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(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this research was to establish the relationship between the stylistic changes the men’s business suit and the masculine roles as represented in advertising imagery in the United States from 1950 through 1988. The men’s business suit is a behavioral expectation for business and professional men often called “white collar workers.” The suits are a social product given to change as collective tastes are manifest over time. The masculine role, a set of behavioral expectations dictated by consensus, is also a social product given to change over time. This research examined the relationship between changes in styling of men’s business suits, and changes in masculine roles apparent in advertising.

A content analysis of men’s business suits was executed to quantify the stylistic expressions, manifest in the structural components of the business suit. The classic appearance was represented by a composite illustration and was used as a device against which to compare the dominant style traits apparent in business suits for each decade researched. A survey of advertising and editorial spreads in The New York Times, Esquire and Vogue was combined with a survey of scholarly literature on gender and masculine roles to determine the pervasive masculine roles for each decade.
It was found that times in which classic styling pervaded were also times in which professional success, a traditionally masculine virtue, was emphasized. Periods in which the styling in men’s business suits deviated from the classic appearance were times when the traditional masculine roles were being challenged.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A man's business suit is a jacket, pants and possibly a vest cut from the same cloth (Schoefler & Gale, 1973). Being an item of clothing, the man's business suit is part of the human constructed environment which is a component of the human ecosystem model proposed by Bubolz and Sontag (1988). In a manner similar to the human ecosystem model, this research treats clothing as the product of transformations that involve the use of material resources and information to produce the clothing artifact. However, within this cycle of transformations, specific functions of clothing pertinent to its wearers are considered. Not only does clothing serve as an environmental barrier, reducing the vulnerability of the wearer to physical and social environments, it is also a fashion object, and, being so, it functions as a consumer offering in an economic system.

Clothing can be a non-verbal form of communication, or a display if you will, used to express individual identity and group affiliation. Groups establish codes of clothing behavior specific to themselves, to establish order in the group and to facilitate member recognition (Sproles, 1974). The clothing preferences of the group are generated by consensus.

Clothing is but one form of display used to indicate one's inclination to act in certain ways. There is an infinite array of gestures and postures in addition to dress that gives us an indication of how one is inclined to act without completely performing the underlying act the display indicates. There is a whole set of displays associated with being male, and these behaviors are the essence of what
is defined as masculinity. The characteristics assigned by the social structure to men that indicate maleness and masculinity become norms. These characteristics become laden with imperatives like "ought" and "should." For example, "Men should be strong." In addition to dressing appropriately, projecting an image of self-reliance, rationality, and assertiveness (traditionally masculine qualities) (Brenton, 1966; Fasteau, 1974; Goldberg, 1976; Richardson, 1988) are essential for a man to gain employment and the trust of colleagues.

"White collar working men" is a social group with a code of clothing (and other behaviors) specific to the work setting. Their clothing behavior is a social norm. Norms indicate social agreement, and the business suit is the clothing norm agreed upon by white collar working men. For this research, a white collar working man is defined simply as a man who wears a business suit to work.

Fashion can be defined as what is "currently appropriate" (Daniels, 1951). In this sense, the fashion of men’s business suits indicates what is currently appropriate among white collar working men. The fashion of clothing is defined by its stylistic elements, the silhouette, and the proportion or overall structural line (Kroeber, 1957).

In all fashions there are stylistic changes over time, and men’s business wear is no exception. It is generally agreed that social forces influence fashion. On the most basic level, the willingness of the social group to accept stylistic change is a governing factor.

The fashion industry responds to social forces in generating the fashion object. Apparel manufacturers must sell clothes if they are to survive. The selling may be achieved by creating need through the introduction of style innovations that are found desirable by the
consumer or by filling realized needs in offering the consumer a currently existing style that has proven acceptable. In either case, whether the manufacturer is offering a stylistic innovation or a currently acceptable style, it is somehow a response to the social climate on the part of the apparel manufacturer.

In response to the social environment, apparel manufacturers and others who sell suits, such as tailors and retailers, present their consumer offerings to their target market in the form of advertising. Advertising tells the audience what is good about the product; but also, it attempts to tell the audience who they are and why they should buy this product. The depiction of men in advertising appeals to consumers by portraying men who embody current concepts of masculinity (unless the purpose of the ad is to elicit a humorous response or to challenge beliefs of the audience).

The purpose of this study was to determine the nature of the relationship between stylistic change in men’s business suits from 1950 through 1988 and masculine roles as represented in advertising imagery for the same period in the United States. Stylistic changes were tracked through the seriation of stylistic elements manifest in the structural components and the determination of the elements’mode frequencies. The analysis of stylistic change in light of masculine roles and images increases the study’s usefulness by relating the changes in the man’s business suit to apparent changes in the behavioral expectations of the men who wear them. The information encompassed by this study will be useful to costume historians, social psychologists, those interested in the social psychological aspects of dress, and designers.
Less research has been done in the area of historic costume for men than for women (Paoletti, Beeker and Pelletier, 1987). Because the men's business suit is so steeped in tradition, its variation over time may be a sensitive indicator, or barometer of changes in the social climate.

Costume history has traditionally centered on the task of classifying clothing artifacts or two dimensional visual representations of clothing artifacts according to physical attributes and chronological origin (Pedersen, 1988). This task is still very important. However, when a clothing artifact is viewed also as the result of evolutionary transformation processes, contingent on a myriad of sociocultural systems reflecting the values, goals and needs of individuals and groups, prospects for increased understanding of the garment unfold. To view clothing as a product of its environment is to rest the artifact in an historical context particular to the time, place and people that produced the garment. The advantage of such an approach lies in its holistic nature, the way it ties historical findings to the diverse but interrelated subfields of clothing and textiles. This approach will hopefully open the door for increased research possibilities and facilitate the interpretation of existing knowledge.
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Overview

In this chapter, theories of the human ecosystem, social interaction, and the diffusion of innovations are synthesized with existing theories of fashion change to develop explanations of change in men's business suits and society at large with regard to the wearers and the behavioral expectations within which they operate. As well, research pertinent to the theoretical areas listed above, and historic costume research are reviewed.

The Human Ecosystem Model

In recognizing the value of costume history research to the field of clothing and textiles, it is useful to discuss the human ecosystem model and to review the functions of dress as a segment of the human ecosystem. The human ecosystem model is the representation of human existence posited in the Human Ecology framework that has been adopted by academicians in fields related to Home Economics and Human Resources. According to Bubolz and Sontag,

Human Ecology can be defined as the study of humans as social, physical, biological beings in interaction with each other and with their physical, sociocultural, aesthetic and biological environments (1988, p. 3). Three dynamic elements of the human ecosystem model are embraced by Bubolz and Sontag. They are the near environment, the individual or family, and the outputs and outcomes. In this model (Figure 1), the three elements are interrelated, interdependent, and interacting. The near environment, which provides inputs of matter, energy and information, subdivides into the natural environment,
Figure 1. The Human Ecosystem Model
the human constructed environment, and the human behavioral environment. The natural environment is comprised of air, water, and land quality and quantity, physical and biological resources for energy, production, consumption, and recreation, climatic conditions, and space-time relationships including geographic and topographic features, evolution and adaptation through time. The human constructed environment includes food, clothing and shelter, each having objective characteristics, such as form and quantity, and subjective characteristics such as quality. It also includes sociocultural systems. Political, educational, health, religious and economic institutions, language, social norms, cultural patterns and technology fall into the category of sociocultural systems. The human behavioral environment consists of significant others, peers and reference groups.

Transformation Processes and Agents

Transformations occur when components from any of the three elements in the ecosystem model are combined to create, maintain or modify outputs. Transformations are cyclical in nature. The outputs from one set of transformations become the inputs for a new set of transformations. Individuals or groups of individuals are the transformation agents in the model. Individual or group characteristics defining values, goals, needs and resources have a bearing on the transformation processes that will occur and how they will occur.

Information processing, communication, management, production, consumption, socialization, design and maintenance are considered transformation processes that change inputs in the near environment into outputs, that in turn generate outcomes. Outcomes represent individual, societal and environmental satisfaction or dissatisfaction, and they serve as inputs for another cycle of transformations (Bubolz and Sontag,
1988). Clothing, as part of the human constructed environment, is subject to transformation processes that will turn it into an output, and subsequently, a new input. Clothing as a product may start as raw materials that are transformed by production processes into a garment. Transformation might also occur as new stylistic elements are introduced in response to real or perceived needs. The assessment of a garment's stylistic elements as transformed by new information (changing aesthetic beliefs, and so on) may be the new output, that is, a different opinion of what is attractive or acceptable. As a product of the transformation processes, clothing is also a statement about the wearer and the sociocultural systems in which he or she is integrated. In the sense that humans hope that their outputs produce desired outcomes, most generally individual, environmental and societal well being, it stands to reason that clothing as part of the ecosystem would serve to meet the needs of the individual and society in response to any number of stimuli from the near environment.

Limitations of the Model

The human ecosystem model is a useful starting point for historians who wish to investigate clothing artifacts as products of the environment in which they were created. The concept of cyclical transformations is an excellent approach for examining fashion change. However, there are shortcomings to the model. The distinction between the human constructed and human behavioral environments is not clean and seems artificial; the model only acknowledges the individual or the family as transformation agents, and the interaction between the three elements in the model is not sufficiently developed. The model is fairly static and also fails to acknowledge the fact that several interactions may be occurring simultaneously. This failure to
recognize multiple transformations makes the model over-simplistic and not very useful in explaining the social interactions which foster social structure formation or generate a clothing artifact.

Proposal for Integration

Pedersen's (1988) proposal that the human ecosystem model could be synthesized with anthropological theoretical concepts to explore the linkages between cultural and historical aspects of dress is a step in the direction of developing an explanatory framework that acknowledges the historical artifact as a product of the environment in which it was produced. Pedersen suggests that "by studying transformation of inputs related to the extant costume, the influences or shaping forces on the costume will become apparent and the functions of the garment in the social milieu will be made clear" (p. 2). She also suggests that the ecosystem concepts of environment and system can easily encompass other theoretical concepts. Pedersen proposes the inclusion of anthropological concepts into the ecosystem framework. For the purpose of this research it appears sufficient to integrate the concept of transformations with existing sociological and social psychological theories of social interaction, fashion change and innovation diffusion to explain fashion change. The transformations involving inputs and outputs of material resources and information can then be related to the clothing artifact and to social constructs, thus establishing a rich context for understanding.

With clothing established as a part of the near environment and as a product of transformation processes, the shortcomings of the human ecosystem model are acknowledged. Discussion will now move into the functions of clothing and social processes pertinent to the men's business suit, its wearers and the role that individual consumers and
the fashion industry have in producing the clothing artifact.

Display

Julian Huxley (1966) suggests that, as a result of "natural selection," certain behaviors become routinized and removed from specific contexts so that efficient communication will be served. These routinized behaviors become signals that serve as displays that free the individual from having to "play out the act" instead; they provide an immediately understood expression of one's situation (cited in Goffman, 1979). For example, a male may appear as a male by dressing and grooming in a manner currently understood to be masculine; his masculine gender display indicates his sex. It is important, however, to recognize that displays do not "communicate in the narrow sense of the term; they don't enunciate something through a language of symbols openly established and used solely for that purpose." They instead "provide evidence of the actor's alignment in the situation" (Goffman, 1979 p. 1), thus giving an indication as to how one will behave.

Gender

It is at the point that display serves to indicate one's genital possession that the difference between sex and gender originates. Gender traditionally equates with sex type and archaically is defined as sex (Websters Third New International Dictionary, 1976), but gender is a term that suggests type, form, or class as a result of apparent characteristics. Sex type is genetic; gender is socially constructed (Richardson, 1988). Gender is an outcome in the ecosystem model, resulting from the transformation of informational inputs in the human behavioral environment. Broadly, it is also the manifestation of displays (apparent characteristics and behaviors) that are deemed
appropriate, or behaviors that are attributed exclusively to one sex or the other, although either sex might be capable of these behaviors. Gender serves the end of efficient communication and reinforces social structures by indicating what is masculine and feminine, i.e., what is the domain of man and what is the domain of woman.

**Masculinity**

Masculinity is that which is attributed to the male sex, the behavioral expectations, norms and roles which are considered the domain of men. Masculinity or male gender traditionally encompasses expectations and attributes that are generally aggressive, self-reliant and unemotional. To appear otherwise is to threaten others' perception of one's manliness, and, in turn, one's self concept as a man (Brenton, 1966; Fastelow, 1974; Golberg, 1976; Richardson 1988).

**Masculine Roles**

Roles are clusters of behavioral expectations that one is assigned or ascribes to in a particular situation. Certain sets of behaviors are created for, and associated with, many different kinds of social positions ranging from certain professions, political affiliations, familial positions on down to sex type. Many of these statuses overlap as a result of the expectations that are socially inculcated from the most basic distinction of sex at birth. For instance, certain professions and familial positions are associated most frequently with men, others with women.

In the twentieth century, men have traditionally been assigned the role of breadwinner or "the good provider" (Fastelow, 1974). As a husband and father, a man's primary function is to bring home enough money to adequately care for his loved ones. Bringing home a merely
sufficient income, however, is not enough to prove one's manhood and love for his family. Working hard, putting in the overtime and achieving professional success (measured in dollars) is necessary for a man entrenched in the traditional role of good provider to maintain his status as such (Fasteau, 1974).

This is not to say that there are not other roles that men in the twentieth century have been allowed to embrace, nor that behavioral expectations do not change over time. However, it does appear that since 1950 the predominant expectation of males in the United States is that they achieve success on the job, and, that, especially before 1980, this also implied being a good provider.

For white collar working men to achieve their socially prescribed goal of professional success, they have to secure a job, keep it and continually obtain promotions in order to experience completion as a male person. In order to get the job and establish his reputation once there, the code of behavior associated with the white collar male has to be observed. He must avoid challenges to the perceptions of his masculinity. That is, he must display a set of stereotypical behaviors that will assure everyone that he is "truly a man" and worthy of trust and responsibility in the workplace. This display begins with one's physical appearance.

Clothing as Communication

A poster by the American Institute of Men's and Boy's Wear from the 1960s bore the message: "Dress right--your clothes never stop talking about you!" The poster illustrates the communicative function of clothing which exists alongside the utilitarian. Although the wearer is not always conscious of it, his garments project an image to those who see him. A complex series of messages, having as much to do with the
viewer's preconceptions as the wearer's garment choices, interacts to form an overall impression. There are, however, some universal motives in dress communication.

Wearers more or less consciously proclaim or disguise their identities, and attract or discourage erotic attention through their garment choices (Lurie, 1981). As with any form of communication, including language, the use of symbols is employed to convey meaning. The extent to which the meaning of symbols is shared determines the effectiveness of communication between individuals and members of groups (Kaiser, 1983). The shared meaning of symbols is the link between the individual and society. "Clothing symbols which are widely adopted and which tend to hold shared meanings...play a role in the interactions among individuals in society" (Kaiser, 1985, p. 125). The shared meaning of symbols in dress may be widespread, or it may be particular to discrete segments of society. Gay men, for example, sometimes employ a set of communicative devices in garment choice to communicate their sexual orientation and preferences to others in their membership group (Kaiser, 1985). A military uniform, on the other hand, indicates the position that its wearer holds in society and its symbols are understood by most persons. Various books and magazines devote sections or their entirety to instructing the reader in how to generate the desired impression among beholders through the effective use of clothing and its symbols.

Business Dress as an Equalizer

Projecting a positive image can make the individual more confident. The phrase "the tailor makes the man" is an expression of the functions of the business suit. Flugel (1929) stated that clothing could give the wearer an increased sense of power by adding to the apparent size of the
body. A suit jacket can be constructed to camouflage the particularly slight or the overweight man. The effective use of fitting and padding can make both these body types appear more like the average (Langner, 1959). In this sense, clothing is a cosmetic, providing wearers with the confidence of knowing that they look similar to others in their reference group.

The Business Suit and Group Identity

The business suit not only provides cosmetic equality to men, it also indicates them as members of a distinct group. Businessmen and other professional men, sometimes called "white collar workers," have selected the business suit to signify their social position to themselves and others. It is generally accepted that social identity is expressed in dress. "Conformity in dress is a method for seeking group membership, or for attaining the friendship and companionship of others" (Sproles, 1974, p. 142). Gurel, Wilbur and Gurel (1972) found that clothing choices were dictated to some extent by the groups to which one belongs. In their study of suburban Washington D. C. high school students, "hippie" students valued non-conformity and favored eccentric dress; "straight" collegiate students preferred traditional styles such as penny loafers and crew neck sweaters worn over sport shirts.

Observing the dress code, or the clothing norm, is an important step "in achieving and maintaining social affiliations with other group members" (Sproles, 1974, p. 142). Dress is a method for maintaining social control within the group (Sproles, 1974). The desire of a social entity to preserve itself can make it unwilling to accept emerging stylistic changes in clothing (Lind, 1974). Men in general, and businessmen in particular, aim to conform to dress standards of their class in order to belong and to preserve their social order (Hurlock,
Molloy's (1977) book, *Dress for Success*, instructs men to select clothing that will project an image of authority, reliability and efficiency. This projected image is very important in the professional realm to gain the trust of employers, clients and colleagues.

**Reference Groups**

Employers, clients and colleagues comprise a reference group for professional men. Social groups are segments of the population that are grouped together because of any number of shared characteristics. The social groups to which an individual orients himself, regardless of actual membership, are the reference groups to which the individual ascribes (Singer 1981).

Festinger (1968) suggested that human beings have a basic drive to evaluate their opinions and abilities. Reference groups serve as an evaluative device against which attitudes, values, and personal performance may be compared for their appropriateness and accuracy, and in the case of personal performance, adequacy as well (Singer, 1981). Reference groups are the groups with which an individual identifies.

