



ISSN Print: 2394-7500
ISSN Online: 2394-5869
Impact Factor: 5.2
IJAR 2020; 6(2): 37-39
www.allresearchjournal.com
Received: 17-11-2019
Accepted: 21-12-2019

Shakti Sagar Katre
Asst. Professor, NIFT,
New Delhi, India

Dr. Chitra Arora
Retd. Associate Professor DU,
New Delhi, India

Role of occupational uniform in context to border security force

Shakti Sagar Katre and Dr. Chitra Arora

Abstract

Occupational wear differentiates professional of different profession and provides identity, and serves the purpose of user to perform desired objective. Occupational wear has evolved over the period of time as per requirement of work. with advancement of technology and material occupational wear has been reached to the specialized category of garmenting to enhance performance with comfort and efficiency. Each type of occupational wear undergoes with changes time to time. Changes are according to upgraded technology and design. If changes are not made as per the availability of newer type of material and garmenting technology it effects the performance, and aesthetics.

Keywords: Occupational wear, Garmenting, Performance, Aesthetics. Design, Material, Comfort

1. Introduction

One of the most important role of occupational wear is to provide identity for occupation which communicates roles assigned to the person and position in organization. As per position role of person gets changed and as per the position and role uniform is decided. like uniform of nurses, pilot, police, armed forces etc. The uniform word has derived from "una" means one "forma" means form that means one type of fabric in particular style with prescribed insignia and accoutrement adopted by all individual as per standard set by tradition or institution. insignia has its role to communicate rank position and achievement. Methodology adopted in this study, literature review to map historical perspective, Phenomenographic of BSF Personal to understand these Points- Communication, Psychological effect, Functionality, Sociological affect.

2. Historical perspective of occupational uniform for armed forces 2.1

Among ancient warriors one of the most important considerations in warfare was already to maintain the solidarity of the fighting group. Techniques of warfare and details of weaponry enabled the members of a group to determine at a glance to which group a person or item belonged ^[1].

A. First signs of uniforms

Early evidence has been recorded of military formations and uniforms more than five thousand years ago, and in ancient history uniformed soldiers were found in particular in militarized civilizations. In Mesopotamia, exposed to outside intrusion, warfare dominated Sumerian life in the third millennium BC and led to military specialization; an army of more than 5,000 soldiers wore metal helmets, cloaks and fringed kilts. In the second millennium BC the rulers in Mesopotamia maintained out of their revenue bodies of armed men ready to go to war ^[2].

In Babylonia, Persia, Rome, Turkey, Japan and Peru conscription was often used by centralized political and military authorities. Their newly formed armies, which were larger organized forces trained to make war, often added various types of armour and helmets to the body protection of the shield and used them as elements of identification. The less centralized governments of Sumeria, India and China relied throughout much of their history on the use of volunteers or militia armies ^[3]. Military Egypt had a war style as distinctive to itself, and almost as long lasting, as its own civilization. The many depictions of warfare in its sculpture and wall paintings show that its soldiers did not wear armour of any sort, but

Correspondence Author:
Dr. Chitra Arora
Retd. Associate Professor,
DU, New Delhi, India

marched to battle bare-chested and bareheaded, with only short shields for protection. Apparently, Egyptian warfare was stylized and perhaps even ritualized^[4].

B. Emergence of large standing armies

Chandragupta, who inaugurated the Maurya Empire immediately after the time of Alexander the Great, is said to have already had an army of 600,000 infantry, 30,000 horsemen, 36,000 men with elephants and 24,000 men with chariots^[5]. The Assyrians also established large standing armies and the principles of military bureaucracy^[6] on which the Romans built. The Roman army at the time of Augustus numbered more than a half a million men at its height. The backbone of the Roman army was formed by a hardcore of professional soldiers wearing clothing and equipment clearly identifying them as belonging to it.

C. Appearance of a distinctive sign

The Middle Ages, including the period of the Crusades, and the Renaissance made extensive use of heraldic signs (of communities, corporations or families) for identification in battle, but also for symbolic or aesthetic reasons or as a demonstration of strength⁷. Soldiers also wore distinctive signs sown on their clothes. An early example is the white cross, in the form of two white bands set at right angles, which appeared for the first time in 1339 in a battle where fighters of a Swiss region wanted to distinguish themselves from the Austrians and the Lansquenets of the King of Burgundy^[8].

D. Present wearing and appearance of military uniforms and insignia

Today, most armies have regulations on uniform policy and penal laws may punish a soldier for the unlawful wearing of a specific military uniform. Military regulations usually prescribe the appearance of uniforms and insignia and how they are to be properly worn by officers and enlisted personnel of the armed forces. The current US Army regulations on uniform policy contain, for example, 369 pages of rules, tables and figures.¹⁵ The absence of written regulations on military uniforms does not, however, mean that uniforms are not usually worn. Custom and cultural traditions may be followed more meticulously than detailed rules^[9].

3. Communication and uniform

Uniform is worn by particular group of people communicates the profession, differentiates within similar profession like;- various type of armed forces uniform are not identical but similar in nature. within one force as per nature of job and designation uniform differentiates but at same time communicates the feeling of belonging to same group. For example in same force different regiment has some identifiable differences in uniform. communication of rank designation through insignia and badges inculcates discipline between all. occasional and ceremonial uniform has been communicating tradition and legacy of that particular force.

