

**SAMUEL D. GOSLING, KENNETH H. CRAIK,
NICHOLAS R. MARTIN AND
MICHELLE R. PRYOR**

MATERIAL ATTRIBUTES OF PERSONAL LIVING SPACES

SAM GOSLING IS ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN. HE IS INTERESTED IN HOW PERSONALITY IS EXPRESSED AND PERCEIVED IN EVERYDAY LIFE AND IN THE ENVIRONMENTS IN WHICH PEOPLE DWELL. HE ALSO DOES RESEARCH ON PERSONALITY IN NONHUMAN ANIMALS.

KENNETH H. CRAIK IS PROFESSOR OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY. HIS RESEARCH INTERESTS INCLUDE PERSONALITY THEORY AND ASSESSMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, AND THE PSYCHOLOGY OF HUMOR.

NICHOLAS R. MARTIN IS A PHD CANDIDATE IN THE INDUSTRIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT AT THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY. HIS INTERESTS LIE IN THE AREA OF PERSONALITY, PERFORMANCE, AND JOB SATISFACTION.

MICHELLE R. PRYOR GRADUATED FROM THE PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT AT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, SHE HAS WORKED IN THE FIELD OF INTERNET RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND CURRENTLY COMBINES ENVIRONMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY, PERSONALITY THEORY, AND BUSINESSES' NEEDS TO CREATE WEBSITES AND MARKETING MATERIALS.

We introduce the concept of Personal Living Space (PLS). More than a bedroom but less than a house, PLSs typically nestle within larger residential settings, affording primary territory for a designated individual. Common examples include rooms in family households, dormitories, or residential centers. We document modal portraits of one particular form of PLS, providing a snapshot at the cusp of the twenty-first century of the material residue found in North American college students' accommodations. Next, we marshal an environmental psychological approach to explore the meanings conveyed by the attributes and item contents of PLSs, focusing on three personal characteristics

of residents: gender, ethnicity, and personality. This analysis is guided by residue theory in personality psychology and the interpretation of instrumental (or use) meaning in the study of material culture.



Personal living space (PLS) is a concept intended to designate a class of residential environments that holds increasing importance within contemporary urban life (Inions 1999; Naar and Siple 1976). Much more than a bedroom but less than a full-fledged house, a personal living space is typically a room nestling within a larger residential setting while affording primary territory for a designated individual. PLSs are pertinent to several developmental stages of modern lives. PLSs can include an adolescent's room within the family household, a room within a college dormitory suite, a room within an apartment shared by young adult peers, a room within a boarding house that serves meals, a bed-sit within a single-occupancy hotel, and a room within a residential center for the elderly.

PLSs support many of the functions and meanings of home (Case 1996: 1; Dovey 1985: 33; Hayward 1975: 2; Smith 1994a: 21). An individual's personal possessions are located within the PLS, which affords privacy, refuge, security, continuity, a medium for personalization and self-representation, and a venue for regulated social interactions. Typically, the surrounding residential setting provides supplemental communal space, such as a dining room, activity room, living room, or lobby.

Thus, while relatively neglected heretofore, PLSs constitute a significant context for examining the agenda of psychological and cultural issues posed by the study of residential environments. These topics include the "back region" or arena for grooming and out-of-role activities (Goffman 1959; Smith 1994b: 124); the regulation of social interaction (Altman 1981); the communication of social identity (Appleyard 1979a: 4; 1979b: 143; Belk 1988: 139; Gibson undated; Pratt 1981: 135); intended and unintended personal expression (Brown and Harris 1989: 119; Cooper-Marcus 1995; Gosling *et al.* 2002: 379; Kaiser and Fuhrer 1996: 225; Wells 2000: 239), and the person-impressions of residents formed by visitors (Burroughs *et al.* 1991: 147; Canter *et al.* 1974: 113; Harris and Brown 1996: 187; Miller 1988: 353; Sadalla *et al.* 1980: 201, 1987: 569; Wilson and Mackenzie 2000: 343). Comparisons of the features of PLSs can be made with regard to gender (Buston and Breton 1992: 129; Devlin 1994: 225; Peterson 1987: 187; Vinsel *et al.* 1980: 1104), culture (Gauvain *et al.* 1983: 180; Miller 1988: 353; Weisner and Weibel 1981: 417), age (Gibson undated), and socioeconomic status (Manaster and Novak 1977: 269), and can serve as a window onto the attitudes, behaviors, life histories, identities, and personalities of the residents (Belk 1988: 139; Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton 1981; Gosling *et al.* 2002: 379; Woodward 2001: 115).

Yet, upon reviewing the research literature on home and housing for the *Handbook of Environmental Psychology*, Tognoli (1987: 655) observed: “On closer examination, one still emerges without a concrete picture of what homes or housing contain, except for the occasional study itemizing the contents of homes...” (p. 676). He argued that such itemizations can offer fresh ideas and approaches to research, “perhaps because home contents are so evocative of the past and laden with rich associations.” In any event, one of Tognoli’s primary conclusions from his comprehensive review held that “more knowledge is needed about home contents in relation to particular residents.” The present article is guided by Tognoli’s premise that the most psychologically and culturally interesting features of residential environments are to be found in the details of their contents.

DESCRIBING PLSs

Kasmar’s Environment Description Scale (EDS; Kasmar 1970: 153) is the most comprehensive instrument to date to document the features of interior spaces. In line with her goal to “develop a lexicon of architectural descriptors that are relevant and meaningful” (p. 145), Kasmar created a set of rating scales for architectural descriptors that non-architects could use to describe physical environments. However, the instrument did not record the specific elements to be found in a space nor provide a detailed itemization of content.

Moving more towards the home environment and the itemization of specific contents, Lauman and House’s (1970: 321) fifty-three-item Living Room Checklist (LRC) did include some specific content items such as “large potted plants,” “French furniture,” and “sunburst clock.” The instrument was designed for use by an interviewer during a ten-minute break of an eighty-five-minute interview conducted in the interviewee’s home. Thus, the goal of the instrument was to be brief and to focus on a few key elements, rather than to obtain a comprehensive assessment of the physical space. Consequently, the list of terms included in the LRC was far from a comprehensive and detailed itemization of even living room contents. Thus, the LRC was in the spirit of our approach but did not provide a thorough assessment of personal living spaces.

Exploring the meaning of things found within the home, Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton (1981) studied the household objects nominated as “special” by members of eighty-two extended families. The method did not aim at a comprehensive itemization of home contents but rather the subset of “special” objects. They devised a forty-one-category system to encompass the nominated objects (e.g., beds, photographs, clocks, carpets, candlesticks). With regard to gender differences, females more often nominated sculptures, photographs, plants, plates, glass, and textiles as special objects, while males identified TVs, stereos, tools, sports equipment, trophies, vehicles, and the yard.

In a study of personalization within university dormitory rooms, Vinsel *et al.* (1980: 1104) made an important step towards PLS assessment. Their method entailed taking photographs of the walls over the beds of fifty-three male and thirty-two female students. Content analysis of the photographs employed eight categories: entertainment equipment, personal relationships, values, abstract, reference items, music-theater, sports, commitment to the university, commitment to home and high school, and idiosyncratic. The total area decorated and the diversity of decorations was also measured. Thus, the approach dealt with one important but quite limited realm (i.e., wall decorations). The findings revealed gender differences, with females' walls featuring more personal-relationship items and males' walls showing more sports and reference items (e.g., schedules).

DISCOVERING THE MEANING OF PLSs

A central goal of the present research was to build upon these efforts by comprehensively documenting the physical features of one prevalent form of PLS, student accommodations. However, a program of descriptive assessment and inventory taking is incomplete without a complementary element that searches out and delineates meaning with regard to the fulsome and varying material artifacts found in an array of PLSs. An analytic framework is required that facilitates interpretation and assigns meaning to objects inventoried (Campbell 1996: 93; Thomas 1998: 97). Such explorations in meaning reveal some of the implications and consequences that go beyond simply knowing what is contained in the PLSs.

One form of meaning is anthropological in nature, afforded by perspectives on the material culture displayed by the contents of an array of PLSs. Within a comparative historical framework, for example, it is evident that the contents of present-day PLSs would differ dramatically from those of university students a half century ago. The impacts of changing technology, social stratification, and mass consumption would be even more apparent in comparisons extending across one or two centuries.

A much more psychological form of meaning can be explored in the entirely subjective and autobiographical significance of each object of a PLS for its individual inhabitant. Indeed, possessions may be used in the construction and maintenance of autobiographical narratives. For example, Belk (1988: 139) observed that "... cherished possessions are not likely to be a random assortment of items that recall our past... These possessions are likely to include objects such as newspaper clippings and trophies representing past accomplishments, mementos of past romances, and souvenirs of enjoyable travel experiences, and to exclude others such as belongings of estranged former spouses, poor report cards, and gifts from suitors who later rejected us." (p. 149). As noted above, Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton (1981) have also explored personal and associative meaning of objects found in residential settings.

In the present article, a central goal is to undertake and illustrate an intermediate examination of meaning that falls between the fully anthropological and the wholly psychological. Our conceptual approach treats each and every attribute and item content of a PLS as a possible physical residue of the prior behavior of the individual who is the resident of the PLS. For example, the presence of certain grooming objects such a tube of lipstick or an electric razor may be linked to the quotidian acts of grooming distinctive to each gender. In a similar fashion, the presence of a varied book and magazine collection represents prototypical act trends of the personality trait Openness to New Experiences (Buss and Craik 1983: 105; Gosling *et al.* 2002: 379).

The upshot is that item contents of PLSs need not be treated simply as objects *qua* objects, but as potential sources of information concerning the behavioral history and trends of their inhabitants. The content analytic framework that follows from this conceptual approach to environmental meaning generates an empirically based exploration of environmental diagnostics. It mobilizes important psychological and social constructs, such as gender, ethnicity, and personality traits and seeks to identify the PLS item content that is systematically associated with each construct within a sample of PLSs and their residents. Lippa (1998: 80; Lippa and Connelly 1990: 1051) has articulated a sex-diagnostic approach to analyzing everyday behaviors. Along these lines we have expanded this notion to guide the broader endeavor of environmental diagnostics.

THE PRESENT RESEARCH

This research has two central aims. First, as an illustrative example of the approach envisaged by Tognoli, we provide a snapshot of eighty-three contemporary PLSs assessed using a specially designed instrument, the Personal Living Space Cue Inventory (PLSCI). Second, we explore the relative diagnostic value, which establishes one form of meaning of broad and specific elements with regard to three kinds of personal characteristics of PLS inhabitants: gender, ethnicity, and personality.

Method

Target Participants

Eighty-three participants volunteered to have their PLSs assessed in return for receiving feedback based on their spaces. The participants were college students attending or recently graduated from the University of California at Berkeley. On average, participants were 21.9 years old ($sd = 2.8$) and the sample was reasonably diverse in terms of gender (65% women, 30% men, 5% did not specify) and ethnicity (42% Asian, 30% White, 20% other ethnicity, 8% did not specify). Participants were specifically asked not to tidy or alter their PLSs and were informed that the PLSs would be assessed

under conditions of anonymity and confidentiality. The coders had no contact with the participants and all photos of residents and references to residents' names were covered before the coders entered the PLSs.

Coding Features of the PLSs

The eighty-three PLSs were coded using the Personal Living Space Cue Inventory (PLSCI), an instrument designed to enable researchers to compile comprehensive inventories of environmental characteristics found in PLSs. The PLSs were coded by a team of three coders.

The Personal Living Space Cue Inventory (PLSCI). The PLSCI includes two types of features: global descriptors (e.g., gloomy–cheerful) and specific content items (e.g., desk). Form A contained the global descriptors. The specific content items were divided across three forms (B, C, and D), each of which was completed by only one coder; thus Coder 1 completed forms A and B, Coder 2 completed forms A and C, and Coder 3 completed forms A and D. This step of dividing the PLSCI into sections reduced the time taken to code a PLS but still permitted us to monitor inter-coder agreement for the global descriptors of the inventory (form A).

The first part (form A) of the PLSCI contained the global descriptors and was completed by all three coders. Bipolar ratings were made on seven–point scales concerning odor (e.g., weak–strong), noise (e.g., quiet–noisy), lighting (e.g., dim/dark–well-lit), atmosphere (e.g., stuffy–drafty), temperature (cold–hot), general state of PLS (e.g., gloomy–cheerful), and the quantity and level of organization of clothing, books, magazines, CDs/records, and stationery. There was a total of forty-two rating categories as well as several supplemental items to clarify the ratings (e.g., specifying the system underlying the organization of the books). An aggregate rating was obtained by computing the arithmetic mean of the three coders' ratings.

The portion of the PLSCI (forms B, C, and D) containing specific content items (e.g., desk) was divided equally among the three coders. Form B included information about the walls and ceilings (e.g., wallpaper), the subject matter of posters, paintings, and photos (e.g., movie stars), the floor (e.g., polished wood), carpet patterns and color (e.g., solid), window coverings (e.g., blinds, closed), and miscellaneous items (e.g., food wrappers). Form C included furniture (e.g., twin bed), electronic equipment (e.g., fax machine), books and magazines (e.g., biography), and CDs/records (e.g., country). Form D included broad categories of items: stationery (e.g., scissors), beauty products (e.g., perfume), bags (e.g., shoulder bag), miscellaneous categories (e.g., plants), and clothing (e.g., gloves). Together Forms B, C, and D contained 385 specific cues along with a large number of items clarifying the codings (e.g., specifying whether the medium of the décor was a photo, poster, or painting).