According to Kelley (1968), the term reference group is used to describe several different relationships between the individual and the group with which he or she identifies. The term indicates a group with which an individual wishes to gain or maintain acceptance. The term also suggests a comparative function in that the reference group is used as a checkpoint for judging one's self and others (Kelley, 1968). Reference groups are not only used by individuals to assess behavior and attitudes, they also serve to validate the justice of social rewards. The reference group's comparative functions have been shown to be a factor in determining an individual's satisfaction with his/her status.
on the job or position in relation to the larger social structure (Patchen, 1968; Form and Geschwender, 1968). There is also a normative function in reference groups. The normative function is served by the standards that are set and enforced by the group. "A group can assume this function of norm setting and norm enforcement whenever it is in a position to deliver rewards or punishments for conformity or nonconformity" (Kelley, 1968, p. 91). This is what Singer (1980) called "referent power." Referent power determines which reference groups will be most salient for the individual.

Hartley (1968) found that male freshmen in their first semester of college (a new situation that they were trying to define) adopted fellow college students as their reference group if they perceived the norms of the new group (their fellow classmates) as consonant with their self concepts. It should be pointed out that these students were commuters at a city college and that most of the students still had ties with their friends from home; therefore, they had a social system to turn to if they rejected the norms of the college group. Freshmen who did not find the norms of the college students consonant with the norms of their friends at home, but who were dissatisfied with their old reference groups, were also likely to adopt the college peers as a reference group.

There are positive and negative reference group functions. Positive reference groups are those who have characteristics that the individual wishes to possess; negative reference groups are perceived to have undesirable characteristics (Singer, 1981). From here on, when the term reference group is used, positive reference functions only are implied. A social group, and a reference group especially, shares similar characteristics. These characteristics may include sex, economic status, religious or political orientation, and vocation. Such
characteristics and many others interact hierarchically according to value systems of the individuals and the consensus of the group to create social norms (Singer, 1981).

According to Sherif (1968), many studies by both sociologists and psychologists have shown that the "major source of an individual's weighty attitudes are the values or norms of his reference groups" (p. 87). Sherif goes on to suggest that reference groups are "the major anchorages in relation to which his experience of self identity is organized" (p. 87).

**Norms**

A set of social norms governs the style of dress. "A social norm will frequently become established when a particular style of dress is worn in the course of social interaction and is learned by many people" (Sproles, 1974, p.26). In this sense, the norm is an input from the human behavioral environment used in the generation of clothing. In the instance of business wear, the norm represents the elements of style that are currently appropriate. The norm provides a guide for clothing behavior particular to the work setting.

There, too, are norms associated with appropriate behavior as a male in society at large. Just as particular styles of dress are established as appropriate, so too particular modes of behavior are considered appropriately masculine, and as such, define male gender.

Norms are a set of beliefs and behavioral expectations that a group holds in agreement. Normative reference orientation is the primary way in which groups are formed and individuals become members of groups. A consequence of normative reference orientation is attitudinal and behavioral conformity, but normative reference orientation also functions to bring about social mobility, acculturation, and attitude
change. When an individual is referrently oriented to a group in which membership is not held, the process of "anticipatory socialization" is in effect (Singer, 1981). For those who wish to break into the professional realm, such books as Dress for Success (Molloy, 1977) offers instructions for readers actively involved in anticipatory socialization with a reference group.

Fashion

In the field of clothing and textiles, use of the word "fashion" has at times been said to be nebulous and "slippery." Fashion can mean a lot of things; without a concise context-specific definition, the term is useless. Regarding the manner of dress, Sproles (1974) analyzed fashion as object--the clothing artifact and its specific details of styling, and fashion as process--a mechanism of change through which the object emerges. Sproles suggested that the fashion process is evolutionary rather than revolutionary in nature, that new objects emerge as an outgrowth or an elaboration of previously existing objects.

Daniels' (1951) definition of fashion as "a conception of what is currently appropriate" is useful in the discussion of men's business wear. Fashion as a conception of what is currently appropriate would suggest that it is a manner of dress generally agreed upon by a group for a particular setting. In the case of businessmen, it is what will be worn to work and related activities.

Blumer (1969a) stressed the importance of fashion as a function of collective selection. He proposed a "fashion mechanism" which transforms "collective taste" as a result of "the diversity of experience that occurs in social interaction in a complex moving world" (p. 282). He suggested that it was an attempt to keep up and remain in harmony "with the movement of modern life in general" that fueled the
fashion mechanism (p. 282).

Collective Tastes

Blumer (1969a) notes that taste is an "organic sensitivity to objects of social experience" and that it has a "tri-fold character." It is (1) akin to a drive for pleasure, (2) a discriminating device that provides a foundation for acceptance or rejection, and (3) "a formative agent" directing behavior and "shaping objects to meet its demands." Although tastes are said to be seemingly subjective, they are a force that "structures activity and molds the world of experience" for individuals. Experiential in nature, tastes emerge from a condition of uncertainty or ambiguity, to one of articulate establishment; "but once formed, they may decay and disintegrate" (Blumer, 1969a, p. 284).

Blumer (1969a) proposed that tastes are formed during social interaction according to the "definitions and affirmations given by others." Individuals who share a social setting and similar experiences are likely to share tastes. "The fashion process involves both a formation and an expression of collective taste in the given area of fashion" (p. 284).

Style

Regarding clothing fashion as a process, Kroeber (1957) says that fashion "is in a constant state of seemingly aimless vibrancy and shift" (p. 9). Novelty, the fleeting fancy of the moment, is a distinctive element in fashion. "Fashion must not cease changing" (Kroeber, 1951, p. 9). Fabric choices, trims and superficial details like cuffs change from season to season and are part of a fashion process in and of themselves. But the overall silhouette, or the "superstructure" of a garment is what we mean when we are discussing fashion change in the
clothing style. The features that delineate the style of a garment are elements slower to change, more regular in their evolutionary process (Sproles, 1974). The shape, line, silhouette and proportions of a garment are manifest in the stylistic expression evident in the components of a garment's structure. For example, in a jacket belonging to a business suit, the stylistic expression is evident in the shape and width of the lapels, shoulder breadth, the closeness of fit to torso, and the length of the jacket. The shapes delineated by the outer edges of the garment's structural components illustrate style. For this research, fashion change will be defined as changes in the stylistic expression evident in a garment's structural components.

Kroeber (1957) referred to proportion and silhouette as elements of style, to be distinguished from superficial garment details which he called fashion (p. 9). In his book Style and Civilizations, Kroeber presented the word style in its historical context; derived from the word "stylus," a "pointed rod used for writing," style originally referred to the characteristic, idiosyncratic writing pattern of an individual (p. 13). However, in contemporary history and criticism, style also carries a social denotation. Considering style as a form of social expression, it can be related to Blumer's (1969a) discussion on collective tastes. In the examination of fashion as what is currently appropriate (Daniels 1951), the elements of style are a social indicator of current agreement.

Fashion has been approached as a mechanism of change which produces outputs or "fashion objects." The human ecosystem model would suggest that the fashion process is a series of transformations and that fashion objects are outputs. Clothing, as a fashion object, contains characteristic structural components that emerge from the dictates of collective taste. In this sense, collective taste determines what is
currently acceptable or appropriate. Therefore, currently acceptable styles of dress are a social product.

Fashion Change

Fashion change is for the most part evolutionary. It is represented by objects that emerge as an outgrowth of, or an elaboration on, previously existing ones. Fashion change is integral to the fashion process.

Veblen (1899), in his book Theory of the Leisure Class, attributed fashion change to the desire of individuals to have an arena in which to competitively display conspicuous consumption, and thus indicate their relative prestige and status.

Simmel (1957) maintained that fashion operated in a "trickle down" manner which is characterized by the rich upper classes adopting new styles to differentiate themselves from the rest of society. In this way, he claimed that the aristocracy were visually displaying their rank and prestige by being dressed in clothes that are absolutely up to the moment. He claimed that no sooner is a new style established by the aristocracy, than it is copied by the lower classes who wish to emulate the aristocracy. The fashion process is proclaimed an attempt on the part of the aristocracy to attain a precariously temporary exclusivity in dress that is established and then, out of necessity, dismantled as people of lower status appear in similar styles, thus diminishing the distinction of appearance that the aristocracy were compelled to cultivate.

Kaiser (1985) concedes that the trickle down process does explain some areas of fashion adoption (like the fad for veiled hats patterned after those worn by Princess Diana of the United Kingdom, or the adoption of polo shirts by people of social statuses that would not
suggest a familiarity with the sport). However, she contends that there
is more going on than merely a trickle down process. In the United
States today, the diffusion process is extremely rapid due to efficient
channels of communication. The mass media disseminate information about
fashion innovations to all social strata simultaneously, which
instigates the evaluation process involving the new styles in each group
at the same time instead of the elite first and then the lower strata.

Perhaps in Veblen's time the trickle down theories of fashion
adoption/change pertained because the efficiency of technology and
communications was such that it was feasible for the upper class to
differentiate itself and maintain a temporal advantage in adopting new
styles. However, in the late twentieth century, one must examine
specific contexts to explain fashion adoption and change. There is a
fashion elite in the sense that stylistic innovations are sometimes made
available first at higher price points, but there is theoretically no
fashion elite when it comes to fashion awareness, a crucial element of
the adoption/diffusion (change) mechanism.

Style and Fashion in Summary

Clothing is a fashion object that results from the transformation
processes in its fashion mechanism. The fashion mechanism brings about
fashion change by producing clothing outputs that are fundamentally
different in their structural components from what was previously
acceptable. The structural components of a garment are changed by
variation of stylistic expression manifest in shape, line and
proportion. To witness fashion change in dress, one looks at the
changes in stylistic expression apparent in the structural components of
the garment.

Fashion as a conception of what is currently acceptable (Daniels
1951) implies that there is some sort of consensus or manifestation of collective tastes; Blumer (1969) states this claim outright. Kroeber (1957) says that style, a mark of one's individuality in expression, also marks the stylistic expression in social products thus reflecting the society from which they emerge. Changes in fashion are the changes in the stylistic expression of what is considered acceptable. Fashion as a social product is, therefore, marked by a stylistic expression that is particular to the society from which it emerged.

Social Forces in Fashion

The man's business suit must be recognized as a consumer offering in order to fully comprehend the power of social forces on the stylistic elements that the garments will possess. A consumer's decision making process regarding dress is powerfully controlled by his immediate social environment.

The social setting and its norms, however, are not immune to change. Although the stylistic elements currently appropriate and evident in the structural components of business wear comprise a norm, fashion can change in response to other social forces. As the result of transformation processes by which resources and information are synthesized in response to social forces, fashion reflects social change. Social change is "the process through which the structure and function of a social system is modified" (Sproles, 1974, p. 55). The political, ideological and technological advances (or merely changes) of society at large may be reflected in the fashion object. The fashion object is offered to society, or to specific social groups called target markets, for acceptance. Target markets are groups of people who share "clusters of complementary wants" (Hayakawa and Venieris, 1977 p. 593). There is no guarantee that the object offered will be generally
accepted. In examining the social forces on fashion it is difficult to discuss the social influences on fashion without acknowledging the influence of social forces on the individual.

The Role of the Individual and His Reference Group in the Fashion Process

The individual consumer who wears a men's business suit is either a member of, or somehow identifies with, the group of men known as white collar workers. As an individual, the consumer interacts with others. The individual's professional reference group is a remarkably powerful element in the consumer decision making process. "As individualistic as the economic actor may be, he nevertheless occupies a certain place in the social system. He is continuously under social pressure to behave in accordance with a complex system of reciprocal role expectations and obligations and he is subject to social sanctions" (Hayakawa and Venieris, 1977, p. 601).

Symbolic Interactionism

Symbolic interactionism is a useful framework for explaining how attitudes, expectations, identity and social structures are created, maintained or modified. Basic to symbolic interactionism is that all objects, social, physical or abstract, are constructed in the sense that their definitions emerge as individuals interact with each other, or with their internal selves, and exchange information.

Blumer (1969b) notes three basic premises to the fundamental understanding of symbolic interactionism. First, "human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have for them." These "things" may be objects, places, humans, behaviors or ideas, for example. Second, "the meaning of such things is derived from
or arises out of the social interaction that one has with others." Third, meanings are "handled" and possibly altered in a process of interpretation that occurs when the individual tries to make sense of what he or she encounters (Blumer, 1969b, p. 2). Meaning is seen as emerging from the exchange of information in the process of social interaction; thus meanings are said to be social products, "creations that are formed in and through the defining activities of people as they interact" (p. 4).

The nature of these "defining activities" is in part determined by an interpretation process in which an individual "communicates with himself" to establish the meanings that will result from the interaction. In this process of self communication meanings are assigned. The individual "selects, checks, suspends, regroups, and transforms meanings in the light of the situation in which he is placed and the direction of his action" (Blumer, 1969b, p. 5).

Meanings are the determinants of subsequent action toward the objects with which an individual is interacting. Action is manifest in the behavior of individuals as they confront the situations that elicit their response (Blumer, 1969b).

Symbolic interactionism contends that the self and the social structure are composed of "objects" and that these objects are the product of symbolic interaction (Blumer, 1969b). That is, the meanings and definitions that form the self, the social structure and other material, social or abstract objects, are the result of social intercourse (Blumer, 1969b).

Reciprocity of Individual and Society

For an understanding of the power that prevailing social structures have on the individual, it is useful to recognize the relationship
between the two. George Herbert Mead emphasized the social world as a factor contributing to the emergence of the individual (Stryker, 1981, p. 7). The social-psychological perspectives of symbolic interactionism claim that there is no self without society, and suggest that there is a reciprocal relationship between the individual and society in their creation of themselves and each other. Stryker’s (1980) “generalized statement of one version of Symbolic Interactionism” (below) emphasizes the reciprocity of the person and social structure, though the description “arbitrarily begins with the impact of society” on the individual (as cited in Stryker, 1981, p. 17).

1. Behavior is dependent upon a named or classified world. The names or class terms attached to aspects of the environment, both physical and social, carry meaning in the form of shared behavioral expectations that grow out of social interaction. From interaction with others, one learns how to classify objects one comes into contact with and in that process also learns how one is expected to behave with reference to those objects.

2. Among the class terms learned in interaction are the symbols that are used to designate ‘positions’, which are the relatively stable, morphological components of social structure. It is these positions which carry the shared behavioral expectations that are conventionally labelled “roles.”

3. Persons who act in the context of organized patterns of behavior, i.e., in the context of social structure, name one another in the sense of recognizing one another as occupants of positions. When they name one another they invoke expectations with regard to each others’ behavior.

4. Persons acting in the context of organized behavior apply names to themselves as well. These reflexively applied positional designations, which become part of the “self,” create internalized expectations regarding their own behavior.

5. When entering interactive situations, persons define the situation by applying names to it, to the other participants in the interaction, to themselves and to particular features of the situation and use the resulting definitions to organize their own behavior in the situation.
6. Social behavior is not, however, given by these
definitions, though early definitions may constrain
the possibilities for alternative definitions to
emerge from interaction. Behavior is the product of
a role-making process, initiated by expectations
invoked in the process of defining situations by
developing through a tentative, sometimes extremely
subtle, probing interchange among actors that can
reshape the form and content of interaction.

7. The degree to which roles are "made" rather than
"played," as well as the constituent elements entering
the constructions of roles will depend on the larger
social structures in which interactive situations are
embedded. Some structures are "open," others
relatively "closed" with respect to novelty in roles
and in role enactments or performances. All
structures impose some limits on the kinds of
definitions which may be called into play and thus the
possibilities for interaction.

8. To the degree that roles are made rather than only
played as given changes in the character of
definitions, the names and the class terms utilized in
those definitions, in the possibilities for
interaction can occur; and such changes can in turn
lead to changes in the larger social structures within
which interactions take place (Stryker, 1980 p. 170,

Stryker proposes that there is interaction between individuals
communicating with themselves and with each other, while being
influenced by the larger social structure as they assign meaning to the
objects and situations they confront. Symbolic interactionism is
"hyper-cognitive" in that it emphasizes a rational human, actively
aware, knowing and making judgments to explain social interaction and
the emergence of norms and the social structure. It does claim,
however, that the more often certain meanings are assigned to objects,
the less likely these objects are to change in their meanings. In this
way, behavioral expectations and social structures become rigid as
patterns of interaction are reinforced by repetition to the point that
definitions become internalized and to some extent subconscious. It
should be stated at this point that not only behavioral expectations
regarding dress but definitions of appropriate masculine behavior or indeed, what the essence of masculinity is, can be negotiated in social exchanges. To synthesize symbolic interactionism with the human ecosystem model, one could view the currently accepted meaning of masculinity as an input that is maintained or modified in the transformations that take place as individuals exchange information.

In applying the symbolic interactionist framework to an individual consumer's potential purchase of a man's business suit, we recognize the white collar workers to be members of a social structure and the workplace to be the context for interaction. According to Kaiser (1983), clothing functions within symbolic interaction to negotiate identities and to define situations. The workplace has a cluster of shared behavioral expectations for its white collar workers, expectations which constantly emerge in the course of the workers' interaction. These behavioral expectations are the components of the role one assumes as a white collar worker. The business suit has emerged as a behavioral expectation for white collar workers. It is an integral element of the role-taking, making and playing processes of interaction. The writer proposes that the specific stylistic expression manifest in men's business suits, that is consensually deemed appropriate, is maintained or modified in the course of interaction.