"uniforms, to the extent that they suggest economic value or status, show what kind of services, as opposed to applications, we should expect from an individual. About this aspect of fashion and clothing, we can say that it indicates the economic or contractual party decoration, as opposed to the social or cultural site. We can see this on

many levels. In addition, dress at least in part describes what services we should expect from these people and you can also indicate what type of service is provided."^[10]

3.1 Psychological effect of uniform

Uniform has psychological effects on person who is wearing it and person who is viewing it, psychologically both are effected, well detailed uniform with good fastener builds the confidence and good aesthetics. Feeling of duty, power, position, pride all comes along with uniform. The influence of uniformed people on the society had already been made the subject of a lot of research. Research as put forward by Richard R. M.S. and Johnson shows that, for example, police and military uniforms reflect power and authority. So they have a strong influence on how people accept each other. Thus, a police uniform has a thorough psychological impact on people, despite the fact that the opinion could be influenced by variations in the style of uniforms^[11].

3.2 Functionality of uniform

Uniform has to be multifunctional and performance oriented. Different operation is required during performance of job, in case of armed forces placement of different pockets and appropriate fastener has to be used, hassle free uniform enhances the performance. combat training and on field duty requires appropriateness in garmenting. combat uniform is highly technical uniform best technology with respect to fabric, Fastening system, threads insignia each and every thing as to be best available technology. "The field of functional clothing is wide and diverse with each functionality having its own specification, material requirements, consequent technologies and processes. Much of the technology used is amongst the most sophisticated available at any given point of time. End use applications are diverse and often quite complex, ranging from life saving and hostile environment responsive to those improving the quality of life"^[12].

3.3 Sociological affect if uniform

Each force uniform has its own colour, style and insignia and all of these makes wearer part of group and he becomes representation of group. Particular group has its own imagery in mind of people as khaki, camouflage, Blue, white and people react as per that indicates the social effect of uniform. "Because of its identification with a group the uniform assumes the properties of a totemic emblem and embodies the attributes of a group in a sense the uniform becomes the group and it rather than the group is often the focus of thought and affect"^[13].

4. Conclusion

Occupational uniform has multidimensional aspects from Mesopotamia to modern day occupational uniform. Armed forces has been evolved as per the available technology of that time, and has achieved different objective with respect to functionality, communication, psychological and sociological aspect, and continual improvement is taking place. Further study is also going to provide suitable option for advancement in few aspect. study in area of functionality is required as technology and material are changing frequently.

As role of armed forces are diverse occupational uniform has to be updated with advance material available.

5. Acknowledgement

Official of Border Security Force. Resource centre National Institute of Fashion Technology New Delhi.

6. References

1. Myres JL. (ed.), *The Evolution of Culture and Other Essays of the Late Lt-Gen. A. Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1906, 51.
2. John Keegan, *A History of Warfare*, Pimlico, London, 1993, 131-136.
3. Quincy Wright. *A Study of War*, 2nd edition, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1965, 145-151.
4. John Keegan. *A History of Warfare*, Pimlico, London, 1993, 131
5. Quincy Wright, *A Study of War*, 2nd edition, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1965, 148
6. John Keegan. *A History of Warfare*, Pimlico, London, 1993, 267
7. Franco Cardini. *La culture de la guerre, Xe – XVIIIe siècle*, Gallimard, Paris, 1992, 217-220.
8. Peter F Kopp. Croix fédérale in: *Dictionnaire historique de la Suisse*, available at: <http://lexhist.ch/externe/protect/textes/f/F10104.html> (visited 19 January 2020)
9. Chapter 7, Art. 1.a (Personal appearance policies) of US Army Regulation 670-1, op. cit. (note 15).
10. Barnard M, *Fashion statements: communication and culture*, 2011, 86
11. Johnson, Richard. *The Psychological Influence of the Police Uniform*, 2020.
12. Gupta, Deepti. *Functional clothing-Definition and classification*. *Indian Journal of Fibre and Textile Research*, 2011.
13. Joseph N, Alex N. *The Uniform: A Sociological Perspective*. *American Journal of Sociology*. 1972; 77(4):719-730. Retrieved January 21, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/2776756
14. Ashworth P, Lucas U. *Achieving empathy and engagement: a practical approach to the design, conduct and reporting of phenomenographic research*. *Studies in Higher Education*. 2000; 25(3):295-308.
15. Bardack, Nadia R. McAndrew, Francis T. (The Influence of Physical Attractiveness and Manner of Dress on Success in a Simulated Personnel Decision. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 1985; 12(01):777-778
16. Bickman, Leonard. *The Social Power of a Uniform*. *Journal of Applied Social psychology*. 1974; 4:47-61.
17. Bonami F, Frisa ML, Tonchi S. *Uniform Order and disorder*, Edizioni Charta, Milano, 2000.
18. Hertz C. *The Uniform: As Material, As Symbol, As Negotiated Object*. *Midwestern Folklore*, 2007.
19. Philip Hoare. *I Love a Man in a Uniform: The Dandy Esprit de Corps*, *Fashion Theory*. 2005; 9(3):263-281
20. Smith WC. *an overview of protective clothing - Market, Material needs (industrial textile association)*, 1999 <http://www.intexa.com/>.