Each section of the PLSCI had space for the coders to manually write in cues that were not already present in the instrument. If a cue was repeatedly added to the inventory early in the study, a new category for it was added to the PLSCI. Over the course of the study we added nine cues (e.g., black light) to the instrument. In addition, there were 146 cues that were not added to the instrument but were recorded with sufficient regularity to warrant inclusion in the analyses reported here. Seven of these write-in cues were clarifications of categories already in the instrument; for example, the “method of hanging” category was qualified by “pins,” “tape,” and so forth. The cues that were written in are marked by a dagger in the tables reported below.

Coding procedure. The three coders entered each PLS together and started by independently completing Form A (global descriptors). Next the coders moved on to the specific content items. The coders were not permitted to touch or move any items so their codings reflect only what could be seen by walking around the PLSs. Clearly, this procedure does not capture the many items stored in drawers, wardrobes, cupboards, boxes, and other storage containers. For the specific content items, coders were permitted to communicate so they could point out items the other coders might miss. For instance, if in the course of recording the window coverings (Form B) Coder 1 noticed a book on the windowsill that could be easily missed, then Coder 1 should alert Coder 2 (who was responsible for books) to the book’s presence.

Personality Measures. Openness to New Experiences was measured using self and peer reports on the Big Five Inventory (BFI), a standard measure of personality (John and Srivastava 1999: 102). Specifically, after providing self-ratings, residents were asked to nominate two people who knew them well and could complete the peer-ratings. The peers were sent the rating scales, which they completed confidentially and mailed directly to the researchers. We obtained seventy-eight self-reports and ratings by one or two peers for seventy-seven of the residents (average acquaintance with resident = 3.4 years, $SD = 3.5$). The self and peer reports were aggregated to form the criterion measure of Openness.

In addition, seven observers who were unacquainted with the residents examined every PLS and completed the set of personality ratings about each resident. Observers were given no instructions regarding what information they should use to make their ratings. The observers had no contact with the participants and made their judgments independently after entering the rooms, using whatever information they thought was relevant. A full account of the methods used to obtain the observer ratings and criterion scores can be found in Gosling *et al.* (2002: 379).

Results and Discussion

Snapshot of Young American Adults' Personal Living Spaces

Our first aim was to provide a snapshot of the eighty-three PLSs. These data offer a glimpse into the everyday PLSs of young adults at the cusp of the twenty-first century. Following Tognoli's (1987: 655) analysis, we expected the specific content items to be crucial elements needed for the "concrete picture" (p. 676) that eludes attempts to characterize environments with broader analyses.

In this section we first present mean-level data for the global attributes and the frequencies with which each of the specific content items were detected in the PLSs. These analyses are meant to provide readers with an idea of "the typical student PLS." Of course, it is important to remember that the coders were not permitted to move or even touch any items in the PLSs, so these analyses merely reflect what can be detected from walking around the PLS and carefully examining it.

Global ratings. The first through fifth data columns of Table 1 show the mean ratings (and standard deviations) for each of the global attributes rated on a seven-point scale. Across all PLSs, the highest rating was 5.0 ($SD = 1.0$) for well-lit (naturally), indicating that PLSs were generally rated as enjoying a large amount of natural light. The lowest rating was 1.5 ($SD = 0.75$) for number of magazines, indicating that overall, coders did not observe many magazines.

Specific content items. Tables 2 to 14 show the occurrence rates for each of the specific environmental attributes we assessed. Thus, the data in Tables 2 through 14 provide an account of the types of content items found in the personal living spaces of eighty-three college students. (We also recorded the colors, patterns, materials, and other specific information, but in the interest of minimizing the space taken by the already extensive tables, these data are not reported here.) The percentages refer to the percentage of PLSs in which a given attribute was recorded. For example, the figures reported in Table 2 indicate that 25.3% of the PLSs had exposed-wood floors. Within each table, the five most frequently recorded items are listed in bold typeface. These data allow us to examine a wide range of questions about the participants' lifestyles and preferences. What items do they have in their PLSs? How do they decorate their PLSs? What books and magazines are they reading? What type of music are they listening to? To provide a snapshot of "the typical PLS" we highlight the most frequently occurring PLS attributes. For this task, we focus on the modal attributes (appearing in at least 50% of the PLSs) and what we shall term "common" attributes (appearing in at least 25% of the PLSs). Note that some of the categories were not mutually exclusive so some items could be categorized into multiple

Table 1 Global Environmental Attributes: Relations to Gender, Ethnicity, and Personality

Attribute	Mean rating					Correlation with Openness	
	All (n=83)	Gender		Ethnicity		Obsrv. rating	Crit. meas.
		Female (n=54)	Male (n=25)	White (n=25)	Asian (n=35)		
Decorated (vs undecorated)	4.6 (1.4)	4.9 (1.4)	> 4.2 (1.3)	5.0 (1.4)	4.5 (1.4)	0.35**	0.21
Neat (vs messy)	3.7 (1.5)	4.0 (1.4)	> 3.3 (1.5)	4.0 (1.4)	3.5 (1.4)	-0.08	0.05
CDs: Many (vs few)	2.5 (1.3)	2.3 (0.94)	< 3.0 (1.7)	2.6 (1.4)	2.4 (1.2)	0.32**	0.17
Clothing: Everywhere (vs none visible)	3.4 (1.6)	3.0 (1.5)	< 4.0 (1.5)	3.5 (1.4)	3.3 (1.5)	0.17	0.04
Books: Many (vs few)	3.0 (1.2)	3.0 (1.2)	3.1 (1.0)	3.1 (1.2)	2.9 (1.1)	0.37**	0.16
Well (vs poorly)-organized	3.9 (1.3)	4.1 (1.3)	3.6 (1.3)	4.0 (1.3)	3.8 (1.2)	-0.02	-0.01
Cluttered (vs uncluttered)	4.7 (1.2)	4.7 (1.2)	1.9 (1.1)	4.7 (1.1)	4.8 (1.2)	0.26*	0.14
Well-lit (vs dark) overall	4.5 (1.1)	4.5 (1.8)	4.5 (0.90)	4.5 (1.1)	4.6 (1.0)	-0.01	-0.05
Hot (vs cold) temperature	4.1 (0.80)	4.1 (0.82)	4.2 (0.77)	4.0 (0.56)	4.2 (0.86)	-0.18	-0.03
Books: Organized (vs disorganized)	4.0 (1.3)	3.8 (1.3)	4.0 (1.3)	4.3 (1.3)	3.7 (1.4)	0.08	-0.02
Colorful (vs drab)	4.0 (1.1)	4.2 (1.2)	> 3.3 (0.75)	4.2 (1.2)	3.9 (1.1)	0.12	0.12
CDs: Organized (vs disorganized)	4.2 (1.4)	4.3 (1.3)	4.2 (1.7)	4.4 (1.5)	4.1 (1.5)	0.02	-0.06
Magazines: Many (vs few)	1.5 (0.75)	1.5 (0.73)	1.6 (0.73)	1.5 (0.76)	1.5 (0.70)	0.16	0.18
Cheerful (vs gloomy)	4.2 (1.0)	4.5 (1.0)	> 3.6 (0.67)	4.3 (1.1)	4.3 (0.96)	0.00	-0.00
Clean (vs dirty)	4.0 (1.0)	4.3 (1.0)	> 3.7 (1.0)	4.0 (1.1)	4.2 (1.0)	-0.12	0.02
Magazines: Organized (vs disorganized)	3.0 (1.5)	3.3 (1.6)	2.6 (1.1)	3.3 (1.5)	3.0 (1.3)	0.02	0.14
Good (vs poor) condition	4.2 (1.0)	4.4 (0.92)	> 3.8 (1.0)	4.3 (1.1)	4.2 (0.87)	-0.04	-0.02
Large (vs small)	4.0 (1.0)	4.0 (1.0)	3.9 (1.0)	4.2 (0.99)	> 3.6 (0.89)	0.10	0.16
Well-lit (vs dark) naturally	5.0 (1.0)	5.1 (0.94)	5.0 (0.98)	5.0 (1.1)	5.0 (0.90)	-0.00	-0.18
Stationery: Many items (vs few)	3.1 (1.3)	3.2 (1.3)	3.0 (1.5)	3.2 (1.2)	3.2 (1.3)	0.19	0.13
Stationery: Organized (vs disorganized)	3.1 (1.4)	3.3 (1.4)	> 2.6 (1.3)	3.3 (1.1)	2.9 (1.4)	-0.13	0.06
Full (vs empty)	4.7 (0.80)	4.7 (0.79)	4.8 (0.76)	4.7 (0.75)	4.8 (0.71)	0.22*	0.15
Roomy (vs cramped)	4.1 (1.0)	4.3 (0.97)	> 3.8 (0.88)	4.1 (0.96)	3.9 (0.89)	-0.05	-0.02
Inviting (vs repelling)	4.2 (0.87)	4.5 (0.85)	> 3.8 (0.67)	4.3 (0.96)	4.2 (0.66)	-0.01	0.05
Drafty (vs stuffy) atmosphere	4.0 (0.93)	4.0 (0.92)	4.0 (1.0)	4.2 (1.1)	3.9 (0.89)	0.03	0.01
Well-lit (vs dark) artificial	4.4 (0.92)	4.4 (0.93)	4.2 (0.89)	4.3 (0.89)	4.5 (1.0)	-0.10	-0.17
Distinctive (vs ordinary)	4.0 (0.88)	4.3 (0.86)	> 3.6 (0.72)	4.1 (0.89)	3.9 (0.73)	0.35**	0.35**
Books: Varied (vs homogenous)	3.6 (1.1)	3.6 (1.0)	3.6 (1.1)	3.7 (1.0)	3.5 (1.0)	0.50**	0.44**
Expensive (vs cheap)	4.2 (0.73)	4.2 (0.70)	4.0 (0.81)	4.1 (0.84)	4.2 (0.60)	0.04	-0.09
Multiple (vs single) purpose	3.7 (1.0)	3.7 (1.0)	3.7 (1.0)	4.1 (1.1)	> 3.2 (0.73)	0.24*	0.13
Stylish (vs unstylish)	4.2 (0.70)	4.3 (0.74)	> 3.9 (0.55)	4.2 (0.82)	4.1 (0.57)	0.11	0.07
New (vs old)	4.5 (0.80)	4.6 (0.81)	4.3 (0.67)	4.5 (0.80)	4.6 (0.76)	-0.01	-0.03
CDs: Varied (vs homogenous)	3.9 (1.1)	4.0 (1.1)	3.7 (1.3)	3.7 (1.2)	3.9 (1.3)	0.09	0.22
Clothing: Strewn about (vs neatly organ.)	4.0 (1.2)	4.0 (1.2)	4.3 (1.3)	3.9 (1.4)	4.0 (1.2)	-0.06	-0.22
Comfortable (vs uncomfortable)	4.6 (0.71)	4.8 (0.71)	> 4.2 (0.52)	4.6 (0.79)	4.6 (0.56)	0.03	0.03
Noisy (vs quiet) in the room	1.7 (1.0)	1.7 (0.74)	1.6 (0.49)	1.7 (0.59)	1.6 (0.62)	0.05	-0.05
Noisy (vs quiet) in the house	1.8 (0.62)	2.0 (0.71)	> 1.6 (0.32)	1.8 (0.50)	1.8 (0.70)	0.04	0.06
Magazines: Varied (vs homogeneous)	2.2 (1.2)	2.1 (1.1)	2.3 (1.4)	1.9 (1.2)	2.3 (1.2)	0.33*	0.51**
Strong (vs weak) Odor	3.5 (1.1)	3.6 (1.1)	3.5 (1.1)	3.6 (1.2)	3.4 (0.83)	0.01	-0.09
Fresh (vs stale) atmosphere	3.6 (0.80)	3.7 (0.83)	3.4 (0.74)	3.7 (1.0)	3.5 (0.66)	0.06	-0.02
Noisy (vs quiet) outside	2.7 (1.1)	2.7 (1.1)	2.7 (1.1)	2.7 (1.1)	2.6 (1.0)	-0.19	-0.16
Modern (vs old-fashioned)	4.6 (0.54)	4.6 (0.59)	4.6 (0.47)	4.7 (0.60)	4.6 (0.53)	-0.03	-0.09

Note: All ratings made on seven-point scales. "<" and ">" indicate means are significantly different at the P < 0.05 level. "CD" includes both CDs and records. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses. "Odor" specifies the strength of odor, not the type (e.g., dank, perfume), although this was recorded. Obsrv. = Observer, Crit. meas. = Criterion measure.

*P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01.

Table 2 Overall Room Features: Percentage of Total PLSs and According to Occupants' Gender and Ethnicity

Attribute Sub-category	All (n=83)	Gender		Ethnicity		Correlation with Openness	
		Females (n=54)	Males (n=25)	Whites (n=28)	Asians (n=35)	Observer rating	Criterion measure
Type of wall covering							
Wallpaper	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	–	–
Painted	83.1	82.4	86.4	85.2	87.0	–0.15	–0.08
Panels	19.5	19.6	18.2	18.5	12.9	0.17	0.12
Unfinished	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Percent covered by décor ^a	52.9 (32.5)	53.1 (33.0)	54.1 (32.1)	52.0 (33.2)	53.1 (32.1)	0.18	0.13
Floor type							
Wood	25.3	31.5	16.0	42.9	11.4	0.26*	0.10
Linoleum	9.6	11.1	8.0	21.4	2.9	0.17	0.15
Wall-to-wall carpet	67.5	61.1	76.0	42.9	82.9	–0.30**	–0.13
Standard size rug	11.0	20.0	16.0	10.7	11.4	0.06	–0.03
Scatter rugs	16.9	18.5	16.0	35.7	11.4	0.16	–0.03
Window coverings							
Blinds	56.6	59.3	52.0	60.7	57.1	–0.16	–0.13
Curtains	28.9	33.3	24.0	32.1	28.6	0.18	0.11
Shutters	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Window shades	13.3	14.8	12.0	14.3	5.7	0.24*	0.14

Note. The five most frequently recorded items are listed in bold typeface. The sub-categories were not mutually exclusive so some PLSs could be categorized in terms of multiple sub-categories (e.g., wood and carpet flooring).