Stryker's description of symbolic interaction also recognizes the influence of larger social structures "in which interactive situations are embedded" (p. 17). Thus, there is an hierarchy of reciprocal influence that colors any interaction. There are simultaneous interactions involving society at large, the smaller immediate social groupings and individuals. This hierarchical interaction, reciprocal in nature, plays a key role in the consumer decision making process by coloring the perceptions that lead to the ultimate adoption or rejection
of the fashion object and its stylistic elements.

Consumer Decision-making Process

Adoption/Diffusion

Diffusion Theory

The process by which the acceptance of newly styled garments or of any novel idea called an innovation is spread has been given considerable attention by Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) in their book Communication of Innovations. They define an innovation as an object or idea perceived as new by the individual. Barnett (1953) stated that any innovation is new because it is qualitatively different from existing forms (cited in Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971).

The "crucial elements in the diffusion of new ideas are (1) the innovation, (2) which is communicated through certain channels, (3) over time, (4) among members of a social system" (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971, p. 18). Diffusion research has been done to determine which communication channels were the most influential in persuading individuals to at least try an innovation. Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) cite the early work of Ryan and Gross which indicated that fellow farmers were more influential than salespeople in convincing farmers to adopt hybrid corn seed; their peer group was the most influential channel of communication. Ryan and Gross were the first researchers to propose that individuals go through distinct mental processes in the adoption or rejection of an innovation (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971).

Certain characteristics that innovations possess will determine their adoption or rejection, and the relative speed with which these outcomes will occur. The characteristics are:

1. relative advantage, the degree to which an innovation is perceived as better than the idea it supersedes.
2. **compatibility**, the degree to which an innovation is perceived as consistent with the existing values, past experiences and needs of the receiver.

3. **complexity**, the degree to which an innovation is perceived as difficult to understand or use.

4. **trialibility**, the degree to which an innovation may be experimented with on a limited basis.

5. **observability**, the degree to which the results of an innovation are visible to others (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971, pp. 22-23).

   Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) proposed a paradigm of the innovation-decision process in which there are four stages:

   1. **knowledge**—individual becomes aware of the object’s existence;
   2. **persuasion**—positive or negative opinions are formed by the individual;
   3. **decision**—processes are carried out that will lead to individual adoption or rejection of innovation; and
   4. **confirmation**—the "individual seeks reinforcement for the innovation-decision he has made" (p. 10). Once a fashion object is recognized as innovative, that is, there is awareness of the object and it is considered "new," individuals collectively engage in an ongoing evaluative process that will determine the adoption, rate of diffusion, rejection or obsolescence of the style over its life course.

   The term "fashion object," in the context of this research, refers to clothing. The functions of clothing, whether social, economic or utilitarian, are integral to the adoption or rejection of stylistic innovation in dress, and therefore hold sovereignty over fashion change.

   The adoption of new fashion objects involves an evaluation process which is easily placed into a symbolic interactionist framework. As symbolic interactionism posits, individuals are continually in the process of exchanging information, both verbal and non-verbal. This
information is processed and evaluated, almost unconsciously, to give meaning to the information exchanged. Through this exchange, norms, attitudes and, subsequently, roles emerge. In this way, opinions and expectations about the stylistic elements of a garment are formed. It is in this way too that new concepts of masculinity are constructed. In this respect, the stylistic elements of the man's business suit and displays of masculine behavior "stand trial" each time they are perceived by white collar workers.

The behavioral expectations that become associated with particular settings are the norms that dictate appropriate conduct in those settings. The more structured interaction becomes, the less likely role making occurs (Stryker, 1981), but even the most rigidly prescribed behaviors (such as those encompassed by masculinity) may change over time as the attitudes of individuals and society change. For the attitudes and expectations regarding the stylistic elements expressed in men's business dress to change, the stylistic innovation must be easily observed. Rogers (1971) suggests that new fashions (those containing stylistic innovations) are highly visible (cited in Sproles, 1974, p. 102) and, with this prerequisite in place, the evaluation of a stylistic innovation may begin.

**Evaluation**

Whether the stylistic innovation appears in the form of a printed advertisement, an actual consumer offering, or in a suit being worn by another, this information (the stylistic elements apparent) is assessed by the perceiver. The perceiver will compare the stylistic elements apparent in the fashion object to those he is already familiar with to determine their similarities and differences from what is currently acceptable. He will also put himself in the place of others in his
reference group to view the evident stylistic elements through the eyes of a "generalized other" to evaluate the acceptability of such stylistic elements to himself and his reference group.

If the evaluator grants the stylistic manifestation a favorable assessment, deeming it appropriate and acceptable, he might be inclined to purchase a similar suit, compliment others who wear such a suit, or discuss the stylistic expression evident in the innovation favorably with others. Conversely, if a negative assessment is arrived at by the perceiver, a link in the diffusion chain is removed, and the potential for "bad publicity" regarding the innovation exists which might prevent others from adopting the new style. In such a manner, the information becomes available that will encourage or discourage others in a reference group/market segment to adopt the innovative style. From a symbolic interactionist standpoint, the clothing norm and its stylistic expression are modified or maintained in the course of interaction. This is achieved as individuals "take account of each others' ongoing acts" and judge the fitness of norms, values and group prescriptions for the situation being formed" (Blumer, 1969b, p. 66). If the stylistic innovation is rejected, then the present norm is reaffirmed in the exchange of information.

It is also during the exchange of information that previously acceptable stylistic expressions become obsolete as new styles emerge. The early adopters of a stylistic innovation may be negatively reinforced for wearing a style so novel that it is incompatible with the styles considered appropriate in their group. This is a fairly infrequent occurrence, since the relative expense of a business suit prevents most men from taking too large a risk in purchasing a suit. Winakor, Canton and Wolins (1980) provided research findings that suggest that perceived fashion risk is embedded in other experiences.
related to social, psychological and economic risks, and in the uncertainty an individual experiences when faced with a consumer decision. The risks associated with an unproven style, both economic and social, compel most men to purchase suits they are fairly confident will be acceptable. This may be part of the reason that stylistic change is claimed to be evolutionary rather than revolutionary (Kroeber, 1957). Rogers and Shoemaker's (1971) concept of trialibility suggests that the lower the risk of expense or difference from current fashions, the more likely the consumer is to take a chance on a new style. The more that they take a chance, the more visible and, in turn, acceptable the style will become to the public at large as they become familiar with the innovation (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971).

Summary of Individual's Role in Fashion Process

To summarize the role of the individual in the fashion process, the individual acts as an independent agent, a prospective purchaser and user of goods. As a prospective purchaser, the individual goes through a decision making process in which the new consumer offering is evaluated to determine its acceptability as a solution to clothing needs. For the white collar working male, he would decide whether or not a stylistic innovation would be appropriate, judging from information that is available to him in the course of social interaction. Social norms, role expectations, the approval of his reference group, and the compatibility of the innovation with his self concept will be considered in the process of evaluating the innovation. The adoption or rejection of a stylistic innovation is contingent on how favorably it passes through the evaluation process. The evaluation process occurs when the individual is confronted with an object that he might buy in a store, is being worn by another in his group, or is in an
advertisement. In this way, the white collar working male is an active agent in the determination of stylistic elements currently acceptable in business wear. Granted, the individual is subject to the social structure of his reference group and society at large, and this will color his decision. It is recognized, however, that society and social groups consist of individuals who either maintain or modify expectations in the course of their interactions. Therefore, the simultaneous influence of the individual on society and of society on the individual is reciprocal and shapes the expectations that emerge from repeated social exchange between individuals and groups of individuals. These behavioral expectations emerge from the same processes of symbolic interaction that define any other objects for the individual. These expectations, as in the case of the men's business suit and its particular stylistic expression, are most salient in the individual's evaluation process, and in turn, his consumer decision making process concerning appropriate dress. It seems obvious to point out that individual consumers' adoption or rejection of a consumer offering will collectively determine whether or not the stylistic expression embodied by current offerings will persist.

When a stylistic innovation is introduced, it is the potential acceptance of the innovation, i.e., the apparel manufacturer's perception of the white collar working males' receptivity to the stylistic change, that drives the fashion process.

Role of the Fashion Industry

The fashion industry provides a body of goods beyond what is needed in a utilitarian sense; thus, what is no longer fashionable can be discarded. This body of goods is offered to a group of consumers willing and financially able to purchase fashionable or potentially
fashionable objects (Tind, 1974). The financial success of the industry depends on its ability to provide choices which are acceptable. The fashion process is a response not only to social change, but to the demands of the market. The industry exerts considerable control over fashion objects offered to consumers, deciding what new styles and current fashions will be made available. However, these decisions are based on the predicted profitability of the objects. Therefore, the consumers’ potential choices drive the fashion industry (Sproles, 1974).

Sproles (1974) suggested that designers and marketers who sponsor stylistic innovations were "change agents." The designer of clothing is clearly a style innovator, but (s)he must be concerned with the consumer who may be motivated more by social acceptance than by fashion innovation (Kroeber, 1957). The consumer, functioning within a social framework, is subject to norms. If any change in fashion is to occur, the social norms must favor innovative behavior (Sproles, 1974). The fashion industry is continually challenged to present acceptable innovations.

Advertising

The presentation of new styles is achieved predominantly by way of advertising. For this research advertising is defined as visual representation that is designed to promote a consumer offering. These promotions may be sponsored by those trying to sell suits either at the wholesale or retail level, or the promotion may occur in the editorial spread of some publication's fashion coverage—a sort of "free advertisement" courtesy of the publication. Advertising occurs in the mass media and in the stores where goods are being sold. This research is concerned primarily with printed advertisements that are present in popular publications other than sales catalogs and circulars.
Advertisements have the apparent function of trying to sell us things. To do this, the concern is not only to represent the innate characteristics of the consumer offering, but how, as well, this offering can be made meaningful to the target market (Williams, 1978). The general approach in contemporary advertising is to appeal to our sense of self (Williams, 1978). That is, if you own this product, you will certainly possess these personal attributes. This equation between the product and the consumer is a compelling message that can extend beyond the product and the consumer. It can be powerful enough in imagery to reshape the expectations that consumers have of themselves and the expectations that others have of them. Failure to comply with these images of ideal appearance will diminish our self appraisal and the perception others have of us. Likewise, we think less of others who fail to meet these established criteria that are reinforced, or sometimes, even created in advertising.

**Masculine Images**

Both the visual and textual representations of men in advertising, which allude to qualities that men might or should possess, are masculine images. These images sell a product, but they also suggest, or sell if you will, conceptions of masculinity. In and of itself, the depiction of a man in a business suit is a cogent image of "manliness" due to images of masculinity it conjures. When combined with text or a specific setting and other visual props, or any teaming of these components, the resultant message can render a poignant imperative that may not necessarily sell a product, but will be likely to sell the concept of masculinity.

The examination of content in advertising that sells men's business suits directly, and the way that men are represented in other
advertising (very often clad in business suits) can provide some insight as to the established concepts of masculinity and how their definitions have changed over time.

Pertinent Areas of Previous Investigation

Anthropologist A. L. Kroeber was perhaps the first researcher to examine the connection between stylistic change and social change. Kroeber, in his study published in 1919, measured several attributes of style and silhouette in women’s full evening dress for the period 1844-1919. His source of data was fashion illustrations. The width of the skirt at its hem, the length of the skirt, the location and width of the waist, and the shoulder width of the garment at its decolletage were all measured in proportion to the body height, and the measurements were averaged and plotted on graphs to illustrate the cyclical nature of fashion and Kroeber’s concept of periodicity (as cited by Weedon, 1977).

Weeden (1977) indicates that she brought Kroeber’s study “up to date” (p.9) by measuring day dresses as depicted in The New York Times, 1920-1976. She adopted Kroeber’s methods and framework. However, she did not measure full evening dress as Kroeber had, and, for this reason, the study did not actually update the work of Kroeber.

A shortcoming in the work of both Kroeber and Weedon was their failure to acknowledge the inaccuracy of fashion illustrations to represent a true human body. Artistic renderings of the body often distort the human figure by elongation. The degree of distortion can vary from illustration to illustration and from period to period. Weedon used both photographs and illustrations in her study. There was no allowance made for the variations in proportion due to the interpretation of the artists in illustrations. As well, there is an element of distortion in the production of photographs depending on the
an. Therefore, Kroeber's and Weeden's method of measurement is flawed, and the interpretation of their findings is threatened. Both studies illustrated the cyclical nature of stylistic change and paired certain variables, such as skirt length with historical events, but not in great detail.

Bellev (1987) acknowledged the "stylistic differences in proportion created by illustrators," and therefore, selected a "category rather than a measurement approach" for assessing design characteristics. She employed methods of cross tabulation and time series line graphs to illustrate the prevalence of certain stylistic manifestations and their longevity. In this process she illustrated cyclical movement in some garment components.

Since Kroeber's time, a "technique was developed in the social sciences for converting verbal and non-verbal communications into quantitative data" (Paoletti, 1982, p.14). This technique of content analysis is especially useful for instances in which the researcher employs documentary evidence as the primary source of data (Paoletti, 1982). Content analysis involves the controlled observation and systematic counting of a symbol's or trait's frequency of occurrence (Holsti, 1969, as cited in Turnbaugh 1977). For the costume historian assessing an illustration, the "characteristics evident" (Paoletti et. al., 1987) may be the non-verbal communication that is converted to quantitative data. The conversion to quantitative data may simply mean indicating the rate of a characteristic's appearance. The process involves the formation of hypotheses or objectives, identifying relevant variables, and the sampling of sources to develop a satisfactory instrument. One must define the instrument categories and determine the level of quantification, then translate the evident characteristics into quantitative data. Content analysis is used to examine clothing
artifacts represented in illustrations by categorizing findings and, thus, facilitates analysis (Paoletti, 1982).

Paoletti has employed the method of content analysis in at least two studies: one involving both written communication and cartoon illustrations (Paoletti, 1981), and men’s jacket styles from 1919 to 1944 was explored using Sears Catalog for the period and comparing the catalog findings to extant garments housed in the Smithsonian Institution (Paoletti et al., 1987). In the 1987 content analysis research, a questionnaire-like device was used as a sort of checklist for nominally assessing the characteristics evident in the structural components of men’s suit jackets.

Turnbaugh (1977) combined the technique of content analysis with a "seriational technique" to investigate stylistic change in women’s headdress for the period 1830-1898 using Godey's Lady’s Book and Magazine. She was concerned with a method for measuring stylistic change. "Seriation is the chronological ordering of frequency and life span of a specific trait or object" (Turnbaugh, 1979, p. 243). Thus the information gathered in content analysis is "ordered for temporal analysis and interpretation" (Turnbaugh, 1979, p. 243).

F orementioned studies have tried to measure stylistic change, and it is notable that Paoletti and Kroöber have tried to lend some cultural interpretation to their historical findings. However, this integrative approach has not been extensively employed by researchers (Pedersen, 1988). It has also been pointed out by Paoletti (1987) that much less work has been done in the area of men’s historic costume than in that of women's historic costume. No previous research is known that employs social psychological concepts to place clothing artifacts in their environment of origin, that is, a context for understanding the garment
in its "social milieu" (Pedersen 1988).

Chapter Summary

Clothing is a part of the human constructed environment, a component of the human ecosystem model. As such it is subject to transformation processes that synthesize material resources and information to produce the output—a clothing artifact. Clothing serves to protect the individual from the social and physical environments, and is a manifestation of many social processes as well.

Display is a social function that indicates an individual's alignment or inclination to act in a particular setting without having to perform the act or acts that the display indicates. Displays include overt behaviors such as the manner of dress. It is through such display that sex type is indicated. The display of behaviors and appearances associated with sex type is called gender. Gender is a term that encompasses all the displays that are attributed to one sex or the other. Polar in nature, gender usually assigns one set of characteristics a masculine attribution and the opposites of these characteristics a feminine attribution.

Masculinity has generally been represented by characteristics of assertiveness, rationality and self-reliance. Men wishing to become white collar workers have to display not only their masculinity, but their other similarities to the group of men called white collar working men by appearing like unto them in dress and deed. This is necessary to establish the trust of those with whom one works.

Clothing is a form of communication used to project a personal image, generating a desired impression among beholders. White collar working men as a distinct social group have chosen the business suit to identify themselves to each other and to the rest of society. White
collar working men conform in dress to belong and to preserve social order in their group. The prevailing fashion of this group is a social norm prescribing appropriate dress.

The stylistic expression apparent in the business suit and its individual garments defines fashion change. The fashion process, in response to social forces, is the mechanism which imparts the elements of style to the fashion object and offers it to the consumer. Stylistic expression is apparent in the silhouette, and the overall proportions of a garment or ensemble. This changes slowly over time unless some upheaval occurs. It is not to be confused with the seasonal changes in fabric choice, and the presence or absence of superficial details which can vary dramatically from season to season.

The social forces that influence stylistic innovation and acceptance are the changes that come from society at large, the response of the fashion process to social change, the industry perceiving the demand of its market, and the consumer's willingness to accept stylistic innovation. Specifically, white collar males are a market segment who share clothing needs relevant to the workplace. Because of this, and many other shared characteristics, white collar males comprise a reference group for each other and for those who wish to become white collar workers. The behavioral expectations or norms concerning dress are constructed in the course of social interaction. These expectations may be maintained, modified or completely rejected as individuals respond to social cues during the exchange of information (both verbal and non-verbal) with others. In keeping with symbolic interactionism, not only behavioral expectations, but the social structure, the self and all other "objects" including gender are constructed as a result of the meaning that is shared by individuals as they interact.

