ABSTRACT

CARTER, LONNY LANGSTON. The Impact of Incarceration on the Relationship Between Clothing and Identity. (Under the direction of Dr. Katherine Annett-Hitchcock).

Research suggests that individuals use clothing to define and display their identity within society (Davis, 1992; McLuhan & McLuhan, 1988; Roach-Higgins et al., 1995; Stone, 1962). In certain circumstances such as incarceration, individuals are unable to choose clothing that best represents their identity. There are an estimated 2.3 million individuals incarcerated in the United States (Sawyer & Wagner, 2020). There are no studies that have explored the impact of institutional clothing on identity throughout the incarceration process. The purpose of this study was to investigate the impact of the incarceration process on clothing and identity. The research study incorporated a phenomenological, two-part research design, with qualitative thematic analysis of prison blogs written by current and formerly incarcerated individuals and semi-structured, exploratory recall interviews with a sample of the formerly incarcerated. A total of 10 blogs were collected and 15 interviews were conducted. Data collected from the prison blogs and semi-structured interviews were used to answer the four research questions in this study. Data analysis of both methodologies was conducted concurrently.

Findings from this study suggest that individuals use clothing as a tool for personal transformation throughout the incarceration process. The findings also suggest that clothing can be used to change the way a person views themselves and the way they believe they are seen by others. The results indicate that for the study participants, clothing served as an important, non-verbal tool with which to express their identity during incarceration.

This phenomenological study investigated the experience of incarceration and its relationship to clothing and identity from the perspectives of current and formerly incarcerated individuals. Results from this study may lead to additional research on how institutional clothing

relates to behavioral factors and the administration of correctional facilities. Findings from this study may also lead to important discussions about the future direction of institutional clothing, and may contribute to decisions about social change and rehabilitation that can help the formerly incarcerated integrate back into society after release.

The Impact of Incarceration on the Relationship Between Clothing and Identity

by
Lonny Langston Carter

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Textile Technology Management

Raleigh, North Carolina
2022

APPROVED BY:

_____   _____
Dr. Katherine Annett-Hitchcock   Dr. Helmut Hergeth
Committee Chair

_____   _____
Dr. Mark Jones   Dr. Marguerite Moore

_____
Dr. Lori Rothenberg

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my incredibly supportive and patient husband, Dr. Andrew

Carter. Words cannot express how grateful I am to share a life with my biggest fan. Thank you,

Mom, for your countless sacrifices throughout the years that allowed me to follow my dreams. I

would not be here today without you.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Dr. Kate, who would have thought a study abroad trip almost 20 years ago would lead to our working together again? I appreciate your taking a chance on me and supporting my unconventional idea for a dissertation topic in textiles. I look forward to what we can do together in the future. Dr. Jones, thank you for your willingness to serve as an external committee member. You have been an inspiration and your expertise in criminal justice has helped me tremendously. Thank you to my committee members, Drs. Hergeth, Moore, and Rothenberg for your guidance and support throughout my graduate school career and my dissertation. Thank you to Dr. Grasso for your mentorship, stories, and empowerment. I am so grateful Kate connected us. I cannot thank you enough for everything you have done for me in a short amount of time.

Thank you to my favorite IRB expert, Yael, for objectively guiding me through the research process. Even when you were busy, you took the time to communicate with me and prevent me from spiraling. I could not have conducted this study successfully without you. Thank you to Bob Barker for helping me realize my interest in criminal justice. I had no idea my textile degree would take me into correctional facilities across the United States and inspire me to create new knowledge about this underserved population. Finally, to my study participants, THANK YOU for your vulnerability, trust, and willingness to share your stories with me. This study would not have been possible without you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

Each day, a person may choose to dress in any way. The choice demonstrates

individuality, expresses creativity, generates comfort, or for more practical purposes, reflects

convenience or cleanliness. Since clothing is a physical extension of the self, clothing has the

power to communicate a great deal about a person (McLuhan & McLuhan, 1988). Clothing is

also a non-verbal, symbolic tool for communication with its meaning depending on the wearer or

the viewer's perception of identity (Davis, 1992; Stone, 1962). Roach-Higgins et al. (1995)

stated that "we learn to depend upon dress to declare our identity to ourselves and others, to pave

a way for interaction with others, and to maintain positive feelings of personal identity" (p. 99).

This suggests that individuals use clothing as a way to define and display their identity to the

world around them. In some circumstances, however, individuals are denied the freedom of

choosing clothing that best expresses their identity. While serving time in a correctional facility

in the United States (US), the incarcerated are required to wear government-issued clothing that

distinguishes them from corrections officers, guards, civilians, visitors, and other incarcerated

individuals (Ash, 2010). This type of institutional clothing serves both functional and symbolic

purposes and removes any identity associated with the outside world.

Although there are differences among facilities, most correctional environments in the

US operate under a stringent, comprehensive set of rules that determine and regulate behavior,

which are implemented by a system of authority that regulates and enforces punishments for

individuals who deviate from these rules (Miller, 1958). The terms "jail" and "prison" are often

used interchangeably to describe locations of confinement (Burns, 2002). According to The

National Institute of Justice (2021), a jail is a place for those awaiting trial or being held for minor crimes, which are usually less than one year. A prison is a state or federal facility for those convicted of serious crimes, which are typically for more than one year (National Institute of Justice, 2021). Another word for the correctional environment is "penitentiary," or "a state or federal prison for the punishment and reformation of convicted felons" (Merriam-Webster, 2011). A juvenile detention center is defined as "a locked facility for juveniles, similar to a jail, where juveniles can be held while waiting for a court hearing or when ordered by the court to serve a period of secure confinement for a delinquent act" (North Carolina Judicial Branch, 2021).

In this dissertation, the terms "correctional facility" or "correctional institution" are used to represent the correctional environment unless the type of facility is specified (i.e., prison, jail, penitentiary, or juvenile detention center). In addition, the terms "incarcerated people" or "incarcerated person[1]" are used to represent the individuals housed in a correctional facility unless the type of facility is specified (i.e., a prison houses prisoners). While incarcerated, an individual is physically separated from their personal property, has no access to privacy, and all activities of their life become routinized (Clemmer, 1958; Goffman, 1961a, 1961b; Sykes, 1958). After becoming incarcerated, individuals are required to surrender all personal property, which is then replaced with standardized items provided by the institution. Goffman (1961c) described these items as belonging to the institution and are regularly "disinfected of identifications" (p. 19). Included in these standardized items is personal clothing (Goffman, 1961c).

---

[1] At the time of writing (February 2022), the agreed upon language for a person in this population.

Ash (2010) stated that correctional facilities use color-coding of uniforms to classify the incarcerated and that either the governors or sheriffs specify the color and design of the individual garments. By associating a certain style or color with a classification of an incarcerated person, clothing serves as both a functional and symbolic label within a facility. Although used as a means to express individuality outside of a correctional institution, the clothing that the incarcerated are required to wear while serving time represents a "visible embodiment of punishment" (Ash, 2010, p. 155).

Research in the social psychology of clothing has been addressed under two broad categories: 1) dress as a stimulus and its influence on the attributions by others, attributions about self, and on one's own behavior (Johnson et al., 2008; Lennon & Davis, 1989) and 2) relationships between dress, the body, and the self (Stone, 1962). It has been found that the relationship between clothing satisfaction and a person's self-perception may result in positive psychological effects (Cosbey, 2001; Kwon, 1994; Solomon & Douglas, 1985). Research also suggests that consumers gravitate toward clothing that agrees with their individual sense of social identity (Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton, 1981; Davis, 1984; Furby, 1978; Kaiser, 1985; Stone, 1962; Solomon, 1983; Wicklund & Gollwitzer, 1982). Thus, the dynamic nature of the self (Hannover, 1997; Markus & Wurf, 1987) enables individuals to use clothing as a critical symbol to define their social identity. Although social identity during adulthood is typically stable, significant life events, such as incarceration, may cause a disruption in self-continuity (Syed & Mitchell, 2015; Mitchell et al., 2020).

From a symbolic interactionist perspective in which social interaction includes symbols and their meanings (Blumer, 1969; Mead, 1934), Stone (1962) concluded that 1) appearance is a fundamental part of identity; and 2) appearance is a process of self-negotiation established

through sender and receiver communication. Stone considered appearance as a variable in which meanings are recognized through mutual understandings between individuals. According to Stone, meanings assigned to a person's appearance may be a) automatic, such as stereotyped or organizational appearance; b) nonsensical, when the receiver is not familiar with how to interpret the sender's appearance and misses their intent; and c) ambiguous, in which there is the likelihood of appearances representing more than one meaning (Davis, 1985; Kaiser, 1985).

Research shows that organizations use clothing and appearance to develop and exhibit cohesion among members (Corley et al., 2006; Kaiser, 1990; Martin, 2002; Pratt & Rafaeli, 1997; Swain, 2002). Scholars have determined that organizational clothing as a symbol serves two critical functions: 1) removal of individual control; and 2) expression of uniform identity (Davis, 1992; Fussell, 1983; Joseph, 1986; Joseph & Alex, 1972; Lurie, 1992; Roach-Higgins et al., 1992; Solomon & Douglas, 1987). Additional studies about organizational clothing, which included the function of uniforms in various social contexts (Joseph, 1986), clothing worn in communes (Kanter, 1972), and uniforms worn by flight attendants (Hochschild, 1983) demonstrated a relationship between organizational control over dress codes and increased member compliance with the rules of the organization. Adam and Galinsky (2012) introduced the term "enclothed cognition" to "designate the systematic influence of clothes on the wearer's psychological processes and behavioral tendencies" (p. 919). This term suggests that a person's psychological processes and behavioral tendencies depend on the symbolic meaning of the clothes and whether the clothes are being worn by the person.

Previous research on clothing used in correctional facilities is limited. An estimated 2.3 million persons are incarcerated in the US (Sawyer & Wagner, 2020), and most are required by law to wear government-issued clothing. Current research in corrections focuses on notions of

law and order, and few studies have investigated the experiences of the current and formerly incarcerated. Several studies have examined identity formation throughout the incarceration experience (Rowe, 2011; Solomontos-Kountouri & Hatzittofi, 2016; Toyoki & Brown, 2014; Walters, 2003). Bosworth et al. (2005) studied four currently incarcerated individuals to better understand life while incarcerated. Ash (2010) provided historical information about institutional clothing in various countries throughout the world. Smiley and Middlemass (2016) investigated obstacles that the incarcerated face upon reentry into society through the lens of clothing, but no studies have explored the impact of institutional clothing on identity before, during, and after incarceration. This study combines the understanding of how clothing affects the self and social identity in the context of the current and formerly incarcerated population.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of incarceration on the relationship between clothing and identity. Thus, the following research questions were developed:

RQ1: How do individuals describe clothing issued to them while incarcerated?

RQ2: How does the incarceration process change a person's relationship with their clothing?

RQ3: How do individuals communicate social identity through clothing throughout the incarceration process?

RQ4: How do individuals communicate self-identity through clothing throughout the incarceration process?

Definitions of Terms

- Correctional facility - A jail, prison, or other place of incarceration by government officials (US Legal, n.d.).

- Hole - A slang term to describe a solitary confinement area within a facility (Delgado, 2021).

- Jail - A place for individuals awaiting trial or held for minor crimes, usually for one year or less (National Institute of Justice, n.d.).

- Juvenile detention center – "A locked facility for juveniles, similar to a jail, where juveniles can be held while waiting for a court hearing or when ordered by the court to serve a period of secure confinement for a delinquent act" (North Carolina Judicial Branch (n.d.)

- Penitentiary - A state or federal prison for the punishment and reformation of convicted felons (Merriam-Webster, n.d.).

- Prison - A state or federal facility for individuals who have been convicted of serious crimes, typically for longer than one year (National Institute of Justice, n.d.).

- Prisonization - The process in which the incarcerated adopt the culture of a correctional facility (Clemmer, 1940; 1958).

- Prison subculture - A subculture in places where individuals are involuntarily confined (Irwin & Cressey, 1962).

- Rehabilitation – The process of helping a person to readapt to society or to restore someone to a former position or rank (Bosworth, 2005).

- Total institution - A place where individuals, who are cut off from society for a length of time, participate in an enclosed, formally regulated way of life (Goffman, 1961c).

- Visitation - A unique experience for family members in that they are free individuals who enter correctional facilities and must then abide by institutional rules (Christian, 2019).

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The US Correctional System

The operation of taking individuals into custody has been in existence as long as society itself (Sykes, 1958). For an incarcerated person in the legal system, custody initially served as a period of waiting between pre-trial and a "hangman's noose" (Sykes, 1958, p. xi). Sellin (1932) stated that as recently as 1771, the sole purpose of incarceration was to hold a suspected offender ahead of trial. In the early 19th century, however, a humanitarian approach to punishment provided an alternative option to existing punishment activities such as hangings, burnings, floggings, and mutilations (Sykes, 1958). Sykes (1958) suggested that the expansion of personal liberties in the early 19th century led to the belief that withdrawal of personal freedom would be a significant criminal deterrent. As the population became more aware of the concept of incarceration, the notion arose that society could enforce punishment for a crime by choosing a sentence for a length of time deemed appropriate for that crime (Sykes, 1958).

The *Encyclopedia of Prisons and Correctional Facilities* (2005) stated that before 1789, the US Congress placed the incarcerated into confinement in an available county or state facility. In the late 1800s, the federal government became significantly involved in corrections. This new involvement led to the creation of the US Department of Justice (DOJ) in 1871 (Fields, 2005). At this time, the low number of federal offenders did not justify the expensive construction and maintenance of separate federal prisons. Therefore, under the Judiciary Act of 1789, the federal government paid county and state facilities to house individuals who violated federal laws (Fields, 2005). In response to overcrowding and undesirable facility conditions, Congress passed The Three Prisons Act in 1891. This act approved the establishment of the first three federal

prisons (Fields, 2005). The Three Prisons Act laid the groundwork for the US prison reform movement of the 19th century and provided the foundation for the federal prison system.

Types of Correctional Facilities

A correctional facility is a location where a person, after being rejected by society (Goffman, 1961a; McCorkle & Korn, 1954), must adapt to a new role in a new social environment. Correctional institutions in the US vary by publicized procedures and performance outcomes (Barak-Glantz, 1981; Sykes, 1958). Separate institutions were created for women, men, state offenders, federal offenders, juveniles, and adults (Sykes, 1958). Correctional facilities may vary by factors such as types of work programs, severity of custody, incarcerated person count, and availability of mental health services. However, most institutional environments include a stringent, comprehensive set of rules that determine and regulate behavior, which are implemented by a system of authority that regulates and enforces punishments for anyone who deviates from these rules (Miller, 1958). The corrections authority is "synonymous with that used during infancy" (Watterson, 1996, p. 79). In the correctional environment, each aspect of a person's daily life takes place in one location, under a single authority. All of an incarcerated person's daily activities are performed in the company of many others; their access to personal property and feeling of privacy is diminished; and their individual freedoms and all aspects of their life become extremely routinized (Clemmer, 1958; Goffman, 1961a, 1961b; Sykes, 1958).

Clothing and Correctional Facilities

Historically, clothing worn while incarcerated has varied among countries, states, and cities. Some facilities require a regimented uniform, while others issue everyday clothes, work wear, or nongendered jumpsuits (Ash, 2010). The design, production, and implementation of the

clothing depends on factors such as the required level of surveillance, type of crime committed, and degree of security within the facility (Ash, 2010). Ash (2010, p. 3) stated that "Prison dress is defined by the power of political systems that dominate networks of criminal justice and stigmatize in order to reduce inmates to interchangeable identities." In the eighteenth century, lack of institutional clothing forced both men and women to wear rags, live nearly naked, and be commonly chained (Ash, 2010). During this time, crime was prevalent among the poor. Clothing was not readily available for this part of the population. Until the 1780s, institutional clothing was either purchased or obtained through bartering as a part of the privilege system (Rothman, 1995).

In 1790, the Quakers proposed the US Prison Reform Act, which would create a more rehabilitative system of incarceration compared to the ordered prison under the colonial system (Turnbull, 1798). In Pennsylvania, institutional conditions improved as a result of the Prison Reform Act, which made institutional clothing available (Turnbull, 1798). Turnbull described the institutional clothing as similar to the plain dress worn by Quaker communities. The clothing was produced inside the facility because of the low cost of incarcerated person labor. The Prison Reform Act was interpreted differently at Newgate Prison in Connecticut beginning in 1796. Newgate implemented the manufacturing of clothing by the incarcerated, and paid them for labor, while charging the incarcerated for replacement clothing (Ash, 2010). This policy distinguished the incarcerated based on need for replacement clothing, while some of the incarcerated wore red shirts and blue trousers instead of all red or all blue. These became the first known institutional uniforms that were designed to embody punishment and prevent escape. The mismatched colors not only appeared to resemble court jesters from the medieval period, but were constructed to also humiliate the wearer (Ash, 2010).

In the nineteenth century, the US viewed institutional clothing as a critical component in the philosophy of discipline that suppressed deviant behavior. A new uniform with bold, black-and-white stripes was introduced for the newly incarcerated (Pastoureau, 2001). By 1815, this uniform was adopted in Newgate prison because of the low production cost of the simple black-and-white stripe fabric, and the black-and-white stripes that symbolized prison bars. While wearing this uniform, an incarcerated person was surrounded by physical bars that were now also imprinted on the incarcerated person's body. During the mid to late nineteenth century, institutional clothing embodied the penal objectives of prison. Prisons continued to suppress deviant behavior by removing the identity of the incarcerated, lowering them to numbers and stripes, and isolating them from the outside world and silently reflecting on their crimes (Foucault, 1975).

By the 1840s, the black-and-white striped prison clothing had been established in most institutions across the US penal regimes of "silence." Solitary confinement viewed the black-and-white striped uniforms not only as a way to identify and demean an incarcerated person, but also as a way to increase the likelihood of recapture if they escaped (Ash, 2010). In addition, the implementation of such visible identification also included engraved images of the incarcerated as a mug shot, where only their face was visible. This visible identification increased public knowledge of the incarcerated held by a correctional facility (Hamilton & Hargreaves, 2001). Incarcerated women were clothed in loose cotton dresses paired with large aprons, similar to the clothing worn by poor women outside of prison (Ash, 2010). In the late 1800s, some women expressed their individuality by gathering their bedding and wearing it as a modified version of a bustle, which was considered fashionable at the time (Mayhew & Binny, 1862). Despite the

authority's efforts to enforce clothing uniformity, Entwistle (2002) found that the incarcerated often tried to convey their unique identities through clothing.

In the early 20th century, there was increased societal awareness of the economic inequalities among the social classes. This resulted in various reform movements, which included reforms in prison conditions (Ash, 2010). New concepts of rehabilitation emerged, and among them was the concept that clothing could be a factor that contributed to normalizing the institutional environment. Thus, penal regimes began to experiment with improvements in facility conditions, which included clothing. This prison reform movement led to the abolition of the black-and-white striped clothing, and by the 1950s, most incarcerated males were allowed to wear clothing that resembled those outside the facility (Paterson & Ruck, 1951). The reformed institutional clothing was the equivalent of workwear and changed very little between the 1940s and 1960s. Women's ready-to-wear and casual dress were new to the fashion industry, in which synthetic materials such as rayon (1930s) and nylon (1950s) enabled rapid production and less restrictive clothing on the body (Handley, 1999).

Unlike the fashion industry, the speed in which incarcerated females experienced changes in clothing was slow (Ash, 2010). Although institutional clothing was no longer intended to stigmatize and punish, correctional facilities continued to exert power and control over the incarcerated in the issue and distribution of clothing (Ruck, 1951). Between 1960 and 1980, there was political controversy about how the incarcerated should be treated while imprisoned (Orland, 1978). Although the incarcerated were beginning to wear less restrictive clothing, they were severely punished if they were considered unruly (Mitford, 1971). By the 1990s, some incarcerated had been given greater liberty with clothing, although their appearance was still controlled by the institution's authorities. Some facilities required incarcerated men and women

to procure their own clothing from the commissary or they were required to wear the imposed color-coded uniform of that particular facility (Ash, 2010). During the 1990s, the public perception that the incarcerated were not being properly punished led to the return of the black-and-white striped uniforms for the first time since the 19th century (Sullivan, 1990). Despite the rehabilitative attempts to allow the incarcerated to wear their own clothing, the embodied punishment of institutional clothing returned as a stigmatization of incarceration.

Theory of Total Institutions

The prison is one example highlighted in Goffman's theory of total institutions. In Goffman's *Asylums* (1961c), a total institution is defined as "a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life" (p. xiii). According to Goffman's theory of total institution, the influence that comes from authority (the system) down to an individual eventually leads to the removal of identity. When incarcerated, individuals must relinquish all personal property and be outfitted in clothing that serves as both a functional and symbolic label that strips away any identity associated with the outside world. Goffman (1961c) described that an incarcerated person's possessions are removed and then replaced with standardized items provided by the establishment. These items are marked as belonging to the institution and are regularly described as "disinfected of identifications" (Goffman, 1961c, p. 19).

Within this process of personal defacement, personal clothing is one category of possessions that is denied to an incarcerated person (Goffman, 1961c). Although a correctional institution is authoritarian in its power over individuals' lives (Barak-Glantz, 1981), the incarcerated find small ways to exert their individual identity (Goffman, 1968). Ash (2010)

highlighted the expression of individuality among the transgender incarcerated population at a maximum-security prison in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. It was reported by a volunteer that some transgender incarcerated individuals "attempted to look as feminine as possible – within the range of what it was possible to do with state issued clothing" (Ash, 2010, p. 153). One volunteer recalled a transgender woman wearing rhinestone sandals that were accepted by the prison guards and another who "would tie his white t-shirt in a knot at the bottom and roll the sleeves up slightly in a feminine way" (p. 153). In an environment designed to remove individual freedoms, there is no greater battle than the battle to retain some individual identity.

Prisonization

As a culture exists in a society of residents, a separate culture exists within the walls of a correctional facility. Levy (1952) explained that in order to comprehend the definition of incarceration, life while incarcerated must be viewed as more than the physical bars, walls, cells, and locks. Instead, a correctional facility must be viewed as a society within a society (Levy, 1952). Clemmer (1940; 1958) pioneered the general study of community within prisons where he coined the term "prisonization." Clemmer (1940; 1958) defined prisonization as the process in which the incarcerated adopt "in greater or less degree…the folkways, mores, customs, and general culture of the penitentiary" (p. 299). This definition suggested that an incarcerated person's behavior is shaped by the structural and social characteristics of daily life inside the institution. After further research, Clemmer indicated that the concept of prisonization not only opposed efforts of rehabilitation, but also influenced behavior that was opposite that of conventional social demeanor (Clemmer, 1940; 1958).

By definition, a prison subculture is "a set of patterns that flourishes in the environment of incarceration" (Irwin & Cressey, 1962, p. 147). This subculture exists in places where

individuals are involuntarily confined, which can be in state and federal prisons, city or county jails, prisoner of war camps, army stockades, or mental hospitals (Irwin & Cressey, 1962). Institutions such as this are defined by limitations and deprivations of freedom. In addition, the exhaustive rules of incarceration, combined with continuous monitoring by authorities, reach all aspects of an individual's life. The accumulation of power among a limited number of authority figures, paired with a broad divide between such figures and the incarcerated, are components typically recognized in a totalitarian regime (Polansky, 1942).

Among the studies conducted about prisonization, the Stanford prison experiment is perhaps the most notable prison experiment ever conducted. In 1971, psychologist Zimbardo and his associates conducted an experiment in a mock prison created in the basement of the psychology building at Stanford University (Haney et al., 1973). The simulated prison environment included distinct features of an actual prison that included bars, a cellblock, and institutional uniforms. Study participants were recruited through a newspaper advertisement that offered paid volunteers an opportunity to participate in a "psychological study of prison life" (Haney et al., 1973, p. 73). Of the 75 respondents, the participants included 24 male college students who were described by the researchers as the "most stable (physically and mentally), most mature, and least involved in antisocial behaviors" (Haney et al., 1973, p. 73). Half of the participants were randomly assigned to play the role of "prisoner," while half were assigned to the role of "guard."

Each group was issued identical uniforms to reinforce the notion of group identity and to reduce individual identity among the participants. Prisoners were given tight-fitting caps made from nylon stockings, oversized rubber sandals, and muslin smocks with an identification number imprinted on the front and back. These participants were not given underclothes, and

were supplied with a toothbrush, soap, soap dish, towel, and bed linen. The institutional uniforms were chosen to symbolize subservience and dependence. Guards were given khaki shirts and trousers, a police nightstick, a whistle, and Ray-Ban sunglasses. The guard uniforms were chosen to represent a military-type attitude, while the night stick and whistle were carried to symbolize power and control.

After less than a week in the simulated prison environment, some prisoners begged for release due to psychological trauma. Others developed a blind obedience to the authority of the guards. This experiment was initially planned to last for two weeks, but was forced to end after only six days. This premature ending was a result of the unexpectedly painful, dramatic impact of the simulated prison environment on both participant groups. The results indicated that the prison experience dominated the day-to-day existence of the incarcerated (e.g., 90% of conversations were about prison-related topics), had a considerable impact on the mental state of both prisoners and guards (e.g., prisoners reported three times the negative impact reported by guards), and a momentarily weakened the sense of self (e.g., prisoners and guards demonstrated more critical self-evaluations throughout the experiment). This study demonstrated the power that the institutional environment on the individuals who experienced it. The use of specific clothing to symbolize roles within the prison environment served as a constant reminder of each prisoner or guard's social identity.

Walters (2003) conducted a study to evaluate how the first six months of incarceration affected criminal thinking and identity. A group of 148 incarcerated males from a medium-security federal prison located in the northeastern US participated in the study. The participants included 93 experienced incarcerated males and 55 newly incarcerated males. The results indicated that some characteristics of criminal thinking and criminal identity were notably

elevated in the newly incarcerated who were exposed to more prison-wise peers when compared to the experienced incarcerated in the same environment. Based on these results, it was suggested that the medium-security prison environment may encourage the incarcerated who are unfamiliar with prison culture to acquire certain attitudes as a way to physically and psychologically survive in their new environment. Thus, it appears to be possible for a change in identity socialization to occur during incarceration. Based on this study, Walters argued that prisonization is an adaptive reaction an incarcerated person uses to make their lives easier in their new prison environment, as opposed to an acceptance of structural and social characteristics of daily life while incarcerated.

Within the concept of prisonization, one way in which the incarcerated adopt the culture of their institution is by detaching themselves from the type of personal clothing worn before incarceration. Upon incarceration, individuals must surrender their civilian clothing associated with their former identity and begin wearing standardized clothing provided by the facility. One of the first studies about institutional clothing, *Dress Behind Bars*, combined prisoner interviews, academic reports, and autobiographical accounts to view institutional clothing from around the world throughout the history of the modern prison.

In this book, Ash (2010) suggested that prison clothing has been overlooked because it does not fit within mass-consumption or commercialized fashion, and it possibly symbolizes the reverse of fashion. Although similar to other types of uniforms, Ash (2010) explains, institutional uniforms suggest a denial of personal identity. Uniforms worn while imprisoned are typically imprinted to identify an incarcerated person as government property (DOC, Inmate, etc.), which communicates how society views them (Smiley & Middlemass, 2016). The clothing that

externally labels an incarcerated person is sometimes used as a form of degradation by the government, along with removal of the gender identity used before incarceration.

This visible form of punishment also includes concealed undergarments that must also be worn as a complement to the required uniform. The incarcerated are provided with government-issued underwear that is only known to them and correctional authorities, and which may or may not have been worn by other incarcerated individuals prior to time of issue. In Maricopa County, Arizona, Sheriff Joe Arpaio required all incarcerated males to wear pink underwear and socks and to sleep on pink sheets while wearing a traditional black-and-white stripe uniform (Whitcomb, 2012). This clothing practice challenged gender roles and masculinity, and also reminded the incarcerated males that their presentation of self and image no longer belonged to them during incarceration. The outward uniform paired with prescribed undergarments marks an incarcerated person as property of the institution where "the invisible clothing acts as a self-regulating mechanism of control" (Ash, 2010, p. 155).

Clothing and Identity

The concept of identity can be broadly understood as the sense of self, which includes the values, beliefs, traits, roles, and experiences that form an individual's position in the world (Schwartz et al., 2015; Syed & McLean, 2016). Benzies and Allen (2001) explained that the concept of self develops through social context in interaction with others, and evolves through interaction in a specific group in which a person would like to be a part. The role of a person within this specific group provides others with expectations of how that person should behave. Erikson (1968) concluded that individuals continuously develop their identity over the course of their lifetime.

Theory of Symbolic Interactionism

The concept of symbolic interactionism can be viewed as the uniting of the self and social interaction as the principal means "by which humans are able to form joint acts" and as type of behavior that constitutes "the social life of a human society" (Blumer, 1981, p. 153). The behaviors of symbolic interaction may be verbal or nonverbal, where nonverbal behaviors are often observable human actions. Blumer (1969) suggested that individuals are products of society and form meaning through social experiences and exchanges. Symbolic interactionists have highlighted that the foundation for the process of social interaction is comprised of symbols and their meanings (Blumer, 1969; Mead, 1934). By concentrating on the interaction between individuals and groups, symbolic interactionists investigate how individuals interpret and use symbols to communicate with one another (Blumer, 1969; Goffman, 1959).

Symbolic interactionism (SI) includes three core principles: meaning, language, and thought (Blumer, 1981). These core principles illustrate how self-identity is created and how individuals are socialized into a larger community. Meaning serves as a central mediating factor in human behavior that leads to someone's perception of his or her sense of self, which in turn influences how individuals engage with one another. This suggests that meanings do not exist in objects. Instead, meanings are shared between individuals, and meanings are learned (Blumer, 1969). When applied to personal appearance and clothing, this suggests that a person's behavior towards another person is affected by that person's appearance (Kaiser, 1997) and the meaning associated with that appearance.

