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The menswear fashion market is a sector of the global fashion industry that is on the move, with an expected growth of 14% between now and 2020 (Sherman, 2016). Yet, a look inside any fashion program across the United States would reveal that the demographics are leaning significantly towards a majority of young women who are enrolled and most classes are geared towards designing women’s wear. Other trends in the fashion industry reveal a significant lack in overall racial diversity in numerous areas including representation in media, models, and designers in addition to mostly thin bodies in fashion media or related outlets. This study takes a critical look at diversity in one of the tools used in the classroom: textbooks, specifically fashion illustration textbooks with a focus on men and if they have diverse representations of race and the body. Previous studies have critically analyzed women, race, and the body in design and product development textbooks and found a significant lack in diversity (Reddy-Best, Kane, Harmon, & Gagliardi, in press) and another study of fashion illustration textbooks revealed similar results (Reddy-Best & Gagliardi, 2016), yet no studies have comprehensively examined men in these educational tools. Using intersectionality theory (Crenshaw, 1989) as a lens, we ask how often men are represented, and then critically analyze their representation in relation to race and the body. As the menswear market is growing, is our academic discipline creating enough tools to teach these techniques and are the tools diverse? This paper sought to answer those questions in order to offer implications to those creating future textbooks.

We used the content analysis method, and analyzed 30 fashion illustration textbooks. A majority of the textbooks (n = 28) were mostly aimed at drawing women and women’s garments, yet had at least one chapter or portion of the text devoted to drawing men and men’s garments. These books were chosen as they were all of the fashion illustration textbooks published since 2000. Then, we searched specifically for men’s fashion illustration textbooks and found three books. Two were published in the 2000s (2008 and 2011), and one was published in 1976. We decided to exclude the book published in 1976 because we assumed most students today would not reference this textbook due to its older date and limited number of pages. We coded each image as a single unit in five categories including gender (woman, man, gender neutral), race (Black, Asian, White, other person of color, and indistinguishable; used categories developed in Reddy-Best, Kane, Harmon, & Gagliardi’s (in press) study), skin color (1-10 using the NIS Skin Color Scale; 1 is the lightest and 10 is the darkest), body size (1-9 using the Thompson & Gray (1995) scale where 1 is the smallest and 9 is the largest), and body position (open, closed off, active, mixed, or neutral; categories were developed from Conley & Ramsey’s (2011) study). Four coders analyzed data; the intercoder reliability check resulted in 94% agreement.

Throughout all of the textbooks there were 7112 (100%) individuals including 1155 (16%) men, 5814 (82%), and 143 (2%) gender neutral individuals represented. Coverage of men
within the 28 fashion illustration textbooks not specifically focused on men ranged in the amount of space dedicated to demonstrating how to draw men from 0% to 47% (average 14%). The books had 720 (62%) White men, 108 (9%) Black men, 32 (3%) Asian men, 54 (5%) other person of color men, and 241 (21%) indistinguishable men. Skin colors of Black men included 11 (10%) in the 1-2 range, 33 (31%) in the 3-4 range, 26 (24%) in the 5-6 range, 4 (4%) in the 7-8 range, and three (3%) in the 9-10 range; the remainder of Black men had an abnormal color (1 or 1%) or no color (30 or 28%). Body size of men included 50 (4%) in size 1-2, 616 (53%) in 3-4, 470 (41%) in 5-6, 17 (1%) in 7-8, and two (less than 1%) who were size 9 or larger. Men were in 121 (10%) closed off positions, 341 (30%) in open positions, 584 (51%) in neutral positions, 69 (6%) in mixed positions, and 40 (3%) in an active position. We also analyzed the intersections of race and body to determine if people of color were further marginalized. Yet, these analyses revealed that across all of the races, men were mostly in dominant positions followed by neutral positions. However, it is important to note that White men had the lowest percentage in closed off positions (9%) as compared to Black (13%), Asian (13%), and other person of color (19%).

Results reveal that men are significantly underrepresented within the fashion illustration textbooks. Analysis of race reveals that the men of color (Black, Asian, and other people of color) have the least representation and are even further marginalized in that they are represented in more closed off positions as compared to White men. This study is similar to past studies on fashion textbooks and highlights the continual lack of racial diversity. Publishers and authors can consider findings for future books in order to promote diversity and inclusion.


