristics (e.g., age). Additionally, through creating this dialogue about the factors that practitioners have control of, such as attire, when engaged in applied work, it aimed to fulfill another purpose of instilling feelings of confidence, empowerment, and reassurance into the lives of practitioners and build a sense of community.

Conclusion

Overall, the results of this study can be useful for SEPP practitioners in that this research can be used to explore the implications of attire of professionals in the field. The attention placed on the perceptions, attitudes and experiences of the self was purposeful in that it aimed to address a gap in the literature that mainly focused on how athletes and clients perceived practitioners. With

this study, there is now insight into both sides, (i.e., client and practitioner), that offers the opportunity to consider clothing choices in a more holistic manner. Supervisors, mentors, and directors can apply the findings to implement formal conversations about attire during graduate and professional training with mentees and graduate student trainees entering the field to better prepare them for consulting and observation. As displayed through this study, practitioners think about the implications of their attire in relation to their applied work. Therefore, sharing these inevitable thoughts and feelings can be valuable to graduate students in training and practitioners who are currently in the field alike. Especially for students in the early stages of training, the dialogue described in this study can serve as a guide when deciding how to effectively present themselves. The honesty and vulnerability of the participants in their responses is appreciated and is truly invaluable to this field of research within SEPP.

REFERENCES

- Adam, H., & Galinsky, A. D. (2012). Enclothed cognition. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(4), 918–925. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.02.008>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic Analysis. In *APA Handbook of Research Methods in Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 57–71). Chapter, American Psychological Association.
- Barnes, M. L., & Rosenthal, R. (1985). Interpersonal effects of experimenter attractiveness, attire, and gender. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48(2), 435–446. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.48.2.435>
- Burke, K. L., Sachs, M. L., & Tomlinson, R. (2018). *Directory of graduate programs in applied sport psychology*. Association for Applied Sport Psychology.
- Chatelain, A. M. (2015). The effect of academics' dress and gender on student perceptions of instructor approachability and likeability. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 37(4), 413–423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080x.2015.1056598>
- Chen, W.-C. (2021). How cultural values affect subjective well-being among older adults: The role of proximity of clothing to Self. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 22(1), 95–111. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-020-00220-0>
- Creekmore, A. M. (1971). *Methods of measuring clothing variables* (Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station Project No. 783). Michigan State University.
- Esters, I., & Ledoux, C. (2001). At-risk high school students' preferences for counselor characteristics. *Professional School Counseling*, 4(3), 165–170.
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T.-A. (1997). Objectification theory: Toward understanding women's lived experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21(2), 173–206. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00108.x>
- Gass, C. S. (1984). Therapeutic influence as a function of therapist attire and the seating arrangement in an initial interview. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 40(1), 52–57. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679\(198401\)40:1<52::aid-jclp2270400109>3.0.co;2-6](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(198401)40:1<52::aid-jclp2270400109>3.0.co;2-6)
- Gough, H. G., & Heilbrun, A. B. (1965). Adjective check list. *PsycTESTS Dataset*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t02310-000>
- Gosling, R., & Standen, P. (1998). Doctors' dress. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 172(2), 188–189. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.172.2.188c>
- Gurel, L. M., & Deemer, E. M. (1975). Construct validity of Creekmore's Clothing Questionnaire. *Home Economics Research Journal*, 4(1), 42–47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077727x7500400104>
- Gurel, L. M., & Gurel, L. (1979). Clothing interest: Conceptualization and measurement. *Home Economics Research Journal*, 7(5), 274–282. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077727x7900700501>
- Gurung, R. A., Punke, E., Brickner, M., & Badalamenti, V. (2017). Power and provocativeness: The effects of subtle changes in clothing on perceptions of working women. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 158(2), 252–255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2017.1331991>

- Hannover, B., & Kuhnen, U. (2002). "The clothing makes the self" via knowledge activation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(12), 2513–2525. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2002.tb02754.x>
- Harrison, K., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2003). Women's sports media, self-objectification, and mental health in black and white adolescent females. *Journal of Communication*, 53(2), 216–232. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2003.tb02587.x
- Howlett, N., Pine, K. J., Cahill, N., Orakçioğlu, İ., & Fletcher, B. (2015). Unbuttoned: The interaction between provocativeness of female work attire and occupational status. *Sex Roles*, 72(3-4), 105–116. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-015-0450-8>
- Johnson, K., Lennon, S. J., & Rudd, N. (2014). Dress, body and self: Research in the social psychology of dress. *Fashion and Textiles*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40691-014-0020-7>
- Johnson, K., & Lennon, S. (2015). The social psychology of dress. *Bibliographical Guides*. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474280655-bg001>
- Karami, A., Swan, S. C., White, C. N., & Ford, K. (2019). Hidden in plain sight for too long: Using text mining techniques to shine a light on workplace sexism and sexual harassment. *Psychology of Violence*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000239>
- Kwon, Y.-H. (1994). The influence of appropriateness of dress and gender on the self-perception of occupational attributes. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 12(3), 33–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887302X9401200305>
- Lennon, S. J. (1986). Additivity of clothing cues in first impressions. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 14(1), 15–21. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.1986.14.1.15>
- Lovell, G. P., Parker, J. K., Brady, A., Cotterill, S. T., & Howatson, G. (2011). Looking the part: Female sports psychologists' body mass index and dress influences athletes' perceptions of their potential effectiveness. *The Sport Psychologist*, 25(1), 82–93. <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.25.1.82>
- Lubker, J. R., Watson, J. C., Visek, A. J., & Geer, J. R. (2005). Physical appearance and the perceived effectiveness of performance enhancement consultants. *The Sport Psychologist*, 19(4), 446–458. <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.19.4.446>
- Lubker, J. R., Visek, A. J., Geer, J. R., & Watson, J. C. (2008). Characteristics of an effective sport psychology consultant: Perspectives from athletes and consultants. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 31(2), 147–165.
- Peluchette, J. V., & Karl, K. (2007). The impact of workplace attire on employee self-perceptions. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 18(3), 345–360. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1208>
- Roach, K. D. (1997). Effects of graduate teaching assistant attire on student learning, misbehaviors, and ratings of instruction. *Communication Quarterly*, 45(3), 125–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463379709370056>
- Roach-Higgins, M. E., & Eicher, J. B. (1992). Dress and identity. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 10(4), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887302x9201000401>
- Solomon, M. R., & Schopler, J. (1982). Self-consciousness and clothing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 8(3), 508–514. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167282083018>

Smith, B. M., & Sparkes, A. C. (2019). *Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Research in sport and exercise*. Routledge - Taylor & Francis Group.