Language also enables individuals to negotiate meaning through the use of symbols (Blumer, 1969). The last core principle is thought, which includes the interpretation of symbols and understanding that different points of view are likely to occur. In the context of appearance

and clothing, both the wearer and the viewer actively attempt to determine the meaning of clothing during a social interaction. The SI theory suggests that reality is a social construct, where meanings are created through negotiation during social interaction between individuals (Krohn & Lopes, 2015; Kronick & Thomas, 2008). In various contexts, these symbols are socially constructed, and a mutual definition of those symbols must exist for both the initiator and the receiver (Morrione & Farberman, 1981). Thus, symbolic meanings are assigned to clothing during individuals' joint interactions. Throughout these social interactions, clothing is used as an individual cue to negotiate identities (McCall, 1976) and in defining a situation (Thomas, 1923).

While original work in SI centered on the importance of verbal communication in the construction of the self, Stone's (1962; 1977) contributions to SI focused on how a person's appearance as a non-verbal means of communication may hinder or help social interactions. Stone (1962) highlighted that 1) appearance is a fundamental part of identity; and 2) appearance is a process of self-negotiation established through sender and receiver communication. Appearance is viewed as a variable in which meanings are recognized through mutual understandings between individuals. According to Stone, meanings given to a person's appearance may be a) automatic, such as stereotyped or organizational appearance; b) nonsensical, when the perceiver is not familiar with how to interpret the sender's appearance and misses their intent; and c) ambiguous, when the likelihood of appearances represent more than one meaning (Davis, 1985; Kaiser, 1985). Through joint acts with another person, the perceiver may recognize clothing or appearance as symbols based on salience or personal meanings. This occurs because the perceiver either has an understanding of the symbols or personally uses them.

Thus, SI provides a solid foundation for the study of clothing, its use as symbols, and its fluid nature in social interactions.

Self-Identity

Research from past studies reveals a strong correlation between clothing and self-perception. Cosbey (2001) explored the relationship between clothing satisfaction and a person's self-perception. A critical variable in this study was the level of clothing interest of the participant (high versus low). The results showed that study participants with a high clothing interest also exhibited higher levels of emotional stability, dominance, and sociability when they were satisfied with their clothing choices compared to those with a low clothing interest. The high clothing interest group also displayed notably lower emotional stability when they were dissatisfied with their clothing compared to the low clothing interest group. Based on these results, Cosbey (2001) suggested that a person in the high clothing interest group, who is also satisfied with their appearance, would likely experience higher levels of comfort within social situations, potentially leading to more assertive or authoritative behaviors. Alternatively, participants who were dissatisfied with their clothing developed feelings of anxiety and self-doubt. Cosbey (2001) concluded that there is a relationship between clothing satisfaction and self-perception in which an individual's clothing interest level plays a significant role.

Although there were no studies that examined clothing interest levels for the incarcerated prior to and during incarceration, there may be a correlation between interest level and identity impact. For example, an incarcerated person with a high clothing interest level prior to incarceration may experience a more significant loss in identity, along with increased anxiety and self-doubt, when being forced to relinquish control over clothing. Alternatively, an incarcerated person with a low clothing interest level prior to incarceration may experience little

to no loss in identity when wearing government-issued clothing. The incarcerated person with a high clothing interest level may prefer to take risks when choosing a wardrobe that best fits their personality and may be unsure of how to express themselves when that liberty is removed. Therefore, a person's clothing interest level may predict self-perceptions and behavioral patterns based on their risk-taking or risk-avoidance disposition toward clothing. This means that wearing government-issued clothing may add significantly more punishment to incarceration for some individuals.

Given the rise in importance of appropriate attire in various professions, the relationship between clothing and self-perception has also been studied in the work setting. Kwon (1994) found that a person's type of clothing affects self-perception related to occupational attributes and that clothing is used to boost certain types of occupational traits. Solomon and Douglas (1985) found that by wearing an outfit suitable for a work setting, an individual may experience positive psychological effects. For example, self-perception could be enhanced when a person receives compliments on their outfit from a co-worker. In contrast, apprehension linked to work attire could produce fear of others' negative opinions or reactions, and might result in a person's reduced self-confidence (Solomon & Douglas, 1985).

Kwon (1994) explored gender perceptions of the role of clothing through general occupational traits. Various occupational attributes were investigated, including intelligence, trustworthiness, professionalism, responsibility, willingness to work hard, competence, honesty, and efficiency. Based on these occupational traits, remarkable gender differences were found between the effect of "properly dressed" and "not properly dressed" for work (Kwon, 1994, p. 38). Overall, females showed more interest in clothing than males. Females were also more likely to associate clothing with the concept of self-enhancement both internally and externally.

Although females did not think an individual can look professional if they are not dressed properly, males placed less emphasis on the appropriateness of clothing in the workplace. Kwon (1994) found that both females and males, regardless of level of clothing interest, were influenced by clothing interest and self-perception of "properly dressed" and "not properly dressed" as enhancing occupational attributes. Since individuals tend to interpret personal characteristics through observation of their own appearance, it was concluded that self-perception in the workplace is often formed through the use of clothing.

Social Identity

Research suggests that individuals often gravitate towards products that are in agreement with their individual sense of social identity (Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton, 1981; Furby, 1978; Solomon, 1983; Wicklund & Gollwitzer, 1982). Previous research has recognized clothing as a consumer product that is parallel to social identity (Davis, 1984; Kaiser, 1985; Stone, 1962). Therefore, the dynamic and flexible nature of the self (Hannover, 1997; Markus & Wurf, 1987) leads individuals to use clothing as an important symbol that defines their social identity. With a significant presence in everyday activities, clothes represent a recurring public display and something that is easy to control (Feinberg et al., 1992). Although originally used to communicate social status, clothing is now indicative of many other characteristics about the wearer (Crane, 2000).

Feinberg et al. (1992) conducted two studies to understand the relationship between clothing, the meaning of clothing, and identity. The first study asked 25 female undergraduate students to compare the relationship between clothing and identity when the clothing represented the participant. This study showed that the identity characteristics described by participants about themselves were in accordance with the characteristics other participants speculated about them.

Alternatively, the second study compared the relationship between clothing and identity when the clothing did not specifically represent the participant. In this study, it was assumed that jeans and their labels carry social information about a person's identity. Two participant groups were used. One group of 125 female subjects had personality inferences based on jean brands and an independent second group of 72 female subjects provided their jean preferences and self attributes. All participants were undergraduate students. The results from this study indicated that observers could make personality assumptions about participants solely based on the jeans label preferences. This was only possible because the five jeans labels were distinct from one another and were understood to be associated with semantic attributes.

Overall, the strong correlation from the first study suggested that clothing could have a semiotic function that is used as a symbolic representation of the social identity of its wearer. Although differences in jean labels from the second study represented different meanings, the differences were not found to reflect differences in identity. Based on these two studies, clothing is more likely to indicate accurate characteristics of identity when the wearer thoughtfully chooses to express their personality through clothing choices. Alternatively, when the wearer does not have the opportunity to choose their own clothing, such as while incarcerated, it is possible that their identity or personality will change or become muted.

Guy and Banim (2000) conducted a study that specifically focused on women and the meanings they associate with clothing. Fifteen women between age 21 and 54 participated in this study. Through personal interviews, clothing diaries, and wardrobe interviews, it was found that women connected clothing and their identity through three perspectives: (1) The woman I want to be; (2) The woman I fear I could be; and (3) The woman I am most of the time (Guy & Banim, 2000). The personal interviews suggested that the women were aware that they used

clothing to conceal, reveal, and create certain aspects of their identity. These narratives suggested that the women discovered that they could manipulate clothing to reflect or initiate changes in their bodies or identity.

In the Guy and Banim study, the theme of power and control emerged as participants viewed their relationship with clothes as a way to create images that were in agreement with different aspects of their identity. Evidence in this study showed that although cultural values, social structure, and family life served as controlling forces that limited the opportunities women had for self-expression, the women who could express themselves through clothing felt empowered. Guy and Banim (2000) argued that identity is a fluid, ever-changing aspect of a woman's life. Women construct images through clothing that are not only personally acceptable but also publicly acceptable depending on the situation. The perpetual force of identity was clear through the ways in which women combined past, current, and not yet realized self-presentation through clothing. It was found that when women determine if they like themselves while wearing specific items at certain times, their clothing becomes interchangeable with their meaning. The results suggested that when a woman has the opportunity to express herself through clothing in everyday life, that woman will adopt the view of 'The woman I want to be.'

Incarcerated females were not included in any of these studies. Based on the results from the studies, however, an incarcerated person with a high interest in clothing may experience a more significant impact on their identity and self-image when forced to wear institutional clothing. The incarcerated have lost power and control within most aspects of daily life, with no hope of re-gaining that power and control until release from incarceration. Thus, an incarcerated person's lack of power over clothing may result in a lower sense of identity and empowerment.

Clothing and Organizations

Within groups and organizations, collective practices and habits indicate membership and are used to promote unity among members. Research suggests that a common way in which members of a group or organization develop and exhibit cohesion is through clothing and appearance (Corley et al., 2006; Kaiser, 1990; Martin, 2002; Pratt & Rafaeli, 1997; Swain, 2002). By understanding the meaning and impact of clothing as a symbol, scholars have found that organizational clothing serves two critical functions: claiming control and expressing identity (Davis, 1992; Fussell, 1983; Joseph, 1986; Joseph & Alex, 1972; Lurie, 1992; Roach-Higgins et al., 1992).

Lurie (1992) stated that any time an organization directs an individual's clothing, the organization is removing individual control. Additional work on organizational clothing such as uniforms (Joseph, 1986), communes (Kanter, 1972), and flight attendants (Hochschild, 1983) showed a powerful association between organizational control over dress codes and an increase in member compliance with organizational rules. Becker et al. (1961) explained that the conspicuous uniform of medical professionals provides both a hierarchical differentiation from outside members and a way to enforce control. Rafaeli and Pratt (1993) suggested that de-individuation, or losing individual identity through becoming part of a group (Zimbardo, 1969), may explain this link by requiring all members to dress in the same way.

In addition, research indicates that organizations often adopt an exclusive identity for the group and its members to further differentiate them from other members of society (Arthur, 1997; Corley et al., 2006; Loseke, 2007; Pratt & Rafaeli, 1993; 1997). An organization may choose to incorporate identifiable clothing or uniforms to develop this exclusionary structure for individuals inside and outside the group (Joseph, 1986; Lurie, 1992; Pratt & Rafaeli, 1997;

25

Swain, 2002). By first establishing an organization's membership as distinct from outsiders, the framework for using clothing and appearance as a symbol ensures that the individual and overall group is 'set apart' from others (Corley et al., 2006; Freitas et al., 1997; Loseke, 2007; Wilkins, 2008).

Thus, the experience of joining an organization can sometimes be referred to as a rite of passage. A rite of passage can vary in length of time but occurs in three phases: 1) an individual's detachment from a previous environment or status; 2) transition to a new environment or status; and 3) incorporation of the new status into the group (Van Gennep, 1960). This implies that a person's identity evolves over time and is molded into a new identity related to a group or environment. Hence, formal and informal clothing mandates may be interpreted as methods of control over individual members of an organization and a way to relinquish individual identity to the identity of the group (Joseph, 1986; Lurie, 1992; Pratt & Rafaeli, 1997).

Not only do organizations use clothing to convey values, practices, and beliefs of the group itself, but by association, clothing also symbolizes the values, practices, and beliefs of the individual member within the organization (Pratt & Rafaeli, 1997). Pratt and Rafaeli investigated how clothing within an organization could be used to represent conflicting perceptions of the staff's professional identities. This study was conducted among nurses in a rehabilitation unit of a large midwestern university hospital. The hospital utilized various uniforms to symbolize hybrid identities of the nursing staff. The uniforms sometimes embodied different meanings that were often contradictory. For example, day shift nurses wore civilian clothing because they believed it symbolized the identity of the rehabilitation unit. Alternatively, the evening and night shift nurses wore traditional scrubs because they were associated with the identity of the acute care unit. The day shift nurses preferred civilian clothing to symbolize a

patient-centered identity, while evening shift nurses preferred scrubs to represent a more

autonomous professional identity. Pratt and Rafaeli (1997) concluded that although an

organization may establish certain uniform expectations to differentiate the group from outsiders,

each member of the organization has different layers of social identity they may choose to

express while working.

Other research suggests that a sense of unity can be developed among members of an

organization through sharing a similar clothing style (Freitas et al., 1997; Kaiser 1993; Pratt &

Rafaeli, 1997; Swain, 2002). Thus, a person's involvement or desire to be included in a certain

subculture, group, or organization is frequently represented and displayed through clothing and

appearance (Brewis et al., 1997; Kendall, 2002; Lurie, 1992; Swain, 2002; Wilkins, 2008).

Individuals gravitate toward clothing that agrees with their individual sense of social identity,

and use clothing to validate social roles through symbolization of a role or identity (Soloman,

1983; Wicklund & Gollwitzer, 1982). It has been suggested that products are often used to

symbolize a certain role or identity by those who are insecure in their role performance.

By participating in this self-symbolization, symbols that represent a person's identity can

be recognized and lead to identity validation. This reduces a person's internal anxieties, and

affirms their self-completion and identity (Wicklund & Gollwitzer, 1982). Studies have shown

that this is the case in sororities. Arthur (1997) describe the sorority experience as a rite of

passage where visual symbols are used to display acceptance and commitment to the traditions

and values of the organization. With sororities, new members are often uneasy as they leave a

familiar social status for a new and unfamiliar environment. This leads them to use visual

symbols that display group acceptance and commitment to the organization (Arthur, 1997;

1999).

The investigation of the sorority experience as a voluntary rite of passage relates to the involuntary rite of passage of incarceration. Women who choose to join a sorority must separate from their prior identity to fully embrace a new image, transition into a new role, and then incorporate symbols into their identity to show commitment to their new role. A sorority member outwardly affiliates herself with her organization through use of symbols on clothing to show her role embracement and commitment. A person who is incarcerated must also separate themselves from their past identity, transition into a new role as an incarcerated person, and then self-symbolize as an incarcerated person to fit into their new environment. An incarcerated person also shows role embracement, although not voluntary, by wearing government-issued clothing that symbolizes their new life as an incarcerated person.

In both experiences, there is an overarching desire to achieve status in a new environment, even if the membership is voluntary or not. An incarcerated person participates in a rite of passage (Maruna, 2011; Van Gennep, 1960) through rituals of release after arrest, legal proceedings, and incarceration. After incarceration, a person participates in a transitional phase between incarceration and free society. The idea that both the sorority experience and the incarceration experience may be viewed as a rite of passage provides a link between two seemingly opposite experiences.

The phase in which formerly incarcerated transition from incarceration to free society involves an attempt to attain clothing to better fit into a free society. Clothing plays a crucial role in reentry into society because appearance helps to establish a social identity that detaches a former incarcerated person from their identity while incarcerated (Smiley & Middlemass, 2016). This often results in reconstructing an entire wardrobe that is appropriate for weather and various social settings. By constructing a new social identity through clothing, a formerly incarcerated

person will decrease the stigmatization of having been incarcerated and will transition from an incarcerated person identity more quickly.

Smiley and Middlemass (2016) conducted a study about how clothing affects performance and social practice among incarcerated men who are transitioning from incarceration into society. This study explored three typologies that connect clothing and identity: 1) loss of identity; 2) reclamation of identity; and 3) creation of identity. The research was conducted from 2011 to 2013 through observations and narratives of formerly incarcerated individuals linked to a nonprofit reentry organization in Newark, New Jersey. This study included clothing experiences of 12 participants, each of whom had been released from prison within six months before the study. Participants were between 31 and 59 and of various ethnicities. The participants lacked resources to obtain clothing after incarceration, were unable to alter their prison image, and experienced a loss of identity. Although they were members of a free society, these formerly incarcerated individuals remained a criminal within their sense of self and identity through appearance. By not obtaining a new wardrobe after prison, participants were unable to create social distance between their identity as an incarcerated person and a new image after reentry into society.

Some participants were able to reclaim their identity through clothing styles that recreated the public image they displayed before incarceration. This group of participants exhibited a high clothing interest before incarceration where they used clothing to symbolize their social status, personality, and identity. After being released from prison, these participants wanted to recapture their former identity through previously worn clothing, regardless of changes in fashion trends that evolved throughout their incarceration period. These participants

had sentimental feelings about the wardrobes that represented their former selves, which made their pre-incarceration clothing styles an important part in reclaiming identity during reentry.

By wearing clothing from before incarceration, the formerly incarcerated individuals could recapture their former identities and status. One participant who completed a 28-year prison sentence recalled vivid memories of his wardrobe and its meaning before he became incarcerated. This man spoke extensively about his clothes, and remembered how important his pre-incarceration wardrobe was to his self-identity. The man depended on his memories of identity before incarceration because he could not use conventional clothing to express himself while being forced to wear an institutional uniform for close to 30 years. Alternatively, there were participants who preferred to create a completely new image to separate themselves from their pre-incarceration wardrobe to signify that they are a contemporary member within a free society. These participants believed that by creating a new identity, they would physically and psychologically distance themselves from their lifestyle before incarceration and signal to others that they have a new identity.

This study by Smiley and Middlemass (2016) explored how the loss of identity, reclaiming identity, and forming a new identity through clothing have significant implications for reentry. Although the study revealed that clothing is a critical resource for the formerly incarcerated who are transitioning from incarceration to free society, the focus was the role of clothing in reentry to society. The results of this study suggest that clothing has the power to alter an incarcerated person's identity and tangibly separate their body from the confines of government-issued clothing, thus allowing them to operate as a free citizen.

Clothing and Behavior

Studies have suggested that anonymity and de-individuation through clothing may influence the expression of certain types of behavior. Rehm et al. (1986) tested the assumption that by reducing personal identifiability, an individual may exhibit an increase in anti-normative behavior. In this experiment, 5th graders were randomly chosen to participate in a game of handball. The children were separated into two teams where the independent variable of personal identifiability was enforced through bright orange t-shirts for one team and personal clothing for the other team. Aggression, the dependent variable, was measured through observation of the number of aggressive incidents from each team. A total of 30 handball games were observed for ten minutes each, with five same gendered students on each opposing team. This study showed that teams that wore a designated uniform were significantly more aggressive than teams that wore personal clothing.

These results confirmed the assumption that a decrease in personal identifiability will lead to an increase in anti-normative behavior. Furthermore, when these results were analyzed by subject gender, male subjects showed major differences in aggression when wearing a designated uniform, while there were no differences in the female teams. Rehm et al. (1986) attributed the more aggressive acts by the uniformed team to the idea that anonymity leads individuals to feel more like their fellow group members and less like an individual. This anonymity leads individuals to think less about consequences of anti-normative behavior because they are less likely to be identified.

Frank and Gilovich (1988) also used sports teams to study the relationship between clothing and aggressive behavior through the use of color. The literature on the study of clothing suggests that color relays meaning, which modifies social perception under the conditions in

which the color is observed (Johnson et al., 2014). As a result, the color-in-context theory was developed as a theory of color psychology in which the meanings of colors are learned through repeated pairings with a specific message or experience (Elliot & Maier, 2007). Frank and Gilovich (1988) investigated how black uniforms influence aggressive behavior within professional contact sports. As in Rehm et al.'s (1986) experiment, Frank and Gilovich (1988) used members of professional sports teams in the National Football League (NFL) and National Hockey League (NHL) to understand if teams that wear black uniforms exhibit more aggressive behavior than teams that wear non-black uniforms.

The first study in this experiment aimed to determine if black uniforms are perceived differently than non-black uniforms. To ensure opinions remained unbiased and were made solely on the color of uniform and not the team association, 25 participants with no knowledge of football or ice hockey were recruited to rate characteristics of a team based on the uniform. For both NFL and NHL teams, the black uniforms looked stronger and more active when compared to non-black uniforms. To determine if NFL and NHL teams with black uniforms were penalized more often than teams with non-black uniforms, official penalty records from 1970 to 1986 for NFL and 1985/1986 for NHL were analyzed in the second study. A total of five teams in the NFL wore black uniforms at the time of this study. Analysis of penalized yards over a 17-year period found that the black uniformed teams incurred more penalties than non-black uniformed teams.

A total of five teams in the NHL wore black uniforms at the time of this study, but only three of those teams wore black uniforms during the 16-year period that was being analyzed. The three teams that wore black uniforms players spent more time in the penalty box than non-black uniformed players. The two teams that switched from non-black uniforms to black uniforms

throughout the investigation period experienced a significant increase in penalty minutes after the switch. While it is possible that players in black uniform indeed play more aggressively, the authors offered another possible explanation. The authors suggested that the black-uniformed players may not have necessarily played more aggressively but were more likely to be penalized for actions that would have been ignored by a non-black uniformed player. This suggestion agrees with information presented earlier that not only does clothing serve as a symbol, it may also cause a change in perception. Although the authors were not able to confirm why penalties were higher for teams who wore black uniforms, it was confirmed that the color of the uniform made a difference.

While the previous studies focused on aggressive behavior in a sports context, the results can be applied to the correctional environment. Color is used to differentiate sports teams, and is also used to differentiate individuals inside correctional facilities. Clothing color serves as a common identifier to distinguish individual incarcerated individuals or groups from one another (Ash, 2010). Color is also used to help facility staff identify volunteers, maintenance staff, and visitors. The 5th graders in Rehm et al.'s (1986) study were not only forced to relinquish their personal clothing, but were also given a bright orange shirt. The shirt was chosen by someone else so that the children would match other players on their team. Frank and Gilovich (1988) suggested that a member of a sports team who wears a certain color may not necessarily behave differently, but may be believed to exhibit anti-normative behavior due to someone else's perception of that color. This is likely to happen within a correctional facility based on meanings associated with certain colors of uniforms. Therefore, since the incarcerated are dressed alike like members of a sports team, the lack of individual expression, increase in anonymity, and perception through clothing may result in perceived anti-normative or aggressive behavior.

Enclothed Cognition

Adam and Galinsky (2012) built upon previous studies on the relationship between clothing and behavior through a study of how clothing influences the wearer's psychological processes. These researchers introduced the term "enclothed cognition" to "designate the systematic influence of clothes on the wearer's psychological processes and behavioral tendencies" (Adam & Galinsky, 2012, p. 219). Their argument compared the experience of wearing clothes to that of physical experiences that provoke related abstract concepts and their symbolic meanings. The idea of enclothed cognition involves the co-occurrence of two independent factors: "the symbolic meaning of the clothes and the physical experience of wearing the clothes" (Adam & Galinsky, 2012, p. 219). Thus, the primary principle of enclothed cognition is the way in which clothing affects a person's psychological processes. This depends on the symbolic meaning of the clothes and if the clothes are being worn by the person. This perspective agrees with the literature that found that individuals who adopt the perspective of a stereotyped group are more likely to exhibit behaviors that are consistent with that stereotype, when compared to those who are exposed to the stereotyped group (Galinsky et al., 2008). To test this argument, Adam and Galinsky (2012) used laboratory coats that are typically associated with doctors and scientists. This attire was chosen because it is symbolic of a scientific focus in which being careful and attentive is critical. Prior to conducting the experiments in this study, 38 participants were recruited to participate in an online survey to verify that a lab coat is typically associated with attention-related activities.

Based on the survey verification, Adam and Galinsky (2012) conducted three experiments to test their primary hypothesis that enclothed cognition depends on the symbolic meaning of clothes and physically wearing the clothes. In first experiment, 58 undergraduates

were randomly chosen for one of two conditions: not-wearing-a-lab-coat versus wearing-a-lab-coat. The symbolic meaning of the lab coat was not explained to the participants before the experiment. Participants who were part of the not-wearing-a-lab-coat group were advised to wear their own clothing. Adam and Galinsky (2012) measured selective attention through a Stroop task (in which a person says the color of a word but not the name of the word) (Stroop, 1935) that directed them to identify quickly and accurately whether letter strings were red or blue on a computer screen.

Results found that participants who were wearing a lab coat made about half as many errors as participants who were not wearing a lab coat. These results suggested that wearing a lab coat increases a person's selective attention. In the second experiment, 74 undergraduate students were randomly chosen for one of three conditions: wearing a doctor's coat, wearing a painter's coat, or seeing a doctor's coat. In this experiment, the symbolic meaning of the lab coat was explicitly stated instead of having the participants assume the meaning. The results of the sustained attention activity found that participants in the wearing-a-doctor's-coat group uncovered more image differences than participants in the painter's coat group and the seeing-a-doctor's-coat group. The accuracy of this visual search task was dependent upon the symbolic meaning of the lab coat and whether it was worn.

In the third experiment, 99 undergraduates were randomly chosen for one of three conditions: wearing a doctor's coat, wearing a painter's coat, or identifying with a doctor's coat. The results found that participants in the wearing-a-doctor's-coat group uncovered more image differences than participants in the identifying-with-a-doctor's-coat group who uncovered more image differences than participants in the wearing-a-painter's-coat group. The third experiment concluded that by identifying with the doctor's lab coat, there was an increased level of sustained

attention. The results from this experiment agreed with the enclothed cognition perspective in which wearing a coat that is described as a doctor's coat was more effective than simply identifying with it.

Although Adam and Galinsky (2012) found that there may be cognitive consequences of identifying and wearing a clothing item with a symbolic meaning, Lopez-Perez et al. (2016) noticed that the behavioral and emotional consequences of the enclothed cognition framework were overlooked. Lopez-Perez et al. (2016) conducted two studies to test Adam and Galinsky's (2012) enclothed cognition framework in the context of emotional response and prosocial behavior of participants while wearing and/or identifying with scrubs. To test this argument, Lopez-Perez et al. (2016) used blue scrubs that are typically associated with the nursing profession. Prior to conducting the experiments in this study, 41 participants were recruited to verify that a nurse's tunic is typically associated with care, concern, and prosocial behavior. In the first study, 150 adults from Southern England, ages 18-24, were randomly chosen for one of three conditions: wearing a nurse's scrub, wearing a cleaner's tunic, or identifying with a nurse's scrub.

The results indicated that wearing-a-nurse's-scrub and identifying-with-a-nurse's-scrub groups exhibited higher empathic concern toward the other participants and reported more helping behavior in a faster time. In the second study, 100 adults from a city in Spain, ages 18-43, were randomly chosen for one of four conditions: wearing a nurse's scrub, wearing a cleaner's tunic, identifying with a nurse's scrub, and identifying with a cleaner's scrub. The results showed that participants in the wearing-a-nurse's-tunic group showed the highest empathic concern, followed by participants in the identifying-with-a-nurse's tunic, wearing-a-cleaner's tunic, and identifying-with-a-cleaner's tunic group. Both studies conducted by Lopez-

Perez et al. (2016) supported the idea that wearing and identifying a scrub with a nursing tunic resulted in higher empathic concern. These results confirmed the enclothed cognition framework that by wearing and identifying a nurse's tunic, traditionally accepted concepts associated with nursing were exhibited by the wearer.

The enclothed cognition studies have shown that there are differences between seeing and wearing clothing when the clothing is associated with a symbolic meaning. Although these studies focused on the medical profession, the enclothed cognition framework can be applied to the incarcerated. Clothing worn while incarcerated is highly regulated in the institutional setting and it appears as if decision-makers have embraced the concept of enclothed cognition decades before the concept was created. Institutional uniforms for the incarcerated are often used to control the types of behaviors in which the incarcerated engage, to limit individuality, and to force them to look and act alike.

In 2016, *Newsweek* published an article that connected the concept of enclothed cognition to the shift in appearance of women's uniforms in the Utah DOC. In 2006, this group of incarcerated women were anxious, unruly, and rebellious against regulations which resulted in violence. Instead of punishing the women, the guards thought the women could be reacting to feelings of dehumanization triggered by their prison clothing. The guards observed that the pants these women were wearing were so thin that sanitary pads were visible from the outside. A spokesman from the Utah DOC stated that "A male's white uniform doesn't do much for [a woman's] self-respect" (Neilson, 2016). The incarcerated women were given new uniforms in a plum wine color and with enhanced fabric, which was a stark contrast from the prior translucent white uniforms. This change led to a significant decrease in disciplinary infractions.

It was concluded that the change in uniforms shifted the women's self-perception from an incarcerated person to a regular, normal person. Not only did this new uniform change the way the women viewed themselves, it also changed the way they viewed the world. Although the plum uniforms were required for the incarcerated women, the change in color and brand-new fabric erased the stigma associated with their old uniforms. The women also felt heard and cared for by the DOC, as if they were people who mattered instead of an incarcerated person. Although the costs were not specified, altering uniforms for any correctional population comes with a hefty price tag. This example of using clothing to empower the incarcerated can be viewed as a small rehabilitative shift in the corrections system.

Clothing and Incarceration

Temporal Identity Integration

Studies have shown that identity formation is the key developmental objective in adolescence and rising adulthood (Arnett, 2000; Erikson, 1959). Erikson (1959) found that identity formation is an attempt to attain an individual sense of coherence and continuity by integrating the self, both contextually and temporally. Syed and McLean (2016) defined identity integration as a sense of self-continuity and coherence, and stated that an integrated identity signals healthy identity development. Although identity during adulthood is expected to be fairly stable, significant life events may disrupt self-continuity, and result in temporal identity integration (Mitchell et al., 2020; Syed & Mitchell, 2015).

Temporal identity integration is a specific type of identity integration that reveals the degree of connection between an individual's past, present, and future identity over time (Syed & Mitchell, 2015). Syed and Mitchell emphasized the importance of temporal identity integration by explaining that individuals are able to restore and incorporate past experiences, current issues,

and future possibilities that lead to a promising identity. Through achieving successful identity formation, an individual is able to commit to self-pledged values (Erikson, 1968), whereas unsuccessful identity formation may result in a negative identity that resists a desired role within society (Erikson, 1959).

Solomontos-Kountouri and Hatzittofi (2016) conducted a study to understand how incarcerated young adults form their identities throughout the process of incarceration and how education contributes to identity formation. The participant group of 26 individuals who were incarcerated in the Cyprus Prison Department were between the ages of 16 and 25. Since incarceration can be viewed as a rite of passage, the young participants in this study viewed their lives as two significant life transitions related to identity. The first life transition was when they were arrested, which separated them from their previous identity. The second life transition would be their future release, when they will become a member of free society. This would signals the beginning of their future identity. Between the two life transitions was the time of incarceration, or their present identity.