Individual actors in their immediate social structure (the
workplace for white collar workers), and society at large respond to the behavioral expectations that the immediate and the larger social structures impose. However the individual's interpretation of behavioral expectations, both in understanding and conformity, can result in an eventual modification of expectations as members of the social structure become familiar with the "new" interpretation. This basic tenet of symbolic interactionism is also a concept integral to the theories of fashion adoption/diffusion. When an individual consumer is involved in the consumer decision making process concerning dress, the expectations that already exist are compelling factors in determining what attitudes emerge about the new object.

Apparel manufacturers wish to generate a profit by accurately ascertaining the demands of white collar working men regarding business dress. Periodically, the stylistic elements acceptable to most wearers of business suits are altered in response to societal changes, or out of the desire to create need for a new product on the part of the manufacturers, to thus enjoy the economic advantage of a successful stylistic innovation by differentiating their product in a highly substitutable product category.

Differentiation of products not only occurs as a result of stylistic innovation but also as a result of advertising. Advertising, the promotion of a consumer offering to the target market, employs tactics that suggest to the consumer who he or she is as much as it illustrates the inherent characteristics of the consumer offering in question. This is achieved by telling the consumer why (s)he personally wants or needs the product (which has as much to do with his/her qualities as it does with those of the product being offered). To sell suits, very often appeals are made to the masculinity of the white collar working man. As well, in advertising other than for business
suits, the depiction of men and their relationships to others and the environment suggests something about the current masculine roles.

In sum, white collar workers tell each other what is appropriate to wear. They respond to themselves and to the larger social structure. Reciprocally, they impact the larger social structure as individuals and as a group. Apparel manufacturers respond to what white collar workers deem appropriate when imparting the stylistic elements to the business suits they will offer. In this sense, they are being told what to do by consumers; however, manufacturers sometimes tell consumers what they should want or even who they should be via the subtle suggestion of advertising. Most likely, there is some sort of dialogue of the consumer with his reference group (the market segment) and the manufacturer. There is also a simultaneously occurring interaction between these aforementioned elements with the larger social structure. This impacts individuals, who are the agents of communication. These agents will exchange the information necessary to shape expectations, and in turn generate the fashion object—a man’s business suit.

Previous work in historic costume has attempted to illustrate stylistic change by measuring variations in stylistic elements over time and plotting frequencies of these particular garment attributes in chronological order. These methods employ content analysis to recognize and record the frequency of occurrence for particular stylistic elements. When this information is placed in a chronological format, it is called seriation. These methods are useful for the analysis and interpretation of findings. In the analysis and interpretation of findings, placing them in an historical/social context leads to further understanding of the garment as the product of its contemporary environment. In examining this contemporary environment, it is helpful to consider the social processes that generate the social structures in
which they are embedded, and how these processes influence the production of the clothing artifact.
III. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Purpose

The purpose of this research was to establish the nature of the relationship between the stylistic changes in men's business suits and the masculine roles as represented in advertising imagery in the United States from 1950 through 1988.

Objectives

1. To seriate the stylistic elements manifest in the structural components of business suits offered, and determine mode frequencies of variation in the individual elements, so as to follow stylistic trends over the period.

2. To seriate the biennial modal frequencies of stylistic elements manifest in the structural components observed.

3. To determine the classic appearance for the white collar working man's suit in this half of the twentieth century in order to provide a prototype against which to compare fashion offerings across the period.

4. To determine the modal appearance for the men's business suit in each decade for the period of investigation in order to facilitate comparisons to the classic suit and between decades.

5. To compare stylistic changes in men's business suits from 1950 through 1988 with the prototype to see to what degree modal offerings vary by decade from the prototype.

6. To draw the relationship between changes in masculine roles represented in advertising and fashion change evident in men's business suits during the period.

Research Hypotheses

1. The business suit and its stylistic elements deviated stylistically from the classic appearance during the late 1960s and early 1970s.

2. Concepts of masculinity changed in the late 1960s and early 1970s relative to the concepts held in the 1950s.

3. The classic stylistic elements of the business suit evident in the determined prototype returned in the 1980s during the neo-conservative social trend of the Reagan Era.
Rationale: The question is "what are the evident relationships," not if there is any relationship. In testing the hypotheses, the researcher will be determining the nature of the relationship of masculine roles and images to stylistic change in this period.

Assumptions

1. A relationship does exist between stylistic change in apparel and social change.
2. The images of men in advertising represent pervading masculine roles.
3. Changes in masculine roles are a manifestation of social change.
4. The business suits offered in the printed media reflect the fashion process.
5. The measures of stylistic expression which are used provide accurate, discriminating observations of the men's business suit.
6. The prototypes as determined by this research represent classic styling.

Limitations

1. The availability of data in popular publications from the period limited the extent to which the findings were generalizable. There may be years in which the true fashion movement was not depicted in the limited selection of visual imagery.
2. The extent to which fashion change was merely an attempt to move merchandise by imposing an accelerated temporal frame to clothing style, out-moding previous fashions so that men will be compelled to buy new suits, was open to question. It was hard to judge from style offerings what is clearly a reflection of social force outside the fashion industry.
3. The descriptions of men from each decade, representing contemporary masculine roles are archetypical, idealized and iconic; the characteristics embodied therein were not necessarily manifest in all men.
4. Careful, objective examination of the data, keeping the findings as free of personal bias as possible was the responsibility of the researcher, and was necessary for the findings of the study to have any reliability.
5. The New York Times was not printed in September of 1978 due to a printers strike. Therefore, the findings from this source for 1978 were limited in quantity to what was found in March.
Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework in this research represents the synthesis of concepts and principles underlying the human ecology framework, symbolic interactionism, and diffusion theory with the theory of fashion change to explain stylistic change in men's business suits and masculine roles. The existence of an identifiable fashion implies that a consensus has been reached as to what is currently acceptable. Fashion change occurs when the expectations about the fashion object are altered in the course of social exchange. In addition to changing the form and content of dress, an hierarchy of interactions occurs in the fashion process, indicating changes in society as well.

The men's business suit—an ensemble composed of a jacket and pants cut from the same cloth, and the stylistic elements expressed in its structural components—are a set of behavioral expectations that change over time as any other behavioral expectations can be transformed as times and people change. The business suit reflects changes in the larger social structure, just as changes in masculine roles indicate changes in the larger social structure. Figure 2 is a schematic showing interactions among the actors and some of the institutions involved in the fashion process and other social processes. Its purpose is to ground the following discussion and indicate the direction of the interactions that take place.

Apparel manufacturers (at left in Figure 2) receive cues from society at large, including their target market (white collar workers), which are used as they attempt to accurately meet the demands of consumers. Recognizing the influence that society has on immediate social structures and the individual, apparel manufacturers use their perceptions of the social climate to gauge their consumer offerings to their target market. Apparel manufacturers synthesize information about
Figure 2.

Theoretical Model--Interactions Among Transformation Agents
society and the target market with material resources to produce the consumer offering. The material resources necessary to produce clothing outputs come from investments and from financial returns--one outcome of a successful selling season. The ability to provide acceptable suits is necessary, but alone, might not be enough to sell through, and thus insure financial success.

Men's business suits are characterized by sameness during any one period and thus high substitutability within the product class. Therefore, manufacturers often must seek means to differentiate their product from others that might be equally acceptable. Differentiation may occur by means of advertising or by offering a suit embodying stylistic innovation (center of Figure 2). Either way, a message has to be sent to the consumer that reflects the social climate and appeals to his sense of self. In advertising, a message can be sent to the consumer that appeals so strongly to his sensibilities that it can successfully differentiate the represented product and thus increase its desirability. In the sense that advertising attempts to portray the product in an appealing manner, it stands to reason that the depiction of men in advertising represents popular conceptions of masculinity. Definitions of masculinity, like other social products, are the result of transformation processes that alter their form and content over time.

Individual consumers (at center right, Figure 2) constantly evaluate stylistic elements apparent in the business suits they see to determine their acceptability. Fashionable suits are those which have successfully passed through current evaluation and which have received favorable attributions. The assignment of attributions, favorable or not, is determined by meanings derived from the information exchanged about suits that is processed internally. The extent to which the meanings are shared is indicated in consensus. The decisions that white
collar working men make concerning dress are influenced heavily by the expectations that they perceive within their reference group (upper right, Figure 2). The risk involved in purchasing untried fashions results partially from the reluctance to appear different from one’s presumed peers. The approval which a white collar working man gains from dressing appropriately can generate an outcome (bottom center, Figure 2) of satisfaction for both himself and those granting approval. An appropriate display also evokes the outcome of recognition and facilitates efficient communication.

Social processes in which information is exchanged to arrive at shared meanings occur at every level of the social structure. As indicated by two way arrows in Figure 2, a reciprocal interaction occurs between the individual and the social structure in which he or she is functioning. The symbolic interaction, between individuals and between individuals and social structures, is the transformation process in which situations and objects are defined. The adoption or rejection of a stylistic innovation (lower right, Figure 2) is a result of the positive or negative meanings that become attached to the innovation, itself being a product of transformation processes and a precursor of outcomes.

For white collar working men, the role hierarchy that dictates their behavior on the job both in dress and deed is a social product that results from the transformation of informational inputs into consensual behavioral expectations. As men, their masculinity and professional identity are tied together. The behavioral expectations of white collar working men overlap with gender, which defines masculine behavior. Donning a man’s business suit is a display that indicates one’s professional aspirations, affiliations, and one’s sex.
IV. MEANS AND METHODS

Overview

A content analysis of men’s business suits was performed by examining thirteen different stylistic elements manifest in the structural components of men’s business suits in even years, 1950 through 1988. The findings from the content analysis were recorded by tabulating the frequency of each stylistic element’s occurrence in each observation year. The frequencies for each structural component were seriated to show changes from 1950 to 1988. Modal graphs showing biennial stylistic expression were produced. The modes of biennial stylistic expression in structural components formed a composite description that was translated into an illustration representing the classic appearance for the period 1950 to 1988.

A survey of advertising and editorial spreads that portrayed men was conducted to determine pervasive masculine images reflecting masculine roles over the period. This information, combined with that in the literature on masculinity and men, was used to create an historical/social context in which to rest the findings from the observations of men’s business suits.

Operational Definitions

Men’s Business Suit- a jacket and pants cut from the same cloth, that would be worn together.

Note: the vest was not included in the definition because its silhouette could not be seen beneath a jacket; if a vest was present, this was recorded.

Fashion Change- the process by which the stylistic expression manifest in the structural components of clothing is modified. The change is evident in the physical variation of the structural components from one time to another.
Style Offering- the pictorial representation of a men's business suit as it appears in an advertisement or an editorial spread of The New York Times or Esquire.

Structural Components- the integral parts of a garment in which stylistic expression are manifest, including lapels, jacket body shape, collars and pant legs.

Stylistic Expression- the physical qualities of size, shape and line generally called silhouette and proportion that are apparent in the structural components of a garment.

Note: the questionnaire used to record observations on the following stylistic elements expressed in the business suit's structural components is in Appendix A. A more detailed definition of the observed characteristics follows.

1. jacket body shape- the silhouette of the jacket body as delineated by the outer edges of the torso and shoulder areas of the jacket, in one of the following five shapes:

- wedge
- natural
- fitted wedge
- close tube
- loose tube

2. depth of the bridle line-the highest point at which the jacket is buttoned, determined by its location in relation to the distance between the middle of the sternum and the waist at center front; designated as high when it reaches the middle to the bottom of the sternum, medium when it is on or near the half-way point between the middle of the sternum and the waist, and low when it is at or near the waist.

Note: the use of the anatomical location in this measure is admissible because most of the anatomical liberties taken by illustrators occur below the waist.

3. lapel width-the distance of the widest point of the lapel from center front; designated as wide when it is from 3/4 of the way to actually touching the armseam seam, and medium when it is 1/4-3/4 of the way to the armseam seam, narrow when it is between the lapel roll line and at 1/4 the distance to the armseam seam.

4. lapel shape-squared or rounded.

5. presence of peak on lapel-yes or no.

6. presence of a flared skirt- an obvious flare to jacket silhouette from the waist to hem; yes or no.

7. collar shape-squared or rounded.

8. size of collar notch-small, medium or large.
9. jacket length—the length in relation to the standard jacket (defined as the place at which the jacket hem would rest in a cupped hand at the man’s side); designated as long if the hem falls below the location of a cupped hand, standard if located at the cupped hand, and short if the hem of the jacket is above the cupped hand.

Note A: The standard length, designated as the place at which the jacket hem would rest in a man’s cupped hand, is a convention in classic men’s tailoring.

Note B: When the arms were not resting at the side, jacket length was measured using a ruler and determining the length of an arm with its cupped hand resting at the side.

10. shape of the jacket at intersection of closure and hem—rounded or squared.

11. type of closure—single breasted or double breasted.

12. shape of pants—straight, pegged or flared.

13. width of pant leg—the relative expansiveness, designated as full, average, narrow, or very narrow.

Classic Appearance—a composite description of the stylistic expression in men’s business suits most frequently apparent from 1950 to 1988, as derived from the mode of each structural component’s biennial modes. This description serves as the basis for a representative composite illustration.

Typical Appearance of the Decade—a composite description of the stylistic expression in men’s business suits most frequently apparent in each decade, as derived from the mode of each structural component’s biennial modes. This description serves as the basis for a representative composite illustration.

Masculinity—physical characteristics and behaviors that are associated with the male sex, which are visibly observable in advertising and editorial spreads.

Collection of Data on Styles Offered

The data were gathered on business suit styles offered as shown either in advertisements or editorial spreads from The New York Times and Esquire for the period 1950-1988. The photographs or illustrations of style offerings met the following criteria: standing, frontal, head-to-toe representations in order to assess all of the structural components to be investigated in the study. The shortage of actual photographs that contained standing, frontal, full body figures led to
the use of both photographs and illustrations to perform the content analysis. Due to the anatomical distortions that can occur in fashion illustrations, a measurement technique using a ruler was decided against; characteristic categories were used instead of actual measurement of the figures. The structural component categories examined were: the jacket body shape, the presence or absence of a flared jacket skirt, depth of the bridle line, lapel width, lapel shape, the presence or absence of a lapel peak, the collar shape, the size of the collar notch, the jacket length, the type of jacket closure (single or double breasted), shape of jacket at intersection of closure and hem, and pant shape and width. The presence or absence of a vest was also recorded.

An exhaustive search was done of March and September issues of The New York Times and all 12 months of Esquire in every even year over the time period. All representations that met the established criteria were used. From 1982 onward, there were so few observations that provided a full view of the pants that an alternative observation criterion had to be established. When it was obvious that a business suit, as operationally defined, was illustrated, the jacket observations only were recorded. Those illustrations that did provide a full pant view were recorded as usual.

Another unexpected complication was discovered in trying to gather the data for September, 1978. The printers of The New York Times were on strike from August through November of that year, and no newspapers were issued. Therefore, no illustrations of men's business suits were available for September, 1978. The findings for 1978 are limited to March as a result.

The observations were assessed using a qualitative questionnaire-like instrument (see Appendix A) to record the source of
the observation, the month and year of its publication, and the particular style characteristics that each structural component possessed in the observation: for example, narrow pant width, peaked lapels, wedge shaped jacket silhouette.

Modal Frequencies of Each Stylistic Element’s Variations

The modal frequency of each stylistic trait apparent in the structural components of the men’s business suit was determined for each even year and for the entire period. A tally was taken to record each individual occurrence of a stylistic element’s expression in each structural component of the business suit that was examined. The stylistic elements that were expressed most frequently in a period were the modal frequencies. Biennial modal frequencies are indicated by bold face type in the cross tabulation (Appendix B).

Determination of Masculine Roles

The *New York Times*, *Esquire* and *Vogue* were examined to ascertain masculine images that indicate something about masculine roles at the time the ad was run. The same biennial issues of *The Times* and *Esquire* that served for costume data served as well for masculine images data. *Vogue* was observed biennially 1950 through 1988. As well, literature on gender and men’s studies was surveyed to ground the discussion of apparent changes in masculine roles.

Presentation and Interpretation of the Data

Time series graphs and a cross tabulation of each stylistic element’s biennial frequencies were expressed in percentages and discussed.
The biennial mode frequencies for each structural component style characteristic were plotted on time series graphs that spanned the research period. The modal frequencies over the entire period were indicated in a cross tabulation. From this information the "mode of modes" for each structural component's stylistic expression was used to generate a composite illustration that represents the classic appearance for the period 1950-1988.

The changes in masculine roles as apparent from changes in the way men were portrayed in advertising were related to the changes in stylistic expression evident in the structural components of the men's business suit. Each decade was highlighted by illustrating the decade's typical business suit and outlining the changes, comparing the typical appearance for the suit in that decade to the classic appearance of the men's business suit for the 1950-1988 period. Then, the typical suit of the decade was related to the masculine roles that pervaded in that decade. Changes from previous decades in both the stylistic expression in dress, and the way men were portrayed in advertising and editorial spreads were related to the decade being discussed.
V. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Overview

This chapter presents and discusses the expression of individual stylistic elements as they appeared in the structural components of the men’s business suits observed. The frequency of appearance is expressed as the percentage of observations in a year that bore the particular trait. Time series graphs of the frequency of each stylistic element’s expression are shown and discussed in this chapter (see Appendix B for the cross tabulations). The modal frequencies were used to generate an illustration representing the classic appearance for the period of investigation. Following the description of findings from the content analysis of men’s business suits, there is a discussion of the fashion change in a temporal context, relating the contemporary stylistic elements’ expression in business dress to the changes in masculine images represented in advertising and editorial spreads. Composite illustrations of the modal suit for each decade are compared to the classic business suit and to the business suits of previous decades. To further facilitate and ground the discussion, the social historical commentary by gender and sex role scholars was surveyed and interjected where useful. The establishment of the relationship between the changes in stylistic expression and changes in masculine roles reinforces the connection that these social products (stylistic elements’ expression in business dress and portrayals of masculinity) have to the society from which they originate, and leads to a richer understanding of that society. It was necessary to establish this relationship to address the research hypotheses and satisfy the objectives set forth in this research.
Jacket Body Shape

Close Tube

Of the five stylistic expressions manifest in the jacket body shape, the close tube shape appeared with the least frequency overall (Figure 3). In its peak years, 1950-1960, the close tube was never seen more than 31% of the time in any year. Since 1970, it accounted for no more than 6% of the biennial observations.