Stillman, S., & Resnick, H. (1972). Does counselor attire matter? *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 19(4), 347–348. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0033076>

James, W. (1890). Empirical self and me. In *The principles of psychology* (Vol. 1-2). essay, Henry Holt and Company.

APPENDIX A

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research in social psychology on attire and dress has revealed two main areas of concern, first, how attire influences behavior and perceptions of the self and second, how it impacts the behavior and perception of others towards the self (Johnson & Lennon, 2015). These two pathways were explored due to the idea that dress has two basic functions: to modify the body and to provide nonverbal communication cues (Roach-Higgins & Eicher, 1992). As described, clothing and attire serve both our internal and external selves as it provides an outlet to communicate with others while also symbolizing our own identities and beliefs. These impacts of clothing can “help people not only present their real self, but also reach their ideal self and generate positive self-evaluation and feedback from others” (Chen, 2021, p. 98). As a result, clothing has also shown to have implications for enhancing psychological benefits to the self like positive self-esteem, body image satisfaction and enhanced confidence and self-acceptance (Kwon, 1994).

Hanover and Kuhnén (2002) added to this research via the investigation into the priming effects of clothing and how different clothing styles may affect psychological experiences like self-perceptions. Specifically, the researchers were interested in the self-descriptive adjectives that participants would use based on their attire. To test these research interests, they recruited undergraduate psychology students and asked them to show up to the experiment as either formally or casually dressed and wear specific clothes that matched the descriptions of the casually or formally dressed individuals they read about previously. This decision to provide a guide for how to dress in a certain way attempts to reduce the subjectivity of the participants attire choices so they would not self-assess what they believed to be formal or casual attire. Once the subjects arrived, they were immediately asked to describe themselves by endorsing or rejecting trait adjectives which were selected based on previous research. These trait adjectives included, “cultivated and accurate” to describe a more formally dressed individual, and “easygoing and tolerant” to describe an individual in casual wear (Hanover & Kuhnén, 2002). The findings were consistent with the researchers’ predictions as the formal dressed participants accepted the

formal trait adjectives more than the casually dressed subjects, while also processing the traits quicker. These results show support for the influence of attire on self-assessments and perceptions and provides a potential explanation for impression formation of others as well, highlighting the two areas of interest within social psychology of attire research. These areas of interest have been further explored across various applied settings like the general workplace to more specific professions like mental health, professionals, and individuals involved in academia. Within the field of sport, exercise, and performance psychology (SEPP), there is a gap that exists in the literature regarding the influence of attire. Research has been conducted mostly on the perceptions and opinions of athletes towards their sport psychology consultants and how they would rate their effectiveness and attractiveness based on dress (e.g., Lubker et al 2005; Lubker et al. 2008; Lovell et. al 2011). However, there has not been an investigation into the effect of attire on the self-perceptions of sport psychology professionals, a key perspective that has been missing.

Attire and The Workplace

Workplace attire can have implications for how individuals form impressions of fellow employees and customers and as well as for their own emotional and cognitive experiences. The type of attire may result in different responses, for example formal versus informal dress codes, which have different meanings depending on the role and work environment. The words formal and professional are also often used interchangeably in attire research but there is a distinction that must be made to clarify what is meant by each (Roach, 1997). Professional dress is more closely associated with if what you are wearing is appropriate for the demands of the role or function of your position (Roach, 1997). For example, a group fitness instructor wearing exercise attire would be considered to be dressed professionally, but not formally. With that, it is of significance to understand and solidify what the researcher means by their types of attire as it may be different across the studies conducted in this field. The common workplace colloquialism “dress for the position you want, not the one you have” illustrates the shared idea that attire and clothing choice has an influence on how people perceive others and

themselves and the inferences they consciously and subconsciously make about them. The influence of attire on the formation of judgements, impressions and other internal and external perceptions have been investigated (e.g., Johnson, Lennon & Rudd, 2014; Peluchette and Karl, 2007), therefore supporting that idea.

Research conducted by Lennon (1986) investigated the impact of single articles of clothing on first impression formation and how it compared to adjective traits. The inspiration behind this research question was rooted in the idea that specific clothing cues, like an article of clothing like a blazer or skirt, reveal a similar first impression response to adjective traits, likeability for example (Lennon, 1986). The purpose of their study was “to further investigate the apparent analogy between clothing/appearance cues and adjective trait descriptions on first impressions when the cues had no particular relevance for the type of judgement elicited” (Lennon, 1986, p. 15). Participants were presented with pictures of the same woman wearing different variations of the additive clothing cues and they were then asked to rate each on competence and sociability. In alignment with previous research and their posed hypothesis, the clothing cues assumed to produce judgements of sociability, a long skirt and boots, and the cues to predict judgments of competency, glasses and a blazer, were both significant in their impression predictions. The competency cues also included the photo of the women wearing her hair up in a bun. This conservative hairstyle in combination with the blazer and glasses can be assumed to hold more of a masculine tone as blazers and suits are part of the clear workplace attire norms for male professionals (Gurung et al., 2018). It is interesting as these cues were investigated to see if they would elicit perceptions of the woman’s competence, which is a trait that would provide a more objective assumption if they would be “good” at their job, compared to sociability which is not exactly related to job performance. Seeing as this study was conducted in the late 1980s, it presents an opportunity for this field to compare the findings to today’s norms and beliefs based simply on fashion decisions and how it relates to the current trends and impressions made based upon specific articles of clothing. Also, this study only involved female participants and the photos were of a woman, so in addition to replicating this study in more modern

times to see how much has changed, or has not, it would add more external validity to explore the potential gender differences as well.