^aStandard deviations are shown in parentheses.

*P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01.

categories; for instance, a PLS with both wood and carpet flooring would get a check under both categories.

Table 2 shows the percentages of PLSs in which various types of room features (i.e., type of wall covering and type of floors) were recorded. The first data column shows the percentages of PLSs with each type of room feature recorded for the whole sample (labeled “All”). The modal attributes (i.e., those in at least half the PLSs) were painted walls, wall-to-wall carpet, and blinds. Other common attributes (i.e., those in at least a quarter of the PLSs) were wood floors, and curtains. Table 3 shows the percentages of PLSs with various types of furniture and linens. The modal attributes were beds, desks, chairs, drawers, wardrobe/closets, garbage cans, bed linens, bedspreads, blankets, and comforters. Common attributes were nightstands, bookshelves, shelves, file cabinets, stereo stands, and towels. Table 4 shows the percentages of PLSs in which various types of wall décor were recorded. The table is broken down into four major columns. The first column shows the percentages of PLSs with each type of décor irrespective of the décor media. Columns 2, 3, and 4 show the percentages of PLSs with each type of décor for

posters, paintings, and photographs respectively. The most frequent media were posters and photographs with relatively few paintings. Within each of these columns, we have provided five sub-columns of data. The first sub-column shows the percentage of PLSs with each type of décor for the whole sample (labeled “All”). None of the décor categories were present in more than half the PLSs but at least a quarter of the PLSs had art on the walls along with photos of friends, family, babies, and people generally. Table 5 shows the percentages of PLSs containing clocks, calendars, and mirrors. The frequencies

Table 3 Furniture and Linens: Percentage of Total PLSs and According to Occupants’ Gender and Ethnicity

Attribute	Gender			Ethnicity		Correlation with Openness	
	All (n=83)	Females (n=54)	Males (n=25)	Whites (n=28)	Asians (n=35)	Observer rating	Criterion measure
Bed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	–	–
Desk	86.7	88.9	84.0	92.9	88.6	0.07	–0.15
Chair^a	94.0	96.3	92.0	96.4	94.3	0.13	–0.07
Table	12.0	11.1	16.0	10.7	11.4	0.11	0.20
Nightstand	32.5	29.6	40.0	32.1	37.1	–0.08	–0.04
Drawers	72.3	70.4	76.0	71.4	65.8	–0.15	0.02
Wardrobe/closet	73.5	75.9	72.0	71.4	74.3	–0.10	–0.06
Percentage open ^b	48.5	38.1	< 77.8	50.5	51.9	0.10	–0.01
Closet organizer	3.6	5.6	0.0	3.6	5.7	–0.05	0.14
Bookshelves	49.4	44.4	64.0	46.4	57.1	0.12	–0.02
Shelves	31.3	31.5	36.0	39.3	34.3	0.05	0.01
File cabinets	28.9	31.5	20.0	39.3	17.1	0.20	0.17
†TV stand	9.6	7.4	16.0	10.7	11.4	0.15	0.02
Stereo stand	9.6	7.4	12.0	10.7	8.6	0.18	0.11
Crates	38.6	40.7	36.0	39.3	40.0	0.11	0.13
†Chest	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	–	–
Coat rack	1.2	0.0	4.0	3.6	0.0	0.11	0.10
Tie rack	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	–	–
†Towel rack	3.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	5.7	–0.04	0.01
Hooks	18.1	7.4	< 36.0	28.6	11.4	0.12	0.08
Garbage can	83.1	81.5	92.0	89.3	82.9	0.23*	–0.05
How full? ^c	2.6 (1.9)	2.5 (1.9)	3.1 (1.9)	2.7 (1.8)	2.6 (2.0)	0.19	–0.19
Bed linen							
Bed skirt	7.2	9.3	4.0	10.7	2.9	–0.02	0.01
Bed spread	65.1	55.6	< 84.0	57.1	68.6	–0.04	–0.09
Blanket	67.5	70.4	60.0	53.6	74.3	–0.06	0.12
Comforter	74.7	72.2	76.0	85.7	> 62.9	0.22*	0.14
Electric blanket	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	–	–
Sheet	18.1	22.2	12.0	28.6	20.0	0.05	0.05
†Towel	39.8	38.9	44.0	46.4	37.1	0.06	–0.01

Note: The five most frequently recorded items are listed in bold typeface. “<” and “>” indicate percentages are significantly different at the P<0.05 level. † Item not included in the original instrument but added in the course of data collection.

^a Statistics are only presented for the first chair recorded (the PLSCI permits up to three chairs to be recorded).

^b Percentage of rooms with open wardrobe/closets.

^c Mean ratings made on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (empty) to 5 (overflowing); standard deviations shown in parentheses.

* P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01.

Table 5 Clocks, Calendars, Mirrors, and Methods of Hanging Décor: Percentage of Total PLSs and According to Occupants' Gender and Ethnicity

Category	Gender			Ethnicity		Correlation with Openness	
	All (n=83)	Female (n=54)	Male (n=25)	White (n=28)	Asian (n=35)	Observer rating	Criterion measure
Clock^a	97.6	96.3	100.0	96.4	100.0	-0.09	-0.06
Slow ^b	3.6	3.7	4.0	0.0	5.7	0.02	-0.01
On time	43.4	40.7	48.0	57.1	37.1	0.00	-0.07
Fast	37.3	38.9	32.0	21.4	45.7	-0.01	0.09
Other (e.g., unplugged)	3.6	3.7	4.0	7.1	2.9	-0.11	-0.08
Calendar^a	65.1	77.8	> 40.0	50.0	71.4	-0.24*	-0.09
Mirror^a	57.8	74.1	> 24.0	3.6	45.7	0.03	0.18
Bulletin board	26.5	27.8	20.0	28.6	20.0	-0.12	-0.11
Dry erase board	14.5	18.5	8.0	14.3	14.3	-0.02	0.10
Flyers	31.3	27.8	32.0	25.0	34.3	-0.09	0.04
Methods for hanging décor							
†Tape	33.7	40.1	24.0	35.7	40.0	-0.17	0.02
†Tack	38.6	40.7	28.0	42.9	31.4	0.06	0.11
†Frame	14.5	11.1	20.0	17.9	17.1	-0.04	0.01
†Nail	18.1	14.8	28.0	25.0	11.4	0.15	0.02
†Staple	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.09	0.01
†Pins	1.2	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.9	0.07	-0.06

Note: the "Flyers" category listed here differs from the "Flyer" category listed in Table 13; the category above codes flyers that were attached to the wall whereas the category in Table 13 includes flyers that were lying around the room (e.g., on the desk or floor). The five most frequently recorded items are listed in bold typeface. "<" and ">" indicate percentages are significantly different at the P<0.05 level. † Item not included in the original instrument but added in the course of data collection.

^aIn cases where multiple items were present, statistics are only presented for the first item recorded.

^bJudges did not always specify the speed of the clock (i.e., there was missing data) so the "speed of clock" variables do not add up to 100%.

*P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01.

reported in Table 5 suggest mirrors, calendars, and clocks were modal attributes and bulletin boards and flyers were common. The most popular methods found for hanging décor were tape and tacks, with each method appearing in more than a third of the PLSs.

Table 6 shows the percentages of PLSs with various types of books and magazines. The books and magazines found in at least half the PLSs were academic books, fiction, reference books, and catalogs. Classics, religious books, travel books, and newspapers appeared in at least a quarter of the PLSs. Table 7 shows the percentages of PLSs in which various music genres were recorded in the CD collections (here, "CDs" refers to CDs, audiotapes, and records). Only two categories appeared in at least half the PLSs—modern rock and soundtracks. However, there were a number of common music categories—1980s, alternative music, classical, pop, rap, rock-n-roll, classic rock, and world/ethnic. Table 8 shows the percentages of PLSs in which various types of stationery were recorded. Only pens

Table 6 Books and Magazines: Percentage of Total PLSs and According to Occupants' Gender and Ethnicity

Attribute	All (n=83)	Gender		Ethnicity		Correlation with Openness	
		Females (n=54)	Males (n=25)	Whites (n=28)	Asians (n=35)	Observer rating	Criterion measure
Books							
Academic	90.4	94.4	84.0	89.3	94.3	0.23*	-0.01
†Acting	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.21	0.19
†Airplanes	1.2	0.0	4.0	3.6	0.0	-0.05	-0.09
Animals	3.6	5.6	0.0	7.1	2.9	0.09	0.07
†Archaeology	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
†Architecture	4.8	7.4	> 0.0	10.7	2.9	0.00	-0.04
Art	10.8	13.0	8.0	17.9	8.6	0.29**	0.27*
†Astronomy	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.21	0.19
Astrology	6.0	5.6	8.0	10.7	5.7	0.21	0.12
Autobiography	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	-0.08	0.02
Biography	10.8	11.1	8.0	17.9	8.6	0.04	0.02
Children's	19.3	22.2	16.0	35.7	14.3	0.14	0.01
Classics	39.8	38.9	40.0	42.9	37.1	0.28*	0.11
Comic books	16.9	13.0	28.0	25.0	14.3	0.15*	0.21
Computer	14.5	9.3	24.0	25.0	> 5.7	0.09	-0.04
Cooking	18.1	16.7	24.0	25.0	17.1	0.30**	0.12
†Decorating books	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Diary	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.12	0.04
Drama	4.8	5.6	4.0	0.0	2.9	0.07	0.10
Entertainment	3.6	1.9	8.0	7.1	2.9	0.12	0.17
Ethics	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.14	0.13
†Ethnic	19.3	22.2	16.0	10.7	25.7	0.05	-0.09
Fantasy	3.6	1.9	8.0	7.1	0.0	0.19	0.03
Fashion	2.4	3.7	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.15	0.06
†Feminist	4.8	5.6	4.0	7.1	2.9	0.08	0.01
Fiction	72.3	66.7	84.0	71.4	77.1	0.17	-0.13
Financial	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
†Folk literature	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.22*	0.13
Foreign language	16.9	22.2	> 4.0	25.0	11.4	0.12	0.11
†Gaming	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.03	0.05
†Gay	2.4	0.0	8.0	3.6	2.9	0.04	0.14
Health	7.2	11.1	> 0.0	0.0	< 11.4	0.09	0.10
Historical	22.9	18.5	> 32.0	32.1	22.9	0.19	0.20
"How to"	21.7	20.4	24.0	17.9	28.6	0.13	0.21
†Humor	1.2	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.9	-0.08	-0.23*
†Mad libs	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.14	0.10
Maintenance	1.2	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.15	0.14
Meditation/yoga	3.6	1.9	8.0	0.0	5.7	0.20	0.07
Military	1.2	0.0	4.0	3.6	0.0	-0.05	-0.09
†Movie	1.2	0.0	4.0	3.6	0.0	0.11	0.10
Music	9.6	7.4	12.0	10.7	11.4	0.33**	0.15
†Mystery	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.03	0.05
†Mythical	1.2	0.0	4.0	3.6	0.0	0.09	0.14
New Age	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.22*	0.13
Pet books	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
†Philosophical	19.3	18.5	16.0	14.3	20.0	0.24*	0.16
†Plays	2.4	3.7	0.0	3.6	2.9	-0.14	-0.04
Poetry	21.7	24.1	16.0	21.4	20.0	0.45**	0.31**
†Political	12.0	11.1	12.0	7.1	17.1	-0.24*	-0.29**

Attribute	Gender			Ethnicity		Correlation with Openness	
	All (n=83)	Females (n=54)	Males (n=25)	Whites (n=28)	Asians (n=35)	Observer rating	Criterion measure
Popular psychology/psychology	8.4	7.4	8.0	7.1	8.6	0.12	0.26*
Pornography	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	–	–
Puzzles	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	-0.05	-0.01
†Book of questions	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.14	0.10
Reference	66.3	64.8	68.0	64.3	71.4	0.18	0.08
Religious	27.7	27.8	24.0	35.7	25.7	0.18	0.15
Science-fiction	15.7	13.0	24.0	21.4	17.1	0.04	0.02
†Sex	2.4	3.7	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.25*	0.17
Self-help	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	–	–
Sports	4.8	3.7	8.0	7.1	2.9	0.14	0.01
Travel	25.3	29.6	20.0	35.7	17.1	0.16	0.08
†Cliff notes	2.4	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.20	0.19
Other reading material							
Photo album	24.1	29.6	16.0	28.6	20.0	0.18	0.08
Newspaper	27.7	24.1	32.0	32.1	25.7	0.23*	0.15
Phone book	22.9	24.1	20.0	17.9	11.4	0.05	-0.02
Catalogs (e.g., J-Crew)	60.2	55.6	76.0	67.9	80.0	0.20	0.13
Magazines							
†Car magazine	1.2	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.9	-0.22*	-0.08
Computer magazine	2.4	1.9	4.0	0.0	2.9	0.07	0.05
Cooking magazine	2.4	3.7	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.18	0.10
Architecture magazine	1.2	0.0	4.0	3.6	0.0	0.10	0.03
Entertainment magazine	9.6	9.3	4.0	0.0	< 14.3	-0.12	-0.08
Fashion magazine	13.3	18.5	> 4.0	10.7	5.7	0.03	0.09
Financial magazine	2.4	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	-0.05	-0.18
Health magazine	3.6	3.7	0.0	0.0	2.9	-0.01	0.04
†Journal article	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	–	–
Military magazines	1.2	0.0	4.0	3.6	0.0	-0.05	-0.09
Music magazines	6.0	5.6	4.0	0.0	5.7	0.13	0.16
†National Geographic	1.2	0.0	4.0	3.6	0.0	-0.01	-0.15
†News magazine	2.4	1.9	4.0	3.6	0.0	0.26*	0.24*
Sport magazine	3.6	1.9	4.0	3.6	0.0	0.08	0.01
†Teaching magazine	1.2	0.0	4.0	3.6	0.0	0.17	0.07
Travel magazine	2.4	1.9	4.0	0.0	5.7	-0.13	0.03
†Yearbook	2.4	0.0	8.0	0.0	2.9	0.09	0.07

Note: The five most frequently recorded items are listed in bold typeface. The categories were not mutually exclusive so some items could be categorized into multiple categories. “<” and “>” indicate percentages are significantly different at the P<0.05 level. † Item not included in the original instrument but added in the course of data collection.