The participants viewed themselves as having an emerging identity where improvements could be made that would lead to their release. The young incarcerated individuals examined their identity using the perspective of time. Four themes emerged from this study: (a) Past identity (prior to incarceration) was characterized by collective risk factors such as detachment from society, family, and institutions; (b) present identity was defined by participation in the prison's educational program; (c) emergent identity (leading up to release) included the incarcerated person's desire for training and education and their commitment to earn qualifications; (d) future identity (after release) was exhibited by investing in individual growth, work, community, and family (Solomontos-Kountouri & Hatzittofi, 2016).

This study found that the incarcerated participated in a informal educational program offered at their prison as an investment towards a positive future identity. The participants showed their commitment to defy negative stereotypes by investing in something that would positively influence their identity. The concept of temporal identity integration agrees with the idea that an incarcerated person who experiences a major life disruption, such as incarceration, will undergo a change in identity. Within this type of major life disruption, the idea of expressing individuality through clothing prior to incarceration is affected by the involuntary trade of personal clothing for institutional uniforms. Upon release from prison, an incarcerated person will experience another disruptive life event where they have an opportunity to develop a new identity through wearing clothing in free society. To fully develop a healthy identity, the incarcerated person will have the freedom to restore past experiences as they work towards a promising new identity.

Stigmatized Identity Management

Goffman (1963) defined stigma as "an attribute that is deeply discrediting" which lessens an individual "from a whole and usual person to a tainted, discounted one" (p. 3). A stigmatized identity often stems from an environment of power and results in a diminished individual who is not fully accepted into society. The experience of incarceration, detachment from society and family, interactions with the fellow incarcerated, and the power and punishment enforced by corrections officers may lead to negative identity meaning. These negative identity meanings can include influence from other incarcerated persons, tarnished personal status, institutionalization (Rowe, 2011) and stigmatization (Rowe, 2011; Toyoki & Brown, 2014).

Rowe (2011) examined how women in two English prisons represented self and identity and how they constructed self-meanings and identities through experiences. Data for this study

were collected from New Hall, a closed prison that housed short-term, long-term, and life-sentenced prisoners and Askham Grange, an open prison that encouraged women to volunteer, study, or work outside the prison. A group of 59 incarcerated individuals were interviewed, with 30 from New Hall and 29 from Askham Grange. The concepts of self and identity were present in participants' reflections of their experience in prison.

It was found that the women actively counteracted painful experiences and meanings associated with incarceration with positive identities. Some of the incarcerated associated the meaning of incarceration with recovery, growth, or freedom. Other participants stated that they developed, challenged, or confirmed their identities while in prison. This helped the incarcerated to cope with any painful or stigmatizing meanings they had associated with incarceration. The Rowe (2011) study suggested that the incarcerated were able to construct and manage the meanings associated with incarceration and daily encounters within the prison, which enabled them to overcome the experiences and meanings associated with pain. By strengthening their identities, the incarcerated could resist the systemic power associated with prison and exert their own power to redefine meanings that would initially threaten their selves and their status. This positive construction of identity while incarcerated helped the women look forward to who they could be upon reentry into society.

Toyoki and Brown (2014) investigated how incarcerated men managed their stigmatized prisoner identities in the oldest 'high-security' prison in Finland, Helsinki. This study included semi-structured interviews with 44 participants, which were conducted over a 12-month period. Toyoki and Brown (2014) found that incarcerated men managed their stigmatized identities by associating a positive meaning with the prisoner label. The participants supported social values and tried to present themselves as good individuals. It was found that the incarcerated managed

their stigmatized identity by redefining the label of 'prisoner,' connecting to roles they valued outside of prison, and personally highlighting that they can be both a prisoner and a 'good' person.

The incarcerated challenged the negative stereotypes associated with incarceration by consistently working on a positive identity instead of adopting a helpless victim role. Furthermore, while adapting to life in prison, the incarcerated were able to simultaneously manage their stigmatized identities by fostering characteristics that were socially embraced, ethical, and aligned with being a valuable human being. Both Rowe (2011) and Toyoki and Brown (2014) concluded that the ways in which prisoners managed their stigmatized identities included a variety of protective disguises, verbally challenging power within their institutional environment, and asserting their individuality through acts of resistance. These strategies helped incarcerated individuals to form stable and secure identities that would not only help them throughout incarceration but also during their transition back into society.

Summary

This literature review incorporated information about US correctional institutions with previous clothing research. Although these topics have been explored individually throughout the literature, there have been no cross-disciplinary studies designed to understand the relationship between them. There is much evidence that supports the concept that clothing plays an important role in the development, continuation, and expression of self and social identity. However, the non-verbal communication of clothing depends upon the interpretation of its meaning. Although this concept has been explored in various organizational contexts where control over clothing is present, the incarcerated population has been overlooked. While it is clear that the life-altering

experience of incarceration affects a person's self and social identity, it is important to

understand how this change is influenced by clothing.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The following research questions were developed to examine the impact of incarceration on the relationship between clothing and identity:

RQ1: How do individuals describe clothing issued to them while incarcerated?

RQ2: How does the incarceration process change a person's relationship with their clothing?

RQ3: How do individuals communicate social identity through clothing throughout the incarceration process?

RQ4: How do individuals communicate self-identity through clothing throughout the incarceration process?

Research Design

A review of the literature affirmed the effectiveness of the qualitative method in research on clothing and prisons. Qualitative research provides value in the openness of the approach (Giorgi, 2005). Oaklander (1992) stated that the objective of a qualitative study is to discover new information rather than to confirm a hypothesis. Through the iterative process of qualitative research, a new meaning or perspective may be discovered about a phenomenon that has not been previously considered (Giorgi, 2005). The objective of a phenomenological approach is to explore the meaning of an experience from the perspective of the person who has lived the experience (Giorgi, 2005). Wertz (2005) explained that throughout a phenomenological study, the researcher seeks to experience a phenomenon in the way it was experienced by the participant. The phenomenological approach enables the researcher to recognize meanings which a participant specifically expresses (Wertz, 2005). The present study consists of a two-part research design: 1) qualitative thematic analysis of personal blogs written by current and

formerly incarcerated individuals; and 2) semi-structured exploratory recall interviews with formerly incarcerated individuals. These methods are independent of one another; therefore, this study incorporated simultaneous data collection and analysis processes.

Personal Blogs

Primary sources of data from currently incarcerated individuals are difficult to obtain. Therefore, the qualitative thematic analysis of blogs served as a method to collect data from currently incarcerated persons without physically entering a correctional facility. Some individuals, specific groups, or issues are considered high risk or vulnerable and have been called "sensitive topics" (Lee & Renzetti, 1990; Schlosser, 2008). The North Carolina State University (NCSU) Institutional Review Board (IRB) considers currently incarcerated persons to be part of a vulnerable population and discourages the inclusion of these participants in research studies. In addition, the North Carolina State DOC has its own IRB with Federal and DOC policies and regulations that may prevent various research studies. The COVID-19 pandemic has also limited face-to-face interviews along with other imposed restrictions from both the University and the DOC.

One limitation while studying the incarcerated in the correctional setting is the non-use of electronic recording devices. Some facilities allow these devices and some do not, and this affects the reliability of transcripts. Vanhouche (2015) found that even when researchers could use an electronic recording device in correctional facilities, it was mandatory that a staff member attend each interview. Thus, the presence of an authority figure increased the likelihood of inaccurate answers. Someone who has never been incarcerated (researcher) may have difficulty gaining trust from a currently incarcerated person (Copes et al., 2012; Schlosser, 2008).

Gaining access to high-risk groups such as the currently incarcerated presents a unique set of obstacles for any researcher. To avoid these challenges, this study explored secondary data in the form of personal prison blogs available in the public domain. Blogs are a useful research tool that provide the researcher with an opportunity to access descriptive thoughts or experiences of groups of individuals who are otherwise socially or geographically distant. A variety of disciplines have used analysis of blogs as a research methodology. These include Olive et al. (2013) who created a blog to better understand women's experiences in a surfing culture through published stories and posts; and Wilson et al. (2015) who collected data from undergraduate research students through blogs as a structured space to record thoughts and experiences about their research. For the current study, the use of blogs enabled the researcher to gain access to members of the incarcerated population from a previously inaccessible space (Goldman, 2008; Hookway, 2008).

Qualitative thematic analysis, an analytic method used to subjectively categorize and analyze textual information (Morgan, 1993), is often used to study blog content. McGannon et al. (2017) concluded that "blogs are advantageous to study because they offer researchers an unobtrusive method to gain access to naturalistic narratives which participants use to construct their identities in a spontaneously generated format" (p. 127). A personal blog is written by a single author and is typically not written for financial gains (von Benzon, 2019). Thematic analysis is defined as "the scoring of messages for content, style, or both for the purpose of assessing the characteristics or experiences of persons, groups, or historical periods" (Smith et al., 1992, p. 1). In this method, counts and tabulations of codes provide a summary of the information, leading to interpretation of a pattern embedded in the codes (Morgan, 1993). The current study used a descriptive qualitative thematic analysis of personal blogs written by

persons who were currently or formerly incarcerated at the time in which the blog was written. This method was used to answer the four research questions.

Sample Description

For a small project using secondary sources, such as personal blogs, 10-100 individual blog entries were suggested (Braun & Clark, 2013) as a sample size. No literature was found to justify how these numbers were determined, but there have been suggestions that they will provide sufficient data to identify patterns but not too much data for management purposes (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2007). Therefore, this study employed a sample size of 10 individual personal prison blog entries.

Data Collection

A blog is the product of user-generated content and personal webpages (Haferkamp & Kramer, 2008; Turkle, 1995). Unlike personal webpages that display original content in a static configuration, blogs present steadily changing content, where new posts emerge daily in reverse chronological order (Wei, 2009). Computer software used for blogs provides the ability of organizing archived posts, so they are easily available to the reader. Since inception, blogs have been described as a powerful means of communication (Kline & Burstein, 2005; Rodzvilla, 2002; Rosenberg, 2009; Woods, 2005). Blogs may include information about a variety of topics (Jost & Hipolit, 2006) and are frequently categorized into genres based on content. Personal blogs are similar to a personal journal used to highlight everyday life events and sometimes include informal photographs (Jung et al., 2007). Hookway (2008) stated that personal blogs may be "highly confessional and self-analytical blogs in which bloggers make sense of their identity and relationships with others" (p. 102). Blogs allow for a "backstage" view of personal

characteristics of a person's life, making this form of media an attractive data source for researchers in the social sciences (Chenail, 2011).

It has been determined that blog posts can be found through simple key-word searches (Cheng et al., 2011; Webb & Wang, 2013). For this study, prison blog websites were identified before searching for individual prison blogs. Prison blog websites were identified through the search engine, Google. To identify these blogs, search queries such as "prisoner blog," "inmate blog," "inmate writing, "and "prisoner writing" were entered. For this study, the researcher completed the following steps: 1) identify prison blog websites; and 2) search for a specific set of keywords within each prison blog website. Table 1 includes the set of keywords searched in each prison blog website.

Table 1. Prison Blog Keywords

Personalization	Customization	Identity
Clothing	Fashion	Uniform

The selected keywords were used frequently throughout literature discussed in Chapter 2. Steps 1 and 2 were carried out until no new results appeared from the search queries or keyword search. The researcher reviewed each search result and clicked on links in the order in which they appeared. After individual blogs were identified, the researcher applied inclusion criteria to each individual blog: the blog must be published in English; and the owner of each blog presented themselves as a currently or formerly incarcerated person in the US. Similarly, exclusion criteria included blogs that require a password, blogs written about other persons who were incarcerated (blog author was not personally incarcerated), and published texts containing citations or comments. These criteria helped to identify blogs readily available in the public domain that

were more likely to have been uploaded by the original author under their own free will, without payment.

These blogs were a reflection of the original authors' thoughts and experiences without coercion or monetary incentives. A benefit of using this type of data is that it can be gathered using tools readily available to the researcher: computers and Internet access. Because blogs are publicly available at low or no cost, extensive amounts of data are widely accessible for downloading and subsequent analysis (Webb & Wang, 2013). Given the previously mentioned limitations in interviewing currently incarcerated persons, immediate access to personal prison blogs provided the researcher with words of experience from individuals with whom they may not be able to ordinarily access face-to-face.

Data Analysis

Blog researchers frequently use qualitative research methods to explore content (Webb & Wang, 2013). Qualitative methods used in this type of media lend themselves to field studies where conversations appear to naturally occur within text (Gray, 2009). Wiles et al. (2011) suggested that blog studies depend on traditional qualitative techniques such as thematic analysis. A thematic analysis uses an open-coding method, with identified themes developing from the data instead of using pre-determined categories forced upon the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). In the open coding method, researchers try to identify common concepts or themes that occur across data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Owen's (1984) three criteria of a theme is widely used by blog researchers: 1) recurrence (the same idea appears and reappears within the data, but words and styles may vary); 2) repetition (the same words or similar language is used to express the same idea within the data); and 3) forcefulness (ideas strongly emphasized within the text or images). Webb and Wang (2013) stated that if the same idea is mentioned across three or more

sources, that idea becomes a theme. Furthermore, a defining or major theme occurs when virtually all sources include the same idea (Webb & Wang, 2013). Past researchers have used a hand-coding method where coders physically highlight key concepts within the text and later recap their findings in separate notes, but advancements in computer technology have provided additional options (Webb & Wang, 2013). The qualitative research software application NVivo 11 was used to organize and code data for thematic analysis (Welsh, 2002).

In this study, personal prison blog posts were analyzed to provide a descriptive account of the phenomenon. After blogs were identified using keywords, each blog was electronically transferred to NVivo for organizational purposes. Harrison et al. (2001) stressed the importance of a researcher's influence in both research and representations when analyzing data. In agreement with this strategy, the researcher read the blog several times and highlighted phrases or sentences that could potentially represent a theme to answer one of the research questions. For example, a blog may reference an alteration in clothing. The researcher could interpret this to mean the incarcerated person was attempting to customize their clothing. The words "clothing customization" would be entered as a node, or theme, in NVivo. Each time a reference was made to the customization of clothing in that blog, the phrase was highlighted and identified under the node of "clothing customization." To reduce the textual data of the blogs, posts that shared similar content were grouped together. These grouped posts were compared to one another to identify related subthemes. Next, the subthemes were grouped into larger categories which represent broad themes (Hycner, 1985). These themes helped to determine which themes were relevant to the phenomenon of this study (Giorgi, 2009; Hycner 1985; Wertz, 2005). Finally, general categories were determined based upon the themes.

For validation purposes, a triangulation procedure was used to corroborate findings (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). In thematic analysis, it is common for multiple coders to compare observations and identify related themes across coders (Webb & Wang, 2013). After ten individual blog posts were identified, the researcher and two committee members examined evidence for themes to triangulate the data.

Exploratory Recall Interviews

Interviews have become a frequently used form of qualitative research data collection (Gubrium, 2012). This method can be utilized as a single method or combined with additional methods for data collection (Roller & Lavrakas, 2015). Interviews are an empirical tool to create knowledge (della Porta, 2014) and are used to understand causes and complicated processes in criminal justice research (Lindquist, 2000; Maxfield & Babbie, 2016; Rosenbaum & Lavrakas, 1995; Rowe, 2011; Schutt, 2004; Smiley & Middlemass, 2016; Toyoki & Brown, 2014). Semi-structured interviews direct the conversation to answer the research questions, while allowing open dialogue between the researcher and participant (Moustakas, 1994; Wertz, 2005). Past phenomenological researchers have used in-depth conversations and interviews as a method in involve participants in a study (Giorgi, 2005; King, 1994; Morse, 1994; Seidman, 2006; Wertz, 2005). The present phenomenological study was conducted through online individual, audio-recorded exploratory recall semi-structured interviews that used open-ended questions. These interviews helped the researcher understand how participants' personal experiences with institutional clothing while incarcerated have affected their identity. All four research questions were addressed by this method.

Sample Description

Qualitative research studies typically require a smaller sample size when compared to quantitative research studies (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). A qualitative sample size should provide enough data to describe the phenomenon and answer the research questions. The researcher must consider the type of research design when deciding on the participant sample size (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Although there is no specific rule for sample size, there are recommendations to help the researcher estimate the number of needed participants. For example, Creswell (1998) suggested between five and 25 participants and Morse (1994) recommended at least six participants for a phenomenological research study. Based on these recommendations and similar research designs found in the literature, this study included 15 participants.

Participant Recruitment

In agreement with other phenomenological researchers, the method of purposeful sampling was used to create the participant group for this study (Groenewald, 2004). Purposeful sampling allowed for the intentional selection and recruitment of participants who have experienced a particular phenomenon (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Moustakas, 1994; Sandelowski, 2000). For this study, participants were selected through a re-entry council or non-profit organization that helps formerly incarcerated individuals with re-entry into society. The researcher emailed a representative from several of these organizations to explain the purpose of this research and requested permission to submit a participant recruitment flyer for distribution among members of the organization. It was explained that the representative does not need to personally recruit participants, but rather inform members of the opportunity to participate in the study. Other participants were recruited through email, or direct message on Facebook, LinkedIn,

Instagram, or other social media platforms by the researcher. To be considered, participants must have been previously incarcerated for any length of time at any correctional institution in the US. Sex, age when incarcerated, and years of incarceration and release varied among the participants. Per IRB guidelines, all participants were required to be at least 18 years old and could not be currently incarcerated in a correctional facility. To ensure these requirements were met, each potential participant engaged in a telephone screening conducted by the researcher. Before participating in this study, subjects were asked to sign a consent form that granted permission for audio recording and any re-identifiable data to be used in future research.

Request for the approval of this research study was submitted to the IRB for the Protection of Human Subjects. Upon approval of all IRB protocol, the process of participant recruitment began. Initially, IRB approval was not requested for participants who were currently enrolled in a post-release program. Due to the interest level of potential participants who were a part of a post-release program, and the desire to obtain data from a variety of participants, the decision was made to request approval for this population. The researcher submitted an amended IRB application, which was approved.

Data Collection

Interviews and in-depth conversations are often used by phenomenological researchers as strategies in which participants engage in a study (Giorgi, 2005; Hycner, 1985; King, 1994; Morse, 1994; Seidman, 2006; Wertz, 2005). Semi-structured interviews allow open interview dialogue between the researcher and participant while guiding the conversation toward the targeted research questions (Moustakas, 1994; Wertz, 2005). An important element in the semi-structured interview process is the relationship between the researcher and the participant. This relationship helps the participant to overcome any perceived boundaries they may have in

sharing their incarceration experience (Giorgi, 2009). Thus, the researcher is actively involved in the interview process by asking probing questions to help gain clarity about the meanings behind their experience of incarceration. The researcher develops the order of questions so that the train of thought will flow smoothly for the participant (Groenewald, 2004; Moustakas, 1994). While the participant will be able to openly share information about their incarceration experience, the researcher will direct the discussion back to the details that best responds to the research questions (Giorgi, 2009; Groenewald, 2004).

A crucial consideration in the phenomenological interview process is the length of an interview (Giorgi, 2009). Although there is no ideal length of time during which a semi-structured exploratory recall interview is conducted, Giorgi (2009) advised that the length of the interviews should be suitable for the phenomenon being studied. For this study, the researcher dedicated 60 minutes for each participant to share their experience of the incarceration process as it related to clothing. This interview framework was determined by the following phases: 1) a brief oral presentation given by the researcher to the participant (5 minutes); 2) participant response to questions about their relationship with clothing before incarceration (15 minutes); 3) participant response to questions about their relationship with clothing while incarcerated (15 minutes); 4) participant response to questions about their current relationship with clothing (15 minutes); 5) demographic questions (5 minutes); and 6) interview wrap-up (5 minutes). While a time frame was allocated to each interview phase, the researcher transitioned to the next topic if a participant moved beyond the scope of the phenomenon or responses become repetitive and no longer produced new information. Furthermore, the pace and length of an interview may vary due to an established rapport between the participant and the interviewer (Groenewald, 2004). It was the responsibility of the interviewer to keep the conversation on track.

As stated above, Phase 1 of the interview included a brief oral presentation. The IRB protocol requires that a brief oral presentation be given to participants prior to their participation in the interview. This presentation included guidelines such as no mention of correctional facility, incarcerated person names, or officer names while answering questions and a reminder that the interview was audio recorded. During this presentation, the researcher reiterated that participation is voluntary, and any participant may withdraw their willingness to participate at any time. Participants were told prior to interviewing that they may choose to skip a question or end the interview at any time if a question causes distress. After the presentation, there was time for the participant to ask additional questions to encourage a level of comfort between the participant and the researcher.

Phases 2, 3, and 4 involved the participant answering a series of general questions about their experience with clothing and the incarceration process that was used to help the researcher answer the research questions (Appendix A). Based on findings from the literature, this portion of the interview included three categories of questions: 1) the participant's relationship with clothing before incarceration; 2) the participant's relationship with clothing during incarceration; and 3) participant's current relationship with clothing. Next, the participant was asked general demographic questions about their incarceration experience, including type(s) of correctional facility, year when incarcerated, and year of release. Finally, the researcher thanked the participant for their time and the interview ended. Interviews were audio-recorded through NCSU's Zoom platform. Per IRB COVID-19 guidelines, no in-person interviews were used for this study. Interviews were recorded to the cloud and transcribed through Zoom. No additional transcription software was used.

Procedure and Instrumentation

Semi-structured interview questions were developed to answer the research questions in this study. To understand each participant's relationship with clothing at three distinct phases in their lives, interview questions were divided into three groups: 1) before incarceration; 2) during incarceration; 3) and after incarceration. There were demographic questions at the end of the interview that contributed to a better understanding of the participant's experience. The interview questions were designed so the researcher could gain a holistic perspective of each participant's incarceration experience. Information obtained through each question collectively answered the aforementioned research questions.

Review of the literature suggests that individuals tend to wear products that agree with their individual sense of social identity (Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton, 1981; Furby, 1978; Solomon, 1983; Wicklund & Gollwitzer, 1982). Clothing has been recognized as a consumer product used to communicate self and social identity (Davis, 1984; Kaiser, 1985; Stone, 1962). Thus, the dynamic and flexible nature of the self (Hannover, 1997; Markus & Wurf, 1987) enables individuals to use clothing as a symbol to define their social identity. Prior to incarceration, participants in this study experienced the freedom to express themselves through their everyday clothing. To understand how incarceration may affect a person's relationship with their clothing, it is important to first understand how they expressed themselves and what they found most important in their clothing choices. Therefore, the following interview question was asked: *Tell me about how you dressed prior to incarceration and what was most important to you.*

Ash (2010) stated that while incarcerated, individuals are required to wear government-issued clothing to distinguish them from corrections officers, guards, civilians, visitors, and other

incarcerated individuals. Ash explained that facilities code uniforms through color. Through the association of certain styles or colors with a type of incarcerated person, clothing serves as both a functional and symbolic label within a correctional facility. This literature led to the following request: *Tell me about how you dressed while incarcerated and describe the clothing.* By understanding the meaning and impact of clothing as a symbol, researchers have concluded that organizational clothing serves two key functions: it claims control and it expresses identity (Davis, 1992; Fussell, 1983; Joseph, 1986; Joseph & Alex, 1972; Lurie, 1992; Roach-Higgins et al., 1992). Lurie (1992) stated that by enforcing certain dress codes, organizations remove the individual control of its members. Not only do uniforms identify members of a group, but they also serve as a nonverbal communication. By participating in a uniform-wearing practice, members of a group are obeying rules set forth by their organization (Craik, 2003).

To understand how this communication is received by the incarcerated, participants were asked the following question: *Why do you think you were required to wear this clothing?* Once incarcerated, individuals must relinquish personal clothing in exchange for standardized clothing that symbolically removes any identity, self or social, associated with the outside world (Goffman, 1961c). This led to the question, *How did it feel to exchange your street clothes for clothes that were chosen for you?* Although a correctional facility exerts power over individuals' lives (Barak-Glantz, 1981), incarcerated persons find small ways to grasp individual identity (Goffman, 1968). In consideration of this literature, each participant was asked the following question: *Were you able to express your personality in some way through changes in your clothing? If so, please describe how.* The questions in this section helped the participant recall the impact of institutional clothing on how they viewed themselves and their place in a new society throughout the incarceration process.

Upon release, a person must decide who they want to be (self-identity) and how they want to fit into society (social identity). Clothing decisions are relatively easy to control (Feinberg et al., 1992) and can serve as a tool for a formerly incarcerated person to exhibit personal characteristics. As highlighted in Chapter 2, Smiley and Middlemass (2016) conducted a study that focused on how clothing impacts social practice among incarcerated men who are transitioning from incarceration to society. This study explored three typologies to connect clothing and identity: 1) loss of identity; 2) reclamation of identity; and 3) creation of identity.

The results indicated that some participants chose to create an entirely new image to separate themselves from their pre-incarceration wardrobe, while others reverted to their pre-incarceration wardrobe. The results demonstrate that the connection between clothing and identity after incarceration is a personal decision. Thus, the following questions were developed to understand the impact of clothing on identity after incarceration: *Tell me about how you dress now that you are a free member of society and why you choose to dress that way.; Has incarceration impacted your choice of clothing? If so, would you describe the impact?;* and *Has your clothing helped you reconstruct your identity since release? If so, would you describe how?*

Finally, the following demographic questions were developed to provide a framework for interpreting each participant's incarceration experience: *In what type of facility were you incarcerated? (ex. county jail, state prison, federal prison, juvenile, county prison, private prison); In what year were you incarcerated?; How old were you when you were first incarcerated?; In what year were you released?;* and *How old were you when you were released?.*

Data Analysis

Giorgi (1985) proposed that methodology, specifically how data are collected and analyzed, establishes the reliability of a phenomenological study. Data collection and analysis often occur simultaneously throughout qualitative research (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). To successfully analyze audio data, interviews must be transcribed and typed accurately. To ensure the accuracy of transcripts, the researcher typically listens to the audio recording while reviewing the transcripts (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). Interview participants were given the opportunity to review for accuracy and to clarify content. After participants had the opportunity to review the transcripts, the researcher began to analyze the data.

The exploratory recall interviews were analyzed using Lieblich et al.'s (1998) holistic-content method. In agreement with this method, interview transcripts were read several times to gain an understanding of patterns in the narratives. Labeling or categorization of data was conducted through open coding. Merriam (1998) defines coding as "nothing more than assigning some sort of short-hand designation to various aspects of your data so that you can easily retrieve specific pieces of the data" (p. 164). The method of open-coding or developing themes from the data instead of using pre-determined categories (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) is typically used in thematic analysis. By using the method of open coding, researchers identify common themes or concepts that occur across data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). In alignment with the analysis of prison blogs mentioned previously, the qualitative research software application NVivo 11 was used to organize and code interview data for thematic analysis (Welsh, 2002).

According to Harrison et al. (2001), the researcher maintains an important level of influence, in both research and representations when analyzing data. In agreement with this strategy, the researcher read each interview transcript several times and highlighted sentences of

phrases that could represent a theme to answer one of the research questions. For example, an interview participant may describe the color of their uniform worn while incarcerated. This refers to an "external attribute" about government-issued clothing. The phrase "external attribute" would be entered into NVivo and created as a node, or theme. The data including the description of the color of a uniform would be highlighted and categorized under the node "external attribute" in NVivo. After the interview coding was complete, nodes that shared related content were grouped together. These nodes were compared to one another to identify related subthemes. The subthemes were then grouped into larger categories which represented broad themes (Hycner, 1985). The researcher then determined which broad themes were relevant to the phenomenon of incarceration (Giorgi, 2009; Hycner 1985; Wertz, 2005). Finally, general categories were matched to the corresponding research question.

For validation purposes, multiple validity procedures were used to corroborate findings (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). A thematic analysis was conducted for each interview using a triangulation procedure. After completion of the first three interviews, the researcher and two committee members examined evidence for themes discovered through the interview process. This strategy helped to construct a rational justification for each theme (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). In addition, rich, thick description was used to convey perspectives about themes uncovered during the interviews.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results and discussion of the data collected from prison blogs and semi-structured interviews. As discussed in Chapter 3, the data were analyzed by using an open-coding method in which themes are developed from the data instead of using pre-determined themes forced upon the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). In this method, the researcher identified common themes or concepts that occur across the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This was achieved by using Owen's (1984) three criteria of a theme: 1) recurrence (the same idea appears and reappears within the data, but words and styles may vary); 2) repetition (the same words or similar language is used to express the same idea within the data); and 3) forcefulness (ideas strongly emphasized within the text or images). Therefore, in this chapter, the research design, blog author, and interview participant information are examined and discussed. For this research study, prison blogs and personal interview data were collected and analyzed simultaneously.

Blog Demographics

A total of 10 blogs were collected from prison blog websites, which were identified through a Google search. Five blog authors were male, four were female, and one was not specified. Two blog authors were incarcerated in each of the following states: Connecticut, Missouri, and Texas. One blog author was incarcerated in each of the following states: Michigan, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania. One author did not disclose the state in which they were incarcerated. Nine blog authors were incarcerated at the time in which the blog was written, while one author wrote after release. Table 2 includes descriptive information of the prison blog authors.

Table 2. Descriptive Information of Prison Blog Authors

Blog number	Gender	US state where incarcerated	Name of blog website
1	Female	Missouri	Prison Insight
2	Female	Missouri	Prison Insight
3	unknown	unknown	Prison Insight
4	Male	Michigan	Prison Writers
5	Male	Pennsylvania	Federal Prison Time
6	Male	North Carolina	Prison Writers
7	Female	Connecticut	Prison Diaries
8	Female	Connecticut	Prison Diaries
9	Male	Texas	Prison Fellowship
10	Male	Texas	Prison Writers

Interview Demographics

For this study, a total of 15 semi-structured exploratory recall interviews were completed. Each interview lasted between 30 minutes and 75 minutes. Participants were asked pre-determined questions and answered accordingly (Appendix A). All interviews were conducted through Zoom and no in-person interviews took place. Audio interview files were automatically transcribed by Zoom. It required approximately two hours to review each audio file and transcript for accuracy. Of the 15 interview participants, nine participated in member checking.