Not only does an influence of attire on impression formation exist, but there are assumptions and judgments made about others, or in the case of the following article by Gurung and colleagues (2018), employees, based on their attire and gender orientation. This trend is even more prevalent amongst female employees and working professionals as they are generally subjected to more roles that are concerned with external appearance compared to males according to Fredrickson & Robert's objectification theory (1997). The consequences of sexual objectification and gender oppression that women face as suggested by this theory, like the trivialization of their workplace accomplishments and demeaning stereotyping based on gender and attire, are further confirmed in the findings of the following study by Gurung et al. (2018) (Fredrickson & Robert, 1997). The amount of attention and sharp focus on women's dress is highlighted in this study that investigated the effects of subtle changes in the professional work attire of female employees on participants' perceptions of their competence, intelligence, and power (Gurung et al. 2018). The results revealed that participants rated the professional women wearing an unbuttoned blouse as the least competent and least intelligent. This falls in line with a previous study that reported that women dressed in "provocative" attire were consistently rated as less competent (Howelett et al. 2015). It is important to recognize the subjectivity of "provocative" clothing and the notion that the term is most often used when talking about women's clothing choices, not men's. This idea of provocativeness was exemplified in this study with the use of an unbuttoned blouse in a formal work attire setting. Surprisingly, a converse result was also revealed as the women wearing a camisole received the lowest scores across all three dependent variables. This camisole was meant to represent the more formal and conservative option of attire, so it is potentially contradicting. A final takeaway from these results is that the women rated most powerful were the ones wearing both the unbuttoned shirt and no camisole, which is an interesting comparison to make, especially considering the adjective used to describe this clothing decision, that trait being "provocative". The researchers decided to not control for gender of the

participants when running analyses of variance (ANOVAs) for this study because there were a small number of male participants, and the covariance analyses were not significant.

As described earlier, one of the areas of focus of research on attire is the effects of attire on one's self-perceptions and behaviors. Peluchette and Karl (2007) focused on this same path and explore the influence that attire has on our own roles, interactions, and perceptions as they believed a majority of the previous research was on how attire influences other's perceptions of the self. The participants, graduate students who had worked at least 20 hours a week and had reported wearing the various types of workplace attire, were provided a survey that gauged their dress preference and self-perceptions associated. The dress preferences were formal business, business casual, and casual, very standard options in the workplace realm, and it was found that the most distinctive differences in self-perceptions existed between those who preferred business formal and casual attire, the polar opposites (Peluchette & Karl, 2007). Their study also revealed that different self-perceptions were associated with different dress preference choices, like those who wore formal business attire felt the most authoritative, trustworthy and competent, while those who wore either of the casual options felt the friendliest (Peluchette & Karl, 2007). Perceived productivity levels were also surveyed, and the respondents felt that casual clothing contributed to a much lower sense of productivity and accomplishment during the workday. Similarly, to the Gurung et. al (2018) article, gender differences were not explored, exemplifying a methodological limitation and missed opportunity to expand the external validity of the findings. The decisions made by the authors to not control for participants diversifying factors like gender and ethnicity does not accurately represent or consider the multicultural and social implications that exist and have influence within our society. The following study conducted at an earlier date did take those potential differences into consideration with a more inclusive approach.

Continuing this line of research investigating the influence of dress and attire, Kwon (1994) examined the potential gender differences of employee self-perceptions as well. Specifically, the impact of perceived effectiveness of dress mode on the enhancement of occupational attributes was explored.

Dress mode was broadly defined as being properly or not properly dressed, which is an efficient way of gauging the impact of that variable as proper dress is independently defined by your field of work. For example, being properly dressed in a business workplace may include wearing slacks or suits but compared to working in an athletic or sport setting where that attire may be considered improper as it is simply not conducive to the environment. The results revealed that employees who wore proper attire did report higher work-related attributes, like increased feelings of competence, intelligence, reliability and professionalism in the workplace, compared to when they were not properly dressed. When these results were explored through the lens of gender, it was found that the male participants generally believed that dressing properly would enhance their occupational attributes, whereas female participants did not share that same belief (Kwon, 1994). Conversely, females did report a higher interest in clothing than males, but that did not influence their opinions of how their dress wouldn't impact their occupational attributes. This may suggest that women are more in tune with the reality that clothing manipulation and overall appearance manipulation has the potential to alter both internal and external perceptions. Individuals who identify as female have been subjected to the pressure from socialization and gender norms that place such an importance on female presentation and appearance, therefore leading them to pay more attention to that than their male counterparts. These conclusions are further explained and supported via self-objectification theory (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997) which highlights the tendency for women to perceive and describe their body as a function of external appearance, like attire, instead of internal traits, like accomplishments (Harrison & Fredrickson, 2003; Johnson et al. 2014). This gender difference is especially more prominent in workplace settings which supports the present research agenda to explore this idea in different occupational fields, like sport and exercise psychology.

Academia

Research on attire within the realm of academia has also been explored through investigations into the effects of experimenters or instructors' attire on students and participants perceptions and performance on certain tasks. More focus was placed on how experimenter and instructor attire

influenced the perceptions of others towards themselves, instead of self-perceptions. This is relevant especially within research, as there is already evidence of how not only experimental settings but the experimenters themselves potentially impact treatments and subsequently, the results too. It is also of significance to acknowledge this implication on the existing replication crisis within psychological research and methodology, as those wishing to replicate may see different findings simply based on the fact that the experimenters themselves are different. Expanding on the literature about experimenter effects in research settings, Barnes and Rosenthal (1985) support that idea as they believe that “physical attractiveness, attire, and gender of experimenters are all nontrivial parts of experimental settings as they influence both participant behavior and perceptions, but their own as well” (p. 443). This belief inspired their research question which explored the impact of experimenter gender, physical attractiveness, attire, and behavior on subject’s photo-rating task, performance on a vocabulary test and their Adjective Check List (ACL) responses. The ACL responses that the researchers inquired about were on the subject’s use of the scale created by Gough and Heilbrun (1965), which the subjects filled out to assess qualities of their experimenters, like favorability, and self-confidence. Experimenter behavior was also investigated. Attractiveness was based on the ratings from undergraduate students and then computed using interrater reliability and the volunteer experimenters were just instructed to dress formally or casually. For the instructions on how to dress, the experimenters were provided a situation to dress for, for example those told to dress formally (high attire) were told to dress as if you were going on a date. Alternatively, those told to dress casually (low attire) were told to dress as if you were cleaning the garage. Although these are two very different situations that one would dress for, it is possible that the subjectivity of these attire choices may influence the perceptions of the participants in a way that was not intended. The results supported the hypothesis that participants would rate the photos of physically attractive people as more successful than the photos of the unattractive people, further supporting the “positive effect” of attractiveness (Barnes & Rosenthal, 1985). As for attire, the researchers also noted that “being well-dressed can be equated with attractiveness” which highlights the interactive effects of both (Barnes & Rosenthal, 1985, p. 438). This effect of attire was found to be most prominent in the case of mixed gender

dyads, and that within these dyads it was the experimenter dressed in high attire that was more positively perceived based on the ACL ratings.