Loose Tube

The peak years of the loose tube shape were 1950-1964 (Figure 3), with frequencies from 48% to 96% of the biennial observations. The loose tube shape practically disappeared in the 1970s, but reemerged in the 1980s with frequencies ranging from 15% to 29%.

Natural

The natural silhouette accounted for less than 10% of the biennial observations until 1962, when it was apparent in 15% of the observations. The natural shape appeared in the 30% to 100% frequency range in the years 1964-1986.

Wedge

The wedge shape’s years of highest frequency were in 1950 and 1988 with frequencies of 22% and 47%, respectively. The years in between showed frequencies no higher than 15%, and after 1954, the wedge shape accounted for not more than 5% of observations until 1988.
Note. 20=loose tube, 40=natural, 60=wedge.
Fitted Wedge

The fitted wedge appeared in less than 10% of all observations for 1950 and 1952, then disappeared until 1970. The fitted wedge showed its greatest and most consistent frequencies 1984-1988, ranging from 18%-23%.

Modal Expression--Jacket Body Shape

To follow the progression of modal progression in jacket body shape, refer to Figure 3 which shows the loose tube silhouette as the mode from 1950 to 1964, the natural silhouette as the mode from 1966-1986, and the wedge silhouette as the mode in 1988.

Looking at the largest time series graph of the natural silhouette (Figure 4.c), it is evident that the natural silhouette, the most frequently occurring silhouette for jackets, was represented less than five percent of the time in the years 1950-1960. The natural silhouette started its rise to prominence in 1962, holding 15% of the observations. From 1966 through 1986, a twenty-year period, the natural silhouette held the majority of observations in jacket shape.

The close tube silhouette (Fig 4.a) was not the mode in any year, but had its most frequent occurrence in 1952. The loose tube occurred most frequently before 1964.

The fitted wedge silhouette (Figure 4.e) was shown only slightly more than the wedge silhouette for the whole period, but showed increasing frequencies in the years 1984-1988. The fitted wedge, with its broad padded shoulders and sharp waist definition, is a cross between the wedge and natural silhouettes and appears unusually small at the waist due to the shoulder emphasis.
Figure 4.
Stylistic Expression—Jacket Body Shape
Flared Jacket Skirt

The years 1966-1976 had jackets that flared from the waist out over the hips. The popularity of this stylistic expression peaked in 1970, present in 88% of that year’s sample. It fell to 47% in 1976, and was gone by 1978. The flared jacket occurred only with the natural and fitted wedge silhouettes; it was only present on jackets that had a pronounced waist indication.

Depth of Bridle Line

High

A high bridle line was present for the most part from 1950 through 1970. Through the 1950s it never accounted for more than 25% percent of the biennial observations. Its peak years were in the 1960s when it appeared 54% of the time in 1960 and 44% of the time in 1962. After 1966, it never appeared in more than 20% of the observations; in fact, there were several years in the 1970s when it was absent.

Medium

The medium bridle line accounted for no less than 40% of observations and was present in as many as 71% of the business suits in several years during the 1950s. In the 1960s, it accounted for no less than 42% of observations and appeared in as many as 63% of biennial observations. In 1970, it was present 38% of the time. From 1972 through 1976, it did not account for more than 21% of the observations. More recently there was considerable fluctuation, accounting for 65% of the observations in 1978, 52% in 1980, 15% in 1982, 58% in 1984, 13% in 1986, and 38% in 1988.
Low

The low bridle line accounted for 33%, 41%, and 53% of the biennial observations in the years 1950, 1952, and 1954 respectively. From 1958 through 1966, it accounted for no more than 19% of the observations, and showed as little as 4% in one year. In 1968, it registered a biennial frequency of 36%. From 1970 through 1988, with the exception of 1978, the low bridle line appeared at least 42% of the time, with three years in this time span having frequencies over 80%.

Modal Stylistic Expression--Depth of Bridle Line

The depth of bridle line is nearly a bi-modal category with the medium and low bridle line depths differing only by one year (Figures 5 and 6), and, from the average frequency table (Appendix C), by only 2% for the period. However, the medium bridle line is just barely the mode for the period. The high bridle line (Figure 6.a) only achieved modal status in 1960, with a frequency of only 54%. Over the whole period 1950-1988, a high bridle line was apparent only 14% of the time, and the medium and low bridle lines appeared 44% and 42% of the time, respectively.

Width of the Lapels

Wide

Wide lapels were apparent in 1950 and 1952, showing at 38% and 32% respectively. The frequency fell to 2% in 1956, and wide lapels did not appear again until 1968 when they resurged at a frequency 21%. Through the 1970s wide lapels accounted for at least 87% of all observations. In 1972-1976, they accounted for 100% of the observations. In the years 1980-1986, wide lapels appeared no more than 25% of the time, and most
bridle line

Note. 20=low, 40=medium, 60=high.

Figure 5.
Modal Expression--Depth of Bridle line
Figure 6.
Stylistic Expression: Depth of Bridle line
often between 8% and 17% of the time. In 1980, wide lapels rose to a
38% frequency.

Medium

Medium lapels showed strongly in the years 1950-1954 with
frequencies ranging from 65 to 85%. Their frequency fell sharply in
1956 and resurged in 1968 at 55% as a transition to wide lapels in the
1970s. Medium lapels were the mode throughout the 1980s with
frequencies above 75% in every year except 1988 when they declined to
58%.

Narrow

Narrow lapels rose from 1% of biennial observations in 1950, to
13% of observations in 1954. In 1956 narrow lapels rose to 83%, they
rose to frequencies in the high 90s in 1962-1964, fell to 87% in 1966,
and were no longer the mode in 1968. Starting in 1970, narrow lapels
did not show at all except in 1982. In that year they appeared in a
mere 6% of all observations.

Modal Stylistic Expression—Lapel Width

As apparent in Figure 7, medium lapels (those extending to halfway
between the armseye and the roll line) were the mode from 1950 to 1954,
in 1968, and from 1978 through 1988; they were also the mode over the
whole research period as indicated in Figure 8. Wide lapels were the
mode 1970-1978. They became the mode again in 1988, perhaps indicating
a trend back in that direction. Narrow lapels were the mode from 1956
to 1964 and again in 1966. The years 1956-1964 showed a pervasive use
of narrow lapels with annual percentages of observations over the range
of 83%-99%. Although the medium lapel is the period mode,
Figure 7.
Stylistic Expression—Lapel Width
lapel width

Note. 20=narrow, 40=medium, 60=wide.

Figure 3.
Modal Expression--Lapel Width
it should be pointed out that it is not decisive in terms of average percentage over the period. The medium lapel only appeared 37% of the time overall.

**Jacket Length**

**Long**

Long jackets appeared 42% of the time in 1950, and were apparent 54% to 76% of the time over 1952-1956. In 1958 33% of the observations had long jackets. From 1960 to 1988, long jackets accounted for no more than 15% of the observations, and there were many years when no long jackets were offered.

**Standard**

The standard length jacket was present in 58% of the 1950s observations and decreased to 24% in 1952. In 1954 and 1956, the standard length jacket appeared no more than 36% of the time. In 1958, it accounted for 61% of observations, and for the years 1962 and 1964 it accounted for 65% and 48% of the biennial observations, respectively. In 1966 and 1968 standard coats appeared not more than 37% of the time. From 1970 to 1988, standard length jackets fell below 88% in only 1984, when 74% of all jackets were of such.

**Short**

Short jackets did not appear at all until 1954, and rose to 15% in 1960. They had frequencies of 50%, 76% and 63% for the years 1962, 1964 and 1966 respectively. Their frequency fell to 31% in 1968, and then they showed minimally for the rest of the research period except for 1982 when 21% of jackets were short.
Modal Expression—Jacket Length

What has been defined as the standard jacket length is the mode jacket length for the period. Looking at Figure 9, observe that it was the annual mode for 15 out of the 20 years investigated, and standard length jackets appeared in 69% of all observations. Short jackets were the mode in 1962, a nearly bi-modal year; they appeared also in the years 1964 and 1966. From the seriation of jacket lengths (Figure 10), notice that short jackets (Figure 10.b) never commanded more than 76% of the observations in any year, and appear only 16% of the time overall. Long jackets were the mode over 1952-1956 before giving way to standard jackets again in 1958 and 1960. The long jacket’s life cycle (Figure 10.a) is comparable to that of short jackets in that its modal percentages never exceeded an annual frequency of 76%, and the first year of its six-year mode, too, was nearly bi-modal. Standard-length jackets appear to have been a transition from the long jackets of the early 1950s to the short jackets of the 1960s, whereas the standard jacket took off as the mode in 1968 and has stayed there. It is as though shorter jackets were attempting a comeback in 1980; however, they did not gain after their 21% percent showing in that year.

Lapel Shape

Squared lapels were the mode every year in the research period. Squared lapels appeared 95% of the time overall. Rounded lapels never appeared more than 20% in any given year.
jacket length

Note. 20=short, 40=standard, 60=long.

Figure 3.
Modal Expression--Jacket Length
Figure 10.
Stylistic Expression—Jacket length
Presence of a Peaked Lapel

Peaked lapels were apparent in 39% of the 1950s observations, and in from 0% to 15% of observations from 1952 to 1966. Peaked lapels appeared in 26% of the observations in 1968, and 44% in 1970. Over the span 1972-1986 there was a biennial high of 26% in 1976, with most other biennial observations in this period ranging from 4% to 9%. In 1980 peaked lapels were present in 54% of the observed jackets. Peaked lapels were a modal stylistic expression only in 1980.

Shape of Collar

Collars, like lapels, were most often squared. Rounded collars were at their period high in 1950, when they appeared 26% of the time. After that, they never exceeded their six-year peak of 11% from 1962 to 1968. Over the period, squared collars were shown 96% of the time, making them unquestionably the period mode.

Size of the Collar Notch

Small

Small collar notches (Figure 11.b) were in evidence 28% of the time in 1950, not more than 17% of the time 1952-1956, and 21% of the time in 1968. The peak years for small collar notches over 1970-1988 were 1970 at 28%, 1976 at 26%, and 1988 at 46%. The balance of frequency percentages in the second half of the research period did not exceed 16% in any of the biennial observations.

Medium

From 1950 to 1966 medium collar notches (Figure 11.b) appeared no more than 10% of the time with the exception of 1950, when 38% of the collar notches observed were medium sized. In 1968, 17% of collar
notch medium

notch small

notch large
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notches were medium; in 1970, 20%. From 1972 to 1988, medium frequencies peaked in 1980 at 21%; for the rest of this time span, the medium collar was not present more than 12% of the time.

**Large**

Large collar notches (Figure 11.2) were the mode in every year, and thus, for the entire research period. The frequency low for large notches occurred in 1958 when 45% of jackets had them. For the rest of the period, large collar notches appeared at least 50% of the time. For 15 out of the 20 years observed, they appeared more than 75% of the time.

**Jacket Shape at Closure-Hem Intersection**

A rounded jacket intersection appeared 62% of the time in 1950, and 90% of the time in 1952. From 1954 to 1964 only rounded jacket intersections were observed. Then the frequency decreased, reaching 56% by 1970. However, it was back at 100% in 1972 and did not fall below 80% until it touched 75% in 1984. In 1986 it was back to 89% of biennial observations, but fell to 38% in 1988.

Jackets with a rounded intersection at the closure and hem were the mode in every year except 1988 when the squared intersection became the mode.

**Single and Double Breasted Jackets**

Single breasted jackets appeared no less than 50% of the time from 1950 to 1986 and from 1954 to 1964, they accounted for 100% of the biennial observations. In 1988, the double breasted jacket became the mode by holding 62% of the observations that year. The double breasted jacket’s other peak years were 1950, at 37%, and 1970, at 44%.
Modal Expression-Single and Double Breasted Jackets

The single breasted jacket was the mode every year except 1988. The single breasted jacket is the mode for the period, showing up in 87% of the observations. From 1954 to 1964 and again in 1972, no double breasted jackets were observed. It is as though the complete absence of double breasted jackets in 1972 was some sort of backlash in response to the remarkable increase in 1970.

Stylistic Expressions in Jackets That Appeared in Tandem

Shape of Jacket at Intersection with Type of Closure

The jacket shape at the closure-hem intersection is directly related to the type of jacket closure observed. As illustrated by Figure 12, single breasted jackets always had rounded intersections; double breasted jackets always had squared intersections. For the period investigated it is safe to say that a double breasted jacket had a squared intersection, and a single breasted jacket had a rounded one.

Lapel Peaks with Double Breasted Jackets

Peaked lapels appeared most often in tandem with double breasted jackets (Figure 13.c), although this is not an absolute rule (Figure 13.b). In fact, peaked lapels also occurred in years where fewer double breasted jackets than peaked lapels were observed; in 1960, for example, no double breasted jackets were noted, and yet 14% of the jackets had peaked lapels. In 1970, however, the number of peaked lapels equaled the number of double breasted jackets.
Figure 12.
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Lapel Peaks with Small Collar Notches

Peaked lapels appeared 16% of the time, and small collar notches appeared in 13% of all observations. Most often a small collar notch and peaked lapel were found together (Figure 13), although some peaked lapels exhibited a medium collar notch. Medium collar notches appeared most often in times when narrow lapels or double breasted jackets were observed. The large collar notch (Figure 11.c) has been a distinctive feature of the man’s business suit throughout the period with the only real challenges occurring in 1970 and in 1980, two years having a high frequency of double breasted coats.

Structural Components of Pants

Pant Shape

Straight

Straight pants (Figure 14.b) were apparent less than 10% of the time from 1950 to 1974. From 1976 to 1980, they appeared no more than 46% of the time, except in 1980 and 1982 when they were shown 96% and 100% of the time, respectively.

Pegged

Pegged pants (Figure 14.c) were shown from 93% to 100% of the time in the years 1950-1964, and 81% of the time in 1966 and 1968. In 1970 pegged pants accounted for 14% of the observations. From 1972 to 1982 pegged pants were not shown except for 9% in 1978. Since 1984, pegged pants have held from 50% to 75% of the observations.

Flared

Flared pants (Figure 14.a) did not appear at all until 1966 when
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they checked in at only 2%; 1968 followed with 17%. From 1970 to 1978, flared pants appeared at least 74% of the time with a peak of 100% in 1974. Flared pants fell to 4% in 1980 and disappeared for the rest of the period starting in 1982.

**Modal Expression—Pant Shape**

Pegged pants (Figure 14.c), which appeared in 53% of all observations, were the mode for the entire period of investigation. Their preeminence was disturbed only for 6 years out of 20. As apparent in Figure 15, flared pants overtook pegged pants in 1970 and remained the mode until 1980. In 1980 and 1982, as a sort of transitional phase, straight pants were the mode until pants again took on a pegged shape in 1984. Flared pants were observed more frequently than straight pants in terms of observation percentage for the period; however, it can be seen that straight pants appeared in more years than did flared pants.

**Pant Width**

**Full**

Full pants (Figure 16.a) were shown 26% of the time in 1950, but only 1% by 1956. No full pants were seen again until 1970, when a mere 2% were observed. The frequency rose to 37% in 1972, and full pants reached their peak in 1976 at 89%. After declining to 13% in 1978, 1980-1982 showed full pants 20%-30% of the time. Full pants appeared less than 20% of the time for the rest of the research period.
pant shape

Note. 20=pegged, 40=straight, 60=flared.
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Medium

Medium pants (Figure 16.b) had biennial frequencies ranging from 74% to 96% in the interval 1950-1956. Medium pants declined in appearance to 41% in 1959 and did not exceed 6% of biennial observations for the entire 1960s. They ranged in frequency from 30% to 60% in the years 1970-1974. They fell to 11% in 1976 and then held frequencies from 70% to 96% for the rest of the period.

Narrow

Narrow pants (Figure 16.c) were not present in the observations until 1954, when they showed at 2%. They then became more evident as the frequency of observations rose to 19% in 1956 and then to 59% in 1958. From 1960 to 1970, they accounted for no less than 63% of the biennial observations. Narrow pants fell to 4% in 1972 and then disappeared for the rest of the period.

Very Narrow

Very narrow pants (Figure 16.d) were present in only three observation years: 1964, 1966 and 1968. The peak was in 1966 at 31%.

Modal Expression-Pant Width

Medium width pants were the mode throughout the period (Figure 17), representing 48% of the total observations. Narrow pants were the mode from 1958 through 1970, representing 100% of the observations in 1962, and 97% percent then 87% in 1960 and 1964, respectively. Narrow pants appeared in 29% of the observations. In 1966, when the mode for narrow pants dropped to 63%, however, the balance was filled for the most part by very narrow pants (Figure 16.d) which were extremely fitted and very often hemmed above or at mid-ankle (shorter than usual).
Pant width

Note. 10=narrow, 20=medium, 30=wide.
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The popularity of wide pants seems to coincide roughly with the modal expression of flared pants. Full pants were the modal expression of pant width only in 1974 and 1976. The seriations of full pants and flared pants are juxtaposed in Figure 18. Full pants (Figure 16.a) disappeared altogether in 1958 and did not reappear until 1970, but since 1970, they have maintained a modest showing in spite of three different modal stylistic expressions in pant shape since that time. Full pants account for 18% of all observations.