Interview participants were recruited through various social media platforms or through non-profit organizations. For confidentiality purposes, participant names were changed to the numerical order in which the interview was conducted. Among the interview participants, there were 12 males and three females. At the time of the interviews, participants' ages ranged from 25 to 68 years old. Of the 15 participants, five were incarcerated in California, three in North Carolina, and two in New York. Each of four participants completed their sentence in the following states: Arizona, Idaho, New Jersey, and South Dakota. Finally, one participant was incarcerated several different times in various states across the country. The time since

participants had been released ranged from one year to 25 years. Table 3 provides the descriptive

information of the 15 interview participants.

Table 3. Descriptive Information of Interview Participants

Participant number	Gender	Age at interview	State where incarcerated	Time passed since release
1	Male	45	North Carolina	4 years
2	Female	49	North Carolina	6 years
3	Male	44	North Carolina	7 years
4	Male	31	New York	2 years
5	Female	42	New York	2 years
6	Male	25	Idaho	4 years
7	Male	51	Arizona	25 years
8	Male	46	New Jersey	1 year
9	Male	55	California	18 years
10	Male	58	California	4 years
11	Male	56	California	1 year
12	Male	61	California	11 years
13	Male	66	California	3 years
14	Male	68	Various	19 years
15	Female	36	South Dakota	5 years

The total number of years each participant had been incarcerated ranged from two years

to 32 years. One participant served many years, but the specific number is unknown. The chart in

Figure 1 illustrates the total years of incarceration for interview participants.

Figure 1. Years of Incarceration of Interview Participants

All prison blog and interview transcriptions were read and re-read several times. Themes and subthemes were derived from an open-coding process through NVivo. The following research questions guided this study:

RQ1: How do individual describe clothing issued to them while incarcerated?

RQ2: How does the incarceration process change a person's relationship with their clothing?

RQ3: How do individuals communicate social identity through clothing throughout the incarceration process?

RQ4: How do individuals communicate self-identity through clothing throughout the incarceration process?

In this chapter, the findings are organized by research question and subsequent themes and subthemes that answer the corresponding question. Each research question serves as a section heading and is followed by a discussion of themes and subthemes determined by an analysis of the data.

RQ1: How do individuals describe clothing issued to them while incarcerated?

Both blog authors and interview participants described clothing issued to them while incarcerated in varying detail. Two broad themes emerged through analysis of the data: extrinsic attributes and intrinsic attributes.

Extrinsic Attributes

Participants described extrinsic attributes of the clothing they wore while incarcerated. Extrinsic attributes refer to the visible cues, such as color, durability, and fabric construction that differentiate one item of clothing from another. Subthemes of color and style, and use of stenciling as labeling emerged through the data analysis.

Color and Style

All blog authors and interview participants (n=25) described in some way the color and style of government-issued clothing they wore while incarcerated. As stated by the author of Blog 3, "Depending on the facility, you could wear everything from orange to gray to green to khaki." The colors varied among facilities, but were most commonly green with white undergarments. Most participants described wearing a two-piece uniform, although some participants received additional government-issued clothing while incarcerated. Interview participants who were incarcerated in California described an all-blue two-piece uniform. Blog authors and interview participants who were incarcerated in other states were issued different colors, which were primarily orange or dark green. For example, Participant 3, who served time in North Carolina, was required to wear a different color. He described, "I was in browns most the time and that's like regular crusty clothes. They're not actually brown, they were kind of purple to me. [I wore] brown pants and white T-shirts." The author of Blog 1 recalled the

clothing in which they were issued upon arrival at Chillicothe Correctional Center in Ohio. She described:

> At the prison where I currently reside, those [issued clothing] items include four khaki uniforms, two green T-shirts, three pair of socks and panties…two bras, an orange stocking hat, a state coat. All other [clothing] items must be purchased by the offender.

The author of Blog 7 stated, "For 2275 days straight, I've worn the exact same thing every single day: burgundy T-shirt and jeans." In Blog 8, the author highlighted, "[Administration] call it the 'Uniform of the Day' – a burgundy t-shirt and elastic-waist Mom jeans – as if anything changes from day to day or even day to night." Two female interview participants, who were incarcerated in different states, described clothing options given to them by their facility. In addition to pants and a shirt, they were also issued dresses. For instance, Participant 2 described:

> [In prison], we had dresses that we were issued. We did not have to wear them, but [we did wear them] when the weather would get warm. Also, we were only issued a certain amount of uniforms so sometimes you had to wear [dresses] because your clothing was in the laundry. The [dresses] look like that sack type dress. Just not tapered, not cut, just something like you'd see back in the old days like peasants wore. It was a smock dress.

Participant 2 also noted that her issued clothing in prison differed from that in jail. She explained, "County jail was a little different. The place where I was, my family had to provide me with all my under clothing and sleepwear. [The jail] just provided the two-piece outfit, which was a dark forest green." Although she was not issued undergarments by the jail, Participant 2 shared facility rules against the incarcerated wearing undergarments worn during arrest. She described, "If [someone] got arrested and they were wearing a pair of pink panties and blue bra or something, that would be taken away immediately, because they were not white."

Furthermore, a few male participants shared clothing differences between jail and prison. For example, Participant 6 wore "orange scrubs [in jail]. You got your tops, and you got your bottoms". Once he was sentenced to prison, Participant 6 experienced a change in his clothing color. He described, "We all have one color and [the clothes] were green. It was a forest green, like a dark forest green." Likewise, Participant 9 highlighted his experience. He said:

> In the jail, it was an orange jumpsuit. Once I got to the California Department of Corrections, we were issued blue jeans and they were good jeans…and a blue chambray button down shirt. And then, [administration] gave you T-shirts and boxer shorts and gray socks.

Participant 12 was content with the shift from jail to prison clothing. He recalled:

> In county jail, you were given this these two-piece smocks and they had the name of the county stenciled on the front. It's [also] stenciled on the back and on the pants. Now, when I got the state prison, you were given state issue blues, so the shirts, when I began getting incarcerated, they were nice blue shirts. What we considered nice. They weren't smocks or anything like a pullover that didn't fit.

While most participants who described their clothing transition from jail to prison as shifting from bright to neutral, or neutral to neutral, Participant 7 had a different experience while incarcerated in Arizona. He described:

> While incarcerated in the county jail, I think we had a jumpsuit that was a neutral color. When I got to the federal holding tank, we had purple pants and a pink shirt…when I finally made it to the prison, we had khaki pants, khaki shirt, like beige khaki, and then a white [under]shirt.

According to participants, each facility utilized different colors of clothing. As Participant 13 described, "LA county was blue, but there are other facilities had different colors. You know, LA county's got five or six different jails that the sheriff's department runs. One of them, their color was green for that facility." Furthermore, certain colors may symbolize something at one facility, but something different at another. Facilities may choose colors to recognize populations among the incarcerated. According to the author of Blog 7, "The divisions among offenders create themselves by what they're wearing: the colors of their shirts." Participants mentioned populations such as level of security, newly incarcerated, and special needs as those signaled by clothing color.

The color of government-issued clothing often symbolized the level of security of the wearer. Participants revealed that the meaning of each color varied among facilities. Participant 1 explained "There's different levels of security and in doing so there's different colors." Colors and subsequent meanings varied among participants. For example, Participant 2 described "In minimum custody, [clothing] was a tan color and then the next level, it was bright mint green." Participant 6 explained, "Yellow and white stripes are max[imum security]. Orange and white stripes were, I want to say, mental hold, like, you're kind of crazy. Orange was close custody, and red was [general population] and white was worker dorm." Participant 8 shared, "The camp was green and if you wasn't at the camp and you was on the other side, where there's less freedom, theirs was khaki, so there was a separation of color depending on your level of security." Likewise, Participant 13 recalled, "Dark blue for the main line, and then they have white for ad[ministrative] seg[regation] and different colors for transportation and things like that…you had death row, they were in white."

In addition, the author of Blog 3 reported that color was used to differentiate between novice and seasoned incarcerated persons. They said, "We were all put in the same place with different colors to distinguish the newbies from gen[eral] pop[ulation]." Furthermore, all three female interview participants highlighted how clothing can be used to identify someone who is newly incarcerated. For example, Participant 5 explained:

> You wear a certain outfit the first 14 days and you're also in a [certain] part of the jail…you're in protective custody…the outfit is a white outfit with red stripes. And it's terrible. It's like [a] candy cane type of thing. And then, after that, you graduate to what is called 'General Population'…[in] the jail that I was at, you wore orange pants and an orange top.

Two participants highlighted specific colors used to identify the incarcerated with special needs. For instance, Participant 14 explained, "If you had a medical condition or are in the hospital or the infirmary, you wore white jumpers with big black letters, 'state corrections.'" Participant 13 described a special needs group and subsequent helpers who were identified based on the color of their clothing. He said:

> When I was at prison in San Luis Obispo, the [incarcerated people] that had mental issues, they put them in yellow so they can be identified. Then they had assistance, other prisoners who had been trained [on] how to do one-on-one as aids. And they would wear a gold shirt, called 'gold coats', and they would escort one or two of these mentally deficient people to make sure they get to where they're going, make sure they eat, make sure they take a shower. Help them with their day-to-day needs.

Participant 5 shared a unique way clothing color was used by administration to symbolize a special need while she was incarcerated. She explained:

Before you go to prison, you have to go to a county jail. During my county jail stay, I gave birth to twins. I gave birth on Monday and on Friday, I arrived at prison. If you're pregnant or if you have had a baby in the last six weeks at the prison that I was at, you had to wear a white shirt and it's like a white maternity shirt. The day that I went to the prison, I was given the white shirt with the green pants…It didn't make any sense to me why you had to wear the white shirt after [giving birth], but it was because you were still healing and everything, for officers to know to handle with care type thing.

Conversely, the use of color to identify certain populations made sense to most participants. For instance, Participant 13 recalled, "There was a color-coding system, but it wasn't anything that I would have called 'horrible' because it actually made sense. It made it easier to identify [certain populations]." Participant 2 believed the reason for symbolism through color was to easily identify specific incarcerated individuals. She described:

[For example], this person is maximum [security], this person's honor grade because they do have a camp that all the things are mixed together. So, you have some green shirts, some tan shirts, some brown dresses, so you're at a place where all [security] levels are in one facility. [Administration] has to know who's who.

After further contemplation, Participant 2 offered a theory:

These colors have been the same for many, many years, so I wonder if that's an easily identifiable outfit. Say I was to just walk out the front door because, you know, you could in minimum security. Authorities can identify you easily. They don't have to say, 'Oh, I think she had a pink shirt on.' They know automatically, 'Well she's either wearing a green dress or a green shirt.'

Participant 13 shared a logical explanation for color identification through clothing while incarcerated:

> The transportation [incarcerated people] were always in orange because you are moving from place to place and, again, that just made sense. Some of the lower-level inmates work do roadwork, like they pick up trash along the roads, clean up the beaches and stuff, the fire crews, they all wear orange. Again, just identify so they don't escape.

Despite logical explanations for the reasoning behind the use of color to identify various populations of the incarcerated, one participant shared the way in which wearing certain colors made him feel while incarcerated. Participant 1 revealed:

> The different colors, it makes you feel a certain way. If you're in close custody, you wear brown and those browns make you feel a little heavier. I don't know how but the material feels different. I really think [it] is more mental, but, again, the color does a lot to you. Say, if you wore brown you feel bogged down. We put on a pair of greens, you felt lighter. When you wore the orange, you felt like you literally was at rock bottom.

Labeling

Many participants described stenciling on their government-issued clothing. For example, Participant 4 described, "they give you beige color, khaki pants, and white T-shirt, and a few button-up shirts with your last name and your prison ID [number] superimposed on it." Participant 9 reported, "[The jumpsuit] says 'Monterey County Jail' on it. It has 'prisoner' stamped on it." Likewise, a few participants who were incarcerated in a California State Prison, each described stenciling on their government-issued clothing. Participant 10 shared, "The pants were a blue denim-ish material, but they had huge yellow letters stenciled on them: 'CDCR' (California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation) 'prisoner' on the back of the shirt and

down the leg [of the pants]." Participant 13 explained that this stenciling "clearly identified you as 'yeah, you're incarcerated.'" Participant 14 stated that by wearing stenciled government-issued clothing, he felt "branded."

Intrinsic Attributes

Blog authors and interview participants recalled the ways in which clothing worn during incarceration had intrinsic attributes, which are defined here as aspects of clothing that may not be overt, but having both physical and psychological implications. Findings included intrinsic attributes such as comfort, fit, quality, and cleanliness.

Several participants described their comfort level with the fabric of government-issued clothing. All interview participants mentioned time spent at both jail and prison and some described clothing that corresponded with each type of facility. Two female interview participants recalled their experience as it related to clothing comfort. Participant 2 explained, "When I got those clothes, they were so big and they were stiff and [the clothes] had a funny smell…You can hardly move [in the clothes]. I felt very constricted." Likewise, Participant 15 recalled, "[The clothing] was like a burlap bag, it's kind of stiff. It's not comfortable. Really not form fitting, not flattering." Furthermore, Participant 1 highlighted his disappointment with the fabric quality of government-issued undergarments. He explained:

> They were really the worst part of the uniform. The undergarments they felt very thin. The material just wasn't your normal brand that you wear at home. So being incarcerated, that material is to me like they just grabbed the first or last piece of cotton and made the thinnest pair of underwear that they could and the thinnest pair of socks that they could.

Participant 10 avoided the government-issued undergarments altogether. He recalled, "I would order my own socks and underwear because the prison-issued gray socks, they weren't the highest quality. They didn't feel good. I like to have my own nice comfortable socks."

Moreover, a few participants shared that the clothing they wore while incarcerated did not provide them with thermal comfort. For example, Participant 2 described, "[Shirts] are short sleeve, and they keep the [prison] at, like, 12 degrees." Participant 5 highlighted the opposite, "[Clothing] is almost like the kind of material that you would use to make a tote bag. Very heavy and hot in the summer." Participant 9 recalled an experience after he was first arrested. He said:

> [Officers] put me in a white paper jumpsuit. This [jumpsuit] was not cloth. It was a paper material, and it was freezing in the jail intentionally. [The jail] had the whole Guantanamo Bay thing going on the loud music the bright lights all night long and cold temperatures, while I'm in a paper jumpsuit.

The perception of improper fit of government-issued clothing was mentioned by several blog authors and interview participants. According to Participant 3, "In [prison], when you get [issued] clothes, you don't have no sizes, they either a size too small or a size too big. You never get anything that fits." He added, "You have these little draw strings on the side of the pants. You're supposed to be able to pull to make them fit if you're not as big as they are. They don't work. They slip." Participant 14 reported the difficulty in exchanging government-issued clothing for a better fit. He said, "It's the luck of the draw. In some places, rarely they would fit. Either be large or too small, and you would have to go through some channels to get an exchange." Participant 10 confirmed this difficult process. He shared, "I hated going down to the clothing room and playing that swap back and forth game trying to get something that fit." Recalling these frustrations led Participant 10 to explain the importance of keeping clothing that

fit. He said: "In prison, absolutely, if you got something that fit you held on to that because you never knew what they were going to hand you out the window."

Despite the standard numbering system of clothing sizes, the sizing of government-issued clothing was rarely reliable. For example, Participant 10 stated, "Just because it came from the stack that said it was a 34 waist 33 inseam doesn't mean it had anything to do with those numbers." Participant 3 recalled:

When they took my [street] clothes, I had to put on these pants, and they went from 31 [waist] to 36 [waist] and I couldn't wear a 31. It was too little and 36 was too big. I couldn't keep my pants up, so I walked around all the time with my pants falling down.

A few participants shared that government-issued clothing did not accommodate their height or weight. Participant 9 recalled his experience with ill-fitting government-issued clothing. He described, "My first jumpsuit was way too small. I'm six foot three [inches] and 215 pounds and this thing was built for somebody like five foot ten inches, and so it was a constant wedgie." Participant 15 shared a female's perspective on the fit of government-issued clothing. She recalled, "[The shirt and pants] were the most awful fitting thing. The tops were just square and big and it was just the most anti feminine thing. It looks just boxy, and they fit awful." Likewise, Participant 5 described the unisex clothing that was issued to her while incarcerated. She said, "It was the same exact outfit as the males for both the orange outfit, and the red and white outfit. There was no difference between female and male." Participant 5 also highlighted her experience with government-issued bras. Participant 5 explained:

When you go to the state shop, you're [allowed] two to three sports bras and they're the lamest of lame. 500 times worse than a Wal-Mart brand of sports bra. And I'm huge in the boob area. Then they have other bras like if you're a plus size woman, maybe like

Cross Your Heart bras. So, you could get like one of the Cross Your Hearts and two

sports bras like if you are my size type person. So, what I would do is I would wear like

the Cross Your Heart one, and then the sports bra over top of that, for support.

Quality issues were defined by the participants as the "newness" of their uniforms. As

stated by the author of Blog 1, "Upon entering prison, you will be issued certain items

automatically." Some blog authors and interview participants said they received all new clothing,

while others received all used. Most participants received a mixture of new and used clothing

upon arrival. For example, Participant 12 explained:

Your first[clothing], depending on the availability, you would get one pair of [boxer]

shorts and undershirt and socks would be new and then the other two pair would probably

be recycled. You had a lot of recycled laundry, but most of the time, your first prison

issue garb everything would be new. But you only had three sets of it.

Despite being issued new undergarments, Participant 8 revealed, "[The undergarments are] all

the low budget, so [administration] gonna give you the socks that that's going to wear out in a

week. They're gonna give you the boxers that are just flimsy." Participant 3 corroborated this

statement. He shared:

The elastic in the boxers, no good. They would just fall down, every pair you get, by the

second or third week after they give them to you. After a couple weeks' worth of

washing, they start fringing up around the waist. Then they start getting loose and you

can't keep them up.

Participant 13 described his frustration with pant elastic. He explained, "One thing that drove me

batty was the pants because the elastic wouldn't last that long after it gets washed a couple times.

It wasn't really high-quality material." According to blog authors and interview participants, it

was apparent if a clothing item was used versus new. For example, Participant 8 said, "You can tell when it's used and you could tell when it's brand new." Participant 1 shared:

Putting on a brand-new pair of green [pants], it felt like a brand-new pair of Levi's. And compared to when you go put on a pair of worn ones, it felt like you was going to put on a pair of basketball shorts.

He shared his theory on why there was a significant difference between new and used issued clothing. He said:

[New clothing] wasn't as thin because they hadn't been worn as much, but they were still not as you wear at home. Also just knowing where you are at it kind of put it in your brain that this material is not good. I don't know the backstory of the materials that are actually used but just being incarcerated knowing where you at throws in your mind this is the worst material. This is not good to wear. It just sticks in your brain.

Alternatively, the author of Blog 8 liked the look of used government-issued jeans worn in their facility. They described:

New admissions wear stiff, dark navy pants that still retain their cheap-dye sheen. An inmate like me who has trod around the grounds for years in uniform jeans, wears a faded, softer look, almost like expensive Japanese jeans or one of the rinse options at Barney's Denim Bar.

Participant 6 vividly recalled the issued undergarments he received in county jail. He said:

I think you got one new pair of white [undergarments] and then you got two used pair of white [undergarments]. So, we call [underwear] 'duh dut duh duhs'. Think about underwear that Captain Underwear is wearing. Those are duh dut duh duhs. Nobody wants to wear them. They're oversized, uncomfortable.

Although participants did not feel satisfied with their clothing options, they lacked the freedom of choice. According to Participant 1, "Some of [the undergarments] just weren't to your liking at all, but we didn't have much choice but to wear the socks and underwear provided." Participant 11 noted, "The clothes wasn't in the best condition, but [the administration] said that's all they had." Despite the lack of choice on the matter, Participant 7 expressed his feelings about the used clothing. He said, "One way is gross and then the other way is I didn't have a choice. The choice was made for me." Moreover, Participant 10 explained how he handled worn issued clothing. He illustrated:

> Let's say I tore a pair of jeans or they simply wore out. They weren't necessarily the highest quality; they did wear out. I would go down to the clothing room, turn in my old unserviceable clothes and say 'Okay, this is my size' and the [administration would] hand something out the window. Maybe it was new, maybe it was used. I didn't have an option, I got what they gave me.

As mentioned by Participant 10, some facilities offered the incarcerated an opportunity to exchange used issued clothing for new. For example, Participant 11 shared that he often received used clothing during laundry exchange, but there may be a later opportunity to exchange those for new items. He explained,

> Every couple of months, they would have new boxers available. [The facility] will post signs 'wide exchange', so we knew what items we can turn in and get new items in exchange. So, new T-shirts, new boxers.

Displeased by his lack of options, Participant 6 highlighted an unconventional way to utilize a government-issued sweatshirt. He explained, "You get [to jail], and then you get a sweatshirt.

We got a used sweatshirt. It was more efficient to use it and turn it into a pillow that was to actually wear the sweatshirt in county [jail]."

A few participants enjoyed wearing new government-issued clothing. For example, Participant 1 recalled the confidence boost associated with new issued clothing. He illustrated:

Wearing a brand-new pair of greens felt like I was going to a job interview, or I was going to church. It's such an uplifted feeling to have brand new [clothes]. I mean, the fabric would be so thick, and it just felt like 'I got a job interview today' and even walking around in a pair of a brand-new greens, so many other guys would be like 'Oh, where you going today? What are you doing today?'

Participant 10 said, "I found the prison boxers just to be real good to lounge around the cell in. They were loungewear." Likewise, the author of Blog 5 described, "The boxers, socks and T-shirts that are given to you are 100 percent cotton and are very comfortable." Participant 2 found government-issued bras to be of brand name quality. She recalled, "The bras were actually really nice. It's like a Hanes bra and so it was a decent bra."

One area of concern for most blog authors and interview participants was the cleanliness of the government-issued clothing worn while incarcerated. For example, Participant 15 reported, "You get those barely washed, itchy, awful, strict [clothes] in our jails." "And, most importantly, they usually smell like urine or something. Just terrible", she added. Likewise, Participant 10 recalled an experience from early in his incarceration. He explained, "I put on these jail clothes and [administration] hands them to me. They weren't clean when I got them. They were stained and raggedy, but I was standing there naked, so my options were pretty limited."

Two female participants shared the frequency of laundering government-issued clothing. Participant 2 described a similar experience, "[Administration] gave you two uniforms for the entire week, so you had to re-wear it and now you're wearing these clothing, with no underpants, no bra, no socks." Participant 15 recalled, "We only got two pairs and they had to last you a week and some days, depending on the rotation." Furthermore, Participant 15 revealed a memorable occurrence from her incarceration. She shared, "One time I had a seizure, and I don't know if you know this, but when you have a seizure, you generally void your bladder. They didn't offer me a change that time."

A few participants specifically highlighted the cleanliness of their undergarments worn while incarcerated. Participant 3 explained that undergarments were rotated between incarcerated people at his facility. He reported, "Every week, you get somebody else's underwear and clothes. Every clothes change, you never get your own clothes back. You're in a camp with 1000 people, so that's 1000 different people that's been in the same clothes." Participant 5 recalled receiving her first pair of government-issued underwear. She said, "They literally gave me underwear other people had worn, there was visible stains inside of the underwear. I was like, "Are you kidding me? I'm not wearing this.' And they're like, 'Yeah you are. That's what we have.'"

Participant 1 believed a different feeling was associated with wearing used undergarments. He said, "There's a feeling about wearing clothes that are recycled and the undergarments, even though the facilities tried to keep them the best they could, but your undergarments, they weren't the best. The socks and underwear had a lot of wear." To reduce his uncertainty about cleanliness, Participant 14 shared his method of personally washing and rewashing undergarments. He "made sure [underwear] didn't have no skid marks." Participant 3 recalled, "The worst part [of the uniform] is your underwear, your boxers, and your socks

because athletes' feet and whatever you may get from not washing the stuff in there. But some people was dirty." Participant 15 recalled her experience with government-issued panties. She said:

> You get one pair of underwear. They're gross and they're itchy and they're just disgusting looking. You don't get to do laundry. So, what if you stayed in jail for a minute and you don't have any money? You're really not left with any options. You either go without underwear in those awful, awful uniforms…or buy underwear on commissary for 20 bucks.

RQ2: How does the incarceration process change a person's relationship with their clothing?

Findings indicate that the incarceration process changes a person's relationship with their clothing in a variety of ways. Blog authors and interview participants shared their perspectives on the ways in which incarceration affected their relationship with their clothing. The findings were grouped into two major categories: government-issued clothing and civilian clothing.

Government-Issued Clothing

Interview participants could easily recall and rationalize the reasons they chose certain clothing before incarceration. Throughout the incarceration process, the notion of choice was removed. As a result, neither interview nor blog participants were certain why they were required to wear certain clothing while incarcerated. Many participants believed issued clothing was required for reasons such as escape prevention, budget concerns, profitability, de-humanization, and control and punishment. According to Blog 3, "If an inmate isn't wearing something that distinguishes them as an inmate, that would be seen as an escape attempt." Participant 14 noted, "If you decide to leave, you can't go too far in a bright orange jumpsuit." Furthermore,

Participant 9 offered two ways in which government-issued clothing reduces the chances of escape during visitation. He explained, "Visitors aren't allowed to wear jeans. They're not allowed to wear blue shirts. They're also not allowed to wear the clothing of the correctional officer…They couldn't wear green and tan…Secondly, it's easy to identify the prisoners. We're all wearing blue." Participant 11 revealed a unique perspective on preventing escape through government-issued clothing. He said:

> If anybody is walking along the highway in a blue chambray shirt…there are signs along the highway to call this number and report it. So, we would get locked down anytime somebody was walking along the highway and somebody thought they were a prisoner. The joke was anybody out there in a blue shirt gets us locked down so that's why [administration] stenciled in big letters 'CDCR prisoner' [on the shirt].

> A few participants believed the reason for enforcing government-issued clothing was rooted in monetary reasons. For example, Participant 9 was "sure the material in the [government- issued] clothing was cheaper. It wasn't as thick. Wasn't as comfortable." Alternatively, Participant 10 theorized the reason for government issued uniforms was profit. He explained:

> Money. Plain and simple. Somewhere, somebody profited. There were almost 180,000 inmates in California prisons, at that time, and we already had all the clothing we needed. Then they locked down all 34 prisons in California and came by, one by one, had us throw away all our old clothing and get all this new stuff. Even though it was cheaply made, [it] was still untold hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Many participants believed the requirement to wear government-issued clothing while incarcerated was de-humanization. For example, Participant 4 reported a noticeable transition from civilian to sentenced property of the state through clothing. He explained:

So, when you're in Riker's Island, you're not sentenced yet, so technically you're not guilty and you're innocent until proven guilty. So, I think a part of it is you maintain that identity of you being still a civilian, but they take that away from us as soon as you get sentenced. You're no longer a civilian. You become property of New York state.

Participant 14 described the process of shedding one identity and exchanging it for another while incarcerated. He explained, "Part of the clothing that you're required to wear…is to make you feel like you're tagged, like a leper in this society. The identity that you have is your population of who you're incarcerated with." Participant 9 compared the incarcerated to a herd of cattle. He illustrated:

The [administration] want us all dressing the same, as a constant reminder in prison, that you are not a member of society…it's very much a control mechanism…to let everybody know that you're a prisoner now. CDC prisoner on the side of [pants], rather than just being nondescript. It was simply because the [administration] could dehumanize more.

Likewise, Participant 12 believed clothing worn while incarcerated was "meant to really psychologically bind you and connect you to prison through the clothing that you wore, especially when the clothing had prisoner stamped all over it." Participant 5 provided a female's perspective. She explained, "These [prison] outfits are not made for women. These outfits are the same exact things that are issued for men…You're a number now…You're all the same. So, I think it's just a dehumanizing thing."

Three participants believed the use of government-issued clothing was an attempt by the facility to prepare incarcerated persons for re-entry into society after completing their sentence. For instance, Participant 15 explained, "As far as individuality is concerned, I think that they take that away because they assume that's probably part of the problem. You have too much of it and that doesn't really work in society." Furthermore, Participant 11 shared:

[It's] an attempt from the state to strip away an individual's identity and uniqueness and have them conform to 'These are the rules. We're stripping your identities, so we can rebuild your identity, because you are a flawed individual, and we need to fix that. So, we have to destroy the identity you have and rebuild it.'

This population's experience with government-issued clothing was perceived as part of the larger context of incarceration. The author of Blog 7 reported, "Apparently, clothes don't just make the man, they also make the inmate. And they make the inmate pliable, quiet, used to having decisions made for them." Two female participants ignored their pre-incarceration clothing preferences to better fit in with their facilities through clothing. For example, Participant 2 did not wear dresses prior to incarceration, but was "issued three dresses," in addition to shirts and pants, once incarcerated. "If I could have, I would have worn the same shirt and pants every day, just so I wouldn't have to wear a dress, but it seemed like I was kind of pushed into it," she explained. In response to why she felt this way, Participant 2 stated, "You're already in a place where you don't want to stand out, and so I felt like I was doing whatever it took to fit in." Over time, Participant 2 noticed a shift in her desire to wear dresses. She recalled, "As I started getting more comfortable [in prison], I just started wearing the dresses a lot more, which is really weird."

Several blog authors and interview participants believed that government-issued clothing was a tool for control and punishment. For example, Participant 12, who spent 21 years incarcerated in the California prison system, said:

> Maybe [19]93, [19]94, California was moving to this real tough on crime. The nation was 'Prison is too soft on criminals. They get more than free people on the outside.'…One of the ways to punish was through dress…to send a message that you are a prisoner, you are incarcerated. You are the lowest on society's totem pole, so to speak. You're on the lowest scale of humanity…dress is every bit of part of it. To remind you of that.