Another study based in academia focused on how one's attire influences judgements and impressions made by others. Roach (1997) drew their attention on instructors' attire, specifically that of graduate teaching assistants (TA). This study examined the relationship of students' perceptions of their graduate teaching assistants dress and how it correlates with the student's perceptions of learning, rating of instruction and the report of student misbehaviors. Similar to the dress variable investigated in Peluchette and Karl (2007), the dress modes considered were casual versus professional dress. Overall, significant differences were found between the students' ratings of instruction based on the level of dress, professional or casual (Roach 1997). Specifically, it was revealed that the graduate teaching assistants with high professional dress, the more positive impression that was left on students. Further, that positive impression also led to an overall enhanced student perception of the graduate TA and their actual course performance, less misbehavior and more learning (Roach, 1997). Alternatively, another study within academics revealed no significance in students' perceptions of the teachers based on attire, Chatelain (2015) specifically explored the effects of attire on approachability and likeability but found no effects. With context to this study, it is important to not make over-generalizations of these findings as there could be other factors that also contribute to the student perceptions, such as the age of the instructor and classroom setting differences. Specifically, this study used graduate teaching assistants which are generally closer in age to the students than other instructors and this decreased age gap may have more significant implications for the student's perceived likelihood of engaging in misbehavior as the graduate TA's may be having to put in more effort to gain respect and control of their students. Again, it is relevant to consider the field of study and nature of the classroom environment that the graduate TA is teaching in as the attire norms may vary depending on the subject. As it relates to the current research question, sport psychology consultants' attire, in addition to the age gap between practitioner and client is worthy of investigation as well.

Healthcare

The influence of attire has also been examined within the mental health and therapeutic environment. A study by Gass (1984) attempted to clear up the mixed results that exists in previous literature looking into the impact of therapist attire on client perceptions. There have been reports of formal attire having no impact on client impression formation and therapeutic behavior as well as findings that support the claim that an influence of attire on similar variables does exist (Stillman & Resnick, 1972). There was also criticism in regard to previous studies as Gass pointed out “failures to control for systematic behavioral effects that may occur as a function of the therapist’s style of apparel” as a major limitation (p. 53). To address this weakness, they investigated the impact of the attire of a male therapist, and also included seating arrangement (desk or no desk) as an independent variable in this study. Four experimental groups were established, therapist attire (casual or formal) and therapist sitting arrangement (behind a desk or no desk at all) and analyzed using a 2 x 2 analysis of variance. Undergraduate subjects were shown photo slides and a video of the therapy session in one of the four potential conditions and then asked to rate their perceptions of the therapist’s attractiveness, expertise, and trustworthiness. The analysis revealed that the therapist dressed in casual attire and not sitting behind a desk was rated as the most attractive amongst both male and female subjects (Gass). When the therapist was sitting behind a desk, male participants perceived him both as more of an expert and more trustworthy than their female counterparts (Gass). The researcher attributed this result to the idea that female participants may have perceived the desk as a barrier to the social benefits of therapy like communication and warmth. The male participants were suggested to be more susceptible to the impact of the contextual cues that represent professionalism, like the desk in the therapeutic environment. This aligns with the ideas of objective symbols explored in the study conducted by Kwon (1994) as male participants were found to believe their clothing, another contextual cue, had more influence on their occupational attributes than females believed. Further research to see if this similar theme amongst male participants could be replicated if the therapist was a female would provide valuable insight into the complex gender differences. Major

limitations of the Gass study include the fact that the participants were not actual therapy clients nor was there enough demographic information about them provided, making it quite unrealistic to generalize these results to therapeutic initial sessions and the eventual development of counselor and client relationships. Also, the lack of gender inclusivity and diversity of the independent variable, the different therapist conditions, is indicative of the the period of time that this study was conducted in.

Within general healthcare, Gosling & Standen (1998) investigated patients' attitudes towards medical professionals' attire. Specifically, aspects of non-verbal communication like attire, facial expression, and posture were examined. These factors were assessed to see if they played a role in patients attributing the personality traits of "competence, trustworthiness, and ability to care to general practitioners" (Gosling & Standen, 1998, p. 188). The participants included patients sitting at their doctor's office who were waiting to see their general practitioners. These patients were shown a series of photos of either a male or female doctor dressed in five types of attire that ranged from very formal (wearing a white lab coat) to casual (wearing jeans). On top of dress variety, the doctors in the photos were also differing based on posture (relaxed or tense) and facial expressions (smiling or not smiling). They were then asked to rate the photos on the three personality dimensions. The results revealed distinct gender differences in that patients rated the male doctors wearing white lab coats, the most formal option, as the most competent and trustworthy (Gosling & Standen, 1998). The female doctors' facial expressions were the most influential factor on participants ratings across all three personality traits, overriding the significance of attire completely. The researchers also did not appear to assess the impact of participant gender. Adam & Galinsky (2012) did not specifically investigate the influence of clothing in a healthcare setting, but instead used a known article of clothing worn by healthcare professionals, a white lab coat, and gauged it's influence on participant behavior. The researchers introduced the idea of encloded cognition which states that the influence that clothes have on the wearer's psychological processes includes two factors, physically wearing an article of clothing and having a symbolic meaning of that specific article of clothing. In the first experiment, the participants wearing a white lab coat performed better on an attention task compared

to those who were not wearing a lab coat. To investigate the influence of the symbolic meaning of the lab coat, some participants wore a lab coat that was described as one for a doctor, and other participants wore a lab coat that was described as a painter's coat. Again, there was a significant difference revealed with the performance on the attention related task as the participants who wore the lab coat described as one for a doctor performed better on a Stroop test compared to other group of participants that wore a lab coat described as a painter's coat. These results highlight the significance of not only the physical act of wearing an article of clothing on psychological processes, but also the meaning and interpretation made about clothes by others or the self.

Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology Settings

Research on attire in SEPP, thus far, has focused on the perceptions of athletes and what they base their impressions of mental performance practitioners on. For example, Lubker, Watson, Visek, and Greer (2005) examined the impact of four personal characteristics; ethnicity, gender, build, and clothing, of performance enhancement consultants (PEC's) on how they were perceived as an effective consultant. They measured the student-athlete's perceptions of PEC's effectiveness by rating their sport knowledge, personality traits, and likelihood to sought out consulting services. (Lubker et. al, 2005). These researchers looked at first impression formation and how that influenced the athlete's perceptions of the mental performance consultants' effectiveness characteristics. Division 1 student-athletes were recruited to participate in this study, and they were shown photos of different individuals who were said to be PECs. Once shown the photos, the First Impression Questionnaire (FIQ), created by the authors, was presented to the student-athletes to complete. This questionnaire was developed to assess athletes' perceptions about PECs based on information gathered from pictures and included three major sections of questions. The first section identified demographics, the second assessed perceived effectiveness which was based on previous literature and included a scale that measured the likelihood of an athlete seeking out services (Lubker et. al, 2005). Finally, the third section of the FIQ included items that rated the strength of influence of the various PEC characteristics; build (lean versus large), dress (athletic versus

academic), gender (male versus female) and ethnicity (Caucasian versus non-Caucasian) (Lubker et. al, 2005). Although the dichotomous nature of these variables, specifically regarding gender and ethnicity, would be considered a limitation, the more detailed differentiation when describing dress was definitely a strength. Specifying the type of dress instead of just using formal or professional versus informal or casual is very relevant to this unique field as a PEC who is dressed in professional attire could be wearing either academic or athletic style clothing.

As for the results of this article, overall findings revealed that athletes first impressions are impacted by PECs' physical characteristics, the changeable characteristics of build and clothing seem to be more influential than gender and ethnicity (Lubker, et. al, 2005). Academically dressed and lean PECs rated highest amongst personality traits and likeliness of student-athletes to seek out consulting services (Lubker, et. al, 2005). In regard to gender, male mental performance consultants were consistently rated higher on sport knowledge, and female performance consultants were rated highest on personality traits, both regardless of ethnicity (Lubker, et. al, 2005). Results also supported the idea that clients wish to seek services of a helping professional who is most similar to them as non-Caucasian student-athletes rated non-Caucasian PECs higher on sport knowledge and likeliness to seek a consulting relationship (Esters, 2001). The applicability and validity of this study were strengthened with the inclusion of a more diverse variety of PEC's and athletes, which is more representative of the actual population. As mentioned earlier, the findings of this study are hopeful as it revealed that the more easily adaptable characteristics of PEC's, like clothing and build, are more influential on athletes perceptions than gender and ethnicity, it puts control back into the hands of practitioners.

As discussed thus far, individuals use nonverbal cues and contextual information like attire and body language to form impressions and assumptions about others. As found by Lubker et al. (2005), athletes are no different when it comes to making inferences about their sport psychology consultants that they use. Lovell and colleagues (2011) focused on investigating the athlete's perceptions of specifically female sport psychology consultants (SPC's). The purpose of their study was to examine how athletes'

perceptions of female SPC's are affected by SPC's physical characteristics of body mass index (BMI) and attire. To test this purpose, undergraduate students that were all engaged in regular competitive sport were recruited and asked to rate photos of the same Anglo-Caucasian female SPC that varied depending on attire and BMI. The photo conditions that were shown to the student athletes included one slide with the formally dressed SPC and one slide with the SPC dressed in sport attire, both slides displaying four photos of the SPC manipulated to represent different BMI levels (normal, preobese, obese class I, and obese class II). The student athletes were then asked to rate their perceived effectiveness of each of the SPC's displayed and rank them in order based on their preference to work with them. The SPC's BMI had the most significant effect on the athletes' rating of effectiveness and rank of preference with normal and preobese SPC's were rated and ranked higher than the obese SPC's (Lovell et al, 2011). A main effect of attire was also reported as the SPC's dressed in sport attire were rated and ranked more positively than the SPC's in formal attire. The moderating effects of athlete gender and competitive standard were also investigated, and it was found that athletes who competed at national and international competition levels rated SPC's dressed in sports attire more positively than the SPC's formally dressed, but regional level athletes did not report a significant difference in that regard. Similar SPC efficacy expectations based on attire and build were found in Lubker et al. (2005) and Esters (2001) as athletes in that study also preferred to seek sport psychology services from SPC's that appeared to be more alike to them, like those with a thin build and dressed in athletic attire, compared to their large build and formally dressed counterparts. Again, there has been support provided for the idea that the more controllable characteristics of SPC's have a large impact on the impression formation and efficacy and competency expectations made by athletes about their mental performance consultants.

Lubker et al. 2008 expanded on the existing research on the influence of attire within the SEPP field by investigating athlete perceptions of effective sport psychology consultants and the self-perceptions of the SPC's themselves. By including the consultant's perceptions, the authors were able to compare the differences between athletes and SPC's ratings of the degree of importance placed on

specific SPC characteristics. The undergraduate student athletes in this sample represented 12 sports from National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I and II institutions and reported that 67% of the athletes had worked with an SPC before (Lubker et al., 2008). As for the SPC sample, the researchers included both graduate student trainees and professionals who reported that they had mental performance consulting experience that ranged from one to thirty years. To assess the differences in perceptions between both populations, the participants, athletes and SPC's, were provided the Characteristics of Effective Sport Psychology Consultants Inventory (CSEPCI; Lubker et al., 2008). The CESPCI was developed specifically for this study as a self-report measure to assess how important athletes and SPC's rate the 31 qualities that were deemed to make SPC's effective which was based on previous literature (e.g., Consultant Evaluation Form; Partington & Orlick, 1978). The importance of these qualities was rated based on a one to six Likert scale ("not at all" to "extremely") and then the responses were analyzed using t-Tests between athletes and SPC's. Based on the ratings made about the 31 qualities, the researchers used an exploratory factor analysis to identify the five factors or constructs that represented correlations among the ratings of each characteristic. These constructs included positive interpersonal counseling skills (e.g., friendly, approachable and confidential), physical characteristics, athletic background, professional status (consulting experience and certifications), and SPC's fit into the sport culture.