*P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01.

were found in at least half the PLSs. The stationery items found in at least a quarter of the PLSs were high-lighters, notebooks, paper, pencils, scissors, staplers, and tape dispensers. Table 9 shows the percentages of PLSs with various types of electronic equipment. The modal items of electronic equipment were CD players, tape players, radios, and phones. Common items were integrated stereos, boom

Table 7 Compact Disk (CD) Music Genres: Percentage of Total PLSs and According to Occupants' Gender and Ethnicity

Attribute	Gender			Ethnicity		Correlation with Openness	
	All (n=83)	Female (n=54)	Male (n=25)	White (n=28)	Asian (n=35)	Observer rating	Criterion measure
1960s	18.1	20.4	12.0	17.9	17.1	0.19	0.11
1970s	13.3	9.3	20.0	14.3	8.6	0.28*	0.10
1980s	26.5	16.7	< 48.0	35.7	22.9	0.27*	0.14
1990s	1.2	0.0	4.0	3.6	0.0	0.16	0.08
Alternative music	45.8	42.6	56.0	53.6	40.0	0.39**	0.28*
Blues	13.3	7.4	< 28.0	17.9	11.4	0.32**	0.22
Classical/opera	49.4	51.9	52.0	60.7	48.6	0.27*	0.14
Country	2.4	1.9	4.0	3.6	2.9	-0.04	-0.07
Dance	15.7	9.3	24.0	14.3	20.0	-0.09	-0.06
Disco	6.0	3.7	12.0	10.7	2.9	-0.00	0.14
Easy Listening	12.0	13.0	12.0	17.9	8.6	0.12	0.06
Folk	22.9	24.1	20.0	21.4	20.0	0.37**	0.08
Heavy Metal	10.8	5.6	16.0	7.1	8.6	0.17	0.26**
Instrumental	13.3	14.8	12.0	14.3	11.4	0.14	-0.04
Jazz	16.9	13.0	28.0	21.4	8.6	0.21	0.16
Modern rock	61.4	59.3	68.0	75.0	51.4	0.26*	0.23*
Musicals	14.5	16.7	12.0	3.6	< 22.9	-0.02	0.01
New Age	20.5	25.9	12.0	25.0	20.0	-0.00	0.01
Oldies	6.0	5.6	8.0	14.3	2.9	0.14	0.04
Pop	33.7	35.2	28.0	25.0	34.3	-0.06	0.02
R & B	14.5	7.4	24.0	7.1	20.0	-0.19	-0.14
Rap/hip-hop	25.3	14.8	< 44.0	21.4	28.6	0.06	0.05
Reggae	7.2	5.6	12.0	7.1	5.7	0.16	0.10
Religious	2.4	1.9	4.0	0.0	5.7	-0.10	-0.10
Rock-n-roll	39.8	35.2	44.0	39.3	35.3	0.17	0.10
Soul	8.4	5.6	16.0	14.3	5.7	0.20	0.04
Soundtracks	54.2	48.1	< 72.0	57.1	57.1	0.08	0.09
Swing	1.2	0.0	4.0	3.6	0.0	0.16	0.08
Techno	4.8	0.0	< 16.0	7.1	5.7	0.05	0.19
Classic Rock	27.7	22.2	40.0	39.3	20.0	0.30**	0.35**
Spoken voice	2.4	1.9	4.0	3.6	2.9	0.20	0.09
World/ethnic	27.7	27.8	28.0	21.4	31.4	0.09	-0.01
†CD-ROM games	3.6	1.9	8.0	7.1	0.0	-0.02	-0.02

Note: The five most frequently recorded items are listed in bold typeface. The categories were not mutually exclusive so some items could be categorized into multiple categories. "<" and ">" indicate percentages are significantly different at the P<0.05 level. † Item not included in the original instrument but added in the course of data collection.

* P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01.

boxes, desktop computers, PC computers, computer printers, TVs, answering machines, and heaters.

Table 10 shows the percentages of PLSs in which various types of kitchen/cooking equipment were recorded. None of the items appeared in at least a quarter of the PLSs assessed. Table 11 shows the percentages of PLSs in which various types of beauty products were recorded. Only lotion appeared in at least half the PLSs, and perfume/cologne was the only common item. Table 12 shows the percentages of PLSs in which various types of clothing and bags

Table 8 Stationery Items: Percentage of Total PLSs and According to Occupants' Gender and Ethnicity

Category	Gender			Ethnicity		Correlation with Openness	
	All (n=83)	Female (n=54)	Male (n=25)	White (n=28)	Asian (n=35)	Observer rating	Criterion measure
Address label	4.8	1.9	12.0	3.6	8.6	0.03	0.04
Address book	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.05	-
Art supplies	10.8	13.0	8.0	10.7	14.3	0.21	0.25*
Bulldog clips	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	-0.11	-0.08
Calculator	10.8	11.1	8.0	3.6	8.6	0.21	0.24*
†Cards	3.6	5.6	0.0	3.6	5.7	-0.09	0.00
Card file	3.6	3.7	4.0	0.0	8.6	-0.11	0.01
†Colored Pencil/Pen	6.0	9.3	> 0.0	3.6	8.6	0.04	0.14
†Electric pencil sharpener	2.4	1.9	4.0	3.6	0.0	0.10	0.08
Envelope	24.4	22.2	29.2	29.6	20.0	0.24*	0.16
Eraser	9.6	14.8	> 0.0	7.1	17.1	0.08	0.00
Folder	9.6	7.4	16.0	10.7	11.4	0.09	0.03
Glue	10.8	13.0	4.0	7.1	11.4	0.20	0.09
High-lighter	28.9	29.6	24.0	25.0	31.4	-0.06	-0.06
Hole puncher	15.7	18.5	8.0	14.3	11.4	0.13	0.10
†Index cards	3.6	3.7	4.0	3.6	5.7	0.05	0.11
In trays	7.2	7.4	4.0	3.6	8.6	-0.07	0.03
Marker pen	24.1	27.8	16.0	25.0	20.0	0.06	0.10
Notebook	27.7	25.9	32.0	25.0	31.4	0.20	0.05
†Paint supplies	3.6	3.7	4.0	7.1	2.9	0.31**	0.21
Paper	36.1	35.2	36.0	32.1	31.4	0.03	-0.03
Paper clip	16.9	16.7	20.0	14.3	20.0	0.01	0.08
Paper weight	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	-0.05	0.01
Pencil holder	20.5	27.8	> 4.0	17.9	22.9	-0.02	0.12
Pencil sharpener	8.4	11.1	4.0	14.3	2.9	0.02	-0.12
Pencils	47.0	51.9	36.0	50.0	40.0	0.10	0.04
Pens	55.4	55.6	56.0	46.4	57.1	0.00	-0.10
†Rechargeable batteries	2.4	1.9	4.0	3.6	0.0	0.14	0.06
Ring binders	4.8	5.6	4.0	3.6	8.6	-0.20	-0.03
Rolodex	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	-	-
Rubber bands	8.4	7.4	12.0	0.0	8.6	0.07	0.12
Ruler	8.4	9.3	8.0	10.7	8.6	0.01	0.04
Scissors	28.9	35.2	16.0	25.0	34.3	0.13	-0.01
Stamps	6.0	5.6	4.0	7.1	5.7	-0.06	0.04
Stapler	31.3	29.6	32.0	25.0	34.3	0.01	0.04
Staples	3.6	1.9	8.0	3.6	2.9	0.07	0.13
Staple remover	2.4	3.7	0.0	3.6	2.9	0.03	0.05
Sticky labels	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Sticky tape	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
†String/thread	3.6	1.9	8.0	7.1	2.9	-0.01	0.10
Tape dispenser	25.3	29.6	16.0	32.1	22.9	0.15	0.03
Thumb tack	12.0	9.3	16.0	10.7	14.3	-0.20	-0.01
White out	6.0	7.4	> 0.0	3.6	5.7	-0.11	-0.21
Xacto-knife	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.22*	0.13
Floppy disk	21.7	18.5	32.0	25.0	25.7	0.08	0.08
Post-it notes	22.9	24.1	16.0	21.4	28.6	-0.11	-0.21
To do list	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	-0.11	-0.01
Miscellaneous items	10.8	11.4	12.0	10.8	11.6	0.02	-0.12

Note: The "Art supplies" category listed here is narrower than the "Art supplies" category listed in Table 13; the category above includes only stationery-type art (e.g., color pencils) whereas the category in Table 13 includes all types of art materials (e.g., easels, spray paint). The six most frequently recorded items are listed in bold typeface. "<" and ">" indicate percentages are significantly different at the P<0.05 level. † Item not included in the original instrument but added in the course of data collection.

Table 9 Electronic Equipment: Percentage of Total PLSs and According to Occupants' Gender and Ethnicity

Category	Gender			Ethnicity		Correlation with Openness	
	All (n=83)	Female (n=54)	Male (n=25)	White (n=28)	Asian (n=35)	Observer rating	Criterion measure
CD player	61.4	59.3	72.0	67.9	62.9	0.04	-0.16
Record player	7.2	3.7	16.0	10.7	0.0	0.30**	0.23*
Tape player	67.5	63.0	80.0	75.0	68.6	0.03	-0.11
Radio	69.9	64.8	84.0	78.6	68.6	-0.05	-0.17
Integrated stereo system	30.1	22.2	< 52.0	25.0	42.9	0.09	-0.03
Hi-Fidelity	2.4	1.9	4.0	3.6	2.9	0.08	-0.06
Boombox	39.8	46.3	> 24.0	46.4	25.7	-0.07	-0.05
Walkman	14.5	7.4	< 28.0	17.9	11.4	0.16	0.13
†CD-walkman	9.6	11.1	8.0	7.1	5.7	-0.05	0.05
Pager	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Desktop Computer	45.8	38.9	60.0	42.9	51.4	-0.03	-0.15
PC computer	30.1	27.8	36.0	28.6	37.1	-0.11	-0.08
Macintosh computer	15.7	11.1	24.0	14.3	14.3	0.10	-0.10
†Laptop computer	10.8	1.1	8.0	10.7	5.7	0.13	0.11
Computer printer	44.6	42.6	44.0	42.9	40.0	0.05	0.03
†Music mixer	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.14	0.11
†Intercom phone	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
†VCR rewinder	1.2	0.0	4.0	3.6	0.0	-0.02	-0.11
†Video game system	6.0	1.9	16.0	7.1	5.7	-0.03	0.03
†Amplifier	1.2	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.15	0.14
†Recorder	8.4	9.3	8.0	7.1	8.6	-0.11	-0.02
Computer zip-drive	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Computer scanner	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Computer modem	8.4	5.6	12.0	7.1	5.7	-0.01	-0.14
†Camera	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
†Camera stand	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
TV	30.1	24.1	40.0	39.3	17.1	0.06	0.08
†TV antenna	2.4	1.9	4.0	0.0	2.9	0.02	0.08
VCR	14.5	13.0	16.0	21.4	5.7	-0.04	-0.06
Fax	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.21	0.14
†Cell phone	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Phone	77.1	79.6	68.0	71.4	74.3	0.11	-0.17
Answering machine	44.6	50.0	28.0	46.4	34.3	0.07	-0.18
Heater	33.7	40.7	24.0	32.1	31.4	0.03	-0.02
†Fan	9.6	3.7	< 24.0	10.7	11.4	-0.14	-0.23*
†Battery charger	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
†Dust buster	2.4	1.9	4.0	3.6	0.0	-0.02	-0.07
†Iron	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.05	-0.03
†Air purifier	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
†Vacuum	1.2	0.0	4.0	3.6	0.0	-0.02	-0.11
†Sewing machine	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.21	0.14

Note: The five most frequently recorded items are listed in bold typeface. "<" and ">" indicate percentages are significantly different at the P<0.05 level. † Item not included in the original instrument but added in the course of data collection.