Presence of a Vest

Vests were present in only 14% of the observations. The presence of a vest achieved modal status only in 1976 and in 1978. In 1978, the "year of the three piece suit," the vest reached its peak approaching 65%.

The Classic Appearance, 1950-1988

The classic stylistic expression in the structural components of the man's business suit (Figure 19) was developed by taking the modal frequency of the biennial modes for each structural component and combining these modes for all components to form the composite illustrating the classic business suit. The resulting classic stylistic expression is composed as follows:

- Jacket body shape: natural
- Depth of bridge line: medium
- Lapel width: medium
- Presence of peaked lapel: no
- Lapel shape: squared
- Shape of collar: squared
- Size of collar notch: large
- Jacket shape at closure-hem intersection: rounded
- Closure: single breasted
- Pant shape: pegged
- Pant width: medium
pants flared

pants full

Figure 18.
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The Classic Appearance for Men's Business Suits
The Relation of Fashion in Men's Business Suits to Changes in Masculine Images

This discussion follows a chronological format beginning with the 1950s and following through to 1988. The findings on specific stylistic expressions manifest in certain years are related to concepts of masculinity that were apparent in advertising and editorial spreads of Esquire, The New York Times, and Vogue. As well, pertinent literature by gender/men's studies scholars will be cited to substantiate the discussion and further establish the relationship between changes in stylistic expression and changes in masculine roles.

The 1950s

Masculine Images in Advertising

In the 1950s, most of the advertisements for men's business suits in The New York Times portrayed either a man alone or a man in conversation with one or more of his male colleagues. Very often, the man standing alone carried a briefcase and appeared to be on his way to a business meeting, or was just standing assertively, legs apart. When women were depicted with a man, they had the appearance of being approving wives, usually younger than the men. The woman most always stood behind the man, petting him or placing a kiss on his cheek.

In Vogue, the images of men in advertising involved the use of stock types, icons of masculinity that inevitably connoted the traditional characteristics of assertiveness, practicality, business sense, career success, physical strength, technical and mechanical prowess, wanderlust and a love of sport. Included in these stock types was the uniformed military man, offering assistance to a woman who was lost, or who had dropped her packages after a hard day of shopping. That the military man was something of an ideal image of masculinity for
this period was demonstrated in the text from an ad in May 1954 which read: "Traveling man--tall, dark and Dacron...Put a man in a Dark Suit and he looks wonderful--Proof: any Navy parade."

*Vogue* also showed the business man. Inevitably a husband, and usually in his 40s, he was always jumping onto an airplane with his briefcase or scanning a ledger. In one ad of March 1954, the man scanning a ledger is billed as a "cool observer," absorbed in his work. His presumed wife, looking rather frivolous in a flowery hat, is leaning over, blowing on his neck and pouting. An advertisement from September 1958, promoting personal aircraft, suggested that women coax their husbands into purchasing an airplane for those business trips that take him away so often; all of this so that she might tag along sometimes and get to see more of "her man of decision."

*Vogue* portrayed daddy only as a little girl's daddy; daddies did not play peek-a-boo with their sons. An ad for little girls' dresses reads "Daddy and I love to play peek-a-boo." The father is behind a tree peeking around at the grade-school age girl in her Kate Greenway dress. In another ad, from May 1956, a little girl tells us that "Father always wanted boys!" The text reads: "I'm Jean, the older girl in the picture. I was supposed to be Gene and go to Yale. That's my sister Roberta. She was supposed to be an engineer like father. But here we are in our Twinkle Frocks. Father looks completely reconciled, don't you think?" The father, smiling and seemingly bemused, stands with hands in the pockets of his business suit.

There was the mystery man in *Vogue*: the man in the back of the picture; the one for whom the stockings are donned; the one who will be quite taken with the image of her in a smart new frock. The ad reminds us that this is why women adorned themselves. In several ads, the man was little more than a shadow. He might also have been the stranger who
pulled the chair for her in a restaurant. Tall, dark and not handsome, but distinguished, he is in his 40s and gray at the temples.

Many ads suggested that, for women, the aim of dress was to allure men. In a dress ad from January 1952 a woman was surrounded by sailors in their summer "bermuda" uniforms. The caption reads: "admired by the local citizenry at home or abroad!" Men were not depicted as inherently faithful or monogamous. There was stiff competition to snag a roving eye, or to prevent your man's eye from wandering. It is generally hard to keep his attention, according to an ad for a woman's ensemble from Vogue, September 1950. A woman enters a restaurant, wearing the style offering, when a young man at a table across the way is practically out of his seat to observe her, despite his female companion who is holding her menu out in an attempt to prevent the fellow from "taking in the scenery." Of course, the ad indicates, his behavior is due to the featured shapely suit.

In Vogue, men were the stronger sex. They did all the "physical stuff," they loved sports, and they were strong! In May 1954, a woman eases herself into the convertible while her husband lugged two suitcases down a long set of stairs in front of their suburban home or a hill.

An ad from Vogue, June 1950, suggested giving a man "his favorite sport in jewelry." The ad implies that all men have had a favorite sport, and that they wear ties that could be secured with a golf club tie tack. In an editorial spread for back to school (August 1954), the young co-ed eats popcorn, her legs covered with a blanket, while her beau rows the canoe.

Esquire ads portrayed the man when he was steadfast, stern and alone, most often as a hunter. When he was not alone, he was a sportsman with his buddies. Esquire's '50s man appeared to like a stiff
drink, cigarettes and the company of buxom women who were invariably in their early to mid-20s, no matter how old the man appeared. In the 1950s, Esquire seemed to provide an escape from wives, children and the job. Its content, both editorial and advertising, reflected this stance. There was less talk of business in the magazine than there would be later, in the 1970s and 1980s, and the ads catered to a masculine fantasy world of hunting, fishing and beautiful young women.

The '50s Man: Operating Within the Patriarchy

The patriarchy is the social institution of male superiority by which younger males and women are afforded second class citizenship and are equated to children who need to be taken care of (Goffman 1979). The older men, not grandfathers, but those who have proven their masculinity as socially prescribed, are in authority. They will know what is best for the women, children and the young men. This being the case, the patriarchy bestows upon its elite privilege and prerogative in all matters (Goffman, 1979). During the 1950s the patriarchy operated with very little challenge, and the cultural myths of gender and the patriarchy, held by most as innate truths, were reinforced societally.

According to Wernick (1987), there have been several changes in the way that advertising addresses the issues of masculinity in its portrayal of men. During the 1950s, men were portrayed most often within a family framework. The Good Life image of the 1950s depicted the male of this period in his 40s, a career conscious married man with a wife, and usually with two or more children for whom he provided well (Wernick, 1987). As described previously, it was apparent in the advertising of this period that men were daddies to their wives as well as to their children. In his execution of patriarchal providence, he was also the steadfast authoritarian. He was supposed to be the solid
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rock, slow to emote if at all, the one to be relied upon for inner strength in all situations. His physical capabilities were to match his constitution; he was to be strong inside and out, always.

The virile man was the good provider. The desirable man was the successful man in the grey flannel suit. The other ideal of masculinity or variation on the virile man was the military man who possessed traits that even the men in the grey flannel suits should aspire to.

Men could certainly demonstrate their strong inner being at work and home. To demonstrate strength, sporting activities were required; they were and still are the peace-time substitute for military experience, necessary to demonstrate aggression, physical ability, and the capacity to perform, unwavered by stress (Brenton, 1966). Through participation in sports, or by identifying with professional sports players as spectators, men reaffirmed their masculinity and physical prowess while forming the only socially sanctioned bond between men—the sharing of sports, alcoholic beverages, cigarettes and the talk of business or attractive women. To discuss something more personal was to appear vulnerable, and was therefore unmanly and out of the question (Goldberg, 1976).

A lot can be determined from the list of products targeted at men during the 1950s. According to Wernick (1987), the list of goods is rather small, including automobiles and life insurance in addition to the sporting goods, alcoholic beverages and cigarettes which have been discussed.

Men were supposed to be mechanically inclined, and automobile advertising appealed to the man’s mechanical sensibilities and his desire for power under his foot. As far as life insurance goes, it is a post mortem extension of patriarchal providence—taking care of others even after he is gone.
In sum, the man of the 1950s was portrayed as a professionally striving good provider in his 40s. He concerned himself with obtaining an income that assured his loved ones of a comfortable life with plenty of roast beef, new clothes and modern appliances. His domain was the work place. His home was his castle, but his wife ran it. His ideal leisure time was spent "with the boys," other men like himself with whom he could drink, smoke and play golf or watch football on television. Emotionally, he was not expressive. It was okay to demonstrate affection for your wife, daughters and sons under the age of five. However, for the reserved man of the 1950s, the physical demonstration of affection, due to the accepted conventions, was too sensual and related to sexuality. Therefore, to demonstrate affection for a grown son might prove a masculinity threat to the father, and worse yet, turn his son into a "sissy" (Goldberg, 1976).

**Fashion of Suits Related to the Classic Suit and the 50s Man**

The typical stylistic expression in men's business suits during the 1950s (Figure 20) was manifest in the appearance of a long loose tube jacket with medium lapels and a medium bridle line. The pants of this ensemble were pegged and of medium width. This typical 1950s suit varied from the classic appearance only in the jacket shape and length. The 1950s business suit was somewhat baggier than that of the classic business suit. However, its similarities to the classic business suit outweigh its dissimilarities. Therefore, there is a close relationship between the classic business suit and the typical men's business suit of the 1950s.

During the 1950s the structural components of the men's business suit did not produce a particularly body-conscious appearance. The
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long, loose tube jacket and medium full pants would camouflage the "middle age spread" of well-fed fathers. The American ideal of the Good Life at this time esteemed the paunch that results from good food, prepared by a wife who is a good cook. The loose fit of the clothing in this period also placed an emphasis on comfort. The cut of the clothing for most of the 1950s provided ample room to comfortably carry large key rings, wallets, checkbooks, "little black books," handkerchiefs and perhaps even a watch in the many pockets that the jacket and pants provided. Perhaps too, the business suit of this period was so loose and, therefore, relatively comfortable because men were expected to wear suits for many more occasions, thus to play the role of good provider in many more social situations than in later decades.

During the 1950s there was a World War II hero president, and the United States was actively involved in a military conflict in South Korea. Thus, the occurrence of men dressed in military uniform in advertising may come as no surprise. The images conjured by a man in a military uniform render its wearer unquestionably masculine. Possibly in the 1950s, a time of rigid masculine stereotypes, often equated with the military, the civilian wore his uniform—the business suit, even when off duty to indicate his manliness.

In 1956, the year of Eisenhower's re-election, lapels became narrow, and in the following year of observation, 1958, pants became narrow and jacket hemlines raised back up to the standard position. These changes diminish the military appearance of the business suit. Fashion trends often coincide with or soon follow election years. These seem to be times of changing stylistic expression. Perhaps to some extent there is a relationship between the changes in the structural components of business suits and the election of the nation's top executive; both may herald a change in attitude reflecting the greater
society. The standard length jacket, which was modal only for the years 1959-1960, represented a transitional phase moving toward short jackets. The narrow pants and lapels also were a movement away from the conservatism of the Eisenhower era and toward the 1960s.

The 1960s

Masculine Images in Advertising

In the early 1960s, the portrayal of men went on very much as it had in the 1950s. The only real change in the masculine portrayals was toward a somewhat younger male representation. It was not until 1966 that an advertisement indicated some sort of change in the perceptions and expectations that were prevalent. The New York Times printed a series of three different ads for Howard Suits, in March 1966, which read as follows: "Howard makes clothes for men who make love;" "Howard makes clothes for men who make babies;" and finally, "Howard makes clothes for men who make the world go." The first two in this series show a remarkable break from the perennial father of the 1950s. The portrayal of men in the previous period established them as having had the children already. The bounds of good taste would not have permitted direct references to making love or babies. It should also be pointed out that, in the ad suggesting that Howard's suits are for men who make love, it is left unclear whether the "mod" woman who accompanied the man was his wife.

Men virtually disappeared from the advertising in Vogue in the 1960s. Compared to the 1950s beforehand and the 1970s afterward, there were remarkably fewer portrayals of men in ads and editorial spreads. However, judging from what was available, it seems that, just as in The New York Times, images of men consistent with those of the 1950s persisted until 1966.
In November 1960, Vogue readers were told: "Smart girls get their way with gifts of sportswear." A woman was depicted standing over her husband’s shoulder in a sort of time lapse sequence of four photographs, as he pondered vacation brochures for hunting, fishing, golf and finally, a ski weekend for two. She showed delight at successfully persuading him with gifts to spend the weekend with her, away from more masculine pursuits.

In the same issue of Vogue, there was an ad for Wembley ties. These ties, bearing a color guide on the reverse, reflect the assumption that men could not match their own clothing. The color guide could assist men in matching when women (naturally predisposed to aesthetic sensitivity) were not present; so, Wembley ties were the perfect gift for the bachelor or for the man who traveled a lot on business. An ad for men’s cologne in December 1962 read "Give him the fragrance of authority." Men had to smell authoritative, not pretty. An advertisement from 1966 suggested that if the woman could not get her man’s head out of the newspaper, it was time for a Beau Soiree negligee. The prospect of a female initiating seduction is a clear break with the apparent expectation in the 1950s that men always take the sexual initiative.

Beyond the ads mentioned, a series of advertisements for alcoholic beverages throughout the 1960s portrayed men greying at the temples and appearing rather suave and continental, typically in the company of somewhat younger women. In these ads the man always wore a business suit or a tuxedo. There were no depictions of the man as a daddy after 1960. It seems that in the 1960s, men became a little more sophisticated. They were sharing cocktails with their women and spending leisure time dressed up, even though it does appear as if the only thing men did in the 1960s was drink scotch.
Esquire ads from the 1960s indicated a shift from the outdoorsman and the sportsman of the 1950s to a playboy. An interest in women certainly evident in the magazine during the 1950s, carried into the 1960s. However, the portrayal of men in Esquire changed in the late 1960s.

In January 1962, an article on President Kennedy's two-button suit detailed descriptions of the suit jacket and illustrated its silhouette. The jacket had a sharper than usual waist definition, lacked the traditional chest padding, and was shorter than standard length. These structural features were attributed to the president's athletic physique and remarkable 32-inch waist.

In 1968 there were two particularly significant Esquire ads because, in each, the men were dressed in business suits. In an ad promoting men's business suits from Sears, the man is entering a Playboy Club. In the other ad, for Vivitar movie cameras, a man has a naked woman slung over his shoulder and the camera in his hand. This ad asked "Are you ready to take charge?"

The '60s Man.

In the 1960s the business man in particular and other men to a lesser extent became sophisticated. The meat and potatoes sportsman and the hubby/daddy of the 1950s, were replaced. After 1960, there were fewer references to men as daddies in the advertising. Instead, the swinging urbanite was the icon, as opposed to the '50s suburban homebody.

With the new president in 1960 came fancy European styled suits. The whole feeling of the early and then later 1960s was one of sophistication. The rather plain, long and loose suit of the '50s was gone. Women now had bouffant hair, and the furniture offered in The New
York Times shifted away from the plain rather utilitarian modern furnishings of the 1950s to French Provincial for the suburbanites and to futuristic Danish modern for the urban cognoscente. The word sexy was noticed for the first time in 1962, within the text of an ad for women's shoes.

In the 1960s, the women's movement, paired with the sexual revolution changed the expectations of men (Brenton, 1966). It was no longer enough to be a good provider. The men had to please their wives sexually, as well as themselves. The sexual revolution increased the opportunities for sex (Boyer, 1981) and this is reflected in the advertising; but along with these increased opportunities, were added expectations (Brenton, 1966). The two ads previously cited from Esquire in 1968 pointed to changes in the sex lives of men.

The challenge to readers of the Vivitar ad in the 1968 issue of Esquire that read "Are you ready to take charge?" is an ambiguous question that addressed concerns related to both the women's liberation movement and the sexual revolution. With a naked woman slung over his back, this business suit-clad man is obviously in power. However, how is he to take charge? Is he to "put the woman in her place" (some would say he has; she is naked! and maintain male superiority; or, is he to take charge by providing this woman with sexual satisfaction? Either way, the sub-text of the ad is "Can you handle it?" During the 1960s, discussions of impotency among men began appearing in the media. An article from the "macho" publication True in 1965 was entitled "Impotence, the Secret Fear that Haunts Men" (Brenton, 1966, p. 30).

The new demands placed on men (that are now norms in 1989) seemed to increase the incidence, or at least the fear of impotence. A failed heterosexual endeavor was, and still is, a tremendous blow to a straight man's masculinity (Goldberg, 1976).
With wives' new demands for sexual satisfaction, nurturance and assistance with the household duties, combined with the pressure from male peers to maintain the male superiority stance, the 1960s were a time of tremendous role strain. In advertising, men still had to be tough and autonomous. But now their wives and lovers expected behaviors that contradicted the traditional concepts of masculinity to which men had been socialized.

In 1968, the first set of baby boomers graduated from college and entered the business world. This major influx of youth into the job market, paired with the emphasis on youth culture that began in 1965, placed pressure on most men under 50 to appear young and swinging. The changes that did occur in the second half of the 1960s seem to partially confirm research hypothesis 2. That is, concepts of masculinity changed in the late 1960s and early 1970s relative to the concepts held in the 1950s.