The results from this study revealed that athletes rated three of the five factors, positive interpersonal skills, athletic background, and professional status, higher than the SPC's did., revealing a significant difference in perceived importance in assessing SPC effectiveness. No significant differences were found in the ratings of physical characteristics and sport culture between both sets of participants. Also, the student athletes and SPC's rank order of the importance of each factor were consistent with one another, positive interpersonal skills ranked as the most important in gauging SPC effectiveness (Lubker et al., 2008). Regarding the influence of attire, although these findings revealed that both athletes and SPC's ranked physical characteristics as among the least important compared to the other four factors, it

was still rated moderately and highly important towards the effectiveness of SPC's by both groups. Seeing as this article just barely stepped into the investigative realm of exploring the self-perceptions of SEPP professionals, the present study aims to capitalize on this opportunity to further expand on self-perceptions of SEPP practitioners and trainees based on their attire and dress.

Through this investigation into previous literature on the influence of attire on the perceptions of others and of the self, major themes and gaps in the literature have emerged. Overall, there is a consensus that attire choices have an impact on how we perceive ourselves and how attire can act as a message for others to receive (Roach-Higgins & Eicher, 1992). When exploring the potential differences across various workplace environments, it was evident that more attention was placed on the external route like looking into the efforts of identifying the cues and messages that attire sends to others and how they perceive the person wearing that specific dress style. This trend was especially prevalent in the research on individuals in specific professions like healthcare, academia and in the relevant area of interest for the present study, sport, performance, and exercise psychology environments. In addition to the lack of focus on self-perceptions in these areas, there was also not a significant amount of consideration given to the diversifying factors of the participants like gender, age, and race. As for the overall findings for this area of interest, there were both agreements and disagreements discovered, as some researchers revealed non-significant effects of attire on perceptions made by others (see Chatelain, 2015) where some discovered the latter (see Lovell et al, 2011). As for self-perceptions specifically, an overall general agreement across research was revealed for there being a significant impact of attire and dress on the self (see Kwon, 1994; Peluchette & Karl, 2007).

Therefore, this leads to the purpose of the present study which is to explore the influence of the attire worn during sport, exercise, and performance psychology (SEPP) sessions and during professional interactions with athletes and other performers on the self-perceptions of SEPP practitioners. Specifically, these self-perceptions will be investigated through various demographics such as gender, training level and experience, and geographical location.

APPENDIX B

CREEKMORE CLOTHING INTEREST QUESTIONNAIRE

Select statements were adjusted and included in the present study from the original questionnaire below (Creekmore, 1971). Specifically, items 1, 14, 37, 40, 57, 63, 70, 71 and 75 were used.

TABLE 1	
Factor structure of the Creekmore Clothing Interest questionnaire.	
Item	Loading
<i>Factor I—Concern with personal appearance</i>	
5. I carefully coordinate the accessories that I wear with each outfit.	.650
7. I pay a lot of attention to pleasing color combinations.	.607
8. I keep my shoes clean and neat.	.602
11. I spend more time than others coordinating the colors in my clothes.	.551
58. I see that my out-of-season clothing is cleaned and stored. (.332 on I)	.547
66. I am more concerned about the care of my clothing than my friends are about theirs.	.545
1. The way I look in my clothes is important to me. (.427 on VI)	.532
59. I look over the clothing in my wardrobe before each season so that I know what I have. (.429 on II)	.497
63. I have something to wear for any occasion that occurs.	.481
65. I carefully plan every purchase so that I know what I need when I get to a store.	.439
6. I wear clothes which have buttons or snaps missing.	-.437
62. I wear a raincoat or carry an umbrella to protect my clothes in rainy weather.	.428
57. I plan for and prepare clothes to wear several days in advance.	.414
4. I consider the fabric texture with the line of the garment when choosing my clothes.	.411
44. I have a long-term idea for purchasing more expensive items of clothing such as coats or suits.	.393
3. It bothers me when my shirt tail keeps coming out.	.322
<i>Factor II—Experimenting with appearance</i>	
27. I try on some of the newest clothes each season to see how I look in the styles.	.682
29. It's fun to try on different garments and accessories to see how they look together. (.353 on I)	.678
32. I try on clothes in shops just to see how I will look in them without really planning to buy.	.673
25. I enjoy trying on shoes of different styles or colors. (.309 on I)	.637
24. My friends and I try each others clothes to see how we look in them.	.579
28. I read magazines and newspapers to find out what is new in clothing. (.438 on I)	.568
30. I experiment with new or different "hair do's" to see how I will look.	.535
31. I like to know what is new in clothing even if none of my friends care and I probably would not want to wear it. (.335 on I)	.511
26. I study collections of accessories in the stores to see what I might combine attractively. (.426 on I)	.495
33. When I buy a new garment I try many different accessories before I wear it. (.364 on I)	.453
80. I decide on the clothes to wear according to the mood I am in that day. (.355 on VI)	.414
5. I use clothing as a means of disguising physical problems and imperfections through skillful use of color, line and texture. (.311 on I)	.335
<i>Factor III—Conformity</i>	
71. I wear clothes that everyone is wearing even though they may not look good on me.	.710
77. When I buy a new article of clothing I try to buy something similar to what my friends are wearing.	.700
72. I am uncomfortable when my clothes are different from all others at a party. (.314 on VI)	.599
70. I feel more a part of the group if I am dressed like my friends. (.338 on VI)	.593
10. I wear the clothing fads that are popular in our school even though they may not be as becoming to me.	.574
74. I get new clothes for a special occasion if the clothes I have are not the type my friends will be wearing. (.317 on VI)	.504
73. I try to dress like others in my group so that people will know we are friends.	.500
75. I have gone places and then wished after I got there that I had not gone because my clothes were not suitable.	.444
69. I would rather miss something than wear clothes which are not really appropriate.	.363
68. I check with my friends about what they are wearing to a gathering before I decide what to wear. (.338 on II; .311 on VI)	.346
41. I would buy a very comfortable bathing suit even if it were not the current style.	-.337
2. When I am shopping I choose clothes that I like even if they do not look the best on me.	.329
60. I am enticed into buying garments I like without having anything to go with them.	.305
<i>Factor IV—Modesty</i>	
20. I feel embarrassed when I see someone in clothes that are too tight.	.705

TABLE 1
Factor structure of the Creekmore Clothing Interest questionnaire.