* P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01.

were recorded. Clothing is usually stowed out of sight in closets or drawers so this index, which only recorded visible items, probably does not provide a good index of what clothing is owned by the residents. Using this index, none of the items were found in at least one out

Table 10 Kitchen and Cooking Equipment: Percentage of Total PLSs and According to Occupants' Gender and Ethnicity

Category	Gender			Ethnicity		Correlation with Openness	
	All (n=83)	Female (n=54)	Male (n=25)	White (n=28)	Asian (n=35)	Observer rating	Criterion measure
†Utensils	3.6	5.6	0.0	7.1	0.0	-0.11	-0.08
†Cooking pot	3.6	3.7	4.0	3.6	2.9	0.16	0.06
Refrigerator	18.1	14.8	24.0	21.4	11.4	0.00	0.03
Microwave	3.6	5.6	0.0	3.6	0.0	-0.04	0.06
Toaster	3.6	3.7	4.0	7.1	0.0	-0.04	-0.09
Oven	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Burner	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
†Hotpot	3.6	3.7	4.0	3.6	5.7	-0.13	0.00
†Juicer	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	-0.11	-0.01
†Rice cooker	4.8	3.7	8.0	7.1	2.9	-0.03	-0.02
†Measuring cups/spoons	1.2	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.9	0.11	0.08
Blender	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	-0.02	-0.10
†Water container	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	-0.02	-0.10
†Coffee maker	4.8	7.4	> 0.0	3.6	0.0	-0.03	-0.10
†Bread maker	2.4	1.9	4.0	3.6	2.9	0.04	0.06
†Bowl	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.12	-0.03
†Plate	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	-0.02	-0.10
†Coffee cup	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	-0.02	-0.10
†Wine glass	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	-0.02	-0.10
†Glass cup	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.06	-0.09
†Chopsticks	3.6	5.6	0.0	3.6	5.7	0.08	0.03
†Teapot	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.07	0.10
†Cutlery	2.4	3.7	0.0	3.6	0.0	-0.10	-0.09
†Water filter	6.0	5.6	8.0	0.0	5.7	0.03	-0.00
†Cappuccino maker	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.9	-0.05	0.01
†Cooking pot	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-

Note: The ten most frequently recorded items are listed in bold typeface. “<” and “>” indicate percentages are significantly different at the P<0.05 level. † Item not included in the original instrument but added in the course of data collection.

of four PLSs. Table 13 shows the percentages of PLSs in which various types of miscellaneous items (e.g., art supplies, candles) were recorded. The modal miscellaneous items were beauty equipment, boxes, candles, knickknacks, mail, receipts, scrap notes, and stuffed animals. Other common items were art supplies, bills, candle holders, cards, cups, glasses, dried flowers, flyers, food wrappers, health products, laundry baskets, letters, matches, childhood memorabilia, postcards, sculptures, security equipment, smoke alarms, spectacles, stickers, tissue, and umbrellas. Table 14 lists what we have called “miscellaneous categories.” There were a number of domains for which it would have been very difficult to list the category members exhaustively. For example, in the athletic-equipment domain, it would have been a pointless task to list every possible type of athletic equipment because most categories would be recorded zero times. Our solution

Table 11 Beauty Products: Percentage of Total PLSs and According to Occupants' Gender and Ethnicity

Attribute	Gender			Ethnicity		Correlation with Openness	
	All (n=83)	Female (n=54)	Male (n=25)	White (n=28)	Asian (n=35)	Observer rating	Criterion measure
1960s	18.1	20.4	12.0	17.9	17.1	0.19	0.11
1970s	13.3	9.3	20.0	14.3	8.6	0.28*	0.10
Body spray	6.0	7.4	4.0	7.1	2.9	0.18	0.13
Hairbrushes	15.7	18.5	12.0	17.9	17.1	0.12	0.08
Combs	7.2	9.3	4.0	7.1	8.6	-0.05	-0.07
Exfoliator	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Hair gel	16.9	24.1	> 0.0	14.3	14.3	-0.15	-0.08
Lipstick	9.6	14.8	> 0.0	7.1	8.6	-0.09	0.05
Lotion	56.6	72.2	> 24.0	53.6	54.3	0.12	0.12
Makeup	13.3	20.4	> 0.0	17.9	8.6	0.18	0.04
Makeup box	9.6	14.8	> 0.0	17.9	5.7	0.13	0.11
Perfume/cologne	31.3	38.9	20.0	25.0	25.7	-0.17	-0.03
Soap	6.0	7.4	4.0	7.1	2.9	0.15	0.14
Toilet paper	4.8	3.7	8.0	3.6	5.7	-0.05	-0.14
†Band-Aid	2.4	3.7	0.0	3.6	2.9	0.14	0.08
†Sun block	2.4	1.9	4.0	0.0	5.7	-0.16	-0.30**
†Shaving cream	9.6	7.4	8.0	3.6	14.3	0.05	0.11
†Mouth wash	2.4	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.02	-0.15
†Jewelry	2.4	3.7	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.04	0.13
†Acne cream	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.19	0.01
†Curling iron	3.6	5.6	0.0	3.6	5.7	-0.02	-0.04
†Hair dryer	3.6	5.6	0.0	7.1	2.9	0.04	0.16
†Astringent	2.4	1.9	4.0	3.6	2.9	0.04	-0.01
†Cream	2.4	1.9	4.0	3.6	0.0	0.08	0.08
†Shoe polish	2.4	3.7	0.0	3.6	2.9	-0.03	-0.26*
†Nail polish remover	4.8	5.6	0.0	0.0	5.7	-0.14	-0.15
†Q-tip	6.0	7.4	4.0	0.0	< 11.4	-0.19	-0.09
†Nail clipper	2.4	1.9	4.0	0.0	5.7	-0.07	-0.06
†Dental floss	4.8	3.7	4.0	0.0	8.6	-0.11	-0.11
†Conditioner	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.14	0.13
†Shampoo	2.4	1.9	4.0	3.6	0.0	0.01	-0.17
†Razor	3.6	3.7	4.0	7.1	0.0	-0.04	-0.09
†Vaseline	3.6	3.7	4.0	3.6	0.0	-0.01	-0.02
†Baby powder	6.0	7.4	4.0	7.1	5.7	0.10	0.07
†Toothbrush	8.4	11.1	4.0	14.3	2.9	0.13	-0.08
†Cotton balls	4.8	5.6	4.0	3.6	2.9	0.15	0.04
†Tissue	14.5	18.5	> 4.0	10.7	17.1	-0.16	-0.17
†Contact lens solution	9.6	13.0	4.0	3.6	8.6	-0.06	-0.16
†Deodorant	18.1	14.8	24.0	17.9	14.3	0.03	0.04
†Hair clips	9.6	14.8	> 0.0	7.1	14.3	-0.12	0.00
†Chap stick	14.5	9.3	24.0	10.7	20.0	-0.02	0.04
†Nail polish utensils	14.5	20.4	> 0.0	10.7	14.3	0.00	0.07
Misc. items	19.2	20.9	20.0	25.2	17.4	0.08	0.00
(e.g., shower cap)							

Note: The "Tissue" category listed here differs from the "Tissue" category listed in Table 13; the category above codes tissues that appeared to be specifically intended for use as a beauty product (e.g., when in a basket holding a variety of other beauty products) whereas the category in Table 13 includes all instances of tissues (e.g., a box by the bed). The five most frequently recorded items are listed in bold typeface. "<" and ">" indicate percentages are significantly different at the P<0.05 level. † Item not included in the original instrument but added in the course of data collection.

* P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01.

Table 12 Clothing and Bags: Percentage of Total PLSs and According to Occupants' Gender and Ethnicity

Attribute Sub-category	All (n=83)	Gender		Ethnicity		Correlation with Openness	
		Female (n=54)	Male (n=25)	White (n=28)	Asian (n=35)	Observer rating	Criterion measure
Clothing							
Athletic wear	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Belt	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Blazer/sport jacket	10.8	7.4	20.0	3.6	14.3	-0.04	0.11
Boots	7.2	7.4	8.0	7.1	2.9	0.20	0.04
Coat	3.6	3.7	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.04	0.06
†Dress	4.8	7.4	> 0.0	7.1	2.9	0.07	-0.06
Gloves	1.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.13	0.16
Hair accessories	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Hat/cap	18.1	11.1	< 36.0	17.9	20.0	0.04	0.09
Jeans	4.8	5.6	4.0	0.0	2.9	0.10	-0.01
Overalls	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Pants	3.6	1.9	8.0	3.6	5.7	-0.14	-0.00
Sandals	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Scarves	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.21	0.19
Shawls	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Shirt	13.3	11.1	20.0	3.6	14.3	-0.10	0.01
Shoes-athletic	9.6	5.6	16.0	17.9	> 0.0	0.09	0.03
Shoes-casual	12.0	13.0	12.0	21.4	5.7	0.15	-0.00
†Shoes-dress	9.6	7.4	16.0	3.6	8.6	0.00	-0.02
Shorts	1.2	0.0	4.0	3.6	0.0	0.17	0.07
†Skirt	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Slippers	4.8	5.6	4.0	10.7	2.9	0.11	0.09
Socks	2.4	1.9	4.0	7.1	0.0	0.03	0.00
Suits	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Sweater	7.2	7.4	4.0	14.3	2.9	0.09	-0.10
Sweatshirts	2.4	1.9	4.0	7.1	0.0	0.02	-0.15
T-shirts	6.0	1.9	16.0	7.1	5.7	0.05	-0.03
Thermals	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Ties	2.4	0.0	8.0	0.0	5.7	-0.13	0.14
Underwear	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Uniforms	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Vests	2.4	1.9	4.0	0.0	2.9	0.03	0.05
Bags							
Briefcase	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Backpack—large	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Backpack—small	22.9	25.9	> 8.0	21.4	20.0	-0.01	0.02
Suitcase	19.3	11.1	< 40.0	28.6	14.3	0.18	0.20
Purse	4.8	7.4	0.0	0.0	5.7	-0.05	0.11
Tote bag	21.7	18.5	28.0	21.4	22.9	0.15	0.16
Suit bag	4.8	0.0	< 16.0	0.0	8.6	0.02	-0.02
Shoulder bag	8.4	5.6	8.0	10.7	0.0	0.03	-0.00
Store bag	1.2	1.9	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.21	0.19
Athletic bag	4.8	0.0	< 16.0	3.6	2.9	0.05	-0.08
Misc. bag	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-

Note: The five most frequently recorded items are listed in bold typeface. "<" and ">" indicate percentages are significantly different at the P<0.05 level. †Item not included in the original instrument but added in the course of data collection.

Table 13 Miscellaneous Items: Percentage of Total PLSs and According to Occupants' Gender and Ethnicity

Attribute	Gender			Ethnicity		Correlation with Openness		
	All (n=83)	Female (n=54)	Male (n=25)	White (n=28)	Asian (n=35)	Observer rating	Criterion measure	
Art supplies	34.9	38.9		28.0	35.7	37.1	0.18	0.12
Ashtrays	3.6	1.9		8.0	10.7	0.0	0.28*	0.18
Bathroom scales	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	–	–
Beauty equipment	66.3	77.8	>	40.0	60.7	68.6	–0.01	0.10
Bills	45.8	33.3	<	72.0	50.0	42.9	0.18	0.05
†Black lights	7.2	5.6		8.0	0.0	< 11.4	–0.15	–0.03
Boxes (e.g., empty shoe)	59.0	57.4		50.0	60.7	62.9	0.04	–0.03
Candle holders	48.2	61.1	>	24.0	53.6	34.3	0.34**	0.32**
Candles	56.6	68.5	>	36.0	67.9	> 42.9	0.36**	0.31**
Cards (e.g., birthday)	34.9	44.4	>	16.0	50.0	> 22.9	0.25*	0.19
Certificates	7.2	3.7		12.0	7.1	8.6	0.03	0.01
Checkbooks	14.5	9.3		28.0	7.1	22.9	0.06	0.07
Cigarettes	8.0	1.9		12.0	3.6	8.6	–0.12	–0.09
Cleaning supplies	20.5	24.1		16.0	21.4	17.1	0.19	0.13
Closet organizers	18.1	18.5		16.0	17.9	17.1	0.07	0.12
Contraceptives	4.8	3.7		4.0	3.6	2.9	–0.01	–0.03
Cups of change	1.2	18.5		40.0	28.6	25.7	0.13	–0.09
Cups	45.8	48.1		44.0	60.7	> 34.3	0.20	0.09
Dolls	10.8	16.7	>	0.0	14.3	8.6	0.15	0.15
Drug paraphernalia	3.6	3.7		4.0	7.1	0.0	0.11	0.13
Earplugs	6.0	9.3	>	0.0	7.1	5.7	0.02	0.05
Executive toys	9.6	11.1		8.0	10.7	8.6	0.08	0.02
Flashlights	8.4	3.7		16.0	7.1	5.7	0.07	0.03
Flowers—dried	41.0	55.6	>	12.0	39.3	42.9	0.01	0.02
Flowers—fake	9.6	14.8	>	0.0	7.1	11.4	–0.14	–0.07
Flowers—fresh	18.1	24.1	>	8.0	25.0	14.3	0.13	–0.02
Flyers	47.0	42.6		56.0	53.6	40.0	0.16	0.06
Food wrappers	47.0	46.3		44.0	32.1	< 57.1	–0.19	–0.12
Glasses	47.0	42.6		56.0	57.1	37.1	0.15	0.12
Hair dryers	8.4	13.0	>	0.0	3.6	11.4	–0.03	0.04
Health products	42.2	44.4		36.0	28.6	51.4	0.07	–0.04
Incense/burner	14.5	14.8		12.0	3.6	14.3	0.20	0.20
Invitations	6.0	7.4		4.0	3.6	11.4	–0.21	–0.04
Iron/ironing boards	9.6	13.0		4.0	10.7	5.7	–0.11	–0.16
Knickknacks	61.4	72.2	>	48.0	50.0	65.7	0.18	0.16
Laundry baskets	33.7	20.4	<	64.0	35.7	40.0	0.11	0.02
Letters	49.4	46.3		56.0	57.1	42.9	0.14	0.05
Lighters	13.3	14.8		8.0	14.3	11.4	0.25*	0.17
Mail	61.4	57.4		68.0	67.9	51.4	0.15	0.07
Maps—unidentified	10.8	11.1		12.0	17.9	8.6	0.22*	0.25*
Maps—city	16.9	18.5		12.0	14.3	22.9	0.14	0.20
Maps—international	19.3	20.4		20.0	28.6	17.1	0.27*	0.25*
Maps—tour	4.8	5.6		4.0	7.1	2.9	0.01	–0.03
Matches	25.3	24.1		28.0	32.1	14.3	0.20	0.16
Memorabilia—childhood	25.3	24.1		16.0	35.7	14.3	0.18	0.13
Memorabilia—college	19.3	24.1		12.0	14.3	22.9	–0.17	–0.19
Memorabilia—cultural	13.3	18.5	>	4.0	7.1	14.3	–0.07	–0.00
Memorabilia—high school	3.6	3.7		4.0	3.6	2.9	0.03	0.04
Memorabilia—sports	6.0	1.9		16.0	7.1	8.6	–0.02	–0.06
Message pads	16.9	18.5		12.0	21.4	14.3	–0.07	0.10