Despite being required to wear government-issued clothing day in and day out, several participants highlighted that adapting to government-issued clothing was one component of adapting to the overall prison environment. For example, Participant 10 explained:

> While I've referred to [clothing] as dehumanizing and all that, I didn't run around every day, thinking that. I became immune to it once I got over the fact that I had to wear this, it was just what I got up in the morning put on and went about my day…initially we complained and then, when it was just how things were, you deal with it and move on.

A few participants shared their feelings associated with clothing worn while incarcerated. For example, Participant 1 said, "Your wardrobe being incarcerated it goes all the way down from the shirt you put on to the underwear to the socks that you wear. All that has a totally different feeling. Everything." He recalled different feelings associated with clothing colors worn in jail compared to clothing colors worn in prison. He explained:

> Being in a county jail wearing that orange [uniform] with the orange socks and T-shirts that have a horseshoe collar is totally worse than the green and gray [in prison]. Being in county [jail], in that orange jumpsuit, it feels like a bull's eye. And you just know those

clothes have been worn 1000 times before they've gotten to you, so even just putting it on

feels like a chain around your neck. It just weighs you down as soon as you put the

orange on.

A change of environment from prison to free society did not change the way certain

clothing colors and styles made participants feel. For example, Participant 10, who wore a light

blue shirt every day for 28 years in prison, said, "I consciously avoid anything light blue as a

top" now that he has been released. Likewise, Participant 15, who served two years in prison,

revealed that she will not wear orange clothing. She said, "It's ugly and it reminds me of

[prison]." Furthermore, Participant 6 shared his feelings about the colors he wore every day for

two years. He explained, "I don't wear dark green or orange. Well, I guess I wear orange but it's

not hi-vis [like in prison]. But, greens, uh uh. I don't think I noticed [wearing green] before

[incarceration], but now I won't [wear it]." Although Participant 3 did not adopt brown or purple

into his wardrobe before or after 20 years of incarceration, he shared strong feelings about those

colors. He said, "I still dress the same way out here [in free society]. I won't never have to put on

no brown purple [clothes] or whatever they are no more." Moreover, Participant 8 described his

distaste for a monochromatic look in prison colors. He said:

> If I would see the right green shirt and I liked it, I would probably get it if it's nice, but I
>
> won't ever get green pants that matches it. I won't even go top and bottom khaki. I'll
>
> break it up…Those days [in prison] matching top and bottom, nobody [who was
>
> incarcerated] does it.

Participant 2 shared her feelings about the color she wore every day for almost five years. She

described, "We moved to teal green, like mint green…I just don't want to see the color. I don't

wear mint green and I don't wear tan at all, either one of those colors…I refuse to wear anything

that teal color." Furthermore, Participant 1 wore green pants and gray T-shirts every day for almost three years. He recalled the impact these colors had on his clothing choices in free society. He said:

> I do not like green pants. I do not like gray T-shirts. I have some, but I'm very reluctant to wear either one. I've got brand new gray T-shirts in my closet that I have not worn and that's just because I had to wear gray T-shirts for a while [in prison].

Participant 1 went on to justify his feelings against these colors. He explained:

> I will never forget the feel. Looking at a gray T-shirt now, it just reminds me of what I went through. It reminds me of that feeling of that fabric and I don't like the feel of a gray T-shirt. I don't like it at all. If I were to go out and get the same pair of green pants from one of the department stores, and gave them to someone that hasn't been incarcerated compared to someone that has been incarcerated, you will get two different reactions. To someone that will walk into the department store and pick up the exact same pair of green pants and gray shirt that is used in the prison, the person that's in a department store they'll put it on say, 'Hey, oh, this feels great. Oh, I just love the way the pants wear. I love the way the shirt feels.' But if I walk in there and buy the same one, mentally I'd be like, "Oh man, these pants, I don't like the feel of the material.' Or, 'This T-shirt, man, I don't like the style of the gray T-shirt.' It could be the exact ones that's used in the facility versus department store. Two different filters.

During his interview, Participant 13 realized his fondness of blue, a color he was required to wear every day for 31 years. He said, "I do wear a blue suit…I do have a blue shirt that I wear because it just looks good. I mean, let's face it, I've got blue eyes. It pops. But I don't have an aversion to wearing blue." However, he developed a negative association between scrub style

clothing and his time in prison. He explained, "I'm averse [to scrubs] and this is really horrible because my wife is a nurse. She doesn't wear scrubs very often, but I see them, and I flash back [to prison] when I go to her facility…it's just, 'Okay, I can't.'" Other participants were able to move past their negative feelings towards colors worn while incarcerated. For example, Participant 9 reflected on the shift in his feelings about the color blue:

> Well, here's what's hilarious, if you were to look in my closet, I have more blue shirts than you would think for a guy that was forced to wear a blue shirt [every day in prison]. I have so many of them, and the only reason is because it's a color that looks good on me. [While incarcerated] I swore I was never going to wear those things again and I have a closet full of blue shirts or white with blue.

Likewise, Participant 4 had a similar experience. He explained:

> When people are in prison, lot of them say, 'When I get home, I'll never wear green. Ever.'…I said that myself but I'm actually wearing a green T-shirt right now. I think you kind of let that go and you don't let that really affect you as much [after release].

Civilian Clothing

Clothing worn throughout the incarceration process led several participants to focus on aspects of clothing that had not been considered before incarceration. Some participants noticed a change in priorities about certain aspects of their clothing choices after release.

Changed Priorities

Some participants noticed a shift in their level of material satisfaction after release. Participants' clothing choices after release were largely determined by financial stability instead of individual expression. For example, Participant 4 explained, "I don't even know how to put a name to [how I dress now]. I think, affordability is a thing…When I came home [from prison], I

only bought work clothes. I focused on buying work clothes and not much recreational." A few participants purchased clothing from thrift stores after release, which was not something they did prior to incarceration. As Participant 2 explained,

> I did not [shop in thrift stores before incarceration], I was always going to get new stuff and now I find that everything was so reasonably priced, and you get a lot of really nice stuff…I didn't know I could get clothes like that in a thrift store.

After incarceration, Participant 9 traded his desire for branded jeans with more generic options. He revealed:

> I don't [wear Levi's]. They're expensive. I'm a thrifty person. I don't want to pay 25 or 35 dollars for a pair of jeans when I can pay 10 [dollars] and that's how I think. In my mind, and this is something I think that happened in prison, clothing is a utilitarian thing to me.

After years of a limited prison clothing wardrobe, some participants had a newfound appreciation for what they have instead of focusing on what they do not have. Participant 10 described the shift in his clothing choices before and after incarceration. He explained:

> Prior to incarceration I was 26 years old, and I had been in the Marine Corps for nine years, so my work attire was simply the uniform that was easy, no thought required. As far as out of uniform, I was never one that was much of a slave to fashion. Jeans and a T-shirt, just clean and serviceable.

After serving 28 years in the California DOC, he began a new life as a free citizen with minimal clothing options. He said:

> One reason [incarceration] affected my choice of clothing is what I can afford. I was 55 years old when I got out of prison. I was starting over with virtually nothing, so I was pretty much restricted to discount stores and thrift stores, which are absolutely fine, but

the selection is not the best. So, there's a restriction based on finances and my position in life. In that respect now, that's definitely a benefit of incarceration. I had higher dreams and aspirations and was living beyond my means prior to incarceration, and I was heavily in credit card debt because of it. But now I'm perfectly content with enough.

Participant 8 described the clothing he wore for work before incarceration. He said, "It just depends on the calendar…As a coach and working in athletics, part of my attire was sweatsuits. Not sweatpants, sweatsuits and zip up Adidas or Nike apparel. Still looking nice and professional, not just a sweatshirt and hoodie." Since his release from prison, Participant 8 prioritizes relaxation and necessity when choosing clothing. He explained:

[I wear] athletic apparel to just relax, T-shirt, shorts, long sleeve shirt. But prior to [incarceration], the things I used to wear I would have to do dry cleaning and I haven't bought anything to dry clean in over two or three years. So, obviously saving money in that aspect.

Participant 8 shared that after two years of incarceration, his clothing style preferences remained the same, but he noticed a significant change in purchasing decisions. He explained:

When it comes to dressing and clothing, it still depends on what I have planned for the day. My taste in certain [clothing] hasn't changed. I don't think [prison] impacted my choice, and what I would get. I think what it did was it made me rethink why. The purchase, is it necessary, is it a need? Is it just to go on a splurge and fulfill? I used to shop a lot for clothes. I haven't shopped in a long time because I don't need to. I got enough…That's what [incarceration] changed…I was [in prison] for 14 or 15 months, where I didn't do that at all. So, when I go to the mall, 'Oh, that's nice but I don't need it.' [Prison] might have broke that habit. So, maybe that's what it did, without me even

thinking about it. Maybe I had to be away for so long to realize that, 'Okay, do I really need that to be fulfilled? Or what I have is enough?' And I have over enough.

Two participants believed incarceration influenced them to wear clothing that was more understated and helped them fit into free society. For example, Participant 7 said "I don't wear as flashy of stuff so that I don't stand out in the crowd. It just helps me fit in with what everyone else is wearing." Participant 15 shared a loss of confidence in her clothing choices because of incarceration. She explained:

[Before prison] I was very individual. It was important for me not to conform [to society], that was absolutely essential. It was important that I stood out in my own way and made a statement as to who I was. I knew who I was before I got incarcerated.

As a result, Participant 15 recalled a shift in her clothing choices after release. She shared, "Well, [prison] definitely impacted my [clothing choices]. I'm not as confident and don't feel as brave to be free or to express my individuality, because I'm afraid to stand out a little more. I don't want to draw attention to myself."

Several participants were first incarcerated at a young age and recalled having to reinvent themselves to better fit in with free society. For example, Participant 4 was 16 years old when he was first incarcerated. He recalled what was most important to him about clothing as a teenager. He explained:

Prior to incarceration, I used to wear jeans, [Nike] Jordon Air Force One sneakers, and American Eagle [clothing]. I think for me what was most important was just fitting in with the fashion trend that was existing where I was hanging out. Everybody was pretty much wearing similar clothes, similar brands, and I think the idea is being part of a group and you feel it [through clothing].

After serving 13 years in New York, Participant 4 was released from prison at 29 years old. He described his clothing choices after incarceration, "Solid [colors]. I think I got used to solid colors [in prison]. I don't really like jazzy, flamboyant colors. The clothes I wear out here are largely solid and pretty plain." Likewise, Participant 6 was a teenager when he was first incarcerated. He described the clothing he wore as a 19-year-old before incarceration. He said:

I dressed to fit in with my peers. I tried to do the whole what was in [fashion], so to speak. Either cut offs or Dickies and then a plain colored shirt. I was usually into blacks, grays, if it wasn't a black or gray it'd be a bold color not necessarily like hi-vis, but more bold…Color coordination [was also important]. My colors always match so my pants and shoes to [shirts].

After a little over two years in the Idaho DOC, Participant 6 realized he should dress the way in which he feels most comfortable while still fitting in with society. He explained:

I think it's human nature, to want to fit in and so I'm not gonna wear something outlandish. I'm 25 [years old now] and if I tried to follow the trends today, I would look like a buffoon. My [current] style is more plain T-shirts, pants that fit. I'm still going to match. I'm still gonna halfway look decent when I go out, but it's more of a comfy thing. How I want to look not how the world wants me to look.

Furthermore, Participant 9 was first incarcerated at 21 years old. He described his non-conforming look before incarceration:

I graduated from high school 1985 and I was a punker. A new wave punk rocker, and we used to make our own jeans, bleach them, certain shirts. But [clothing] was very much an expression of how I felt in my rebellion. [Clothing] was very much about expressing myself, however I wanted to. Some days I might want to be more dancey and have a

Paisley shirt on with a bolo tie and other days it was going to be a shirt that said, 'F you' or something like that. Just how I felt on a given day, but it was about me expressing myself to the culture that, 'I'm not like you.'

After serving 15 years in the California DOC, Participant 9 realized he was a "different person" compared to when he was first incarcerated. He believed this change should be reflected in his clothing and looked to a mentor for advice. He explained:

[Once I was released] I knew I wasn't bad anymore and I had to figure out who I was…I kind of just fell into [my current style], because this is what my boss wore and he was a friend of mine… Otherwise, I had no idea, especially since clothing styles changed [since I went to prison]…At the end of the day, when you don't know what your style is, you have to invent it and I don't think I have a style, other than to say, 'Okay I'm golf casual. That's what my style is.' A different golf shirt every single day, and I have like 35 of them. I bought them all at thrift stores brand new, most of them with tags on them. I love to find the deals.

Moreover, Participant 12 considered the current state of criminal justice as it related to race in the late 1980s and early 1990s when choosing clothing before incarceration. He explained:

I dressed conservative, more or less. I didn't start getting incarcerated until I was 27 [years old] or 28 [years old] and by that time fashion had really begun to change. So, even though I was still in my 20s, I did not wear fashions that were fashionable for young African American men at that time. I was still a conservative type dresser, so I didn't wear baggy pants or stuff that are stereotypically connected with black males…[I wore] jeans and T-shirts, things with athletic logos on them and so forth. Comfort and fit [was most important] but also style, because at that point in my life I was still cognizant of

dressing in a way, that I was not stereotyped…I thought that if I didn't dress with the typical 80s styles type of clothing that was becoming fashionable for young African American men, then I was less apt to be followed or stereotyped by the police and everybody else.

Participant 12 was incarcerated twice between the ages of 27 and 33. Once he was incarcerated a third time at 33 years old, he served 17 consecutive years in a California prison. He revealed how this third experience of incarceration impacted his social growth, and subsequently, his clothing choices. He said:

I'm 50 [years old], so I can't walk around like I'm 30 [years old] anymore. Because if I did, that impacted the way that people reached out to help me…So, you have to start looking at the way that you dress, who you present yourself as. I was in my 50s [when I was released from prison] and as I got to be 52 [years old], 53 [years old], my dress did change from that of a 33-year-old to someone who was in their 50s.

Some participants gravitated towards comfortable clothing after release instead of dressing to impress others as they did prior to incarceration. The uncomfortable and ill-fitting clothing worn while incarcerated led participants to choose clothing based on fit and texture after release. For example, Participant 5 was forced to procure an entirely new wardrobe after incarceration. She realized her priorities changed from before incarceration. She explained:

Before I was incarcerated, I wore more blazers and dress pants. When I was in prison, my friend took my clothes and she sold them. So, when I came out [of prison], I really didn't have clothes and so it was like starting all over, new. I noticed that I was like really into stuff that was comfortable to me…I want everything to be soft. I think that is definitely one change that I like paying attention to, the texture of things.

Likewise, Participant 6 described the clothing he wears in free society not only as "comfortable" but also fitting for his body. He described why he chooses to wear this clothing:

I think I did a big wardrobe change last year, and it was more of, 'I'm going to buy clothes that fit me and that are not necessarily standoutish.' It's more of, 'These pants fit. They're comfortable and I can match a shirt with it.' Because [before incarceration] I'd wear clothes that necessary weren't the most comfortable or wouldn't fit…And it's about what I want [to wear] and not about other people.

Likewise, three female participants shared a new appreciation for wearing clothing that fit their feminine shape. For example, after release, Participant 2 wanted to wear clothing opposite of the unflattering clothing she wore before and during incarceration. She explained:

I noticed after [incarceration] that before [incarceration] I was always wearing baggy shirts and then during [incarceration], I was restricted to whatever clothes they gave me and then, when I came home, I found myself wanting to wear any and everything. All of that had to do with what we were and weren't allowed to do [in prison]. Plus, my life before [incarceration] I was so controlled. Now, the new me, my second act, I want to just wear anything. I want to try anything…I'll wear something that's clingy now…But not overly show [my breasts], but you know just enough to say, 'Hey, I have these.' Because [during incarceration], you had to have your [shirts] buttoned all the way to the top of your throat. But now, it's like, 'Hey, I'm free. I can unbutton my shirt all the way."

Awareness of Choice

Serving time in prison eliminates the freedom of choice of the incarcerated. The incarceration experience resulted in some participants' realization of the importance of choice,

especially as it relates to clothing. For example, Participant 1 recalled his feelings when his freedom of choice was restored after release. He explained:

> [Before incarceration], the most important aspect of my wardrobe would be selection and variety…Once I was released [from prison] and I was able to go in my closet and wear what I wanted to wear, I felt like I got a major part of myself back. [After incarceration], I dressed as I've always dressed, in a wide range of clothes, as in different brands of jeans, different shirts, like some days I might want to wear cotton shirts. Some days I might want to wear a linen shirt. Even some days, I might switch the fabric up and switch over to like a little rayon or silk fabric shirt. I have the opportunity now.

Thirteen years of incarceration helped Participant 4 appreciate the freedom of choice as it relates to clothing after release. He realized:

> People take this for granted, but I could wear whatever I want, whatever size I want [before incarceration]. Oftentimes in prison, you're given clothes that don't fit nicely. And the fact is that you can go into a [store] changing room and then try out different clothes and pick whatever you want, without having to worry.

Participant 5 discovered the importance of clothing liberation after release. She revealed:

> Clothing is more important to me now than it was before incarceration. I went so long without really having choices so [I love] being able to pick out my own clothes. I'll see a dress that I want, and I'll save up for it and I'm going to have that dress. And I'm very proud when I'm able to get that dress and it just [feels] different [after incarceration]. I didn't really think that clothes were so important, I would say, before prison.

Interestingly, Participant 9 adopted a required work uniform as his personal style after release.

At the time [my boss] had shirts for the company with our [company] logo on it, and so I

was kind of forced to wear it. It was a polo shirt with a logo and at the time I was forced

to wear that, but I ultimately adopted it as who I am. All the people at the company wore

a company shirt, which I didn't mind doing.

He explained that wearing the same stenciled, government-issued clothing every day for 15 years

was different from wearing clothing required by his job in free society. He said, "It was different

[than stenciling on a prison uniform] because I chose it. I chose to go there. I chose to work there

and so I chose the shirt."

Some participants did not notice a difference in the clothing they chose to wear before

and after incarceration. Participant 10 shared, "I grew up in the disco era, my shirts in high

school were loud." He continued to enjoy wearing bright colors after serving 28 years in prison.

He described:

We did go to Wal-Mart [after release] and bought a few things and I got, this is going to

sound familiar, a really loud yellow T-shirt and a pair of lime green tennis shoes…I

definitely stood out in the crowd…I went right for the colors right off the bat.

Three participants prioritized clothing functionality for employment before and after

incarceration. For example, Participant 13 served time in the military and worked as a software

engineer before prison. He explained:

A lot of times I wore a suit to work, depending on what was going on. I spent a lot of

time in the military, so I was always wearing a uniform, cammies or utilities, or the dress

uniform. But after I left the military, suits, casual clothes. I was working as a software

engineer and that's got its own set of rules. It wasn't shorts and flip flops, but it was just

regular casual wear. Polo shirt or slacks, maybe wear jeans if you wanted to. And that's

how I used to do it.

He also shared the logic behind these clothing choices. He said:

To always look professional was always important. In the Marine Corps, you always

want to look good for variety of reasons, but when I was working as a software engineer,

when we would travel, I would always make sure I had a suit with me. One or two suits

just to give that air of professionalism to what we're doing.

Furthermore, Participant 13 described his clothing choices in free society as similar to his

choices before incarceration but specified a customization: ironing. He said, "Because of where

[I work], I wear…khaki [pants] and a polo shirt to work each day. I always [wear] this fresh

shirt. I've got five pairs of khakis, a new one every day, and I iron them on Sundays."

RQ3: How do individuals communicate social identity through clothing throughout the incarceration process?

Despite requirements to wear government-issued clothing while incarcerated, blog

authors and interview participants shared ways in which they could communicate their social

identity throughout the incarceration process. Analysis of the data resulted in two major themes:

clothing customization to signal group affiliation and clothing customization to signal social

hierarchy.

Group Affiliation

Several participants described ways in which incarcerated people customize their

government-issued clothing as a non-verbal symbol for group affiliation. These findings align

with the theory of symbolic interactionism, previously discussed in Chapter 2. Blog authors and

interview participants described how changes in their clothing were symbolic of various groups

affiliations: ethnicity or religion; age or length of incarceration; and gang affiliation. Meanings of these non-verbal symbols were understood by the population at a given facility. Participant 1 described:

> You could literally sit on a bench and look at people on the way they wear their uniform, and you can kind of get an idea of who they are, what kind of crime they did just by the way they wear their [issued] green pants and gray shirt.

Likewise, Participant 8 compared social identification among incarcerated people to the operation of people in free society. He explained:

> Everybody gets the same clothes [in prison]. The people that's going to welcome me in [to prison] is going to be the people that can identify with me. So, they see a black guy, a young black guy, 'Hey, go talk to him.' 'Where you from?" If you from Maryland, 'Hey, let me connect you with somebody from Maryland.' It's very territorial like that. First, they'll identify you based on your look, your origin, your nationality, where you from, then, where you live. People will come up and ask you and introduce themselves and, again, it's like building a community. It's like being a new neighbor in a neighborhood.

Ethnicity and Religion

While incarcerated, participants were exposed to different ethnicities. Participant 1 described that "even though you might wear the same brown pants or the same green pants with the same gray T-shirt, each nationality wears that uniform a different way so that you would know." Specific ethnicities were identified among participants along with their subsequent clothing customization. Participant 1, a black man, illustrated his ethnicity's look as "a walk on the runway." He reported "we're going to fold our pants [leg] twice" compared to the Muslim population who would "fold theirs also but they're gonna fold theirs three times." Participant 13

observed that "Hispanics would roll their pant [legs] up to a certain height on their shin" to signal their ethnicity. This type of customization was also found at a women's facility. For example, Participant 15 mentioned "the pant leg thing that was done along racial line. I mean, I don't think it was like a hard and fast rule, but I know that the African American girls roll those up."

Another way in which an incarcerated person may signal ethnic group affiliation was highlighted by the author of Blog 10. He explained, "You might find the Mexicano crew rocking knee-high socks…and a neatly ironed handkerchief in the back pocket." Participant 6, a white male, would "cut the elastic band and unfold" his shorts to "make them about four inches longer because we didn't want them to go above our knees." Rounding out the look, he reported "the whole, having your New Balances [shoes] with the long socks and long shorts and a white T[shirt] going out to rec[reation] that was a pretty predominantly white look in an Idaho prison." Participant 13, an American Indian male, noticed "many of the Blacks love to wear the low riders down below, hanging underneath their butts." In addition, Participant 6 explained that there was an "unsaid rule" that clothing customization would not cross ethnic lines. He shared:

> Southsiders, they had green shorts also, so it was cotton blues and green shorts so a lot of the Southsiders wore the green shorts. And, so, it's kind of like, 'Hey, don't go outside wearing a white T[shirt] and green shorts. You're White.'

Some participants highlighted accessories worn by other incarcerated individuals to symbolize religious affiliation. Several interview participants observed that Muslims were allowed to don a kufi cap. In addition to the kufi cap, Participant 4 described "Muslims had their pants leg cut a little bit at the bottom, so that their ankles show, and that was allowed for religious purposes."

Gangs

While incarcerated, participants observed "those who were affiliated with street gangs, they wore their clothes or dressed in different ways" (Participant 12). Participant 13 emphasized, "Some of these guys were so into their gang lifestyle and everything else, it was their identity…In terms of clothing, the way they would put certain things on their clothes, it could be a mark. It could be a kerchief." Participant 9 explained the origin of customization for gang affiliation as he understood it:

> I don't know if you're familiar with the term 'cripping,' but if you ever see a young man with his pants hanging down below his butt cheeks, excuse my language, that's something the Crips started as a means to identify themselves from other gang bangers. When they did away with the colors inside of prisons, guys had to figure out a way to express themselves and who they were and so lowering the pants like that was something that the Crips came up with.

Participant 12 observed a different way to customize for the purpose of gang affiliation. He explained, "Early on, when you could have your own clothes, those that were associated with the Los Angeles gangs, the Bloods gang, they would have red flannel shirts sent in [from the outside]." Participant 13 illustrated how a specific gang signaled affiliation while he was incarcerated. He said, "Hispanics, they would also have bandanas. The way that they would carry their bandana out of their back pocket, or their breast pocket would determine what gang they were associated with [or] what group they were with." Participant 11 identified Mexican gang members by the fit of their clothing.

> A lot of the Mexican gang members had really baggy clothes, so they would get a larger pant size, by maybe four or five sizes, and then cinch up the waistband so the elastic holds in place. But the pants kind of flare out a little bit.

Participant 13 described that "there were groups that would just lace [shoes] up a certain way. They may leave the top two open and then tie them off. Or maybe they would go back and forth with the laces instead."

Age

Some blog authors and interview participants explained how the incarcerated expressed their affiliation with a certain age group through clothing. Participant 8 described the importance of sweats and how wearing, or not wearing them served as a symbol for a certain age group.

> My age group, and I'm in my mid-40s, everybody has sweats…A lot of people that didn't have [sweats] was over 60 [years old]. I've got guys that just didn't want to be in it, because they were never accustomed to wearing sweats. They were shirt and tie suit guys so they wanted to be in their [prison] uniform every day.

Likewise, younger incarcerated people were easily identified by the fit of their clothing. For example, Participant 4 explained "a lot of the younguns would wear smaller fit clothes and then the old timers would make fun of them saying, 'Why you wearing tight ass clothes?'" Although wearing this style did not guarantee a person was young, Participant 4 continued, "it was likely, they were young and usually wore tight clothes, so you know that you're pretty fresh."

Social Hierarchy

As in free society, the society within a prison operates by using a social hierarchy among the incarcerated. Incarcerated individuals signal and understand this hierarchy through non-verbal cues, as exhibited through clothing. Although the incarcerated are required by most facilities to wear government-issued clothing, there are ways in which positions in the prison social hierarchy are demonstrated through clothing customization. For example, Participant 4

presented his views on signaling a social hierarchy through clothing worn while incarcerated. He explained:

> If someone had prison issued clothing that were very wrinkled and dirty, I think we automatically classify them as someone who is the bottom of the social tier within the prisons. We know that they don't take care of themselves. There is a way in which you look down upon them, I guess, and for those who are wearing nice crisp shirts that they iron…it takes effort and time. And, I think, for the most part, you want to hang out with folks who have a clean get up. So, it's interesting how clothing creates societal divisions, even within prison.

In understanding how the incarcerated signal their social hierarchy through clothing, the following subthemes emerged: procuring additional clothing; social networking; altruistic behavior; and clothing worn during work release.

Procurement

Blog authors and interview participants revealed that individual social status was often symbolized through clothing while incarcerated. Despite the requirement to wear government-issued clothing, there were ways in which the incarcerated communicated their financial standing by procuring additional clothing. According to Participant 4:

> Even in prison, you can look at someone and how they dress and see if they're receiving support…you notice people wearing issued [items] all the time, then you know that person is not receiving any [monetary] support. I guess it's just like out here [in society].

One way in which the incarcerated acquired additional clothing while incarcerated was through their facility's commissary. According to the author of Blog 1, "The commissary at each prison sells casual clothing items. If an inmate has the money to do so, they can order these items to be

more comfortable while hanging out in their cell or going to the rec[reation] yard." One way to gain funds to spend at the commissary is by earning it through work within the facility. As Participant 15 explained, "the longer you're [in prison], the more you can work to buy things out of the commissary."

Another way to obtain money to spend at commissary is through family and friends. One participant described how he used money given to him by family and friends to purchase additional clothing. After he arrived to prison, Participant 6 chose to purchase shorts from commissary to expand his wardrobe. He described, "You could buy shorts, cotton basketball shorts [in prison]. And it was definitely a must to have like two to three pair of shorts…In prison, you can buy sweatpants and sweatshirts. You can't buy those [in jail]." These purchases indicated his elevated social status while incarcerated. He shared his justification for these purchases:

> Because then you could like cut [the shorts] and style them how you wanted to, and it was more comfortable and it was more relaxing to wear shorts and it was also a flex because the more clothes you had, the more money it looked like you had because you could afford it.

A few participants commented on the significant markup of the cost of clothing items found at commissary. The author of Blog 1 explained, "All items [were]…much more expensive than what you would pay for the same thing on the street. For example, the sweats you could buy for ten dollars at Wal-Mart are going to cost you twenty [dollars at commissary]." Furthermore, Participant 8 shared, "[Prison] gonna give you the low budget items. Some people use that low budget [issued clothing] and then increase their load by going up to commissary and spending their money." While a risky endeavor, Participant 5 acquired as much civilian clothing as

possible to help maintain a sense of identity while incarcerated. She said, "I was insane about clothes, and it was one of the things that gave me a little bit of identity. I loved having so many different sweaters and shirts and stuff." She also chose to wear dresses to exhibit her femininity. She explained, "None of these people [in prison] have dresses at all. I'll tell you, I'm gay. I'm a lesbian. The dresses were a way for me to be like, 'Look, I'm a girl.'"

Another way in which blog authors and interview participants added clothing to their prison wardrobe is through a package system. Such packages could include various administration-approved items, including clothing. Although the incarcerated at Participant 4's facility were allowed to receive packages from friends and family, it was a rarity. He described, "Sometimes people [only] wore inmate clothing. And that's largely because a lot of their families didn't send them anything, It was only a small part of the population that was actually receiving packages from their family on a consistent basis." Participants who served time in the California Department of Corrections revealed that they were allowed 30-pound packages from family and friends. For example, Participant 10 used the package system to find a compromise between government-issued undergarments and what was socially acceptable by others who were incarcerated. He explained:

> The prison issued boxers, which I had never worn in my life. I got briefs because that's what I had always worn…There was a problem with that. In the prison culture, wearing briefs was considered to be gay and you didn't want to be seen walking around in them. But there was a compromise, boxer briefs, so that's what I went with. I just never liked the boxers.