Item	Loading
<i>Factor I—Concern with personal appearance</i>	
9. I carefully coordinate the accessories that I wear with each outfit.	.650
7. I pay a lot of attention to pleasing color combinations.	.607
8. I keep my shoes clean and neat.	.602
11. I spend more time than others coordinating the colors in my clothes.	.551
58. I see that my out-of-season clothing is cleaned and stored. (.332 on I)	.547
66. I am more concerned about the care of my clothing than my friends are about theirs.	.545
1. The way I look in my clothes is important to me. (.427 on VI)	.532
59. I look over the clothing in my wardrobe before each season so that I know what I have. (.429 on II)	.497
63. I have something to wear for any occasion that occurs.	.481
65. I carefully plan every purchase so that I know what I need when I get to a store.	.439
6. I wear clothes which have buttons or snaps missing.	-.437
62. I wear a raincoat or carry an umbrella to protect my clothes in rainy weather.	.428
57. I plan for and prepare clothes to wear several days in advance.	.414
4. I consider the fabric texture with the line of the garment when choosing my clothes.	.411
44. I have a long-term idea for purchasing more expensive items of clothing such as coats or suits.	.393
3. It bothers me when my shirt tail keeps coming out.	.322
<i>Factor II—Experimenting with appearance</i>	
27. I try on some of the newest clothes each season to see how I look in the styles.	.682
29. It's fun to try on different garments and accessories to see how they look together. (.353 on I)	.678
32. I try on clothes in shops just to see how I will look in them without really planning to buy.	.673
25. I enjoy trying on shoes of different styles or colors. (.309 on I)	.637
24. My friends and I try each others clothes to see how we look in them.	.579
28. I read magazines and newspapers to find out what is new in clothing. (.438 on I)	.568
30. I experiment with new or different "hair do's" to see how I will look.	.535
31. I like to know what is new in clothing even if none of my friends care and I probably would not want to wear it. (.335 on I)	.511
26. I study collections of accessories in the stores to see what I might combine attractively. (.426 on I)	.495
33. When I buy a new garment I try many different accessories before I wear it. (.364 on I)	.453
80. I decide on the clothes to wear according to the mood I am in that day. (.355 on VI)	.414
5. I use clothing as a means of disguising physical problems and imperfections through skillful use of color, line and texture. (.311 on I)	.335
<i>Factor III—Conformity</i>	
71. I wear clothes that everyone is wearing even though they may not look good on me.	.710
77. When I buy a new article of clothing I try to buy something similar to what my friends are wearing.	.700
72. I am uncomfortable when my clothes are different from all others at a party. (.314 on VI)	.599
70. I feel more a part of the group if I am dressed like my friends. (.338 on VI)	.593
10. I wear the clothing fads that are popular in our school even though they may not be as becoming to me.	.574
74. I get new clothes for a special occasion if the clothes I have are not the type my friends will be wearing. (.317 on VI)	.504
73. I try to dress like others in my group so that people will know we are friends.	.500
75. I have gone places and then wished after I got there that I had not gone because my clothes were not suitable.	.444
69. I would rather miss something than wear clothes which are not really appropriate.	.363
68. I check with my friends about what they are wearing to a gathering before I decide what to wear. (.338 on II; .311 on VI)	.346
41. I would buy a very comfortable bathing suit even if it were not the current style.	-.337
2. When I am shopping I choose clothes that I like even if they do not look the best on me.	.329
60. I am enticed into buying garments I like without having anything to go with them.	.305
<i>Factor IV—Modesty</i>	
20. I feel embarrassed when I see someone in clothes that are too tight.	.705

APPENDIX C

SURVEY

The survey for the present study.

Informed Consent

**WATERS COLLEGE OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCES AND KINESIOLOGY**

Informed Consent

For

Exploring Sport, Exercise, and Performance Practitioner's Attitudes on Attire

1. My name is Claire Harding and I am a second year master's student in the sport and exercise psychology program at Georgia Southern University. The present survey is being conducted as a master's thesis, towards completion of a master's degree. My research advisor is Dr. Megan Byrd, whose contact info can be found at the end of this document.

2. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research is to investigate the influence of attire on perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of sport, exercise, and performance psychology practitioners (SEPP) during their applied work.

3. Procedures to be followed: If you choose to participate, participation in this research project will include completion of the following survey that includes demographic questions, questions about self-and other-perceptions, and questions about attitudes and experiences regarding attire. It is estimated that completion will take no more than 30 minutes.

4. Discomforts and Risks: The risks of this study are believed to be comparable to risks experienced on a daily basis. Overall the benefits of this survey outweigh the potential risks. The potential risks may include reflecting on uncomfortable past experiences or sensitive situations you have encountered during your applied work as it relates to attire.

5. Benefits:

a. The benefits to you as a participant include that you will be able to share your own voice and experiences with your attire choices in regard to SEPP client interactions. The present research aims to facilitate a conversation about this topic amongst SEPP professionals.

b. The benefits to society include to use the present research to further expand on the idea of the influence of attire in the workplace, specifically within a sport and performance-related context. An additional benefit includes exploring how the behaviors and attitudes of individuals involved in these SEPP environments are influenced by attire.

6. Duration/Time: The survey is a one-time data collection, and will require no more than 30 minutes of your time.

7. Statement of Confidentiality: Your participant information will be kept confidential by compiling the data in an aggregate form to help protect your identity. The questions asked are broad enough as though identifying individual participants would be difficult. All investigators, whose contact information is located at the end of the informed consent, will have access to the data. Data will be maintained for five years by Dr. Byrd on a password protected computer, in a password protected file, in a locked office. After five years, the data will be discarded.

8. Future use of data: Data will be maintained in a de-identifiable manner for the potential of future research. De-identified or coded data from this study may be placed in a publicly available repository for study validation and further research. You will not be identified by name in the data set or any reports using information obtained from this study, and your confidentiality as a participant in this study will remain secure. Subsequent uses of records and data will be subject to standard data use policies which protect the anonymity of individuals and institutions.

9. Right to Ask Questions: As a participant, you have the right to ask questions and have those questions answered. If you have questions about this study, please contact Claire Harding at ch31093@georgiasouthern.edu or the researcher's faculty advisor, Dr. Megan Byrd, whose contact information is located at the end of the informed consent. For questions concerning your rights as a research participant, contact Georgia Southern University Institutional Review Board at 912-478-5465 or irb@georgiasouthern.edu.

10. Compensation: You will not be compensated for participation in the present survey. 11.

Voluntary Participation: You do not have to participate in this research. You may end your participation at any time by exiting out of the browser you are using and closing the online survey. You do not have to answer any questions in the survey that you do not want to answer.

12. **Penalty:** There is no penalty for deciding not to participate in the study. You may decide at any time that you don't want to participate further and you may withdraw without penalty or retribution.