Attribute	Gender			Ethnicity		Correlation with Openness	
	All (n=83)	Female (n=54)	Male (n=25)	White (n=28)	Asian (n=35)	Observer rating	Criterion measure
Parking tickets	2.4	0.0	4.0	3.6	0.0	0.17	0.08
Piggy banks	13.3	16.7	8.0	3.6	< 20.0	0.07	-0.03
Plaques and medals	10.8	13.0	4.0	17.9	2.9	0.14	0.16
Plates	22.9	27.8	16.0	25.0	17.1	0.15	-0.06
Pocket knives	3.6	1.9	4.0	3.6	0.0	0.06	0.03
Postcards	51.8	51.9	56.0	67.9	> 42.9	0.14	0.06
Receipts	41.0	35.2	48.0	39.3	37.1	0.02	0.01
Recycling bins	3.6	1.9	8.0	7.1	2.9	-0.12	-0.24*
Relaxation supplies	8.4	11.1	4.0	10.7	2.9	-0.03	0.02
Room fresheners	15.7	16.7	12.0	10.7	17.1	-0.09	0.04
Scrap notes	79.5	77.8	88.0	82.1	82.9	0.11	-0.04
Sculptures	33.7	35.2	32.0	39.3	34.3	0.28*	0.10
Security equipment	47.0	46.3	40.0	50.0	45.7	0.08	0.00
Sex toys	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-
Smoke alarms	47.0	46.3	44.0	42.9	45.7	-0.01	-0.12
Spectacles	43.4	38.9	52.0	46.4	48.6	0.10	0.04
Stickers	28.9	35.2	16.0	21.4	28.6	0.05	0.09
Stuffed animals	62.7	74.1	> 40.0	53.6	74.3	-0.24*	-0.02
Tickets—Concert	20.5	18.5	20.0	21.4	17.1	0.17	0.04
Tickets—Movie	13.3	9.3	20.0	17.9	8.6	0.29**	0.13
Tickets—Museum	1.2	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.9	0.11	0.08
Tickets—Travel	7.2	5.6	4.0	3.6	2.9	0.17	0.22
Tissue	45.8	46.3	40.0	32.1	< 57.1	-0.31**	-0.17
Travel souvenirs	16.9	24.1	> 4.0	17.9	17.1	0.26*	0.14
Umbrellas	18.1	22.2	> 4.0	17.9	14.3	0.08	0.10
Vases	30.1	42.6	> 4.0	28.6	25.7	0.16	0.14
Wallets	6.0	5.6	8.0	7.1	2.9	-0.08	0.01
Wind chimes	6.0	9.3	> 0.0	3.6	11.4	0.22*	0.19

Note: The “Art supplies” category listed here is broader than the “Art supplies” category listed in Table 8; the category above includes all types of art materials (e.g., easels, spray paint) whereas the category in Table 8 includes only stationery-type art (e.g., color pencils). The “Tissue” category listed here differs from the “Tissue” category listed in Table 11 (Beauty Products); the category above includes all instances of tissues (e.g., a box by the bed) whereas the category in Table 11 codes tissues that appeared to be specifically intended for use as a beauty product (e.g., when in a basket holding a variety of other beauty products). The “Flyers” category listed here differs from the “Flyers” category listed in Table 5; the category above includes flyers lying around the room (e.g., on the desk or floor) whereas the category in Table 5 codes flyers that were attached to the wall. The five most frequently recorded items are listed in bold typeface. “<” and “>” indicate percentages are significantly different at the P<0.05 level. † Item not included in the original instrument but added in the course of data collection.

*P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01.

to this problem was simply to list the broad category label and allow the coders to name the specific items as they came up. In Table 14, we list the broad category labels and the named items that were recorded most frequently by the coders. The modal items were athletic equipment, collections, and food. Other common items were candle collections, sweets, water, instant food, medication, and miscellaneous toys.

Table 14 Broad Categories and Named Items: Percentage of Total PLSs and According to Occupants' Gender and Ethnicity

Attribute Sub-category	All (n=83)	Gender		Ethnicity		Correlation with Openness			
		Female (n=54)	Male (n=25)	White (n=28)	Asian (n=35)	Observer rating	Criterion measure		
Athletic equipment	54.2	46.3	<	72.0	50.0	54.3	0.15	-0.08	
†Weights	14.5	16.7		12.0	14.3	17.1	-0.10	-0.14	
†Rackets	20.5	14.8		32.0	25.0	20.0	-0.00	-0.03	
†Sleeping bag	10.5	5.6		24.0	14.3	8.6	0.20	0.02	
†Swimming	4.8	3.7		8.0	10.7	2.9	0.15	0.04	
†Baseball/softball	8.4	5.6		16.0	7.1	14.3	-0.01	-0.17	
Collections	53.0	61.1	>	36.0	64.3	>	37.1	0.49**	0.32**
†Candles	31.3	38.9	>	16.0	42.9	>	17.1	0.33**	0.14
†Figurines	14.5	16.7		8.0	10.7	11.4	0.16	0.04	
†Alcohol related	6.0	3.7		12.0	10.7	2.9	0.13	0.02	
Food	61.4	63.0		56.0	71.4	51.4	-0.14	-0.15	
†Alcohol	6.0	5.6		8.0	14.3	>	0.0	-0.09	-0.23*
†Sweets	25.3	25.9		28.0	21.4	28.6	-0.16	-0.13	
†Drinks	28.9	33.3		16.0	32.1	25.7	0.02	0.07	
†Instant food	22.9	24.1		16.0	25.0	22.9	-0.04	-0.12	
Jewelry									
†Earrings	10.8	16.7	>	0.0	14.3	11.4	0.02	0.01	
Medication	31.3	25.9		40.0	35.7	31.4	0.11	0.17	
†Cold medicine	9.6	9.3		8.0	10.7	5.7	0.00	0.16	
†Pain killers	9.6	5.6		20.0	10.7	8.6	0.08	0.11	
†Vitamins	10.8	7.4		16.0	7.1	14.3	0.16	0.06	
Musical instruments	7.2	7.4		8.0	0.0	5.7	0.26*	0.25*	
Pets	7.2	9.3		4.0	10.7	2.9	0.12	0.10	
Plants									
†Live	24.1	25.9		16.0	32.1	17.1	0.09	-0.03	
†Fake	1.2	1.9		0.0	0.0	2.9	-0.05	0.01	
†Arranged	9.6	14.8	>	0.0	0.0	11.4	0.04	-0.06	
Religious artifacts	22.9	25.9		20.0	21.4	20.0	0.01	0.03	
†Eastern	10.8	11.1		12.0	10.7	14.3	0.22*	0.19	
†Western	14.5	16.7		12.0	10.7	8.6	-0.15	-0.08	
Tools	6.0	3.7		8.0	7.1	2.9	-0.03	-0.14	
Toys	28.9	31.5		28.0	35.7	22.9	0.20	0.35**	
Weapons	3.6	1.9		8.0	3.6	5.7	0.04	0.01	

Note: The five most frequently recorded items are listed in bold typeface. In some cases the category items were not specified beyond the broad category label (e.g., “food”). “<” and “>” indicate percentages are significantly different at the P<0.05 level. † Item not included in the original instrument but added in the course of data collection.

In cases where multiple items were present, statistics are only presented for the first item recorded.

* P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01.

Exploring the Environmental Meaning of Personal Characteristics of PLS Inhabitants

We have presented two means of characterizing PLSs—rating global attributes and recording specific content items. Clearly, these two methods will show some overlap—a PLS with many posters, paintings, photos, and other adornments will be rated as high on “decorated” and a PLS with barely any items recorded in it will be rated as low

on “full.” But are these methods redundant or do they each provide unique information?

Our approach to unpacking the environmental meaning of personal characteristics of PLS residents treats each and every global attribute and item content as a possible physical residue of the trends in the inhabitant's everyday conduct. This empirical exploration of environmental diagnosticity was conducted for three important personal characteristics: gender, ethnicity, and personality.

Assessing Gender, Ethnicity, and Personality

The present sample consisted of fifty-four females and twenty-five males (four participants did not report their gender), permitting us to examine gender differences. In addition, 72% of the sample could be classified as either White ($n = 25$) or Asian ($n = 35$), giving us sufficiently large numbers of each group to examine ethnicity differences. To examine the gender and ethnicity differences, we divided the sample by gender and ethnicity and compared the PLSCI attributes and items across groups. To test the reliability of the gender and ethnicity differences, we conducted a series of *t*-tests. Inequality signs in the tables indicate that the gender and ethnicity differences were reliable at the $P < 0.05$ level. To explore the extent to which global and specific content features of the PLSs were related to residents' personalities, we selected the dimension of Openness to New Experiences (or, more simply, Openness).

What do PLSs convey about their residents' gender? Previous research has identified a number of gender and ethnicity differences in PLSs (Buston and Breton 1992: 129; Devlin 1994: 225; Gauvain *et al.* 1983: 180; Peterson 1987: 187; Rheingold and Cook 1975: 459; Vinsel *et al.* 1980: 1104; Weisner and Weibel 1981: 417). When Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton (1981) asked individuals to nominate household objects as “special,” females more often nominated sculptures, photographs, plants, plates, glass, and textiles as special objects, whereas males identified TVs, stereos, tools, sports equipment, trophies, vehicles, and the yard. In an analysis of the content of the walls over beds of college students, Vinsel *et al.* (1980: 1104) found that females' walls featured more personal relationships and males' walls showed more sports and reference items (e.g., schedules).

Tables 1–14 show the occurrence rates for each of the environmental attributes we assessed. The occurrence rates are shown for the sample overall, then separately for males and females, and then separately for Whites and Asians (the two main ethnic groups in this sample). Table 15 brings together the statistically significant gender differences identified in Tables 1–14. As can be seen from this table, our findings include some striking conceptual replications of the findings from previous research. That is, compared with males'

Table 15 Gender Differences for Global Ratings and Items

Attribute	Gender		
	All (n=83)	Female (n=54)	Male (n=25)
ATTRIBUTES FOR WHICH FEMALES WERE HIGHER THAN MALES			
Global Attributes	Mean Ratings		
Decorated (vs undecorated)	4.6 (1.4)	4.9 (1.4)	> 4.2 (1.3)
Colorful (vs drab)	4.0 (1.1)	4.2 (1.2)	> 3.3 (0.75)
Cheerful (vs gloomy)	4.2 (1.0)	4.5 (1.0)	> 3.6 (0.67)
Clean (vs dirty)	4.0 (1.0)	4.3 (1.0)	> 3.7 (1.0)
Good (vs poor) Condition	4.2 (1.0)	4.4 (0.92)	> 3.8 (1.0)
Stationery: Organized (vs disorganized)	3.1 (1.4)	3.3 (1.4)	> 2.6 (1.3)
Distinctive (vs ordinary)	4.0 (0.88)	4.3 (0.86)	> 3.6 (0.72)
Roomy (vs cramped)	4.1 (1.0)	4.3 (0.97)	> 3.8 (0.88)
Inviting (vs repelling)	4.2 (0.87)	4.5 (0.85)	> 3.8 (0.67)
Stylish (vs unstylish)	4.2 (0.70)	4.3 (0.74)	> 3.9 (0.55)
Comfortable (vs uncomfortable)	4.6 (0.71)	4.8 (0.71)	> 4.2 (0.52)
Noisy (vs quiet) in the house	1.8 (0.62)	2.0 (0.71)	> 1.6 (0.32)
Specific Items	Percentage of Rooms Containing Item		
Décor: Baby (e.g., baby picture)	27.7	38.9	> 8.0
Décor: Family (e.g., Parents)	33.7	48.1	> 4.0
Décor: Friend (e.g., Best friend)	42.2	51.9	> 20.0
Décor: Impressionist Art (e.g., Renoir)	9.6	14.8	> 0.0
Mirror ^a	57.8	74.1	> 24.0
Calendar ^a	65.1	77.8	> 40.0
Books: †Architecture	4.8	7.4	> 0.0
Books: Foreign language	16.9	22.2	> 4.0
Books: Health	7.2	11.1	> 0.0
Magazines: Fashion magazine	13.3	18.5	> 4.0
Stationery: †Colored pencil/pen	6.0	9.3	> 0.0
Stationery: Eraser	9.6	14.8	> 0.0
Stationery: Pencil holder	20.5	27.8	> 4.0
Stationery: White out	6.0	7.4	> 0.0
Boombox	39.8	46.3	> 24.0
†Coffee maker	4.8	7.4	> 0.0
Beauty products: Hair gel	16.9	24.1	> 0.0
Beauty products: Lipstick	9.6	14.8	> 0.0
Beauty products: Lotion	56.6	72.2	> 24.0
Beauty products: Makeup	13.3	20.4	> 0.0
Beauty products: Makeup box	9.6	14.8	> 0.0
Beauty products: †Tissues	14.5	18.5	> 4.0
Beauty products: †Hair clips	9.6	14.8	> 0.0
Beauty products: †Nail polish utensils	14.5	20.4	> 0.0
Clothing: Dress	4.8	7.4	> 0.0
Bags: Backpack—small	22.9	25.9	> 8.0
Beauty equipment	66.3	77.8	> 40.0
Candle holders	48.2	61.1	> 24.0
Candles	56.6	68.5	> 36.0
Cards (e.g., birthday)	34.9	44.4	> 16.0
Dolls	10.8	16.7	> 0.0
Earplugs	6.0	9.3	> 0.0