The Fashion of Suits Related to the Classic Suit and the '60s Man

The 1960s were fairly consistent in the biennial modal frequencies of stylistic expression throughout the decade. With the exception of the change from the loose tube to the natural jacket shape in 1966, the structural components of the men's business suit for the 1960s (Figure 21) can be described as follows: a short loose tube jacket with a medium bridle line, narrow lapels and narrow pegged pants. This varies from the stylistic expression of the classic appearance in jacket length, lapel width and pant width. The suits of the 1960s seem almost skimpy compared to the classic business suit. As proposed in research hypothesis 1, the business suit and its stylistic elements did indeed deviate stylistically from the classic appearance.
Figure 21.
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The structural components of the suit from this decade suggest youthfulness. The short jacket with its medium bridle line and lapel is reminiscent of a Fauntleroy suit. Perhaps the inauguration of a young president in 1960, combined with the rise of the youth culture which erupted in 1965, placed such an emphasis on styling.

President Kennedy, whose father was an ambassador and whose wife could claim aristocratic European lineage, appeared rather sophisticated when juxtaposed with Dwight and Mamie Eisenhower from Pennsylvania. One cannot say whether the Kennedy White House shaped or reflected the times, but that era coincided with the new era of sophistication. Suits with body-conscious European styling became more popular. In fact, there were single breasted business suits observed in the early 1960s that featured a short, one button cut-away coat.

The sexual revolution and the women’s liberation movement, although born in the 1960s, did not seem to be reflected in the styling of men’s business suits until the 1970s. One could say, perhaps, that the closely fitted pants of the ’60s were sexy in their revelation of the male physique, especially when combined with the modal short jacket.

**The 1970s**

**Masculine Images in Advertising**

In *The New York Times* of the 1970s, there was a marked decrease in the number of business suits advertised to men. Instead, much more advertising targeted at men promoted other clothing categories, reflecting the increase in male consumerism as discussed by Wernick (1987). Sportswear, including jump suits, was on the rise. There were a lot more sports jackets shown with a tie, and it seems that the sports jacket replaced the business suit as the clothing norm for some professions.
In 1970, the year that the Equal Rights Amendment first gained national attention, there was an ad on September 20 that billed its offering as an "anti-establishment suit." This was a suit that did meet the operational definition of a man’s business suit, but it was a departure from the stylistic expression apparent in the suits of 1968.

It should be pointed out that the stylistic expression of the 1970s did vary from the period modes of every category except jacket body shape. Therefore, research hypothesis 1 was confirmed, seeing that the '60s and '70's data both were affirmative. However, this does not mean that more classic models were not available. Even though these suits were not necessarily recorded (because the illustration did not always meet the established criteria), there were ads that assured the reader that more conservative models were available.

In Vogue, September 1970, a man offers a woman a bouquet of flowers. The caption reads: "He thinks he's so romantic and you're about to sneeze." A typical woman in ads of the early 1960s would have been delighted at such an overture even if the bouquet was goldenrod and she had hay fever! The woman in this ad appears less than thrilled with the overture. Perhaps she feels this man is presumptuous. Such changing relationships between men and women were reflected throughout the decade. Women now seemed to have a choice. They were now portrayed as initiators of sexual interest rather than always taking the passive role. Likewise, they did not necessarily have to accept unwanted attention as was their duty in the past.

A rather vague and patronizing ad for a men’s and women’s fragrance in November 1972 portrayed a man and woman on the beach, in the dunes. The ad reads: "You’re more woman--a new sense of self and the world you live in. He’s more man--because he accepts your important new role for what it is."
In spite of the changes taking place in gender roles related to the family and child rearing, some ads still reflected the traditional convention of the mother as child rearer, and placed all of the importance of reproduction and subsequent care into the hands of women. A whole series of ads for Kayne boys' shirts (in Vogue and other publications) from 1974 read: "Boy by Mrs. Levine, the boy's shirt by Kayne."

Two Vogue ads addressed the issue of equality for women. In one ad the man and woman are wearing business suits from the same company. An ad for wristwatches in 1974 shows a man and woman with hands clasped as if to arm wrestle. Each wrist bears a version of a watch that was styled for both men and women. The ad read: "Equal pay—Equal time."

The sexual revolution was reflected in several ads that placed women in a new role of sexual initiator, or in ads that simply reflected a relaxed moral stance in sexual matters. In Vogue, December 1972, an ad of a nude man on a bearskin rug (resembling a centerfold) promoted natural hairstyling. This was the first time the role reversal, placing the man in the position of sex object, was observed. This is in direct opposition to the 1968 Esquire ad which showed a naked woman slung over a clothed man's shoulder. Also in this issue, an editorial spread featured a man and a woman in flesh colored swim suits drenched in oil, wrapped in a sensual embrace. A swimwear ad from 1974 depicted a naked man seated in a chair and swathed with three women in swim suits. The women are all touching him, and he is caressing two of them. A musk oil promotion pictured a man's hand on a woman's bare knee. The text states: "Jovan musk oil—the only musk oil dedicated to the proposition."

The changing roles of women were reflected in the portrayal of women in positions of relative power. Starting in 1974 ads began to
appear that placed men in positions subordinate to women. An ad in 1974 pictured the woman standing firm and tall with her hands placed on the shoulders of a man. He stands with his legs and arms crossed, leaning toward her, and wearing a unisex sweater with hip emphasis. In an ad for sleepwear in June 1976, a woman in a nightgown is being adored by two men wearing only briefs. She is standing tall, assertive, legs apart; she looks as strong as either of them. In October 1978, a woman in a business suit instructs a man, also in a business suit. This editorial spread is set in a work place. In an editorial spread from November 1978, a fully dressed woman locks her arm around the neck of a shorter man wearing no shirt under his jacket.

*Esquire* reflected changes in the structure of society during the 1970s, both in its advertising and in its articles. At the same time, elements of traditional masculinity were upheld. An ad for men’s business suits featured a group of young men around a vintage World War I airplane. These men all wore business suits and one of the men had an arm in a sling. The text read: “The Escadrille Collection for the young, confident and the courageous.” The prestige attached to white collar professions was maintained, and considerable value was still placed on the man’s breadwinning capabilities. In an advertisement for correspondence courses, a man dressed in a casual outfit consisting of a sport shirt, cardigan sweater and slacks steps out of his Cadillac automobile as his wife does. There is an expansive lawn; the other houses in the neighborhood are grand. The pitch reads: “The accountant—*you* should earn his salary.” An editorial spread featuring business suits was billed that year as the return of the grey flannel suit. The suits in this spread were just right for Wall Street, according to the copy.

Things were changing in the 1970s. The content of *Esquire* shifted
away from the pages of scantily dressed women that were in the magazine through the 1960s. The obligatory sports coverage, alcoholic beverage advertisements and seasonal recipes for cocktails remained. However, the focus of the magazine seemed altered. The magazine became more personal. Articles began to focus on male concerns. There were discussions of the new sexuality and how to cope, rather than how to score. More direct instruction on how to dress and groom surfaced. An article from 1978 instructed men on what to do when a woman is the boss. Other issues of business and professional savvy began to appear as well.

A remarkable feature on social dancing, published in 1974, included photographs of the dance called the "Bump" as danced by pairs of gay men. There were flamboyant "Ziggy Stardust" types with unabashedly-made up faces, affecting feather fans, boas and cigarette holders. There were also archetypical macho men: mustached, short haired and in coveralls that a moving and storage company worker would wear. These pairs of men were "Bumping" hips and buttocks in a manner evidently worthy of coverage in *Esquire*, a man's magazine.

The '70s Man

The 1970s bore the fruit of much of the ideology that originated in the 1960s. The new sexuality had opened doors of communication. Not only could people acknowledge where babies came from in polite conversation; it was now appropriate to discuss intimate details of sexuality and the social implications of sexual behavior in the text of non-pornographic publications. The comfort with which *Esquire* depicted gay men dancing and making physical contact suggests an overall acceptance of challenges to the regime ancien, and a "let it all hang out" philosophy.
The anti-establishment suit reflecting anti-establishment sentiments indicated the social current of the early to mid-1970s. The gender blending, body conscious "unisex" sportswear and hair styles were direct blows to the rigid patriarchal establishment. Many of the fashions of the 1970s suggest what have been labeled "bubble up" phenomena--ways of behaving and appearing that reflect the concepts or ideologies of subcultures. Long hair and jeans, for example, came from hippies--young and counter to the established economic and political systems. The unisex trend reflected the ideas of the women's movement (women were certainly a subclass in the very recent past) and concepts of androgyny familiar to gay culture.

Women went braless; men and women wore shirts unbuttoned to the navel; and men sometimes left the top button of their pants undone. Garb like this suggested a readiness to engage in sexual activity (which was further facilitated by the availability and effectiveness of contraception).

It was the number one job of the heterosexual male to acknowledge and accept the "New Woman." Not only was she to be sexually satisfied, nurtured and helped with the house chores; now, she was to be his unquestioned equal, capable of supporting herself, and gaining prestigious employment just as he.

These new freedoms and role choices that women gained for themselves freed men to some extent from the rigid expectations of their traditional masculine roles. There was less pressure for men to be the sole breadwinner in a marriage. Men could be more expressive (at least at home). The '70s man was free to wear androgynous clothing. The 1970s were the true beginning of sanctioned clothing interest by men in the twentieth century; men became fashion conscious. The narcissism associated with clothing interest was traditionally assigned a feminine
attrition, and had been, therefore, taboo (Wernick, 1987).

The '70s man was presented with opportunities for relief from the rigid expectations of patriarchal masculine role expectations. He did not have to be embarrassed about being concerned for his own appearance. He was allowed to appear seductive, to attract women rather than always being the sexual hunter/initiator (Wernick, 1987). He was not necessarily solely responsible for his wife and family financially. In his acceptance of alternative roles, he incorporated sub-cultural stylistic expressions into his clothing vocabulary, and thus appeared comfortable with himself and others. In this light hypothesis 2 is confirmed: there were any number of challenges to concepts of masculinity that pervaded in the 1950s apparent in the advertising of the 1970s, and in the 1960s as well.

The Fashion of Men's Suits Related to the Classic Suit and the '70s Man

The modal stylistic expressions in the men's business suits for the 1970s produced a suit that appeared as follows: a natural shaped jacket of standard length with wide lapels, and for the most part, a low bridle line. For the first half of the '70s, a flared skirt appeared on the jackets. The pants had medium to wide flared legs. The typical 1970s suit (Figure 22) differed from the classic business suit in lapel width, the presence of a flared jacket skirt, the depth of bridle line, pant shape and width. Thus research hypothesis 1 is fully confirmed: the business suit and its stylistic elements deviated stylistically from the classic appearance during the late 1960s and the early 1970s.

At the beginning of the 1970s, marked departures from the established stylistic expression in business suits occurred. Every stylistic expression listed above was a break with the features of the '50s and early '60s except the depth of bridle line, which has been
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given to more frequent changes in modell expression anyway.

The appearance of the 1970s business suit, at least before 1976, was rather xand and somewhat androgynous. With its naturally shaped, flared jacket skirt, wide lapels and a low bridle line, the jacket conjures an image that crosses a late eighteenth century fop with a cavalier of the reformation. Combined with large-legged flared pants, this man's business suit was set in motion when its wearer walked. The sensuous display of flowing fabric was previously reserved for women.

The dapper suit of the early to mid-1970s was perfect for the '70s "dude." He could swagger about displaying his dramatic finery and attracting attention in peacock fashion. This peacock display reflected the freedom of sexual expression associated with the '70s.

With a change from his Florsheim wing tipped oxfords, to a pair of platform shoes, and, with the removal of his tie and the unfastening of most shirt buttons, this man was ready to "do the Hustle." The remarkably exaggerated stylistic expression of the early 1970s can be compared in some ways to the zoot suit of the 1940s, not so much in actual appearance, but in its employment of exaggerated stylistic expression. It is also interesting to note that the zoot suit originated with black and hispanic men. The stylistic expression in the business suit of the early '70s embodies a form of male display through clothing that ethnic subcultures were traditionally more comfortable with, another example of how "bubble up" was at work in the 1870s.

The fact that there was a business suit at all suggests that some of the traditional masculine behavioral expectations carried over from the previous two decades. The Esquire ads that talked about clothes for the courageous, et cetera are an example of the maintenance of some traditional masculine characteristics.

In the latter half of the 1970s, it appears that the extreme
stylistic characteristics of men's business suits began to moderate. In 1976, the flared skirt left suit jackets. In 1978, pants returned to a medium width; and, the bridle line rose back up to a medium position. In 1976 and 1978 the three piece suit was a modal observation. Men were wearing vests under their single breasted coats in these years. This seems to have been a nostalgic throwback to a time like the 1930s when vests were de rigueur.

The trend back to the classic appearance in men's business suits was beginning in the late 1970s. Maybe the social upheaval associated with the early 1970s was beginning to settle down as people grew comfortable with the new expectations. Perhaps also, the baby boomers were becoming established in the world of work as they turned to the concerns associated with raising families. The return to a more classic, stable cycle of stylistic expression may indicate this. By way of conjecture, perhaps with Jimmy Carter in the White House, the need to illustrate the changes in social expectations through one's dress seemed less necessary. It may have been thought that the war against patriarchal white supremacy had been won, or, at least, that the desired changes were under way to assimilate the undervalued subclasses into society, creating a new establishment.

The 1980s

Masculine Images in Advertising

In The New York Times, the feeling of the 1980s was reflected best by an ad promoting a business suit in 1982, which extolled the virtues of "working within the rules" (nothing anti-establishment about this). In 1988 an ad for business suits portrayed the wearer as a "modern traditionalist." The ads for business suits all depicted men in their late 20s or early 30s. These men were youthful and sported trim
physiques. An allusion to the fitness craze of the 1980s is evident in an ad for Daniel Hechter suits from 1984 in which a man in a double breasted suit holds a basketball under his arm.

In June of 1980 Vogue ran an ad for suntan lotion depicting a throng of men ogling a perfectly tanned young woman with blond hair, firm breasts and a flat stomach. She is their ideal of feminine beauty and they are appropriately smitten, lusting in her presence. This ad demonstrated concepts of male sexual competition and suggested what kind of woman it is that men should find attractive. The depiction of a woman with more than one male admirer was not born in the 1980s. Nothing in this suntan lotion ad went against concepts of masculinity held in the 1950s. However, there are depictions of women with more than one admirer or even lover that appear through the 1980s in Vogue.

In an ad for the Italian designer Gianni Versace, six men are on the floor worshipping a woman who is standing. There was also a depiction of two men sharing a woman in a Vogue editorial spread in March 1982. A Christian Dior advertisement spanning several pages portrayed the classic menage a trois arrangement in which an attractive woman married to an older man keeps a very young man under the same roof with her husband. Such a polite arrangement was set up in the eighteenth century to keep the woman at home and save her husband from public embarrassment. Especially challenging elements of the Dior ad were that the trio was labeled as siblings and the woman sensuously kissed and hugged both of these men. It appeared to be an amiable set-up. One man and the woman in the presence of the other while he bathed.

A more believable version of a menage a trois depicted a rich, middle-aged husband leaving his wife at their beach house to go play polo. A young beach bum from a couple doors down catches the young woman’s eye. A series of photographs follow, alluding to the tryst
perpetrated in the absence of the husband.

A photograph accompanying an article entitled "Men: a new image," from *Vogue*, June 1986, showed a man receiving a haircut, facial, manicure and pedicure all at once. The caption stated that men have always cared about their looks, but now, they are more willing to admit it. Part of the new concern for appearance can be attributed to the fitness craze of the 1980s. As the decade wore on, the male icon established himself as a trim muscular man, obviously a weight lifter. The youth culture of the previous two decades, comprised of baby boomers, did not seem willing to accept the physical changes that occur in the male physique during the 30s and into middle age. The pursuit of fitness was their antidote to aging. An advertisement for Spiegel showed a woman massaging a physically fit man. He is on the phone, ordering clothes from Spiegel catalog; a man, hedonistic and narcissistic, shopping by mail for fashion clothing! This image is as much about the "yuppie Good Life" image as it is about male narcissism. Yuppies--young upwardly mobile professionals in the 1980s, were a group of men and women baby boomers in their late 20s and early 30s who were out to get their version of the Good Life before 35, it seems. These people placed as much value on quality material possessions as they did on the professional success that would finance material acquisition. The quality of their lives directly related to the acquisition of prestigious merchandise. These people also prized fine food and wine, exotic vacations and the possession of a flawless physique.

A cigarette advertisement from 1986 depicts a Sunday brunch at a chic, modern, urban loft apartment. Everyone in the room is "thirty-something." They wear comfortable weekend clothing. The man, for instance, is in Khaki pants, a polo shirt and leather deck shoes. These young singles are enjoying Mimosas (champagne and orange juice) with
coffee and cigarettes after the meal. One gets the feeling that the man prepared the meal. In the 1980s, it became acceptable for white collar men to become gourmet cooks. The people in the photograph represent the young upwardly mobile professionals who characterized the 1980s. Their weekend leisure time, traditionally spent with family, was now spent with friends. People stayed single or became single (divorced) more often. People moved across the country, sometimes far away from family in order to take jobs. As Wernick (1987) pointed out, professional and age peers became the primary support group for the yuppie in place of the traditional nuclear family.

Esquire was most poignant in its depiction of the trends that shaped the 1980s. Concern for business issues, fitness and the recognition of the '80s woman shed considerable insight on the social structure of the decade. In 1982, Esquire published a book entitled How a Man Ages. The physical aging process, a reminder of our fleeting mortality, was something baby boomers, former youth-quakers, wanted to understand and combat. Several articles in a feature issue on fitness were printed in 1984. The feature was entitled "Fitness, the best revenge."