13. All information will be treated confidentially. There is one exception to confidentiality that we need to make you aware of. In certain research studies, it is our ethical responsibility to report situations of child or elder abuse, child or elder neglect, or any life-threatening situation to appropriate authorities. However, we are not seeking this type of information in our study nor will you be asked questions about these issues.

14. You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this research study. You can obtain a copy of this consent form to keep for your records.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the GS Institutional Review Board under tracking number H22202.

Title of Project: Exploring Sport, Exercise, and Performance Practitioner's Attitudes on Attire

Principal Investigator: Claire Harding, ch31093@georgiasouthern.edu

Other Investigator(s): Dr. Brandonn Harris, bharris@georgiasouthern.edu, Dr. Jenna Tomalski, jtomalski@georgiasouthern.edu, and Skylar Clement, sc27788@georgiasouthern.edu

Research Advisor: Dr. Megan Byrd, mmybyrd@georgiasouthern.edu, 912-478-2274

Please select an option below to indicate whether or not you agree to participate in this research:

- Yes, I read the terms above and consent to participate in this research
- No, I do not consent to participate in this research.

Demographics

Age

Race (select all that apply)

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian or Asian American
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino/Latina/Latinx
- Native Hawaiian or Pacifica Islander
- White
- Not listed above (specify)

How would you describe your ethnicity? *Ethnicity refers to the shared cultural characteristics such as language, beliefs, traditions, and nationality.*

What census region of the U.S. do you reside in CURRENTLY?

- New England (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont)

- Middle Atlantic (New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania)
- West North Central (Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota)
- East North Central (Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin)
- South Atlantic (Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia)
- East South Central (Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee)
- West South Central (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas)
- Mountain (Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Montana, Utah, Nevada, Wyoming)
- Pacific (Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, Washington)
- Not listed above (specify)
- If international, please identify the country:

If you completed your training in the United States, what census region did you complete your most recent education?

- New England (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont)
- Middle Atlantic (New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania)
- West North Central (Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota)
- East North Central (Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin)
- South Atlantic (Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia)
- East South Central (Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee)
- West South Central (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas)
- Mountain (Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Montana, Utah, Nevada, Wyoming)
- Pacific (Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, Washington)
- Not listed above (specify)
- Not applicable

What is your sexual orientation?

- Straight (heterosexual)
- Gay
- Lesbian
- Bisexual
- Asexual
- Pansexual
- Queer
- Prefer not to disclose
- Prefer to self-describe

What is your gender identity?

- Female/Cisgender Female
- Male/Cisgender Male
- Trans Female/Trans Woman
- Trans Male/Trans Man
- Genderqueer/Gender nonconforming
- Non-binary
- Agender
- Prefer not to disclose
- Prefer to self-describe

Do you identify as a religious person?

- No, not religious
- Yes, religious

If yes and if comfortable, what religion do you practice?**Are you currently enrolled in college?**

- Yes
- No

If yes, what degree are you currently working towards?

- Associates degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Doctoral degree
- Vocational degree
- Other

What is your highest level of education completed?

- Less than a high school degree
- High school degree or equivalent (e.g., GED)

- Some college but no degree
- Professional degree
- Associate's degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Doctoral degree

What area do your degree(s) specialize in? Select all that apply.

- Sport Psychology
- Exercise Psychology
- Counseling
- Clinical Psychology
- Other (specify)

How many years of SEPP applied experience do you have?

- 0 - 1 years
- 2 - 3 years
- 3 - 4 years
- 4 - 6 years
- 6 - 8 years
- 8 - 10 years
- More than 10 years
- Not applicable

Are you CMPC certified?

- Yes
- No, but in progress
- No, and no intention to become certified

What level of athletes/performers/clients do you primarily work with as a consultant? Select all that apply.

- Youth
- High School
- Collegiate
- Professional
- Olympic

- Military
 First responders
 Other (specify)

 Not applicable

Do you primarily work with athletes in individual or team sports?

- Individual sports
 Team sports
 Both
 Other (specify)

Self-Prescribed and Social-Prescribed Adjective Traits

Self-Prescribed and Social-Prescribed Adjective Traits.

Please consider the following questions in regard to the influence of attire worn during your applied SEPP work.

Self-Prescribed Adjective Traits

To what degree does your attire influence your own feelings of...

	Not at all	Slightly	Somewhat	Moderately	Very much	Extremely
Competence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Capableness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Belongingness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Trustworthiness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-respect	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Approachableness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professionalism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-esteem	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Empowerment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Confidence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Morality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ethicalness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sport specific intelligence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attractiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Social-Prescribed Adjective Traits

To what degree does attire influence the way others perceive you as...

	Not at all	Slightly	Somewhat	Moderately	Very much	Extremely
Competent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Capable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Belonging	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Trustworthy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-respecting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Approachable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Having self-esteem	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Empowered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Confident	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Moral	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ethical	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sport specific intelligent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attractive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Clothing Attitudes and Interests

Please consider the following statements in regard to your applied SEPP work and rate the extent to which you agree or disagree.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
The way I look in my clothes is important to me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have something to wear for any SEPP related occasion that occurs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I plan for and prepare clothes to wear several days in advance.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I wear clothes that everyone is wearing even though they may not look good on me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel more part of the team or sport if I am dressed like my clients and colleagues.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have gone to SEPP related places and then wished after I got there that I had not gone because my clothes were not suitable.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I select clothes that are conservative in style.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I find it difficult to buy clothes suitable for the temperature.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Experiences of SEPP Practitioner's Regarding Attire

Please answer the following questions in relation to your applied SEPP work.

Does your own body image influence your attire choices? If so, and if you are comfortable with sharing, how so?

How does your mood influence your attire choices?

Has anyone ever commented on your attire? If yes, and if you feel comfortable with sharing, please expand on the content of the comments and who said them.

What factors contribute to what you decide what to wear to athlete/performer/client consultation sessions? During practice observation versus game/performance observations?

Have you ever felt uncomfortable or judged based on what you were wearing to these athlete/performer/client interactions? If yes and if you feel comfortable with sharing, please expand on what aspects you feel you were judged upon and by whom.

Do you discuss your attire choices with others? If yes, who?

What do you perceive as professional attire in SEPP settings?

Is there anything else regarding attire and SEPP applied work that you would like to add?