Participant 9 observed a shift from the package system to mail order catalog during his 15-year sentence. He explained:

The system went through a massive change from [19]93 through [19]97, where [administration] took away a lot of the liberties that we had. So, now, you could only buy things through catalogs. What I could do is tell my family, 'Can you go get this, send this to me', [and] they'd send the money to [the catalog company]. And then they would send me the product from the company. If you get a package, it has to come from a [facility] approved vendor and the items are all listed there, and you pay [the facility] per dollar what [family] is sending and then you pay the shipping.

Although participants spoke positively about the mail order catalog system, one blog participant shared that lead time was a downfall of the catalog process. The author of Blog 1 revealed:

Unfortunately, once the items are ordered, the offender must wait for the item to come in, which can take anywhere from two to four months. [Incarcerated people] often joke that it's necessary to buy winter clothes in the summer and vice versa to insure getting them in time to use them.

Despite certain allowances in the package and mail order systems, the facility administration controlled the number of clothing items owned by an incarcerated person at a given time. For example, Participant 11 was at the forefront of the package exchange process during his job in Receiving and Release (R&R) and used it to his advantage. He recalled:

Somebody would come in and pick up a quarterly package. They would have to turn in clothing to get the new item so it's a one for one exchange. So, when someone would get a new pair of sweats, they'd have to turn in a pair. It's called the 'hot trash' where the turned in items are thrown away. As a clerk, one of the R&R workers, we had access to this bin and the officers knew what we were doing. They left it as a perk, 'Yeah, go ahead and grab what you want.'

Facility administration also controlled package and mail order clothing parameters. Clothing that contained metal was not allowed at Participant 5's facility. Therefore, no clothing items that contained metal were offered in the catalog. She shared, "You were able to get bras from the outside, so I would get them through that same type catalog and they were so beautiful. It's very hard to find good bras that don't have metal in them." A few interview participants revealed color restrictions enforced on package and mail order clothing. For example, Participant 12 said, "They were very bland shirts at that point. They could not be blue shirts; they could not be the color of the shirt that you [are issued in prison]. They were like gray or black and you could wear black jeans or blue Levi's." Furthermore, Participant 4 described the "ridiculous" clothing specificity enforced in his facility. He explained, "If the inseams have different color thread than the actual shirts. Little things like that [would be denied], because their argument is that you can collect a bunch of those clothes and take out those inseams and then sew an entire shirt."

Social Networking

The data analysis revealed the importance of social networking to acquire better government-issued clothing while incarcerated. As stated by Participant 6, "It was all about who you knew." A few participants highlighted the importance of social connections with people who worked in the laundry area. For example, Participant 6 "definitely made it a point to find somebody who worked in laundry, so therefore you had that connection on freshly white T[shirts] and socks, underwear, whatever." Participant 7 described his experience with the social hierarchy in prison as it related to laundry. He said:

> We would drop our clothes off to get them washed…sometimes you wouldn't even get your same stuff back. [It was] traumatic. I had a brand-new beige shirt. Now, I have a

used beige shirt. It was part of the hierarchy of the people, because prison was not a good place to be, but if you had money, then you always got the best stuff. If you didn't have any money, they give you whatever they felt they wanted to give you. And the laundry was run by the other people that were incarcerated.

A few participants incorporated a barter system with their connections in laundry. As Participant 12 explained, "If you had a friend that worked in the laundry that was responsible for doing the laundry services of the guards' uniforms, you can give them, what, two packs of cigarettes, and they would crease [pants] for you." Participant 7 shared the importance of strong finances while incarcerated. He said, "Someone will give [laundry workers] stamps or money…And the more money you had, the nicer your clothes…I could put money on inmate A's books, and I would have nice clothes if he worked in the laundry." Some participants used their social networks to elevate their personal laundry experiences while incarcerated. For example, Participant 1 used his social network to procure better clothes. He recalled:

You got guys working in the clothing house and when you go get your clothes, it's just walking up to a door and they just [say], 'Hey, here's three pair of pants, three pair of socks, and three pairs of underwear' is given to you. But if you know the guy that's passing them out, when you walk up to the window, he will look at you, and say 'Hold on for a minute', and he'll try to go through the pile and pick out three of the fresher pair for you.

Furthermore, boxer briefs were highly sought items among the incarcerated in Participant 6's facility. He used social networking to acquire used boxer briefs at a low cost. He explained, "Guys in laundry, we're all criminals, if they find a nice pair [of boxer briefs], they're going to swipe them. They'll bring [them] back here and sell them to you." He went on to describe the

next phase in this cycle of social networking, where he himself could make a profit. He explained:

> If I buy [boxer briefs] from [laundry workers], I got a homie on the tier who needs boxer briefs. I'm going to sell them to him for a cheap price because I can make money off my guy from laundry. He's going to bring [boxer briefs] to me and I'm going to sell them to somebody else who can't afford to buy a brand-new pack.

Participant 6 also shared how certain social connections in prison could work together to overcome facility control over clothing. He explained:

> A majority of us had people that were in property and so [when] we got shit taken away [by authority] we just have our person in property bring it to the laundry room and hide it in our laundry and bring it back to the tier.

Altruistic Behavior

As mentioned in Chapter 2, prison is a society within a society. Several blog authors and interview participants shared experiences that prove this to be true. For example, Participant 8 described the "important" prison culture in which the incarcerated take care of one another by sharing clothing. He said:

> As soon as you get there…you're going to find a group of people that's going to welcome you, and a lot of people will welcome you with sweats…I was given already another two sets [of sweats] as soon as I got there so it was welcoming like, 'Here you go, [fellow incarcerated people] gonna take care of you.'

He revealed that this generous behavior was apparent throughout his sentence and beyond. He said, "When you leave [prison], you make sure you pass down your clothing to other [incarcerated people], that's the culture. Everybody did it, so you made sure you take care of the

next person because you just want to help, give a helping hand." The author of Blog 1 offered advice to incarcerated persons who will be released in the future. She advised, "When it's time for [people] to get out [of prison], make sure to hook them up with some stylish clothes, because I assure you, we are all a little sick of wearing khakis." Two female interview participants recalled specific clothing items that were considered a status symbol among the incarcerated at their facilities. For example, Participant 2 explained:

> Somebody who was a long-term [incarcerated] person left and they had, we'd call them 'summer robes' and was like something pretty in a dark place and it had colorful stripes, different color stripes. But the gown I had, of course, was so old, so all the colors looked pastel by the time I got it. So, the person that had it before me was there for 20 years and that was what they used to issue.

Unfortunately, sometimes incarcerated individuals who are released cannot leave clothing behind. For example, the author of Blog 7 shared an experience around the time of their release from prison. They recalled:

> 'You excited to wear your own clothes?' [a fellow incarcerated person] asked. I think she wanted my T-shirts and that was a way to see if I would admit whether or not I have clothes waiting for me [for my release]. It's a common problem. Women get arrested, come here, stay for even a month, and the landlord wherever she was living throws out all her stuff. Ex-offenders aren't selfish when they can't give someone the shirt of their back; many times, it's the only one they have.

Work Release

Toward the end of their sentence, some participants were able to leave their facilities to work in free society for the day. This type of employment was rare, as Participant 1 explained:

"You got a few camps out here that has work release and then you also have the very few camps that also has the ability to let you actually leave the facility and go out into the public." An important aspect of work release was the opportunity to shed government-issued clothing and wear clothing worn in free society.

A few participants described various ways in which they procured clothing for work release. Participant 1 explained the rules he followed while on work release. He reported, "You was allowed to have, let's say, three pair jeans…and shirts of your choice…if you were able to leave the facility for the day go out to the public, you [were] also able to have clothes from home." Participant 14 recalled a time when he was employed full time while incarcerated, which allowed him to wear his own clothes. "While you're in [prison] you do have to wear your uniform except, they had slacks, shirt, and you could have your own underwear and undergarments." Participant 2 highlighted a few ways in which she acquired clothing for work release. She described, "A lot of times we went to local thrift stores, because one, you get more clothing for your money, and two, a lot of the thrift stores have special programs and discounts [for work release]." Some participants described their feelings associated with alternative clothes used for work release. As Participant 1 described:

> Those days when we were able to go out society. Those days when you were able to take
> off your green pants and put on your blue jeans and your button-down shirt…from home.
> Whenever you were able to go from your greens to your, we call 'street clothes', it felt
> like you actually transformed, even just for those few hours.

Participant 14 noticed "a tremendous self-esteem boost" and felt "part of the crowd outside in society" when he wore his clothing for work release. He recalled, "They would never know that I

was [incarcerated] except for the big old bus that says, 'Department of Corrections' in big bright bold letters."

RQ4: How do individuals communicate self-identity through clothing throughout the incarceration process?

Results from this study suggest that individuals used clothing to communicate their self-identity throughout the process of incarceration. An analysis of the data produced the following themes: civilian clothing exchange process; clothing customization and self-identity; visitation; and government-issued clothing exchange process.

Civilian Clothing Exchange Process

All blog authors and interview participants were required to exchange their civilian clothing for government-issued clothing at some point throughout the incarceration process. This exchange commonly occurred during intake, or at the beginning of the incarceration process. This event marked a rite of passage from free society to incarceration. Most blog authors and interview participants engaged in this exchange while in jail, prison, or at the crime scene. For example, the author of Blog 2 outlined their experience with the exchange. They said:

> When you are sentenced to time in prison and placed into custody, the process of stripping away your personal identity immediately begins. Officers take away your clothes and all personal belongings and give you a jail uniform to wear while you wait for your transfer to prison.

Regardless of location, findings revealed that this exchange was an emotional and memorable experience. For example, Participant 4 was allowed to keep his civilian clothes while in jail until he was sentenced to prison. He detailed his intake experience:

Well, in Rikers island, which is the jail, not a prison, we were allowed to wear clothes that we would wear out in society, which included jeans…and T-shirts. And then when I went to prison, after I got sentenced, that changed…There they make you get rid of all your clothes, which you brought from Rikers Island, and ask you if you want to throw it out or send it home and most people elect to throw it out. After you remove your clothes, you strip butt naked…then you line up and you go to the dressing area where they have prison garments ready for you.

Participant 8 had time to prepare himself for exchanging his civilian clothes for government-issued clothing. Although he believed he was prepared for this exchange, he was surprised by his feelings. He said, "When they took [my clothes] I expected it and that was the moment of saying, 'Okay, this is really happening'. And that was probably one of the lowest moments, when you're officially wearing [prison clothes]." A few participants remembered this exchange as a "humiliating" experience. For example, Participant 7 described the event, "It was as if our identity was being stripped immediately." Participant 3 "didn't like it. [He] felt kind of violated." Participant 5 reported a lack of emotion from administration as they conducted her clothing exchange. She vividly remembered officers' reactions during this event. She said:

How do I explain this kind of like the removing of what I was upon arriving at the jail, I remember what I was wearing was almost a mockery of what everybody else who was coming in was wearing. I was fresh from court and trial. Most people there, [in] the jail, they were like not in their best outfit, let's just say. I was standing there in a black lace dress with heels, and I had hosiery on. You could tell that the female officers were like, 'We're getting this bitch out of his outfit.' It wasn't sad but it was a [similar] feeling.

Two participants were required to surrender their civilian clothing at the crime scene to be used as evidence. For example, Participant 2 described:

> [Administration] had to take my clothing I was wearing right away for evidence, so when they took my clothing, they issued this uniform for me that was like three sizes too big on me. They give you no under clothing and no socks or anything. I had to wait a few days for my family to bring [undergarments] up there to me when we found out what I could have.

Some participants revealed that the process of abandoning their civilian clothing evoked a feeling of self-loss. For instance, Participant 1 recalled, "[Exchanging my clothes] brought on a slight form of depression. It felt demeaning and it felt like I lost a large part of who I am." "Our clothes identify part of our personality and part of who we are. So, taking that from a person kind of takes away from who you actually are," he explained. Likewise, the exchange of clothing led Participant 12 to realize a loss of choice. He described, "I was no longer distinct from everybody else. I became a part of this prison environment where everybody's the same because we all have to dress the same." Even as a teenager, Participant 4 remembered relinquishing his identity when he surrendered his civilian clothing. He recalled:

> I realized that I wasn't me anymore. I became my last name and my inmate number because you get a sticker on your clothes that they iron and you can't remove. And all the prison garments had that identification tag on it.

The author of Blog 9 recalled the first time seeing their reflection in government-issued clothing. They shared:

> I still remember the first time I caught a glimpse of myself in the white uniform Texas prisoners wear. That was when my incarceration really sank in: I had become just another

face in a sea of hundreds of people reduced to the worst thing they'd ever done. Dressed in those drab garments, I looked no different from the next prisoner in line…In the free world, I had been an overachiever. By all outward appearances, I was going to do big things with this life. But behind bars, staring at myself in that uniform, I felt like the biggest failure in the world.

Five participants completed a lengthy prison sentence between 15 and 32 years in the State of California. These participants began their incarceration in the late 1980s and shared similar experiences regarding a shift in government-issued clothing. The clothing requirements for these participants changed from less institutional, sometimes personal clothing to more government-controlled clothing over the course of several years. For example, Participant 12 recalled how the political climate in the 1990s affected the shift in government-issued clothing during his time of incarceration. He said:

The tough on crime era, which was in the early [19]90s, mid [19]90s, those policies in California began to change. You had to wear prison issued garb in visiting. You could no longer wear your own blue jeans, you could no longer wear your own sweatshirt or anything of that nature, they would have to be your standard issue prison clothes. When I first started going [to prison] early on in the early [19]90s, you could wear your own clothes at one point.

Participant 10 described government-issued clothing "that fluctuated a lot" over his 30 years of incarceration. He said, "When I first went to prison, they had us wearing, as we call them, 'State made' blue jeans, but they weren't denim. They were serviceable, they were OK, and they wore blue sleeve button down chambray shirts." He explained that eventually, "[Administration] gave

114

us what we refer to as a 'mental patient uniform.' And they were a cheaper quality of denim with a stretch waistband and just a pullover shirt that looked like a smock you wore in art class."

After exchanging street clothing for government-issued clothes, blog authors and interview participants observed facility control over the state of that clothing. As the author of Blog 1 stated "There is no freedom of expression without punishment." The author of Blog 10 spoke of their opinion regarding facility control over clothing. They said, "The TDCJ (Texas Department of Criminal Justice) seeks to suppress [clothing customization] and imposes penalties for those that seek to venture outside of the protocol lines." Participant 13 found humor in the idea of enforcing government-issued clothing. He said, "The CDCR actually came out with rules [regarding issued clothing]. I remember when they came out, we started laughing. When I read about proper wearing of your prison attire, 'You can't do this, can't do that.' God bless them, they tried." Several participants corroborated these statements through recollection of facility control over their issued clothing and subsequent punishment. Participant 8 shared that he "was never able to express [his] personality through [his] clothing." He explained, "My personality didn't really shine through because you were limited in that area [of clothing]. I mean, we all look alike with what we wear."

Participant 14 shared that clothing enforcement differs between facilities. He explained, "It's all depending on the facility that you're in. But mostly in high security areas, no, you cannot alter [clothes] not one bit. You would be locked down or a lock up, individual cell. You're just there by yourself." According to several blog authors and interview participants, not only is this enforcement dependent upon the facility, but it also depends on the administration.

Customization and Self-Identity

According to the author of Blog 1, "Prison is a place where conformity is emphasized, and originality is allowed only to a certain extent." Participant 3 shared, "You won't allowed to tamper with your clothing. The [administration] would send us to the hole for it but we do it anyway, just so we wouldn't have to wear the same stuff all the time." Despite the risk of punishment for altering government-issued clothing, some participants found creative ways to express themselves through customization of their issued clothing. For example, Participant 4 described, "You can start adding some distinctions to get up and start raising your visibility and your sense of class." Participant 6 shared, "I think the biggest thing about clothing, while being incarcerated, is it's how you're going to express yourself and then you got to make do with what you got. So, we did." The author of Blog 10 revealed the possibilities for customization of government-issued clothing in their Texas facility. They said, "How many ways can one change-up a pair of white socks, shirt and shorts from the next person? As many ways as you can mix up the wardrobe in your closet." According to this blog author, there were so many ways in which incarcerated people customized their clothing. They described, "on the prison pods, you're not finding inmates with identical wear."

A few participants added creases to their shirts or pants through ironing. According to the author of Blog 10, "These days, you will find crispy, creased, starched uniforms so well pressed that you could stand them up in a corner." Some facilities provided community irons for this purpose. Participant 13 took advantage of this perk. He described, "I would wash my clothes each week and iron them and try to make them look neat. 'Try to be professional', that was always my thought…That was one of the things I did that helped me maintain who I was." Participant 12 used his social network to customize his government-issued clothing. He said:

You can get creases put in your shirts, or at the bottom of my pants, I can have them cuffed so that they were more straight leg. I could pay for those type of things and that, in a way, brought a sense of my identity because to have a standard of neatness in prison.

Another way in which participants were able to customize their government-issued clothing was by flipping their pant legs. For example, Participant 1 described this small change he incorporated into his daily life while incarcerated. He said:

Being me compared to another person…'Even though I'm wearing this [issued clothing], this is who I am.' I will put the pants on one day and I might flip one of my pant legs up, just to kind of be like. 'Hey, this is me today.'

The author of Blog 10 shared other ways in which pant legs may be customized. They described, "Pant legs are rocked with one cuff tucked under the tongue of the boot or tennis shoe to make the fashion more visible." People could also wear "Two pairs of boxers AND a pair of gym shorts over [their pants]," they highlighted. In addition to customization of pant legs, a female participant shared a way to increase the number of issued clothing outfit options. As Participant 15 reported, "There is a group of girls for a minute that were wearing their pants inside out because it gives us another four things [to wear]." Participant 6 recalled a popular way to customize issued clothing in jail. He said, "In county [jail], the big thing was tucking [shirts or socks] in your pants or wearing different socks. The way you wore your socks, the way you wore your shorts, you tucked in your T-shirt." Two participants shared how they used networking in their facility to customize sleeve length on government-issued clothing. For example, Participant 4 explained the reason he wanted to customize his short sleeve shirts into long sleeve shirts. He said:

When the prison provides you the garments, they're all short sleeves. There's no long sleeve shirts. So, prisoners actually made long sleeves, to make [the issued clothes] look more professional. For instance, when I would go to school [in prison], I would often make it a point to try to wear long sleeves to seem as though I was more academic or professional or less prison like.

Several participants customized their government-issued clothing through alterations. A female participant used alterations to make her unisex government-issued clothing more form-fitting and feminine. Participant 5 recalled, "Over time, I wanted to have something that was different and something that made me feel beautiful and unique." "I have big boobs and [altering my dresses] made me feel sexy. It made me feel like a woman and it made me feel like, not a number," Participant 5 explained. She described, "On all of the dresses, I would pull it in real tight around the waist and the boobs so that would really accentuate the curves and stuff." Participant 5 revealed, "Some of the women [in prison] tried to make some their clothing more masculine. They would turn their collars up, and they would make their cuffs a certain way, or the hems on their pants would be a certain way." The author of Blog 10 described, "Tank tops are stitched (as clean as a sewing machine could stitch) to match body forms to perfection." Other participants altered their issued clothing for a general fit. As described by Participant 11, "If the shirt and the pants were a little loose, what I ended up doing was just getting a needle and thread and making the adjustments myself." He also prioritized clothing functionality and added pockets to his government-issued pants "to have a place to put stuff."

Some participants found that clothing customization while incarcerated provided an outlet for self-expression and a way to connect to the outside world. As Participant 12 explained, "[Clothing customization] allowed me to imagine what it was to be free and still be able to hold

on to a part of the world that was outside your grasp." Participant 5 felt that fashion was not only enjoyable to her but provided a bright spot in an otherwise negative environment. She said:

> I think I told myself, 'You have a lot of time to do. Are you going to wake up every single day in these ugly clothes? Who are you going to be?' I took a lot of pride in the way that I dressed on the outside. It was something that made me stand out…[in prison] it brought a little bit of whimsy to the day. Prison is not a fun place, so I really tried to push the fashion.

Visitation

The findings conveyed the importance of visitation from family and friends while incarcerated. According to Participant 1, "The number one day anywhere is visiting day." The author of Blog 10 said, "For most [incarcerated people], weekend visits are the prom. A time to show out and show up." Participant 15 said, "I always wore my best things." Likewise, the author of Blog 6 revealed, "I dress in my cleanest, brightest state issue clothing." Although most participants were required to wear certain clothing during visitation, many of them recalled attempts to express self-identity through clothing customization. For instance, Participant 9 noted that, "The best thing you can do in prison is get a visitor, to go into the visiting room. So why would I not want to dress as nicely as I could in the visiting room?" Participant 1 shared instructions to prepare for visitation upon arrival at a facility. He said:

> The very first thing was you need to find the newest pair of pants and the newest shirt... Once you find that one outfit, it's only for visitation. It's used for nothing else. And you kept that separate from your other clothes all the time.

Participant 8 quickly learned the importance of visitation after he was incarcerated. He recalled:

If I didn't have my [clothes] pressed, somebody would say, 'Why are you looking like that? You gotta present yourself.' I didn't know that level of expectation…I would get [my clothes] pressed every week and just pay for it. [I would] just have it ready, hanging there [in my cell] for whenever I knew somebody was coming.

Participant 15's favorite visitor was her daughter. She highlighted how she customized outfits for her daughter's visits:

You just dress up to the best of your ability. [My daughter] came up like three or four times, so I would just alternate long sleeve shirt with one pair of pants or a long sleeve shirt with the other pair of pants. Or maybe my favorite sweatshirt.

Participant 4 felt more like a civilian than an incarcerated person during visitation because he could wear a non-prison issued shirt. He said:

I had dress shirts that were red, but the pants are always green…I think an important part for me in the visiting room was when you would sit down, you don't see the green pants, so you only see the upper half of the body. So, when you trying to look at it from an objective point of view, you just see four ordinary people, four civilians, just having a conversation…And as soon as you stand up, the green pants they really stick out, especially if you look out here in society. How many people do you see in green pants?

You kind of feel a sense of normality [during visitation] and you feel like a civilian again.

Several participants agreed that the reason for dressing nicely during visitation was to show family and friends from the outside that they were safe and thriving while incarcerated. It was believed by participants that this message could be visibly communicated through clothing. For example, Participant 11 explained:

It was important for me, out of respect for the people that are visiting, to go all out to make the best presentation possible to tell them, 'You matter to me this much that I want to put on my Sunday best for you.'

Participant 9 used visitation as an opportunity "just to show [his] family that [he] could look good, even in prison clothing." "I think there's a comfort in that to your family," he added. Participant 15 not only wanted to look good for her family, but she also wanted to look good for herself during visitation. She shared, "I already felt like a different person [in prison]. I just felt so freaking ugly in there all the time and I just want to be reminded, a little bit, of how I felt before, I guess." Likewise, Participant 5 shared her perspective on the importance of looking her best for visitation. She explained, "I didn't want my friends to think that, just because I had come to prison, that I was going to stop caring about myself or the way that I looked…I just didn't want to lose who I was."

A few blog authors and interview participants recalled a time in which they could wear personal clothing during visitation. For example, Participant 12, who served 21 years in the California Department of Corrections, remembered wearing his own clothes to visitation in the beginning of his sentence. He explained, "For me to wear something that was not exclusively prison [issued], I was wearing something that people sent to me. And I think, for me, it gave them a comfort level of knowing that 'Hey, everything in prison is okay.' He noticed a different feeling when he was eventually required to wear government-issued clothing to visitation. Participant 10 revealed his feelings when he was no longer allowed to wear his personal clothes to visitation. He shared:

Walking around inside the prison with all the other inmates, I couldn't care less what I look like, or what they thought of me…But having to wear that [prison] outfit out there in

front of my friends and family and get a picture taken…now there's a stigma. They don't

even want to show the picture to their friends or put it in a frame.

The author of Blog 9, a formerly incarcerated person, recalled his surprising demeanor in a

picture taken of him during visitation. He said:

I still have a picture of me in that white prison uniform. It's a snapshot with my wife in

the unit visitation room. Each time I stumble across it, I'm struck by how strangely happy

I seem. The uniform is as drab as ever, but neither of us seems to mind.

While visiting with family and friends, two participants recalled feeling emotional, especially

when visiting with their children. For example, Participant 1 described why his emotions were

high on visiting day. He shared:

Whew, it's kind of hurtful because that's one special outfit. Whenever your wife and kids

come to see you, you still wanted them to think and see that Daddy still had his style of

dress, even though it wasn't blue jeans and orange shirt you still wanted them to look at

Daddy again, 'Wow, my dad still got a pair of brand-new pants and a brand-new shirt.'

That's why.

Government-Issued Clothing Exchange Process

Several interview participants shared experiences from the day they were released from

prison. Simply changing out of government-issued clothing into clothing worn by free society

physically and psychologically transformed participants from incarcerated people to free

citizens. Therefore, participants used clothing as a vehicle for re-humanization after release. For

example, Participant 1 described the day he was released from prison. His facility allowed him to

receive clothing from family and friends for release day. He said:

I will never forget that feeling of when I was able to go from wearing the state greens to putting on the sweatpants that it took my wife three weeks to find…the whole time I was gone I had in my mind what I wanted to wear home. And when I took off those state clothes, and I took my time in putting on those brand-new socks that she found, those brand-new sweatpants that it took [my wife] forever to find, that certain T-shirt that she found for me, when I put that on it felt like I went through a total change. It just felt like I got myself back. I got my life back. I'm back in reality.

Likewise, Participant 4 recalled the events of his release day. He said:

My dad bought jeans and a blue sweater, and I remember taking off the green pants and putting on the jeans, for the first time, in, what, 12 and a half years? And it was so hard, I was just an oceanic surge of emotions that I felt at the time, as I try to put on the jeans. And there was a hesitation, as if I was fearful. The idea of becoming me again through clothes because I didn't know what a me was out here. And trying to get in touch with that by wearing the clothes and the jeans was really difficult, and I stood there trembling, and I even cried a bit. And I had to really muster my strength, to put it on and it felt like a different person once you got rid of the green clothes. Everything felt so much fresher and you felt lighter as if a burden was lifted from your shoulders.

Participant 10 recalled feeling a significant confidence boost after putting on civilian clothing on release day. He said:

[I received] a pair of store-bought Kirkland blue jeans and a nice shirt and a belt and a jacket…It didn't even fit. I had lost weight since she had bought it, but it didn't matter. Putting that stuff on made it [leaving prison] real. And I'm confident I had a butt stupid

grin on my face that just would not go away. It just felt amazing…I was walking out that gate and [clothes] changed my whole attitude. I became a happier person.

After serving two years in a New Jersey prison, Participant 8 wanted his wife's help to create a release day outfit that combined new clothes with shoes from his pre-incarcerated life. He described, "Changing out of my [issued] sweats to that [outfit] was a great feeling, because you revert back to that feeling [through clothing] of 'this is real' coming in [to prison], and now I was like, 'This is real. I'm leaving.'" During her interview, Participant 15 realized she experienced relief after removing government-issued clothing on the day she was released from prison. She noted, "Finally putting on something comfortable seems like it took a ton of weight off my shoulders. I felt like I could breathe again. I didn't even realize that until just now. [Comfortable clothes] helped. Showering first then that." In addition to receiving clothing from the outside, Participant 12 also revealed a monetary allowance given to those released from a California prison, "I was only released with $200 [from the state] and I got a pair of clothes sent in for my release. One of them was a nice sweatsuit."

Most participants received clothing to be worn on release day, but three participants explained the protocol for people who were not so lucky. For example, Participant 15 recalled:

When you get out [of prison], you don't necessarily have even a coat. Here, it's cold…[The facility] just gives you whatever they have lying around…I had this teeny tiny little coat like for a seven-year-old and I'm like squished into this [coat].

Summary

Results from this study suggest that clothing may be used as a non-verbal tool for personal transformation throughout the incarceration process. Both blog authors and interview participants shared intrinsic and extrinsic perspectives on clothing issued by correctional

facilities across the US. Although all blog authors and interview participants were required to wear government-issued clothing at some point throughout incarceration, it was found that clothing customization was universally understood as a way to express social and self-identity throughout the incarceration process. Data collected from this study show that the incarceration process influenced blog authors and interview participants to shift their priorities in regard to clothing. Findings suggest that clothing may be used as a vehicle to not only alter the way a person sees themselves, but also, the way they believe they are seen by others.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this qualitative study was to gain the perspective of current and formerly incarcerated individuals as it relates to clothing worn throughout the incarceration process. Four research questions were developed for use in the study:

RQ1: How do individuals describe clothing issued to them while incarcerated?

RQ2: How does the incarceration process change a person's relationship with their clothing?

RQ3: How do individuals communicate social identity through clothing throughout the incarceration process?

RQ4: How do individuals communicate self-identity through clothing throughout the incarceration process?

The study incorporated a qualitative, phenomenological research design to examine the impact of incarceration on the relationship between clothing and identity. This study implemented a research design with two data collection techniques that were conducted simultaneously. One part included a qualitative thematic analysis of 10 personal blogs written by current or formerly incarcerated persons. The second included semi-structured exploratory recall interviews which were conducted between July and September 2021. A total of 15 formerly incarcerated individuals were interviewed, 12 men and three women. Interview participants were selected through non-profit organizations, email, or direct messaging on various social media platforms. Interviews included open-ended questions and were audio recorded through Zoom. No in-person interviews were conducted.

Both research methods were used to address all four research questions and the data were analyzed simultaneously. Of the 10 blog authors, nine were incarcerated at the time of writing.

There were no perceived differences in the experiences of the currently incarcerated and the formerly incarcerated. Despite an extended length of time in which interview participants were separated from incarceration, their memory recall aligned with the narratives of those currently incarcerated. Furthermore, although blog authors were not asked questions by the researcher, the information they chose to disclose in their blogs was also reflected by interview participants in response to prompted questions.

RQ1: How do individuals describe clothing issued to them while incarcerated?