Articles and advertisements pandered to the baby boomer, former hippie turned yuppie of the 1980s. An advertisement for hair groom in 1984 said that hair was unkempt in the 1960s and 1970s but in the 1980s the "neat look" prevailed. The photograph illustrating the neat look presented a man with short hair gleaming with hair groom. An ad in 1986 was more pointed. This ad for shoes and boots asks "Where have the radicals of the 1960s gone?" It replies: "They're still around, taking over companies instead of college libraries, these days." Reflecting this claim is an article in 1984 entitled "The Best of a New Generation-Men and Women Under Forty who are Changing America."
The '80s woman was honored in a series of articles presented in a feature issue of *Esquire*, June 1986, entitled "A Celebration of the American Woman--Professional, Lover, Competitor, Mother, Daughter, Activist, Partner." In this acknowledgement of diverse feminine roles, *Esquire* indirectly acknowledged the changes in men's roles, a natural extension from the changes in women's. Part of the new roles for men was that of the nurturant, sensitive '80s man who often was a yuppy father--young, active and attractive, on the scene with his beautiful wife and children who were impeccably dressed for whatever physical activity they were sharing. The adults in these ads must have been teenage parents to be so young and have such grown children. Ads for Ralph Lauren and Espirit in 1984 and 1986, respectively, depicted this mythical family.

The '80s Man

The man of the 1980s has been a young upwardly mobile professional, usually a person who wears a business suit to work. The ideal man in the 1980s is a single man eternally in his early 30s and phenomenally successful at his job (Wernick, 1987).

The preoccupation with high-end earning is apparent in the consumer goods and services that became popular in the 1980s. Arrival in the "real world" was signified by the possession of audiophile stereo equipment and high tech furnishings, ideally placed in a posh apartment on Manhattan Island. Yuppies aspired to Wall Street success, or to otherwise gain admission to the *Fortune* 500.

Expectations placed on men increased further in the 1980s, especially in the educated class of workers wearing business suits. As illustrated in the advertising and editorial content of publications in the 1980s, these men were expected to be tough, to compete with men and
women, and to remain cool, rational, and succeed at work. At home, the father was to spend nurturant "quality time" with his children and then with his wife or lover, and to share the cooking and cleaning duties while remaining physically fit and youthful.

There was a considerable segment of yuppies who decided to have children in the 1980s. These people in their 30s and 40s created a baby boom of their own and advertising congratulated them for having children. They were addressed as though they were the first people in history to assume this role.

While some were having babies, others were divorcing or staying single longer, as a result of education and striving for professional success (Wernick, 1987). Therefore, some advertising portrayed men alone or in peer groups rather than with families (Wernick, 1987). The advertising that pandered to yuppies was rather congratulatory. It was as if these men needed a pat on the back for getting a haircut and taking a serious job. They needed to be assured, however, that they had not sold out, forsaking the ideals of their youth, when they had actively rejected the political and economic establishment. Beer ads assured them that they could have "pinstripes and rock and roll;" they "could have it all." No cognitive dissonance for these guys; it was okay to succeed and want what money could buy. It seems that these youth-quakers now in their 30s and 40s felt an instinctual urge to achieve, to experience fulfillment (measured by prestigious possessions).

The Fashion of Men's Suits Related to the Classic suit and the 80s Man

The 1980s have been characterized by a single breasted suit with a natural shaped, standard length jacket, medium lapels and a low bridle line. The pants became pegged, and of medium width, as illustrated in
Figure 23. This suit differs from the classic business suit for the period only in one structural component, the depth of the bridle line. It is low during most of the 1980s. This is not of great importance since the depth of bridle line is nearly bimodal in its stylistic expression, the modal position being held in nine observation years by the low bridle line and in ten by the medium one. For the most part the stylistic elements manifest in the structural components of the 1980s business suit are those of the classic suit for the entire period. Therefore research hypothesis 3 is partially confirmed, that is the classic styling did return to men's business suits in the 1980s. The only difference between this modal suit of the 1980s and the modal suit of the 1950s is the shift from the loose tube to a naturally shaped jacket.

The fitness craze of the 1980s might account for the retention of a waist definition in suits during most of the 1980s. The fit, trim body of the '80s man is flattered by such a coat. These men were thin in the 1970s as young men, but stayed trim into their 40s because of exercise.

As the 1980s progressed the ideal shifted from thin and trim, to a more muscle bound appearance. Advertisements for all sorts of at-home weight systems and public health spas perpetuated this new ideal. Movie idols, such as Arnold Schwarzeneggar and Sylvester Stalone, epitomized this trend. These men often appeared in militaristic scenarios that reaffirmed traditional masculine values that had waned in the '60s and '70s.

To some extent, we can say that there was a coincidence of traditionally masculine sentiment and the wedge jacket shape that was evident throughout the 1980s and became the mode in 1988. The bulked up physiques appeared better in the wedge shaped jacket. It accommodated a
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broader chest. The wedge silhouette also gave an illusion of a more muscle bound appearance to slighter men. The increased padding of the shoulder and chest areas in the wedge jacket created a muscular illusion.

In spite of the expectations that the '80s man be nurturant, sensitive and comfortable in the kitchen, his business suit suggested a powerful, traditionally masculine man on the job. There were literally "power suits" in the 1980s. These were high quality, often hand tailored suits. The successful man could afford these suits; the aspiring man could not afford to scrimp by purchasing a more affordable suit. The expectation that a white collar working man in the 1980s dress for success meant that one had to appear successful ever before being successful. The equation between consumption and success was emphasized in business suits.

The conservative trend in politics marking the entire decade was coincident with the business suit's return to classic styling. The promise of prosperity under Republican economic leadership proved irresistible to most Americans. The desire to restore national prestige through the military also might have appealed to Americans after the embarrassment of the Iran hostage situation in 1979. The promises of a presidential candidate with an ideology that nostalgically interpreted and embraced the Eisenhower years as a time of economic prosperity, military strength and national prestige was optimistically taken to heart by the electorate. With the initiation of the Reagan era, coincidentally, classic styling in the business suit, similar to the styling of the 1950s in many respects, returned to men's business suits. However, the coincidence with classic styling might more strongly relate to the emphasis on professional success that figured prominently in the 1980s. Professionally oriented individuals were probably concerned with
economic prosperity. Therefore, the relationship between the neo-conservative trend and the return of classic styling may be the result of the increased number of professionally oriented men who wore the suits.
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this research was to establish the nature of the relationship between the stylistic changes in the men's business suit and the masculine roles in the United States from 1950-1988. The stylistic expression apparent in the structural components of men's business suits and masculine roles are both behavioral expectations and, as such, products of the environment from which they emerge that are given to change over time as society changes.

In an attempt to establish the men's business suit as a product of the social environment from which it emerged, its stylistic changes were related to changes in masculine roles from 1950 to 1988. A content analysis of men's business suits was undertaken to track stylistic change through the period. A survey of advertising was executed to determine the ways in which masculine roles apparent in advertising changed. As well, a survey of gender and men's studies literature was also conducted to form a basis for discussion in relating stylistic change to changes in masculine roles.

From the content analysis the classic appearance was determined for the men's business suit. It contained the following stylistic expressions in its structural components:

- Jacket shape: natural
- Depth of bridle line: medium
- Lapel width: medium
- Presence of peaked lapel: no
- Lapel shape: squared
- Collar Shape: squared
- Size of collar notch: large
- Jacket shape at closure-hem intersection: rounded
- Closure: single breasted
- Pant shape: pegged
- Pant width: medium
The suit of the 1950s differed only in jacket shape (loose tube) and length (long). The suit of the 1960s varied on several counts; its jacket was a loose tube shape, it was short, its lapels were narrow, and its pegged pants were narrow. When the 1970s suit is compared to the classic suit, its modal expression varies from the classic in every area except the jacket shape. It has wide lapels, a low bridle line, a flared jacket skirt, and full flared pants, making it radically different from the classic appearance.

The archetypal masculine roles apparent in advertising changed over the decades. In the 1950s the male appeared as a good provider, a professionally successful man in his 40s with a wife and children. In the 1960s the emphasis shifted to leisure, and the first half of the ’60s the man was still in his 40s, but he took on a continental flare, more urban, sophisticated and in pursuit of nightlife. In the second half of the ’60s and on into the ’70s the emphasis shifted to younger men. The major change in masculine images from the ’70s as compared to the two previous decades was a further emphasis on youth and the androgynous portrayal of men, or the depiction of men in reversals of traditional sex roles. In the 1980s, a pervasive emphasis on professional success returned to masculine portrayals in advertising, and the young upwardly professional was depicted as wealthy, successful, physically fit and in his early 30’s.

The classic stylistic expression coincides with periods in which a greater emphasis is placed on the white collar working man’s professional success; the 1950s and the 1980s were such times. Although the expectation was that white collar working men should be successful throughout the period of investigation, it was much more of an imperative in the first and last decades observed.

During the 1950s, the image of the good provider suggested a man
had to continually improve the life of his family through income gains. In the 1980s, advertising portrayed the yuppies as equating six-digit incomes with personal fulfillment. In the 1960s, the good provider expectation softened, as apparent in the masculine images in *Vogue*, *Esquire*, and *The New York Times*, men were supposed to enjoy nights out on the town, not in the office working late. The rather skimpy suit with its narrow pants, narrow lapels and short jacket which characterized the business suit of the 1960s is youthful, almost child-like, and certainly a deviation from the classic appearance. In the 1970s the greatest deviation from the classic stylistic expression in men's business suits occurred. This coincided with the portrayal of women joining men in the work force as competitors and co-breadwinners. The androgynous styling of the business suit from 1970 to 1976 reflected the changing and perhaps somewhat ambiguous expectations in the workplace and out. In spite of the greatest deviations in stylistic expression from the classic appearance during the 1970s, it was during the 1970s that the natural jacket shape appeared as the mode and became part of the classic business suit.

During the 1980s, the men who wore business suits were portrayed as "keeping their figures" through exercise and thus retained the natural jacket body shape to display their physiques. However, the classic stylistic expression returned in other structural components of the suit at a time when these men were represented as seeking the traditionally masculine attainment of professional success.

Conclusions and Implications

The major conclusions center around three hypotheses which were supported by findings summarized above. The business suit did deviate stylistically from the classic appearance during the late 1960s and
early 1970s. Concepts of masculinity held in the 1950s were challenged in the late 1960s and early 1970s. And finally, the classic stylistic elements of the business suit evident in the determined prototype returned in the 1980s, coincident with the neo-conservative trend of the Reagan era.

To a certain extent, these hypotheses initially implied that the 1950s were a time when the classic business suit pervaded (this was supported by the findings). Thus it can be concluded that times when exceptional emphasis is placed on the professional success of men, the social climate will appear to be in a conservative state. Although everything about masculine roles that changed during the '60s and '70s did not revert in the 1980s, other social movements including civil rights, women's rights, and the concern for the environment did lose ground during the 1980s.

As indicated by Boyer (1981) men were experiencing role strain in the 1980s. They faced the dilemma of assimilating women's altered expectations of them with the increased pressure to behave traditionally masculine in the workplace. In this sense, the 1980s have been dualistic, presenting two opposing sets of gender expectations for men simultaneously. Although synthesis and assimilation of new gender roles occurred, there have been reactions and counteractions through the decade, making it difficult to determine what was carried through from the '60s and '70s. The expectation for male nurturance was maintained. In the '80s, it was truly acceptable for men to cook and show an interest in aesthetic pursuits. The latter two phenomena may be related to the Good Life ideals of the decade's yuppies as they appeared in advertising.

What the 1990s will bring is not clear. There is a definite trend toward the wedge jacket body shape with its wide shoulders. The
continued emphasis on physical prowess might manifest itself in the wedge shaped jacket. By way of conjecture, maybe the continuing emphasis on muscular arms and chests is a reaction against the increased social power of women. Perhaps the establishment of a strong physical appearance asserts dominance in an arena where women, by virtue of genetic predisposition, find it much more difficult to compete. That is, very few women are naturally able to develop their muscles to the extent that most men can. For some men, the attainment of physical superiority might be a compensation for decreased automatic privilege.

This research did find fashion change as evident in stylistic change to be cyclical and related to social changes. Certainly the styling of men's business suits will continue to change over time. The stylistic expression apparent in jacket body shape in 1988 is a departure from the classic appearance which was determined for the research period. Perhaps in future research periods, the wedge shaped jacket will become part of a new classic appearance, or perhaps the pendulum will swing in another direction altogether.

It seems safe to predict the maintenance of the men's business suit as a behavioral expectation in the workplace until some profound social change redefines expectations. The stylistic expression in this suit will manifest itself in an evolutionary manner unless social upheaval occurs. These two assertions are in accord with the findings of Kroeber and Richardson (1940) and others who have investigated fashion change over time.

Finally, only a clairvoyant could predict the nature of changes in fashion and society over time. All that can be said is that it will change, and that certain social phenomena seem to coincide with particular stylistic expressions repeatedly.
VII. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The use of a composite to establish classic stylistic expression can be useful in other clothing categories for both men and women over any period of investigation. The establishment of a classic appearance is a springboard for analysis and discussion by assisting in the recognition of stylistic variations.

Existing historic costume research findings not related to their social milieu could be. The components of the framework used to explain fashion change in this research could be adapted to other garment categories and periods of investigation. Some relevant aspect of society which produced the clothing artifact could be observed over time and its changes compared to the changes that are already known to exist in the stylistic expression of a garment’s structural components.

There is a continuing gap in the body of knowledge that specifically addresses menswear. A better understanding of stylistic change in men’s clothing will increase our understanding of costume history and social history by filling in “the other half of the picture” and perhaps lend insight in ways that the previous focus on women’s attire has not.
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APPENDIX A

The Stylistic Expression Manifest in the Structural Components

Research Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication:</th>
<th>Date of Publication:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacket Body Shape-</td>
<td>wedge fitted wedge natural loose tube close tube</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Presence of Flare- yes | no |

| Depth of Bridle Line- high | medium low |

| Width of Lapels- wide | medium narrow |

| Presence of Lapel Peak- yes | no |

| Shape of Collar- square | rounded |

| Size of Collar Notch- small | medium large |

| Length of Jacket- long | standard short |
Shape of Jacket at Intersection of Closure and Hem—
squared rounded

Type of Closure— single breasted double breasted

Shape of Pants— pegged straight flared

Width of Pant Leg— wide medium narrow very narrow
## APPENDIX B

**Cross Tabulation of Findings by Biennial Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Observations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jacket body shape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wedge</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fitted wedge</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close tube</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loose tube</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flared jacket skirt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depth of bridle line</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lapel width</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wide</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lapel shape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>squared</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rounded</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Biennial modes are in boldface.
### Cross Tabulation of Findings by Biennial Frequency—Continued

#### Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stylistic Expression</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence of lapel peak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Shape of collar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>squared</th>
<th>rounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>size</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shape</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>color</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>material</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>style</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Size of collar notch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>28</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Length of Jacket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>42</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Shape of jacket at intersection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>squared</th>
<th>rounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>size</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shape</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>color</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>material</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>style</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pattern</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Jacket closure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>63</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>single breasted</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double breasted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Biennial nodes are in boldface.
### Cross Tabulation of the findings by Biennial Frequency—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stylistic Expression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pant shape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straight</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pegged</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flared</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pant width</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very narrow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presence of a vest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Biennial modes are in boldface.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross Tabulation of Findings by Biennial Frequency-Continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stylistic Expression</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Observations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jacket body shape</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fitted wedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close tube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loose tube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flared jacket skirt</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depth of bridle line</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lapel width</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lapel shape</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>squared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note.</strong> Biennial modes are in boldface.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cross Tabulation of Findings by Biennial Frequency—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stylistic Expression</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>72</th>
<th>74</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presence of lapel peak</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collar shape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>squared</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rounded</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of collar notch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jacket length</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standard</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shape of jacket at intersection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>squared</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rounded</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jacket closure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single breasted</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double breasted</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Biennial modes are in boldface.
### Cross Tabulation of Findings by Biennial Frequency—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stylistic Expression</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>72</th>
<th>74</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pant Shape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straight</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pegged</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flared</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pant Width</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrow</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very narrow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presence of a Vest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Biennial modes are in boldface.
APPENDIX C

Mean Frequencies for the Research Period

| Stylistic Expression |  |
|----------------------|--|  |
| Jacket body shape    |  |
| wedge                | 5.55 |  |
| fitted wedge         | 7.10 |  |
| natural              | 47.10 |  |
| close tube           | 5.80 |  |
| loose tube           | 34.45 |  |
| Flared jacket skirt  |  |
| yes                  | 13.9 |  |
| no                   | 86.1 |  |
| Depth of bridle line |  |
| high                 | 13.55 |  |
| medium               | 44.30 |  |
| low                  | 42.15 |  |
| Lapel width          |  |
| wide                 | 33.55 |  |
| medium               | 36.50 |  |
| narrow               | 29.95 |  |
| Lapel shape          |  |
| squared              | 94.85 |  |
| rounded              | 5.15 |  |
APPENDIX C-Continued

Mean Frequencies for the Research Period

Stylistic Expression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of lapel peak</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shape of collar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape of collar notch</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>squared</td>
<td>94.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rounded</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Size of collar notch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of collar notch</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>13.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large</td>
<td>78.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length of Jacket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Jacket</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standard</td>
<td>69.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shape of jacket at intersection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape of jacket at intersection</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>squared</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rounded</td>
<td>87.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jacket closure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jacket closure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>single breasted</td>
<td>87.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double breasted</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C-Continued

**Mean Frequencies for the Research Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stylistic Expression</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pant shape</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straight</td>
<td>17.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pegged</td>
<td>53.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flared</td>
<td>28.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Pant width**       |    |
| full                 | 16.60 |
| medium               | 47.60 |
| narrow               | 32.05 |
| very narrow          | 3.75  |

| Presence of a vest   |    |
| yes                  | 18.90 |
| no                   | 91.10 |
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