Attribute	All (n=83)	Gender	
		Female (n=54)	Male (n=25)
Flowers-dried	41.0	55.6	> 12.0
Flowers-fake	9.6	14.8	> 0.0
Flowers-fresh	18.1	24.1	> 8.0
Hair dryers	8.4	13.0	> 0.0
Knickknacks	61.4	72.2	> 48.0
Memorabilia—cultural	13.3	18.5	> 4.0
Stuffed animals	62.7	74.1	> 40.0
Travel souvenirs	16.9	24.1	> 4.0
Umbrellas	18.1	22.2	> 4.0
Vases	30.1	42.6	> 4.0
Wind chimes	6.0	9.3	> 0.0
Collections	53.0	61.1	> 36.0
Collections: †Candles	31.3	38.9	> 16.0
Jewelry: †Earrings	10.8	16.7	> 0.0
Plants: †Arranged	9.6	14.8	> 0.0

ATTRIBUTES FOR WHICH MALES WERE HIGHER THAN FEMALES

Global Attributes	Mean Ratings			
CDs: Many (vs few)	2.5 (1.3)	2.3 (0.94)	<	3.0 (1.7)
Clothing: Everywhere (vs none visible)	3.4 (1.6)	3.0 (1.5)	<	4.0 (1.5)
Specific Items	Percentage of Rooms Containing Item			
Wardrobe/closet percentage open ^b	48.5	38.1	<	77.8
Hooks	18.1	7.4	<	36.0
Bed linen: Bedspread	65.1	55.6	<	84.0
Décor: Car (e.g., Porsche)	2.4	0.0	<	8.0
CDs: 1980s	26.5	16.7	<	48.0
CDs: Blues	13.3	7.4	<	28.0
CDs: Rap/hip-hop	25.3	14.8	<	44.0
CDs: Soundtracks	54.2	48.1	<	72.0
CDs: Techno	4.8	0.0	<	16.0
Integrated stereo	30.1	22.2	<	52.0
Walkman	14.5	7.4	<	28.0
†Fan	9.6	3.7	<	24.0
Clothing: Hat/cap	18.1	11.1	<	36.0
Bags: Suitcase	19.3	11.1	<	40.0
Bags: Suit bag	4.8	0.0	<	16.0
Bags: Athletic bag	4.8	0.0	<	16.0
Bills	45.8	33.3	<	72.0
Laundry baskets	33.7	20.4	<	64.0
Athletic equipment	54.2	46.3	<	72.0

Note: All ratings made on seven-point scales. “<” and “>” indicate means or percentages are significantly different at $P < 0.05$ level. “CD” includes both CDs and records. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses. †Item not included in the original instrument but added in the course of data collection.

^aIn cases where multiple items were present, statistics are only presented for the first item recorded.

^bPercentage of rooms with open wardrobe/closets.

PLSs, females' PLSs were characterized by décor depicting family and friends, had more flowers and plants but had less décor depicting cars, and had fewer integrated stereos, personal stereos, and items of athletic equipment. These findings are also broadly consistent gender differences identified in personalization of workspaces (Wells 2000: 239).

In addition, our gender-difference findings are consistent with traditional gender roles, interests, activities, and values. One area of gender differences is in terms of care for children, with women devoting relatively large amounts of attention and behavior to nurturing and child-rearing activities (Maccoby 1995: 135). Consistent with this gender role, women's PLSs contained more baby-related décor, dolls, and stuffed animals than did men's PLSs. Women also devote more resources than do men to their physical appearance, and this is consistent with the gender differences we identified in prevalence of beauty products, beauty equipment, hair dryers, mirrors, and fashion magazines in women's PLSs. Gender roles of the homemaker also socialize women to attend to the upkeep of living spaces and females' PLSs had more plants, flowers, and vases and were rated as significantly cleaner, in better condition, more decorated, cheerful, colorful, comfortable, distinctive, and stylish, and their stationery was more organized than in men's PLSs. Other qualities associated with women include having communal (versus agentic) values (Eagly and Steffen 1984: 735). Perhaps reflecting this value, women's PLSs had more pictures of friends and family than did men's PLSs.

Men, on the other hand, tend to show more interest than do women in mechanical activities and sports, and this is reflected in the relative prevalence of car-related décor and athletic equipment in men's PLSs.

Thus, in addition to replicating previous findings, we extend them with detailed description of props and equipment that are consistent with gender roles still prevalent at the turn of the century. Accordingly, it can be demonstrated in specific, empirical fashion that the gender of their inhabitants appears to establish one facet of the environmental meaning conveyed by PLSs.

What do PLSs convey about their residents' ethnicity? Table 16 brings together the statistically significant ethnicity differences identified in Tables 1–14. There were barely any ethnicity differences on the global dimensions. The only significant ($P < 0.05$) differences were that Whites' PLSs were rated as significantly larger and as more multipurpose than Asians' PLSs. Moreover few of the ethnicity differences for specific content items made conceptual sense, suggesting that they may have arisen by chance. For example, compared with Asians, Whites had significantly more comforters, were more likely to have nature paintings, had significantly more computer books but

significantly fewer health books and entertainment magazines, had significantly more musicals CDs, and had significantly fewer Q-tips. The only ethnicity difference to make any conceptual sense was that Whites were more likely than Asians to have photographs of themselves. This ethnicity difference is consistent with the stereotypical view that Western cultures tend to emphasize individualistic values more than Eastern cultures do (e.g., Markus and Kitayama

Table 16 Ethnicity Differences for Global Ratings and Items

Attribute	All (n=83)	Gender	
		Female (n=54)	Male (n=25)
ATTRIBUTES FOR WHICH FEMALES WERE HIGHER THAN MALES			
Global Attributes		Mean Ratings	
Large (vs small)	4.0 (1.0)	4.2 (0.99)	> 3.6 (0.89)
Multiple (vs single) Purpose	3.7 (1.0)	4.1 (1.1)	> 3.2 (0.73)
Specific Items		Percentage of Rooms Containing Item	
Bed linen: Comforter	74.7	85.7	> 62.9
Décor: Self (e.g., Occupant)	18.1	32.1	> 8.6
Books: Computer	14.5	25.0	> 5.7
Clothing: Shoes—athletic	9.6	17.9	> 0.0
Candles	56.6	67.9	> 42.9
Cards (e.g., birthday)	34.9	50.0	> 22.9
Cups	45.8	60.7	> 34.3
Postcards	51.8	67.9	> 42.9
Collections: general	53.0	64.3	> 37.1
Collections: †Candles	31.3	42.9	> 17.1
Food: †Alcohol	6.0	14.3	> 0.0
ATTRIBUTES FOR WHICH ASIANS WERE HIGHER THAN WHITES			
Specific Items		Percentage of Rooms Containing Item	
Books: Health	7.2	0.0	< 11.4
Magazines: Entertainment	9.6	0.0	< 14.3
CDs: Musicals	14.5	3.6	< 22.9
†Beauty products: †Q-tip	6.0	0.0	< 11.4
†Black lights	7.2	0.0	< 11.4
Food wrappers	47.0	32.1	< 57.1
Piggy banks	13.3	3.6	< 20.0
Tissue	45.8	32.1	< 57.1

Note: All ratings made on seven-point scales. “<” and “>” indicate means or percentages are significantly different at *P* < 0.05 level. “CD” includes both CDs and records. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses. †Item not included in the original instrument but added in the course of data collection.

1991: 224). But even this link must be interpreted with great caution given the paucity of convergent evidence from the other items assessed. In short, we found scant evidence for reliable differences in the features and contents of PLSs belonging to Asian and White residents. These findings may reflect the acculturation that follows the multi-generational status of the Asian students.

What do PLSs convey about their residents personality? We took two approaches to this question. First, we examined implicit notions about the kind of PLS features that might be associated with the inhabitant's degree of Openness. To examine how the global and specific features of PLSs were associated with observer impressions of the residents, we correlated the PLSCI items with Openness ratings made by seven observers who had viewed the PLSs (but who were completely unacquainted with the residents). These correlations are shown under the term "Observers' Ratings" in the penultimate columns of Tables 1–14.

The correlations shown in Table 1 between the observers' Openness ratings of the residents and the global attributes of the PLSs show that residents were judged to be high on Openness if their PLSs had many CDs and books, had varied collections of books and magazines, were multipurpose spaces, and were distinctive, decorated, cluttered, and full. In other words, observers rated residents high on Openness if their PLSs had a large quantity and wide variety of things in them. To determine what these things were we must go beyond the global attributes and turn to the specific codings. For example, the global ratings showed that rooms with many and varied books were judged to belong to residents high on Openness, but they do not tell us what type of books suggested Openness to the observers. The specific codings (Table 6) indicate that observer judgments of high Openness were associated with books on academic topics, art, cooking, folk literature, music, new age, philosophical, poetry, and sex, and with the presence of newspapers and news magazines. Similarly, the correlations with wall décor (Table 4) clarify the global "decorated" attribute, suggesting that art may have been the type of décor used by observers to make their attributions. PLSs judged to be high on Openness also tended to house international maps, travel souvenirs, and sculptures (Table 13), and collections, musical instruments, and Eastern religious artifacts (Table 14). Together these cues provide a far richer flavor of the types of PLSs associated with high Openness than is offered by the global ratings alone. The codings generate a coherent theme of learned, worldly, and cultured curiosity and appreciation.

Our second approach to the question identified the attributes of PLSs empirically associated with what the residents were really like, as assessed by a combination of self and peer ratings of Openness. The correlations shown in the last column of Table 1 under the

term “Criterion Measure” suggest that residents high in Openness have PLSs that are distinctive, with varied collections of books and magazines. Thus, consistent with the Openness construct, which emphasizes breadth of interests, it is the variety, not the quantity, of books and magazines that serves as the crucial cue to an individual's Openness. Turning to specific cues we again get a picture of a resident who is learned, worldly, and cultured. Specifically, the PLSs of residents high in Openness have art on the walls (Table 4), have news magazines and books on art, poetry, and psychology (Table 6), have art supplies (Table 8), international maps (Table 13), and toys and musical instruments (Table 14). These content-level analyses of PLSs are generally consistent with research linking workplaces to personality (Wells and Thelen 2002: 300). Moreover, these correlations between PLS features and the personalities of the resident are consistent with the folk theories of Openness reflected in the observer ratings; in line with this, the criterion measures and observer ratings of openness were strongly correlated ($r = 0.65$).

Overall these analyses of global and specific codings with regard to three important characteristics of their inhabitants suggest that the two levels of analyses provide complementary ways of assessing spaces. These analyses parallel Craik's (2000: 233) analyses of the “lived days” of individuals, in which he argued that the documentation of specific everyday acts provide a distinctive insight into personality that is not captured by the abstracted summaries of behaviors offered by trait constructs (also see Buss and Craik 1983: 105). In a similar vein, we document the value of recording specific items within PLSs over and above the descriptions provided by global ratings; for example, it is conceptually profitable to record the specific genres in a book collection beyond a simple rating of the collection's diversity.

Processes Linking Individuals to Features of Their PLSs

The anthropological and sociological literatures studying material culture provide several theories emphasizing the links between persons and objects. Some theorists have observed that objects carry two kinds of meaning: Instrumental (use) meaning and symbolic meaning (e.g., Baudrillard 1968; Campbell 1996: 93; Miller 1988: 353; Woodward 2001: 115). Both types of meaning reflect processes potentially linking individuals to their dwellings and both types may serve as cues to observers forming impressions of the residents.