The prison subculture was previously defined in the literature review as "a set of patterns that flourishes in the environment of incarceration" (Irwin & Cressey, 1962, p. 147). The study sample described this subculture as it relates to the clothing issued to them in this environment. Specific clothing was mandated for each blog author and interview participant at some point, if not throughout the entirety of their incarceration. Each blog author and interview participant described clothing worn while incarcerated through the use of extrinsic attributes, such as color and style. Most blog authors and interview participants included intrinsic attributes in their descriptions, such as comfort, fit, and cleanliness. The impact of wearing this clothing was recalled through specific descriptions of the clothing. Interview participants, regardless of length of time served, age at interview, or age when first incarcerated, easily recalled the extrinsic and intrinsic attributes of clothing worn while incarcerated.

The findings from this study align with previous research on the function of organizational clothing. As cited in Chapter 2, organizational clothing removes individual control and expresses group identity (Davis, 1992; Fussell, 1983; Joseph, 1986; Joseph & Alex, 1972; Lurie, 1992; Roach-Higgins et al., 1992). Although the style and color of government-issued clothing varied among blog authors and interview participants, they all reported wearing

the same clothing as other individuals serving time in the same facility. This supports the function of organizational clothing and suggests that correctional facilities follow protocols found in organizations within free society.

Blog authors and interview participants also shared that facilities used color as a symbol for the overall facility and different groups within the facility. These findings support the idea that organizations may incorporate specific clothing or uniforms to develop an identifiable structure for individuals on the inside and outside of the organization (Arthur, 1997; Corley et al., 2006; Loseke, 2007; Pratt & Rafaeli, 1993; 1997). Not only did participants report the style of clothing required by their facility to separate them from civilian clothing, but they also highlighted the importance of clothing color. Specifically, facilities implemented the use of color as a symbol among various populations, which supports the color-in-context theory. This theory of color psychology, cited in Chapter 2, argues that the meanings of colors are learned through repeated association with a message or experience (Elliot & Maier, 2007). Findings from this study included certain colors used to represent levels of security, length of incarceration, and special needs. Johnson et al. (2014) found that a shift in the perceived meaning of a color occurs based on the conditions in which the color is observed. The findings in the current study corroborate this concept. The learned meanings of these colors used in the correctional environment varied by facility, but the social perception of the color was present.

RQ2: How does the incarceration process change a person's relationship with their clothing?

The results from this study suggest that incarceration changes a person's relationship with their clothing and their perceived meaning of clothing. Results support the concept of prisonization, as discussed in Chapter 2. Clemmer (1940; 1958) defined prisonization as the

process in which the incarcerated adopt "in greater or less degree…the folkways, mores, customs, and general culture of the penitentiary" (p. 299). For example, blog authors and interview participants shared their distaste for wearing government-issued clothing and believed the clothing was required to prevent escape, rooted in monetary reasons, and further enforced control and punishment. The results from this study align with findings from Walters (2003) who argued that prisonization is a reaction that results from an incarcerated person's adaptation to their new prison environment. This reaction is based on an attempt at survival and is not an acceptance of daily life while incarcerated (Walters, 2003). The findings in the current study indicate that over time, blog authors and interview participants became familiar with the idea of government-issued clothing and it soon became normalized during their incarceration. Blog authors and participants realized that their options were limited, if non-existent, and that government-issued clothing would help them to survive in the prison environment. Furthermore, the clothing was more acceptable to participants because they were surrounded by other incarcerated persons who were experiencing the same phenomenon.

Participants indicated that throughout the incarceration process, their perspective of clothing shifted from a societal requirement to a symbol of freedom or punishment. Participants carried this perspective with them even after they left prison. For example, colors that had little to no meaning before incarceration triggered negative episodic memories of time incarcerated after release. Although a participant's physical self was removed from an institutional environment, they could be psychologically transported back to that environment when recalling the clothing worn while incarcerated. Other key findings noted that the experience of incarceration exposes the importance of clothing comfort. Participants gravitated towards comfortable clothing after release instead of dressing to impress others as they did prior to

incarceration. Participants also found that they focused on small details of clothing that they had not otherwise considered. The ill-fitting and uncomfortable clothing worn while incarcerated led participants to choose clothing based on fit and texture after release.

In addition, findings from this study suggest that incarceration marks a shift in level of material satisfaction. Interview participants' clothing choices after release were largely determined by financial stability instead of individual expression. After years of having a limited prison clothing wardrobe, participants had a newfound appreciation for what they have instead of focusing on what they do not have. A major contribution to this new appreciation was the lack of choice while incarcerated. After the freedom of choice was granted to participants upon release, they realized how much they took for granted before incarceration.

RQ3: How do individuals communicate social identity through clothing throughout the incarceration process?

As cited in the literature review, to better understand incarceration, a correctional facility should be viewed as a society within a society (Levy, 1952). Furthermore, the definition of prisonization (Clemmer, 1940; 1958) suggests that the behavior of an incarcerated person is influenced by the structural and social characteristics of daily life inside a correctional facility. As the ideas of a society within a correctional environment and prisonization would suggest, individuals develop and maintain their social position among others while incarcerated. Findings from the current study suggest that people communicate social identity through clothing customization.

Pratt and Rafaeli (1997) argued that members of an organization have layers of social identity that they may choose to express through clothing that differs from the overall group expectations. The literature also suggests that clothing is often used to validate a person's social

position through symbolization of identity (Soloman, 1983; Wicklund & Gollwitzer, 1982). The findings from the current study support these arguments. For example, blog authors and interview participants recalled how they used clothing as a tool to signal group affiliation and their place within a social hierarchy. Findings indicate that this individual expression helped blog authors and interview participants to validate their identity among the other incarcerated individuals in their environment. By participating in this act of self-symbolization, blog authors and interview participants were able to validate their identity within the society of their facility.

The non-verbal signals communicated through clothing customization support the theory of symbolic interactionism cited in the literature review. Blumer (1969) argued that individuals form meaning through social experiences, and therefore, meanings are learned. Symbolic interactionists suggest that the foundation for social interaction is rooted in symbols and their meanings (Blumer, 1969; Mead, 1934). Furthermore, symbolic interactionism in the context of clothing suggests a person's behavior towards another person is influenced by that person's appearance (Kaiser, 1997). The study results indicate the meanings associated with an incarcerated person's appearance were understood among the facility's population.

Most blog authors and interview participants recalled learning the meaning associated with certain aspects of appearance immediately upon arrival. For example, despite the requirement to wear identical clothing styles among their facility's population, blog authors and interview participants made small adjustments in their clothing to signal a certain group affiliation, such as ethnicity or religion. This type of customization was present in most facilities represented in the current research sample, although meanings varied among blog authors and interview participants. A seemingly small change, such as rolling up a pant leg, non-verbally signaled an understood group affiliation among blog authors and interview participants.

Blog authors and interview participants reported communicating their place in the social hierarchy by procuring additional clothing or paying for clothing services, such as ironing. By obtaining additional clothing or a freshly ironed uniform, the incarcerated population recognized that the wearer was high in the social hierarchy. Alternatively, an incarcerated person who only wore wrinkled government-issued clothing was viewed as near the bottom of the facility's social hierarchy. Despite serving time in various facilities, these examples of clothing customization (or lack thereof) carried the same meanings among most blog authors and interview participants.

RQ4: How do individuals communicate self-identity through clothing throughout the incarceration process?

Results from this study suggest that the incarceration process, as it relates to clothing, aligns with the concept of rite of passage. As discussed in Chapter 2, a rite of passage occurs in three phases: 1) an individual's detachment from a previous environment or status; 2) transition to a new environment or status; and 3) incorporation of the new status into the group (Van Gennep, 1960). This suggests that a person's self-identity evolves over time and may be shaped into a new identity related to a group or environment.

According to the data in the current study, the first phase of a participant's rite of passage into incarceration occurred when they exchanged their personal clothes for government-issued clothing. Data collected at this phase supported Goffman's (1961c) theory of total institutions. According to this theory, the influence of authority on the daily life of an incarcerated person eventually results in the removal of self-identity. Specifically, Goffman (1961c) highlights personal clothing as a category of personal possessions that is denied to a person once incarcerated. In the current study, blog authors and interview participants described that this clothing exchange marked a shift in their identity from free citizen to incarcerated person.

Participants recalled feelings of humiliation, de-humanization, and an instantaneous loss of self-identity as they physically and psychologically detached from free society.

During the second phase, participants adapted to life in their new correctional environment, and began to embrace their new identity through clothing. This aligns with the concept of prisonization (Clemmer, 1940; 1958). For example, while incarcerated, participants found small ways to customize their government-issued clothing to express self-identity. These findings support Goffman's (1968) claims that the incarcerated find ways to grasp individuality after their personal possessions are replaced with standardized items provided by the facility (Goffman, 1961c). Blog authors and interview participants adjusted their clothing, adding a longer sleeve to a shirt or wearing their socks in an untraditional way, for example, to set themselves apart from the rest. Participants viewed these changes as a signal that they were unique among the population in their new environment, which supports Ash's (2010) research on individuality through clothing while incarcerated.

Finally, the third phase of a participant's rite of passage in the incarceration process occurred during the process of release from prison. As a new member of free society, a "different" person from the person who previously began the incarceration process, it was necessary to signal this new identity through clothing. As an effort to reclaim a new identity as a member of a new environment, participants used clothing as a vehicle for re-humanization after release. Simply removing prison-issued clothing and replacing it with clothing worn by free society helped participants to feel like different people. Other participants mentioned their ability to re-claim parts of their former selves and their identity through clothing after release. Clothing was a way to visibly separate participants from their criminal image, allowing them to better fit in with society.

The idea of a rite of passage within the context of the incarceration process supports Erikson's (1968) idea that people continuously develop their identity over the course of their lifetime. Interview participants in this study experienced a major life event that disrupted their sense of self-continuity. According to Syed and Mitchell (2015) and Mitchell et al. (2020), this would be considered temporal identity integration, as discussed in Chapter 2. This type of identity integration indicates the degree of connection between a person's past, present, and future identity over the course of time (Syed & Mitchell, 2015). Each interview participant described their incarceration process as it related to clothing in great detail, which suggested that this was a significant life event that altered their identity. Given the suboptimal government-issued clothing requirements, most interview participants described the incarceration with a sense of nostalgia. Despite the past experience of incarceration, findings suggest that interview participants were able to restore their self-identity after release which indicates a successful identity formation (Syed & Mitchell, 2015).

Implications

This research study aimed to understand the impact of incarceration on the relationship between clothing and identity. Overall, the experience of incarceration led participants to view clothing as a function of personal transformation. Both interview participants and blog authors recalled the feeling of personal transformation as they relinquished their civilian clothing and received government-issued clothing. It can be argued that this clothing exchange represented a rite of passage from free society to prison, and therefore transformed a free citizen into a prisoner. While incarcerated, participants embraced their government-issued clothing and adopted customization to better fit in with certain society groups in prison, or to express themselves. Finally, after a participant was allowed to exchange their government-issued

clothing for street clothing upon release from prison, they shed their criminal identity and exchanged it for the identity of a free citizen. Several participants claimed to feel like a "different" person while wearing civilian clothing at the end of their sentence, even if they were physically in a correctional facility at the time. Throughout the incarceration process, clothing became a powerful, non-verbal tool that participants used to express their identity. Results illustrate that clothing could be used to not only change the way a participant viewed themselves, but also the way they believe they are viewed by others.

Results from this study may encourage future discussions about changing institutional clothing. Although this is a highly charged social and political issue, findings from this study suggest that a change in government-issued clothing may have a positive impact on the individuals who wear it. For example, removing labels such as "prisoner" or "DOC" from uniforms could help the incarcerated population feel more human and less like government property. This change may help the incarcerated with their transition into free society upon release. The implementation of unisex clothing in most correctional facilities aids in the removal of gender identity associated with individuals prior to incarceration. The negative impact of this clothing was cited by female blog authors and all three female interview participants in this study.

Facilities could introduce a new silhouette, in softer textures and more feminine colors to better suit the female incarcerated population. Results from the Utah DOC example in the literature review indicate that a change in uniform for the female population was directly related to more positive behavior in the facility. In this case, a change in clothing had a positive impact on the incarcerated and the administration. Despite evidence that a change in government-issued

clothing may have a positive impact on people while incarcerated and after release, there are

challenges that must be overcome to implement such changes.

Limitations

Since there were a number of limitations in this study, the replicability of the results

should be filtered through this lens. Interview participants were recruited through non-profit

organizations, through email, or various social media platforms. This recruitment method limited

the interview participant sample to formerly incarcerated individuals with access to technology

and connection with organizations and social media services.

According to the literature, the blog and interview participant samples in this study were

acceptable, although they do not represent individual experiences of all current and formerly

incarcerated persons. Although correctional institutions across the US share similarities in

various policies and practices, differences between facilities remain. Therefore, the findings and

implications of this study may not be generalizable (Gray, 2010) to experiences shared by all the

incarcerated and formerly incarcerated in the US criminal justice system. The information gained

from this study, however, may inform future research on a larger scale.

Blogs allow authors to write about personal experiences, construct meanings from those

experiences, and categorize their own narratives (Friedman, 2013; Keller, 2012). Blogging gives

authors the opportunity to edit and re-edit their writing until it reflects the narrative they find

appropriate. Therefore, Von Benzon (2018) argued that written blogs may reflect the priorities

and emotions of participants rather than an accurate account of an experience. In addition,

personal blogs could be more refined or provide a less "truthful" evaluation of someone's

experience, which suggests that imaginary information might be communicated online

(Bartholomew et al., 2012; Jang & Dworkin, 2014). Hookway (2008) stated that bloggers are

mindful of their audience and tend to write for that audience. Although this audience may be real or imagined, the blogger's goals could include impression management or persuasion (Hookway, 2008). Therefore, there may be validity concerns with the data collected from prison blogs.

Due to research limitations with currently incarcerated individuals, certain details may have been lost through the recall of experiences of formerly incarcerated interview participants. When studying the experience of incarceration through a phenomenological approach, there is a concern about how any participant distinguishes between their actual experience and communicating a memory of that experience. Oiler (1982) stated that "In reflecting back on experience, what is uncovered is not pure experience but rather it is remembered experience. There is a tendency to interpret experience in reflection rather than to allow it to speak simply for itself" (p. 179).

Furthermore, the COVID-19 pandemic limited the use of face-to-face communication throughout the participant recruitment and interview processes. This restriction reduced the opportunity for the researcher and potential participant to build a rapport, which may have led to hesitancy in the overall interview process for the participant.

Recommendations for Future Research

This research study contributed new information about the impact of incarceration on the relationship between clothing and identity. To better understand the implications of these results, future studies could address clothing-related behaviors of the incarcerated. The literature suggests that groups normalize behaviors based on their surroundings and appear to behave homogeneously. A future study could investigate how the type of clothing worn while incarcerated causes changes in behavior of those who wear it. Therefore, a collaboration between scholars in the fields of textiles, criminal justice, psychology, and sociology could contribute to

137

the understanding of topics related to the incarcerated individuals' clothing-related behaviors while incarcerated. Such interdisciplinary research can inform previously unexplored areas, specifically in corrections.

This study focuses on the voices of formerly and currently incarcerated individuals through the lens of phenomenology. The descriptions of their experiences are based on their perception of the incarceration process. Such perceptions are valuable for the current study but fall short in the understanding of facility administration and their views of government-issued clothing throughout the incarceration process. For example, how do corrections officers view the implementation and execution of government-issued clothing in their facilities? The findings of the current study illustrate how the incarcerated view government-issued clothing, but what are the motives and psychological reasons for enforcing such rules? In addition, what obstacles are presented to the staff from a logistical standpoint? Hence, future research could employ other research methods, such as a case study, to elicit perspectives on how facility administration identifies the challenges in adopting and enforcing government-issued clothing throughout the incarceration process.

Two subjects of interest were mentioned by participants that were not included in the findings of this research study. A few participants enlisted in various branches of the military and offered comparisons between those experiences and incarceration as it relates to clothing. Several participants highlighted areas of dress such as accessories, religious adornments, and shoes. These topics were not directly related to the research aims of this study but may contribute to future research.

Such future research will help bring awareness to how institutionalized clothing affects the identity of an incarcerated person, not only while incarcerated but also upon release. Current

policies and practices indicate that the type of clothing used in the institutional environment is determined by a higher-level officer or government official. Findings from this study may contribute to discussions about the future direction of institutional clothing and encourage additional research on social conditions and rehabilitation in correctional facilities.

For example, in 2020, nationwide protests in response to racial inequality gained public attention. Media coverage of discrimination and violence encouraged individuals from various backgrounds and experiences to participate in important conversations about racial inequalities. These protests included demands for changes in policing, which placed a spotlight on the systemic racism in the US criminal justice system (Sawyer, 2020). Sawyer (2020) stated that systemic racism is present at each stage of the system, including discipline while incarcerated and reentry into society upon release. In early 2021, the Biden administration issued an executive order on reforming the US incarceration system (The White House, 2021). The idea of prioritizing rehabilitation in correctional facilities is a key focus of this reform. This executive order provides an opportunity for a close look at additional aspects of the understudied topic of institutional clothing. The findings from this study may aid in the development of best practices that will help this population fully integrate back into their communities upon future release.

This qualitative study provided the perspectives of current and formerly incarcerated individuals and their experience with clothing throughout the incarceration process. The experiences shared by blog authors and interview participants provided insights into how incarceration affects the relationship between clothing and their identity. Based on the findings from this study, participants used clothing as a tool for personal transformation throughout the incarceration process. The results from this study may lead to additional research in this area as it relates to behavioral implications and facility administration. Findings from this study may also

initiate discussions for social change and rehabilitation to help the formerly incarcerated fully

integrate back into society.

REFERENCES

Adam, H., & Galinsky, A. D. (2012). Enclothed cognition. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(4)*,* 918-925. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.02.008

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist, 55*(5), 469-480. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469

Arthur, L. B. (1997). Role salience, role embracement, and the symbolic self-completion of sorority pledges. *Sociological Inquiry, 67*(3), 364-379. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1997.tb01102.x

Arthur, L. B. (1999). Dress and the social construction of gender in two sororities. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, 17*(2), 84-93. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0887302X9901700203

Ash, J. (2010). *Dress behind bars: Prison clothing as criminality.* I. B. Tauris.

Barak-Glantz, I. L. (1981). Toward a conceptual schema of prison management styles. *The Prison Journal, 61*(2), 42-60. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F003288558106100206

Bartholomew, M. K., Schoppe-Sullivan, M., Glassman, M., Kamp Dush, C. M., & Sullivan, J. M. (2012). New parents' Facebook use at the transition to parenthood. *Family Relations, 61*(3), 455-469. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2012.00708.x

Becker, H., Greer, B., Hughes, E. C., & Strauss, A. (1961). *Boys in white: Student culture in medical school.* The University of Chicago Press. http://hdl.handle.net/10822/762260

Bem, D. (1972). Self-Perception Theory. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (6),* 1-62. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60024-6

Benzies, K. M., & Allen, M. M. (2001). Symbolic interactionism as a theoretical perspective for multiple method research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 33*(4), 541-547. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2001.01680.x

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method.* Prentice Hall.

Blumer, H. (1981). George Herbert Mead. In B. Rhea (Ed.), *The future of the sociological classics* (pp. 136-169). George Allen & Unwin.

Bosworth, M. (Ed.). (2005). *Encyclopedia of prisons and correctional facilities.* Sage Publications, Inc.

Bosworth, M., Campbell, D., Demby, B., Ferranti, S. M., Santos, M. (2005). Doing prison research: Views from inside. *Qualitative Inquiry, 11*(2), 249-264. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1077800404273410

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Brewis, J., Hampton, M., & Linstead, S. (1997). Unpacking Priscilla: Subjectivity and identity in the organization of gendered appearance. *Human Relations, 50*(10), 1275-1304. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016982423169

Burns, R. (2002). Assessing jail coverage in introductory criminal justice textbooks. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 13*(1), 87-100. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511250200085341

Burton, S., & Soboleva, A. (2011). Interactive or reactive? Marketing with Twitter. *Journal of Consumer Marketing, 28*(7), 491-499. https://doi.org/10.1108/07363761111181473

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory.* Sage Publications, Inc.

Chenail, R. (2011). Qualitative researchers in the blogosphere: Using blogs as diaries and data. *The Qualitative Report, 16,* 249-254. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2011.1050

Cheng, J., Sun, A., Hu, D., & Zeng, D. (2011). An information diffusion-based recommendation framework for micro-blogging. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 12*(7), 463–486. https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1713486

Christian, J. (2019, November 27). Prison visitation. *Oxford Bibliographies.* https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195396607/obo-9780195396607-0273.xml

Clemmer, D. (1940; 1958). *The prison community.* Rinehart.

Cooley, C. H. (1902). *Human nature and the social order.* Charles Scribner's Sons.

Copes, H., Hochstetler, A., & Brown, A. (2012). Inmates' perceptions of the benefits and harm of prison interviews. *Field Methods, 25*(2), 182-196. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1525822X12465798

Corley, K., Harquail, C. V., Pratt, M. G., Glynn, M. A., Fiol, C. M., & Hatch, M. J. (2006). Guiding organizational identity through aged adolescence. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 15*(2), 85-99. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1056492605285930

Craik, J. (2003). The cultural politics of the uniform. *Fashion Theory, 7*(2), 127-147. https://doi.org/10.2752/136270403778052140

Craik, J. (2005). *Uniforms exposed: From conformity to transgression.* Bloomsbury. http://dx.doi.org/10.2752/9781847881212

Cramer, R. J., Wechsler, H. J., Miller, S. L., & Yenne, E. (2017). Suicide prevention in correctional settings: Current standards and recommendations for research, prevention, and training. *Journal of Correctional Health Care, 23*(3), 313-328. https://doi.org/10.1177/1078345817716162

Crane, D. (2000). *Fashion and its social agendas: Class, gender, and identity in clothing.* University of Chicago Press.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative, and mixed methods approaches,* 5th edition. Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approac*hes, 4th edition. Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* Sage Publications, Inc.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Rochberg-Halton, E. (1981). *The meaning of things: Domestic symbols and the self.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139167611

Davis, L. L. (1984). Clothing and human behavior: A review. *Home Economics Research Journal, 12*(3), 325-339. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077727X8401200308

Davis, F. (1985). Clothing and fashion as communication. In M. R. Solomon (Ed.), *The psychology of fashion* (pp. 15-27). Health/Lexington Book.

Davis, F. (1992). *Fashion, culture, and identity.* The University of Chicago Press.

Davis, L. L. (1984). Clothing and human behavior: A review. *Home Economics Research Journal, 12*(3), 325-339. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077727X8401200308

Delgado, A. (2021, September 14). *Prison slang: The complete guide.* Aaron Delgado & Associates. https://communitylawfirm.com/prison-slang-guide

della Porta, D. (Ed). (2014). *Methodological practices in social movement research.* Oxford University Press. https://www.scinapse.io/papers/200728096

Denzin, N. (1992). *Symbolic interactionism and cultural studies.* Blackwell.

DiCicco-Bloom, B., & Crabtree, B. F. (2006). The qualitative research interview. *Medical Education, 40*(4), 314–321. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02418.x

Dictionary. (n.d.). Juvenile detention center. *Dictionary.com.*
https://www.dictionary.com/browse/juvenile-detention-center

Elgesem, D. (2002). What is special about the ethical issues in online research? *Ethics and Information Technology, 4*(3), 195–203.
https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021320510186

Elliot, A. J., & Maier, M. A. (2007). Color and psychological functioning. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16*(5), 250-254.
https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fj.1467-8721.2007.00514.x

Emmel, N. (2013). *Sampling and choosing cases in qualitative research: A realist approach*. Sage Publications, Inc. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781473913882

Entwistle, J. (2002). The dressed body. In M. Evans, & E. Lee (Eds.), *Real bodies.* Palgrave.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-230-62974-5_9

Erikson, E. H. (1959). *Identity and the life cycle.* W. W. Norton.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis.* W. W. Norton.

Feinberg, R. A., Mataro, L., & Burroughs, W. J. (1992). Clothing and social identity. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, 11*(1), 18-23.
https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1177/0887302X9201100103

Fields, C. B. (2005). Three prisons act of 1891. In Mary Bosworth (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Prisons and Correctional Facilities.* Sage Publications, Inc.

Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* Vintage Books.

Frank, M. G., & Gilovich, T. (1988). The dark side of self- and social perception: Black uniforms and aggression in professional sports. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(1), 74-85. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.54.1.74

Freitas, A., Kaiser, S., Chandler, J., Hall, C., Kim, J., & Hammidi, T. (1997). Appearance management as border construction: Least favorite clothing, group distancing, and identity…not! *Sociological Inquiry, 67*(3), 323-335.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1997.tb01099.x

Friedman, M. (2013). *Mommyblogs and the changing face of motherhood.* University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442665231

Furby, L. (1978). Possession in humans: An exploratory study of its meaning and motivation. *Social Behavior and Personality, 6*(1), 49-65.
https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.2224/sbp.1978.6.1.49

Fussell, P. (1983). *Class: A guide through the American status system.* Simon and Schuster.

Fussell, P. (2002). *Uniforms: Why we are what we wear.* Houghton Mifflin.

Galinsky, A. D., Wang, C. S., & Ku, G. (2008). Perspective-takers behave more stereotypically. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(2), 404-419. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.95.2.404

Giorgi, A. (1985). *Phenomenology and psychological research.* Duquesne University Press.

Giorgi, A. (2005). The phenomenological movement and research in the human sciences. *Nurse Science Quarterly, 18*(1), 75- 82. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0894318404272112

Giorgi, A. (2009). *The descriptive phenomenological method in psychology* A modified Husserlian approach. Duquesne University Press. https://doi.org/10.1163/156916210X526079

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Aldine.

Goffman, E. (1961a). On the characteristics of total institutions: The incarcerated person world. In D. R. Cressey, (Ed.) *The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change.* Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Goffman, E. (1961b). On the characteristics of total institutions: Staff incarcerated person relations. In D. R. Cressey, (Ed.) *The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change.* Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Goffman, E. (1961c). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates.* Anchor Books/Doubleday.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity.* Prentice Hall.

Goldman, A. (2008). The social epistemology of blogging. In J. Van Den Hoven & J. Weckert (Eds.), *Information technology and moral philosophy*, 111–122. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511498725.007

Grassi, S., Mandarelli, G., Polacco, M., Vetrugno, G., Spagnolo, A. G., & De-Giorgio, F. (2018). Suicide of isolated inmates suffering from psychiatric disorders: When a preventive measure becomes punitive. *International Journal of Legal Medicine, 132* (4), 1225-1230. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00414-017-1704-5

Gray, D. E. (2009). *Doing research in the real world, 2ⁿᵈ edition.* Sage Publications, Inc.

Groenewald, T. (2004). A phenomenological research design illustrated. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 3*(1), 42-55. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F160940690400300104

Gubrium, J. F. (Ed.). (2012). *The SAGE handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft.* Sage Publications, Inc. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452218403

Guy, A., & Banim, M. (2000). Personal collections: Women's clothing use and identity. *Journal of Gender Studies, 9*(3), 313-327. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1080/713678000

Haferkamp, N., & Kramer, N. (2008, May 24). *Entering the blogosphere: Motives for reading, writing, and commenting/* [Paper presentation]. Meeting of the International Communication Association, Montreal, Canada.

Hamilton, P., & Hargreaves, R. (2001). *Beautiful and the damned: The creation of identity in nineteenth century photography.* The National Portrait Gallery. https://www.npg.org.uk/business/publications/the-beautiful-and-the-damned.php

Handley, S. (1999). *Nylon: The story of a fashion revolution.* The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Haney, C., Banks, W. C., & Zimbardo, P. G. (1973). Interpersonal dynamics in a simulated prison. *International Journal of Criminology and Penology, 1,* 69-97. http://pdf.prisonexp.org/ijcp1973.pdf

Haney, C., & Zimbardo, P. (1998). The past and future of US prison policy: Twenty-five years after the Stanford Prison Experiment. *American Psychologist, 53*(7), 709-727. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0003-066X.53.7.709

Hannover, B. (1997). *The dynamic self: The context-dependency of self-related knowledge.* Huber.

Hochschild, A. (1983). *The managed heart*: *Commercialization of human feeling.* University of California Press.

Hookway, N. (2008). Entering the blogosphere: Some strategies for using blogs in social research. *Qualitative Research, 8*(1), 91–113. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1177/1468794107085298

Hycner, R. H. (1985). Some guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data. *Human Studies, 8*(3), 279-303. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00142995

Irwin, J., & Cressey, D. R. (1962). Thieves, convicts and the incarcerated person culture. *Social Problems, 10*(2), 142-155. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/799047

Jang, J., & Dworkin, J. (2014). Does social network site use matter for mothers? Implications for bonding and bridging capital. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 35, 489-495. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.chb.2014.02.049

Johnson, K., Lennon, S. J., & Rudd, N. (2014). Dress, body and self: Research in the social psychology of dress. *Fashion and Textiles, 1*(20), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40691-014-0020-7

Johnson, K. K. P., Yoo, J-J., Kim, M., & Lennon, S. J. (2008). Dress and human behavior: A review and critique of published research. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, 26*(1), 3–22. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0887302X07303626

Joseph, N. (1986). *Uniforms and nonuniforms: Communication through clothing.* Greenwood Press.

Joseph, N., & Alex, N. (1972). The uniform: A sociological perspective. *American Journal of Sociology, 77,* 719-730. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2776756

Jost, K., & Hipolit, M. J. (2006). Blog explosion. *CQ Researcher, 16*(22), 505-528. http://library.cqpress.com/cqresearcher/cqresrre2006060913

Jung, Y., Vorderer, P., & Song, H. (2007, May 26). *Motivation and consequences of blogging in social life* [Paper presentation]. Meeting of the International Communication Association. San Francisco, CA.

Kaiser, S. B. (1985). *The social psychology of clothing and personal adornment.* Macmillan Publishing Company.

Kaiser, S. B. (1989). Clothing and the social organization of gender perception: A developmental approach. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, 7*(2), 46-56. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0887302X8900700207

Kaiser, S. (1983). Toward a contextual social psychology of clothing: A synthesis of symbolic interactionist and cognitive theoretical perspectives. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, 2*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0887302X8300200101

Kaiser, S. (1990). *The social psychology of clothing.* Macmillan.

Kaiser, S., Freeman, C., & Chandler, J. L. (1993). Favorite clothes and gendered subjectivities: Multiple readings. *Studies in Symbolic Interaction, 15,* 27-50.

Kaiser, S. B. (1997). *The social psychology of clothing: Symbolic appearances in context.* Fairchild.

Kanter, R. M. (1972). *Commitment and community: Communes and utopias in sociological perspective.* Harvard University Press.

Keller, J. M. (2012). Virtual feminisms: Girls' blogging communities, feminist activism, and participatory politics. *Information, Communication, and Society, 15*(3), 429-447. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1080/1369118X.2011.642890

Kendall, D. (2002). *The power of good deeds: Privileged women and the social reproduction of the upper class.* Rowman & Littlefield.

King, N. (1994). The qualitative research interview. In C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds.), *Qualitative methods in organizational research: A practical guide,* (pp.14-36). Sage Publications, Inc.

Kline, D., & Burstein, D. (2005). *Blog! How the newest media revolution is changing politics, business, and culture.* CDS Books.

Krohn, M. D., & Lopes, G. (2015). Labeling Theory. In M.D. Krohn & J. Lane (Ed.), *The handbook of juvenile delinquency and juvenile justice* (1st ed.) (pp. 312-330). John Wiley & Sons.

Kronick, R., & Thomas, D. (2008). Prisoner citizen: Carl Upchurch, labeling theory, and symbolic interactionism. *Journal of Progressive Human Services, 19*(2), 112-124. https://doi.org/10.1080/10428230802475406

Lee, R. M., & Renzetti, C. M. (1990). The problems of researching sensitive topics: An overview and introduction. *The American Behavioral Scientist, 33*(5), 510-529. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0002764290033005002

Lennon, S. J., & Davis, L. L. (1989). Clothing and human behavior from a social cognitive framework part I: Theoretical perspectives. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, 7*(4), 41–48. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1177/0887302X8900700406

Levy, Jr., M. J. (1952). *The structure of society.* Princeton University Press.

Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R., & Zilber, T. (1998). *Narrative research: Reading, analysis, and interpretation.* Sage Publications, Inc.

Lindquist, C. H. (2000). Social integration and mental well-being among jail inmates. *Sociological Forum, 15*(3), 431-455. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007524426382

Loseke, D. (2007). The study of identity as cultural, institutional, organizational, and personal narratives: Theoretical and empirical integrations. *The Sociological Quarterly, 48*(4), 661-688. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.2007.00096.x

Lurie, A. (1992). *The language of clothes.* Bloomsbury.

Markus, H., & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 38*, 299-337. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.ps.38.020187.001503

Martin, D. D. (2002). From appearance tales to oppression tales: Frame alignment and organizational identity. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 31*(2), 158-206. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0891241602031002003

Maruna, S. (2011). Reentry as a rite of passage. *Punishment and Society, 13*(1), 3-28. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1462474510385641

Maxfield, M. G., & Babbie, E. R. (2016). *Basics of research methods for criminal justice & criminology* (4th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Mayhew, H., & Binny, J. (1862). *The criminal prisons of London: Scenes of prison life.* Griffin, Bohn, and Company. https://ia800200.us.archive.org/35/items/cu31924024894481/cu31924024894481.pdf

McCall, G. J. (1976). Communication and negotiated identity. *Communication, 2,* 173-184.

McCall, G. J., & Simmons, J. L. (1966). *Identities and interactions.* Free Press.

McCorkle, L. W., & Korn, R. (1954). Resocialization within walls. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 293(*1), 88-98.

McGannon, K. R., McMahon, J., & Gonsalves, C. (2017). Mother running in the blogosphere: A discursive psychological analysis of online recreational athlete identities. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 28,* 125-135. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.11.002

McLuhan, M., & McLuhan, E. (1988). *Laws of media*: *The new science*. University of Toronto Press. https://monoskop.org/images/e/ec/McLuhan_Marshall_McLuhan_Eric_Laws_of_Media_The_New_Science.pdf

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self & Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist* (edited by C.W. Morris). University of Chicago Press. http://tankona.free.fr/mead1934.pdf

Meltzer, B. N. (2003). Mind. In L. Reynolds & N. Herman-Kinney (Ed.), *Handbook of symbolic interactionism* (pp. 253-266) AltaMira Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). Qualitative research and case study applications in education (2nd ed., rev.expanded.). Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriam-Webster (2011). *Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law* (2nd ed.). https://www.merriam-webster.com/legal

Miller, W. B. (1958). Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. *Journal of Social Issues, 14*(3), 5-19. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1958.tb01413.x

Mitchell, L. L., Frazier, P. A., & Sayer, N. A. (2020). Identity disruption and its association with mental health among veterans with reintegration difficulty. *Developmental Psychology, 56*(11)*, 2152–2166.* https://content.apa.org/doi/10.1037/dev0001106

Mitford, J. (1971). Kind and unusual punishment. In A. Davis, *If they come in the morning: Voices of resistance.* The Third Press.

Morgan, D. L. (1993). Qualitative content analysis: A guide to paths not taken. *Qualitative Health Research, 3*(1), 112-121. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F104973239300300107

Morrione, T. J., & Farberman, H. A. (1981). Conversation with Herbert Blumer: I. *Symbolic Interaction, (4)*1*,* 113-128. https://doi.org/10.1525/si.1981.4.1.113

Morse, J. M. (1994). Designing funded qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 220-235). Sage Publications, Inc.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods.* Sage Publications, Inc. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412995658

National Institute of Justice. (n.d.). Correctional Facilities. https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/corrections/correctional-facilities

Neilson, S. (2016, November 22). Prison uniforms make it harder to 'go straight.' *Newsweek, 166*(11). https://www.newsweek.com/prison-inmate-uniforms-clothed-cognition-434177

North Carolina Department of Correction. (n.d.). *Research Guidelines.* https://www.doc.state.nc.us/rap/researchguidelines.pdf

North Carolina Judicial Branch. (n.d.). *Juvenile Delinquency.* https://www.nccourts.gov/help-topics/family-and-children/juvenile-delinquency

Oaklander, L. N. (1992). *Existentialist philosophy: An introduction.* Prentice Hall, Inc.

Olive, R., Mccuaig, L. A., & Phillips, M. (2013). Women's recreational surfing: A patronizing experience. *Sport Education and Society, 20*(2), 258-276. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2012.754752

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2007). A call for qualitative power analyses. *Quality & Quantity, 41*, 105–121. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-005-1098-1

Orland, L. (1978). *Prisons: Houses of darkness.* The Free Press.

Owen, W. F. (1984). Interpretive themes in relational communication. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70,* 274-287. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335638409383697

Pastoureau, M. (2001). *The devil's cloth: A history of stripes and striped fabric.* Columbia University Press.

Poland, B. (1995). Transcription quality as an aspect of rigor in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 1*(3), 290-310. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F107780049500100302

Polansky, N. A. (1942). The prison as an autocracy. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 33*, 16-22. https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc/vol33/iss1/3

Pratt, M., & Rafaeli, A. (1997). Organizational dress as a symbol of multilayered social identities. *Academy of Management Journal, 40*(4), 862-868. https://doi.org/10.2307/256951

Rafaeli, A., & Pratt, M. G. (1993). Tailored meanings: On the meaning and impact of organizational dress. *Academy of Management Review, 18*(1), 32-55. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.2307/258822

Rehm, J., Steinleitner, M., & Lilli, W. (1987). Wearing uniforms and aggression—A field experiment. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 17*(3), 357-360. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1002/ejsp.2420170310

Roach-Higgins, M. E., Eicher, J. B., & Johnson, K. K. P. (Eds.). (1995). *Dress and identity.* Fairchild Publications. https://hdl.handle.net/11299/170351.

Roberson, D. W., White, B. L., & Fogel, C. I. (2009). Factors influencing adherence to antiretroviral therapy for HIV-infected female inmates. *Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care, 20*(1), 50-61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jana.2008.05.008

Rodzvilla, J. (Ed.). (2002). *We've got blog: How weblogs are changing our culture.* Perseus Books Group.

Roller, M. R., & Lavrakas, P. J. (2015). *Applied qualitative research design: A total quality framework approach.* The Guildford Press.

Rosenbaum, D. P., & Lavrakas, P. J. (1995). Self-reports about place: The application of survey and interview methods to the study of small areas. In J. E. Eck and D. Weisburd (Eds.), *Crime and place: Crime and Prevention Studies* (pp. 285-313). Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image.* Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400876136

Rosenberg, S. (2009). *Say everything: How blogging began, what it's becoming, and why it matters.* Crown Publishers.

Rothman, D. (1995). Perfecting the prison: United States, 1789-1865. In N. Morris and D. Rothman (Eds.), *The Oxford History of the Prison* (100-116). Oxford University Press.

Routh, D., Abess, G., Makin, D., Stohr, M. K., Hemmens, C., & Yoo, J. (2017). Transgender inmates in prisons: A review of applicable statutes and policies. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 61*(6), 645-666. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0306624X15603745

Rowe, A. (2011). Narratives of self and identity in women's prisons: Stigma and the struggle for self-definition in penal regimes. *Punishment & Society, 13*(5), 571-591. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1462474511422151

Ruck, S. K. (Eds.). (1951). *Paterson on prisons*: Being the Collected Papers of Sir Alexander Paterson. Frederick Muller.

Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing & Health, 23*(4), 334–340. https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X(200008)23:4%3C334::AID-NUR9%3E3.0.CO;2-G

Sawyer, W. & Wagner, P. (2020, March 24). Mass incarceration: The whole pie 2020. Prison Policy Initiative. https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/pie2020.html

Schlosser, J. A. (2008). Issues in interviewing inmates: Navigating the methodological landmines of prison research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 14*(8), 1500-1525. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1077800408318325

Schutt, R. K. (2004). *Investigating the social world: The process and practice of research, 4ᵗʰ edition.* Sage Publications, Inc.

Schwandt, T. A. (2015). *The SAGE dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (4ᵗʰ ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Schwartz, S. J., Luyckx, K., & Crocetti, E. (2015). What have we learned since Schwartz (2001)?: A reappraisal of the field of identity development. In K. C. McLean & M. Syed (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Identity Development*, 539–561. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199936564.013.028

Sellin, T. (1932). "Imprisonment" in *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (edited by Edwin R. A. Seligman). Macmillan.

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research, 3rd edition.* Teachers College Press.

Smiley, C. J., & Middlemass, K. M. (2016). Clothing makes the man: Impression management and prisoner reentry. *Punishment & Society, 18*(2), 220-243. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1462474516636953

Smit, B., & Fritz, E. (2008). Understanding teacher identity from a symbolic interactionist perspective: two ethnographic narratives. *South African Journal of Education, 28*, 91-101. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1150029.pdf

Smith, C. P., Atkinson, J. W., McClelland, D. C., & Veroff, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Motivation and personality: Handbook of thematic content analysis.* Cambridge University Press. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1017/CBO9780511527937

Smith, P. N., Wolford-Clevenger, C., Mandracchia, J.T., & Jahn, D. R. (2013). An exploratory factor analysis of the acquired capability for suicide scale in male prison inmates. *Psychological Services, 10*(1), 97-105. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0030817

Solomon, M. (1983). The role of products as social stimuli: A symbolic interactionism perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research, 10*(3), 319-329. https://doi.org/10.1086/208971

Solomon, M., & Douglas, S. (1985). "The female clotheshorse: From aesthetics to tactics." In M. R. Solomon (ed.), *The psychology of fashion,* (pp. 387-401). Lexington Books.

Solomon, M. R., & Douglas, S. (1987). Diversity in product symbolism: The case of female executive clothing. *Psychology & Marketing, 4*(3), 189-212. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.4220040304

Solomontos-Kountouri, O., & Hatzittofi, P. (2016). Brief report: Past, present, emergent and future identities of young inmates. *Journal of Adolescence, 47,* 119-124. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.10.022

Stone, G. (1962). Appearance and the self. In A. Rose (Ed.), *Human behavior and social processes: An interactionist approach,* (pp. 86-118). Houghton Mifflin.

Stone, G. P. (1977). Personal acts. *Symbolic Interaction, 1,* 2-19. https://doi.org/10.1525/si.1977.1.1.2

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Sage.

Stroop, J. R. (1935). Studies of interference in serial verbal reaction. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 18,* 643-662.

Sullivan, L. E. (1990). *The prison reform movement: Forlorn hope.* Twayne Publications.

Swain, J. (2002). The right stuff: Fashioning an identity through clothing in a junior school. *Gender and Education, 14*(1), 53-69. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250120098889

Syed, M., & McLean, K. C. (2016). Understanding identity integration: Theoretical, methodological, and applied issues. *Journal of Adolescence, 47,* 109 –118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.09.005

Syed, M., & Mitchell, L. L. (2015). "Temporal identity integration as a core developmental process." In R. A. Scott & S. M. Kosslyn (Eds.), *Emerging trends in the social and behavioral sciences*. Wiley. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Moin-Syed/publication/299864967_Temporal_Identity_Integration_as_a_Core_Developmental_Process/links/5d32a6e1299bf1995b3984c9/Temporal-Identity-Integration-as-a-Core-Developmental-Process.pdf

Sykes, G. M. (1958). *The society of captives: A study of a maximum security prison.* Princeton University Press.

Tafarodi, R. W., & Vu, C. (1997). Two-dimensional self-esteem and reactions to success and failure. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23(*6*)*, 626–635. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0146167297236006

The White House. (2021, January 26). Executive order on reforming our incarceration system to eliminate the use of privately operated criminal detention facilities. https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/01/26/executive-order-reforming-our-incarceration-system-to-eliminate-the-use-of-privately-operated-criminal-detention-facilities/

Thomas, W. I. (1923). The unadjusted girl: With cases and standpoint for behavior analysis. *Criminal Sciences Monographs, 4*, 1-257.

Toyoki, S., & Brown, A. D. (2014). Stigma, identity and power: Managing stigmatized identities through discourse. *Human Relations, 67*(6), 715-737. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0018726713503024

Turkle, S. (1995*). Life on the screen: Identity in the Age of the Internet.* Simon and Schuster.

Turnbull, R. J. (1798). *A visit to the Philadelphia prison.* Robert Dapper.

US Legal. (n.d.). Correctional Facility Law and Legal Definition. https://definitions.uslegal.com/c/correctional-facility/

van Gennep, A. (1960). *The rites of passage*. University of Chicago Press.

von Benzon, N. (2019). Informed consent and secondary data: Reflections on the use of mothers' blogs in social media research. *Area, 51*(1), 182-189. https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12445

Walters, G. D. (2003). Changes in criminal thinking and identity in novice and experienced inmates: Prisonization revisited. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30*(4), 399-421. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0093854803253137

Walther, J. B. (2002). Research ethics in Internet-enabled research: Human subjects issues and methodological myopia. *Ethics and Information Technology, 4,* 205–216. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021368426115

Watterson, K. (1996). *Women in prison: Inside the concrete womb.* Northeastern University Press.

Webb, L., & Wang, Y. (2013). "Techniques for analyzing blogs and micro-blogs." In Natalie Sappleton, *Advancing research methods with new technologies*. IGI Global. http://www.igi-global.com/book/advancing-research-methods-new-technologies/72357

Wei, L. (2009). Filter blogs vs. personal journals: Understanding the knowledge production gap on the Internet. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14*(3), 532–558. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01452.x

Welsh, E. (2002). Dealing with data: Using NVivo in the qualitative data analysis process. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 3(*2). https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-3.2.865

Wertz, F. J. (2005). Phenomenological research methods for counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 167-177. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.167

Whitcomb, D. (2012, March 7). Sheriff's pink-underwear policy may be unconstitutional. *Reuters.* https://www.reuters.com/article/us-sheriff-underwear-court/sheriffs-pink-underwear-policy-may-be-unconstitutional-court-idUKTRE82624F20120307

Wicklund, R., & Gollwitzer, P. (1982). *Symbolic self-completion.* Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wiles, R., Crow, G., & Pain, H. (2011). Innovation in qualitative research methods: A narrative review. *Qualitative Research, 11*(5), 587-604. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1468794111413227

Wilkins, A. (2008). *Wannabes, goths and christians: The boundaries of sex, class and style.* University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, A. N., Howitt, S. M., Higgins, D. M., & Roberts, P. J. (2015). Making critical thinking visible in undergraduates' experiences of scientific research. In M. Davies, & R. Barnett (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of critical thinking in higher education.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Woods, J. (2005). Digital influencers: Business communicators dare overlook the power of blogs? *Communication World, 22(1),* 26–30.

Zimbardo, P. G. (1969). The human choice: Individuation, reason, and order versus deindividuation, impulse, and chaos. In W. J. Arnold and D. LeVine (Eds.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation,* (pp. 237-307)*.* University of Nebraska Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Interview Protocol

1. Tell me about how you dressed prior to incarceration and what was most important to you.

2. Tell me about how you dressed while incarcerated and describe the clothing.

3. Why do you think you were required to wear this clothing?

4. How did it feel to exchange your street clothes for clothes that were chosen for you?

5. Were you able to express your personality in some way through changes in your clothing? If so, please describe how.

6. Tell me about how you dress now that you are a free member of society and why you choose to dress that way.

7. Has incarceration impacted your choice of clothing? If so, would you describe the impact?

8. Has your clothing helped you reconstruct your identity since release? If so, would you describe how?

Demographic Questions

9. In what type of facility were you incarcerated? (ex. County Jail, State Prison, Federal Prison, Juvenile, County Prison, Private Prison)

10. In what year were you incarcerated?

11. How old were you when you were first incarcerated?

12. In what year were you released?

13. How old were you when you were released?

14. Is there anything else that you would like to share that I haven't asked you about in relation to the clothing that you wore while incarcerated?

Thank you for your time.

Appendix B. Recruitment Email

Hello [insert name here],

I am a PhD student at NC State University and am conducting a study to learn more about the impact of imprisonment on the relationship between clothing and identity of incarcerated people. The study would include one audio-recorded interview through Zoom, focusing on questions about your time while incarcerated as related to clothing and uniforms. This audio-recorded interview is expected to take 45-90 minutes to complete.

To be considered, you must no longer be incarcerated or in a post-release program. Participants must also be at least 18 years old. I would appreciate consideration in participation in this study if you are interested and meet these requirements!

Please respond to this message if you are or are not interested in participating. If you are interested, I will request a telephone screening to explain more about the study and answer any questions you may have. If we both agree that you would be a good fit for this study, I will follow up with additional details to plan the best day and time for our Zoom interview.

I look forward to hearing from you!
Lonny Carter
lelangst@ncsu.edu
919-307-7648

<center>**Appendix C. Telephone Screening Script**</center>

Protocol Title: The Impact of Imprisonment on the Relationship Between Clothing and Identity of Incarcerated People **(eIRB #** 24123**)**

Hello, my name is Lonny Carter from the Wilson College of Textiles at NC State University.

I am contacting you because:

<<(Choose one)>>
-you responded to my email/Facebook/LinkedIn message showing interest in my study
-you called/left a message in response to one of my flyers

I am working on a research study about the impact of imprisonment on the relationship between clothing and identity of incarcerated people.
. This study will include one audio interview with me, the researcher and you, the participant through Zoom.

Your taking part in this phone call is completely voluntary.

May I ask you a few questions to help determine if you may qualify for the study?

<<If person says "No," thank the person for his/her time and politely end call>>
<<If person says "Yes," proceed with the following>>

I will be collecting information about you during this phone call. Before I ask you the screening questions, I would like to tell you about what we will be doing with the information you give us.

Whether you join the study or not, the information collected today may be seen by researchers at NC State University and those responsible for oversight of the study. We try to make sure that the information we collect from you is kept private and used only for the research study we are discussing. If you do not agree to continue the phone call, you will not be penalized in any way

Your personal information will not be kept if you choose not to enroll in the study or if you do not qualify to be in the study.

<<If phone call will continue, ask the following questions>>

- Are you at least 18 years old?
- Were you previously incarcerated at a correctional facility in the United States?

We have completed the telephone screening portion of our call.
- Do you have any questions?
- Do you think you would like to take part in this research?

If you are interested in participating in this study, I would like to set up a day and time for an audio Zoom interview.
If you have any questions about the study, please do not hesitate to contact me at 919-307-7648 or at lelangst@ncsu.edu. Thank you for your time!

<div align="center">**Appendix D. Adult Consent Form**</div>

Title of Study: The Impact of Imprisonment on the Relationship Between Clothing and Identity of Incarcerated People **(eIRB #** 24123**)**
Principal Investigator(s): Lonny Carter, lelangst@ncsu.edu or (919) 307-7648
Funding Source: None
Faculty Point of Contact: Dr. Kate Annett-Hitchcock, kate_annetthitch@ncsu.edu or (919) 515-0905

What are some general things you should know about research studies?
You are invited to take part in a research study. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You have the right to be a part of this study, to choose not to participate, and to stop participating at any time without penalty. The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of imprisonment on the relationship between clothing and identity of incarcerated people. We will do this through asking you a series of questions through the chat platform, Zoom. Your responses will be recorded.

You are not guaranteed any personal benefits from being in this study. Research studies also may pose risks to those who participate. You may want to participate in this research because you will have an opportunity for your voice to be heard about your prior involvement with a correctional institution. You may not want to participate in this research if you are uncomfortable speaking about your past experiences with a correctional facility.

Specific details about the research in which you are invited to participate are contained below. If you do not understand something in this form, please ask the researcher for clarification or more information. If, at any time, you have questions about your participation in this research, do not hesitate to contact the researcher(s) named above or the NC State IRB office. The IRB office's contact information is listed in the *What if you have questions about your rights as a research participant?* section of this form.

What is the purpose of this study?
The purpose of the study is to understand the psychological and physical impact of uniforms among incarcerated individuals in American correctional institutions. I will personally interview 10-20 formerly incarcerated people about their past experiences in corrections as related to clothing and uniforms. This study is not intended to design or develop new clothing, although improvements may emerge from the analysis of information obtained through experiences of formerly incarcerated people.

Am I eligible to be a participant in this study?
There will be approximately 10-20 participants in this study.

In order to be a participant in this study, you must agree to be in the study, you must be at least 18 years old, and you must have been incarcerated at a correctional facility in the United States.

You cannot participate in this study if you do not want to be in the study ot you are currently incarcerated.

What will happen if you take part in the study?
If you agree to participate in this study, I will ask you to answer questions about your experience while incarcerated as related to clothing and uniforms. This interview will be conducted through Zoom and will be audio-recorded. The interview is expected to take 45-90 minutes to complete. After our interview has been transcribed, I will ask you to provide member-checking to ensure the transcription accurately represents our conversation. During member-checking, you will be able to read through a transcript of our conversation and make clarifications as appropriate. Member-checking is expected to take 30-45 minutes.

The total amount of time that you will be participating in this study is 75-135 minutes.

Recording and images

If you want to participate in this research, you must agree to be audio recorded. If you do not agree to be audio recorded, you cannot participate in this research.

Risks and benefits

There are minimal risks associated with participation in this research. The risks to you as a result of this research include emotional risk that may occur if a participant is triggered by an interview question that suggests an unpleasant past experience. Participants may choose to skip a question or end the interview at any time if a question results in an unpleasant emotional impact.

Direct benefits of this study include the opportunity for a formerly incarcerated person to share their experiences while incarcerated. They will be able to speak freely about their clothing preferences before incarceration, how they interacted with clothing while incarcerated, and how they currently interact with clothing now that they are no longer incarcerated.

Results from this study may contribute to important discussions about the future direction of institutional clothing. This study may also encourage future corrections research concerning social conditions and rehabilitation, including institutional clothing. This study will help bring awareness to how institutional clothing impacts a person's identity, not only while incarcerated but also upon release.

Right to withdraw your participation

You can stop participating in this study at any time for any reason. In order to stop your participation, please contact Lonny Carter at lelangst@ncsu.edu or (919) 307-7648 or Dr. Kate Annett-Hitchcock at kate_annetthitch@ncsu.edu or (919) 515-0905. If you choose to withdraw your consent and to stop participating in this research, you can expect that the researcher(s) will redact your re-identifiable information from their data set, securely destroy your data, and prevent future uses of your re-identifiable information for research purposes wherever possible. This is possible in some, but not all, cases.

Confidentiality, personal privacy, and data management

Trust is the foundation of the participant/researcher relationship. Much of that principle of trust is tied to keeping your information private and in the manner that we have described to you in this form. The information that you share with us will be held in confidence to the fullest extent allowed by law.

Protecting your privacy as related to this research is of utmost importance to us; however, there are very rare circumstances related to confidentiality where we may have to share information about you. These are limited to instances in which imminent harm could come to you or others.

How we manage, protect, and share your data are the principal ways that we protect your personal privacy. Data generated about you in this study will be re-identifiable. Data that will be shared with others about you will be re-identifiable.

> **Re-identifiable**. Re-identifiable data is information that we can identify you indirectly because of our access to information, role, skills, combination of information, and/or use of technology. This may also mean that in published reports others could identify you

from what is reported, for example, if a story you tell us is very specific. If your data is re-identifiable, we will report it in such a way that you are not directly identified in reports. Based on how we need to share the data, we cannot remove details from the report that would protect your identity from ever being figured out. This means that others may be able to re-identify from the information reported from this research.

Compensation
There will be no compensation for participants in this study.

If you withdraw from the study prior to its completion, you will receive no compensation.

What if you have questions about this study?

If you have questions at any time about the study itself or the procedures implemented in this study, you may contact the researcher, Lonny Carter at lelangst@ncsu.edu or (919) 307-7648 or the faculty advisory, Dr. Kate Annett-Hitchcock at kate_annetthitch@ncsu.edu or (919) 515-0905.

What if you have questions about your rights as a research participant?
If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact the NC State IRB (Institutional Review Board) Office. An IRB office helps participants if they have any issues regarding research activities. You can contact the NC State IRB Office via email at irb-director@ncsu.edu or via phone at (919) 515-8754.

Consent To Participate

By signing this consent form, I am affirming that I have read and understand the above information. All of the questions that I had about this research have been answered. I have chosen to participate in this study with the understanding that I may stop participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I am aware that I may revoke my consent at any time.

Participant's printed name _____

Participant's signature _____ **Date** _____

Investigator's signature _____ **Date** _____

Title of Study where Broad Consent is Initially Sought: The Impact of Imprisonment on the Relationship Between Clothing and Identity of Incarcerated People **(eIRB #** 24123**)**
Principal Investigator(s): Lonny Carter, lelangst@ncsu.edu or (919) 307-7648
Funding Source: None
Faculty Point of Contact: Dr. Kate Annett-Hitchcock, kate_annetthitch@ncsu.edu or (919) 515-0905

This form asks you to make an important choice about the use of your re-identifiable information. It asks you to decide if you are willing to give your consent to the use of your re-identifiable information for future research.

If you agree, researchers in the future may use your re-identifiable information in many different research studies over an indefinite period of time without asking your permission again for any specific research study. This could possibly help other people or contribute to science. If you do not agree to allow your re-identifiable information to be used for future research, your information will not be kept for future use by anyone.

This form explains in more detail what saying "yes" or "no" to this use of your information will mean to you.

If you say "Yes" on this form
The researcher(s) will store, use and share your re-identifiable information, and may do so for the purpose of medical, scientific, and other research, now and into the future, for as long as they are needed. This may include sharing your re-identifiable information with other research, academic, and medical institutions, as well as other researchers, drug and device companies, biotechnology companies, and others.

If you say "yes", there are no plans to tell you about any of the specific research that will be done with your re-identifiable information.

By saying "yes," your re-identifiable information may be used to create products or to deliver services, including some that may be sold and/or make money for others. If this happens, there are no plans to tell you, pay you, or give any compensation to you or your family.

The main risk in saying "yes" is that your confidentiality could be breached. Through managing who has access to your re-identifiable information and through regularly updated data security plans, we will do our best to protect your re-identifiable information from going to people who should not have it.

Another risk is that if you say "yes," your re-identifiable information could be used in a research project to which you might not agree to if you were asked specifically about it.

You will not personally benefit from saying "yes" in this form. Saying "yes" in this form is not a condition of participating in The Impact of Imprisonment on the Relationship Between Clothing and Identity of Incarcerated People study.

If you say "no" or do not complete this form
The researcher(s) and institution(s) identified above will not store, use, or share your re-identifiable information beyond the purposes stated in the previous consent form that you agreed to and signed for The Role of the Uniform in the Life of an Inmate study.

If you want to withdraw your consent
You can stop participating at any time for any reason. Please contact Lonny Carter at lelangst@ncsu.edu or (919) 307-7648 or Dr. Kate Annett-Hitchcock at kate_annetthitch@ncsu.edu or (919) 515-0905. You can expect that the researcher(s) will redact your re-identifiable information from their data set, securely destroy your data, and prevent future uses of your re-identifiable information for research purposes wherever possible. This is possible in some, but not all, cases.

If you have questions
Please ask the research team to explain anything in this form that you do not clearly understand. Please think about this broad consent and/or discuss it with family or friends before making the decision to say "Yes" or "No." If you have any questions about this broad consent, please contact Lonny Carter at lelangst@ncsu.edu or (919) 307-7648 or Dr. Kate Annett-Hitchcock at kate_annetthitch@ncsu.edu or (919) 515-0905.

If you want to discuss your rights as a person who has agreed to, refused, or declined to respond to an offer of broad consent or believe that your rights were violated as a result of your agreeing to this broad consent, please contact the NC State IRB Director, at irb-director@ncsu.edu or via phone at (919) 515-8754.

Please choose one statement

Statement of agreement

I say yes. The future use of my data and consent has been explained to me, and I agree to give my consent to the future research uses of my information. My participation is voluntary, and I may withdraw my consent at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits to which I am entitled.

_____

Printed Name

_____

Signature

_____Date

Statement of refusal

I say no. The consent has been explained to me, and I do not agree to this consent.

_____

Printed Name

_____Signature

_____Date