In an analysis of Hummel figurines, Chaimov (2001: 49) argues that souvenirs serve the symbolic goal of communicating the collectors' ideologies. As shown in Table 13, the presence of travel souvenirs predicted observers' impressions of the residents Openness, a trait dimension associated with personal values (McCrae and Costa 1997: 825). Belk (1988: 139) argues that, via a wide range of processes,

personal possessions contribute to and reflect individuals' identities. One process is by serving as physical reminders of earlier times: "possessions are a convenient means of storing the memories and feelings that attach our sense of past . . . An heirloom may record and recall family heritage" (p. 148). Consistent with this idea, memorabilia were found in a substantial proportion of the PLSs (see Table 13).

The symbolic and psychological meaning of creating collections has received considerable theoretical and empirical attention (e.g., Belk 1988: 139; Owen 1999: 283; Pearce 1992, 1995). As shown in Table 14, it would seem that the presence of collections is a cue to Openness and observers appear to make use of this cue. Owen (1999: 283) demonstrates that an individual's collection can be broken down into several more focused elements, such as internal coherence, source of items, and collecting pattern; one avenue of future research would be to examine how these dimensions of collections relate to characteristics of the residents.

The symbolic meaning of possessions has received considerable attention by lay-persons and social scientists alike, perhaps even at the expense of the equally important instrumental meaning of possessions (Campbell 1996: 93). Yet, as Campbell points out, this bias may not be justified, especially under the conditions of constrained choice, habit, and other limiting factors that may influence which items an individual acquires. We suspect that this bias has diminished the significant role of instrumental meaning, and therefore underemphasizes the impact of everyday non-symbolic acts on physical spaces. Building on the tradition of trace measures (Rathje 1979: 75; Zeisel 1981), Gosling *et al.*'s (2002: 379) model emphasizes the fact that many elements of a room simply reflect everyday behaviors; thus, the unpaid parking ticket on the floor may not represent a self-conscious symbolic act of defiance by the resident but instead may reflect such prototypically low conscientiousness acts as parking illegally, not paying the ticket, and leaving the ticket on the floor. Theories focusing on the formation of such "behavioral residue" also warrant a place in devising explanations that meaningfully link persons to their environments.

Our findings on gender provide particularly striking evidence for the establishment of environmental meaning through the gender-specific accessories associated with the quotidian conduct entailed in personal grooming. Furthermore, our analyses uncover additional global attributes and item content that contribute to the environmental diagnostics of gender. The more frequent presence of plants and flowers for women and the greater likelihood of mechanical equipment of various kinds for men constitute residues of differential forms of everyday activity patterns.

The relative paucity of environmental attributes and item content diagnostic of ethnicity may represent multi-generational acculturation, yielding to the predominance of an overarching university-student

culture. Unfortunately, we did not gather data on whether the participants were first-generation Asian Americans; however, in another study of the same population conducted at about the same time, 50% of the 199 participants were first generation and 50% were at least second generation (Benet-Martínez and Karakitapoğlu-Aygün 2003: 38). The effect of generational status is a topic that warrants future empirical examination.

Nevertheless, with so many mechanisms linking personal characteristics and physical environments, it should be no surprise that the individual items in PLS proved to be rich sources of information about the residents' gender and personality. Clearly, methods for systematically describing the attributes and item content of PLSs are needed to pursue the empirical exploration of the various forms of environmental meaning. This article reports our attempts to develop such a method.

Conclusion

In this article we advance the concept of Personal Living Space (or PLS). We furnish illustrative portraits of one common form of PLS—student accommodations, such as rented rooms in houses, apartments, dormitories, and co-ops. We examined facets of the environmental meaning of PLSs through the empirical relations of attributes and item content to gender, ethnicity and personality. Our findings sustain and extend previous research on the environmental diagnostics of gender and expand the inquiry into the realm of personality traits. We conclude that global ratings and specific codings provide complementary yet distinct characterizations of PLSs. More generally, the investigations reported here bring to the fore a ubiquitous yet hitherto neglected environmental context in which to examine the broad range of psychological and cultural issues posed by the study of residential environments.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Preparation of this article was supported by a Humanities Research Grant from the University of California, Berkeley, National Institute of Mental Health Grant MH64527–01A1, and by fellowships from the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences and the Peter Wall Institute for Advanced Studies. We are grateful to Lauren Altman, Allison Bonburg, Keren Brooks, Alice Chuang, Linda Huang, Lane Johnson, Adam Klinger, Peter Lwin, Susan Orgera, Jenny Vuong, Alex Wang, and Mei-Ling Woo for their help in collecting the data reported here. We thank Oliver John, Webb Keane, and Delroy Paulhus for their advice on the research design and their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this article. We are also grateful to Anthony Maxwell of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for his consultation on scene of the crime techniques and advice in the design of the PLS assessment procedures.

REFERENCES

- Altman, I. 1981. *The Environment and Social Behavior*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Appleyard, D. 1979a. "Home." *Architectural Association Quarterly* 2: 4–20.
- Appleyard, D. 1979b. "The Environment as Social Symbol." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 45: 143–54.
- Baudrillard, J. 1968. *The System of Objects*. London: Verso.
- Belk, R. 1988. "Possessions and the Extended Self." *Journal of Consumer Research* 15: 139–68.
- Benet-Martínez, V. and Z. Karakitapoğlu-Aygün. 2003. "Personality in Predicting Life Satisfaction: Comparing Asian Americans and European Americans." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 34: 38–60.
- Brown, B. B. and P.B. Harris. 1989. "Residential Burglary Victimization: Reactions to the Invasion of a Primary Territory." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 9: 119–32.
- Burroughs, J. W., D. R. Drews and W. K. Hallman. 1991. "Predicting Personality from Personal Possessions: A Self-Presentational Analysis." *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality* 6: 147–63.
- Buss, D. M. and K. H. Craik. 1983. "The Act Frequency Approach to Personality." *Psychological Review* 90: 105–26.
- Buston, T. and M. Breton. 1992. "Home and Homeless Women." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 12: 129–34.
- Campbell, C. 1996. "The Meaning of Objects and the Meaning of Actions: A Critical Note on the Sociology of Consumption and Theories of Clothing." *Journal of Material Culture* 1: 93–105.
- Canter, D., S. West and R. Wools. 1974. "Judgments of People and their Rooms." *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* 13: 113–18.
- Case, D. 1996. "Contributions of Journeys Away to the Definition of Home." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 16: 1–16.
- Chaimov, J. 2001. "Hummel Figurines: Molding a Collectible Germany." *Journal of Material Culture* 6: 49–66.
- Cooper-Marcus, C. 1995. *House as Mirror of Self: Exploring the Deeper Meanings of Home*. Berkeley, CA: Conari Press.
- Craik, K. H. 1971. "The Assessment of Places." In P. McReynolds (ed.) *Advances in Psychological Assessment, Volume Two*, pp. 40–52. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.
- Craik, K. H. 2000. "The Lived Day of an Individual: A Person Environment Perspective." In W. B. Walsh, K. H. Craik and R. Price (eds) *Person–Environment Psychology: New Directions and Perspectives* (2nd edn), pp. 233–66. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. and E. Rochberg-Halton. 1981. *The Meaning of Things*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Devlin, A. S. 1994. "Gender Role and Housing Preferences." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 14: 225–36.

- Dovey, K. 1985. "Home and Homelessness." In I. Altman and C. Werner (eds) *Home Environments*, pp. 33–64. New York: Plenum Press.
- Eagly, A. H. and V. J. Steffen. 1984. "Gender Stereotypes Stem from the Distribution of Women and Men into Social Roles." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 46: 735–54.
- Gauvain, M., I. Altman and H. Fahim. 1983. "Homes and Social Change: A Cross-Cultural Analysis." In N. R. Fiemer and E. S. Geller (eds) *Environmental Psychology: Directions and Perspectives*, pp. 180–218. New York: Praeger.
- Gibson, S. undated. "Habitat: An Examination of the Relationship Between Self Identity and the Possession and Display of Household Goods." *The International Journal of Urban Labour and Leisure* 2. Available at: <http://www.ijull.com/vol2/1/000012.htm>, accessed May 27 2002.
- Goffman, E. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Gosling, S. D., S. J. Ko, T. Mannarelli, and M. E. Morris. 2002. "A Room With a Cue: Judgments of Personality Based on Offices and Bedrooms." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 82: 379–98.
- Harris, B. P. and B. B. Brown. 1996. "The Home and Identity Display: Interpreting Resident Territoriality From Home Exteriors." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 16: 187–204.
- Hayward, D. G. 1975. "Home as an Environmental and Psychological Concept." *Landscape* 20: 2–9.
- Inions, C. 1999. *One Space Living*. New York: Watson-Guptill.
- John, O. P. and S. Srivastava. 1999. "The Big Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Theoretical Perspectives." In L. A. Pervin and O. P. John (eds) *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, pp. 102–38. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kaiser, F. G. and U. Furher. 1996. "Dwelling: Speaking of an Unnoticed Universal Language." *New Ideas in Psychology* 14: 225–36.
- Kasmar, J. V. 1970. "The Development of a Usable Lexicon of Environmental Descriptors." *Environment and Behavior* 2: 153–69.
- Laumann, E. O. and J. House. 1970. "Living Room Styles and Social Attributes: The Patterning of Material Artifacts in a Modern Urban Community." *Sociology and Social Research* 54: 321–42.
- Lippa, R. 1998. "The Nonverbal Display and Judgment of Extraversion, Masculinity, Femininity, and Gender Diagnosticity: A Lens Model Analysis." *Journal of Research in Personality* 32: 80–107.
- Lippa, R. and S. Connelly. 1990. "Gender Diagnosticity: A New Bayesian Approach to Gender-Related Individual Differences." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 59: 1051–65.
- Maccoby, E. E. 1995. "Divorce and Custody: The Rights, Needs, and Obligations of Mothers, Fathers, and Children." *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* 42: 135–72.

- Manaster, G. J. and D. Novak. 1977. "Post High School Adolescents: An Ecological Approach to Studying Group Differences." *Adolescence* 12: 269–75.
- Markus, H. R. and S. Kitayama. 1991. "Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion, and Motivation." *Psychological Review* 98: 224–53.
- McCrae, R. R. and P.T. Costa Jr. 1997. "Conceptions and Correlates of Openness to Experience." In R. Hogan, J. A. Johnson and S. R. Briggs (eds) *Handbook of Personality Psychology*, pp. 825–47. New York: Academic Press.
- Miller, D. 1988. "Appropriating the state on the council estate." *Man* 23: 353–72.
- Naar, J. and M. Siple. 1976. *Living in One Room*. New York: Random House.
- Owen, J. 1999. "The Collections of Sir John Lubbock, the First Lord Avebury (1834–1913): An Open Book." *Journal of Material Culture* 4: 283–302.
- Pearce, S. 1992. *Museums, Objects, and Collections*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Pearce, S. 1995. *On Collecting: An Investigation Into Collecting in the European Tradition*. London: Routledge.
- Peterson, R. B. 1987. "Gender Issues in the Home and Urban Environment." In E. H. Zube and G. T. Moore (eds) *Advances in Environment, Behavior and Design, Volume 1*, pp. 187–218. New York: Plenum Press.
- Pratt, G. 1981. "The Home as Expression of Social Worlds." In J. S. Duncan (ed.) *Housing and Identity: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*, pp. 135–80. New York: Holmes and Meier.
- Rathje, W. L. 1979. "Trace Measures." In L. Sechrest (ed.) *New Directions for Methodology of Behavioral Science: Unobtrusive Measurement Today*, pp. 75–91. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Rheingold, H. L. and K. V. Cook. 1975. "The Context of Boys' and Girls' Rooms as an Index of Parents' Behavior." *Child Development* 46: 459–63.
- Sadalla, E. K., J. Burroughs and M. Quaid. 1980. "House Form and Social Identity." In R. Stough and A. Wandersman (eds) *Optimizing Environments: Research, Practice and Policy*, pp. 201–6. Washington, DC: Environmental Design Research Association.
- Sadalla, E. K., B. Vershure and J. Burroughs. 1987. "Identity Symbolism in Housing." *Environment and Behavior* 19: 569–87.
- Smith, S. G. 1994a. "The Essential Qualities of a Home." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 14: 21–30.
- Smith, S. G. 1994b. "The Psychological Construction of Home Life." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 14: 124–36.
- Thomas, J. 1998. "The Socio-Semiotics of Material Culture." *Journal of Material Culture* 3: 97–108.

- Tognoli, J. 1987. "Residential Environments." In D. Stokols and I. Altman (eds) *Handbook of Environmental Psychology, Volume 2*, pp. 655–90. New York: Wiley.
- Vinsel, A., B. B. Brown, I. Altman and C. Foss. 1980. "Privacy Regulation, Territorial Displays, and Effectiveness of Individual Functioning." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 39: 1104–15.
- Weisner, T. S. and J. C. Weibel. 1981. "Home Environments and Family Lifestyles in California." *Environment and Behavior* 13: 417–60.
- Wells, M. M. 2000. "Office Clutter or Meaningful Personal Displays: The Role of Office Personalization in Employee and Organizational Well-Being." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 20: [239–55](#).
- Wells, M. M. and L. Thelen. 2002. "What Does Your Workspace Say About You? The Influence of Personality, Status, and Workspace on Personalization." *Environment and Behavior* 34: [300–21](#).
- Wilson, M. A. and N. E. Mackenzie. 2000. "Social Attributions Based on Domestic Interiors." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 20: [343–54](#).
- Woodward, I. 2001. "Domestic Objects and the Taste Epiphany: A Resource for Consumption Methodology." *Journal of Material Culture* 6: [115–36](#).
- Zeisel, J. 1981. *Inquiry By Design: Tools for Environment-Behavior Research*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.