

# “What Women Designer Want”

## The Female Point of View in the Fashion Creative Process

**Vittorio Linfante**

Politecnico di Milano

### **Keywords**

Fashion, Design Processes, Branding, Social Studies, Women’s Entrepreneurship.

### **Abstract**

We Should All Be Feminists, the speech given in 2012 by Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie, became a fashionable slogan in 2017, having been printed on the T-shirts presented by Maria Grazia Chiuri in her first collection for Dior. An operation that also aimed to contribute to the redefinition of the female role within the fashion system. Even though Poiret has freed women from corsets and constrictions, it is thanks to Madame Grès, Madeleine Vionnet, Elsa Schiaparelli and Coco Chanel, that a renewed relationship between dress and woman’s body has been questioned, opening the doors to the creations of Mary Quant, Krizia, Vivienne Westwood, Rei Kawakubo, Miuccia Prada, Consuelo Castiglioni and Phoebe Philo, to mention the most relevant. These figures all looked at woman’s body through cuts and formal and material experimentations by using a personal vision of style and a precise creative process.

Far from being limited to gender discourse, the article intends to investigate, the evolution of the relationship between the creative process implemented by women designers and the fashion project. A dialogue that does not end in pure formal experimentation, but that succeeds in giving shape to new cultural and social values and, in defining fortunate entrepreneurial stories.

## 1. What Does Women Designers Want?

“The great question, which has never been answered and to which I have not been able to answer, despite my thirty years of research on the female soul, is *What does a woman want?*” (Jones, 1955, 420). This sentence, stated by Sigmund Freud, well represents the great dilemma that anguished the father of psychoanalysis over a century ago and that remains unsolved today, even when restricting the field of investigation to the relationship among fashion, creativity and the female gender; it is a question that has passed through various phases and that cyclically comes up again in an attempt to delineate a shared thought – an objective not yet fully achieved despite the several experiences and reflections carried out over the years on the role of women within the system of the cultural and creative industries (Flew, 2012, p. 85) (i.e. architecture, visual and performing arts, crafts, design, publishing, cinema, photography, art and antiques market, music, advertising, computer services and interactive entertainment software, television, radio and fashion).

Among the countless actions taken to broaden the debate on the role of women in art, creativity and design, MoMoWo (Women’s Creativity since the Modern Movement) is a cultural cooperation project, co-funded by the European Union, created by the collaboration among the Politecnico di Torino, the IADE of Lisbon, the University of Oviedo, the ZRC SAZU of Ljubljana, the University of Grenoble, the Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam and the Slovenská technická univerzita of Bratislava; similarly, Rebelarchitette and Voices of Women (VOW) have been developed to give visibility to women in the architectural field. As for the other cultural and creative industries,

moments of reflection on the “women’s question” in the arts have increased especially in the last period, as demonstrated by the numerous conferences and exhibitions: *Pictures by Women: A History of Modern Photography* (MoMA, New York, 2011), *Designing Modern Women 1890–1990* (MoMA, New York, 2014), *W. Women in Italian Design* (La Triennale, Milan, 2019), *I Am ... Contemporary Women Artists of Africa* (National Museum of African Art, Washington, 2019), *Female Perspectives. Women of Talent and Commitment 1861–1926* (Gallerie degli Uffizi, Florence, 2019), *Women Take the Floor* (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 2019), *Code Breakers: Women in Games* (ACMI, Melbourne, 2017).

In the fashion world (meant here both as a manufacturing and as cultural system, hence as a producer of both artefacts and significance), the relationship between women and fashion itself has long been central. For Georg Simmel, women particularly strongly adhere to fashion because “fashion gives form to equalization and individualization, to the fascination of imitation and showiness” (Simmel, 1905, 196); for Roland Barthes, fashion offers women a double dream of identity and pleasure, perhaps an invitation to play with identities (Barthes, 1983, p. 255); more recently, Eleonora Fiorani affirms that clothes and the dressing up are a playful sign through which one person finds expression (Fiorani, 2006, p. 17). Fashion is therefore understood as a system of objects and significance, that takes on value depending on who makes, who uses and who wears the dresses; as an essential concept that sometimes defines and sometimes adapts itself to social, taste and style changes.

The continuous mutations through which fashion undergoes made the debate on the relationship between fashion itself and women’s creativity particularly fascinating yet complex. Considering once more the other cultural and creative industries, it is clear that the historical feminine/feminist issue is mainly linked to the emancipation of women and to the battles that, since the beginning of the 20th century, have contributed to the definition of gender equality in terms of rights, responsibilities, opportunities and recognition of a role within a given sector. It is a process that has allowed women to pursue careers in creative areas linked to markets that tend to have a transversal public. However, in fashion, it is a whole nother story since, within the fashion system, women are multiple subjects who play different roles at the same time: they are the designers or creative directors who act to create and produce fashion and its artefacts, they represent the agents who activate processes of choice (fashion editors, buyers, stylists and fashion journalists) and, finally, they are the customers who buy, wear and use fashion artefacts. The overlap of roles is also complicated by the fluidity of shapes, materials and types of products, which increasingly shifts from male to female and vice versa; nevertheless, this overlap of genders have contributed over the years to the liberation of women – aesthetically and socially – also thanks to hybrid, unisex or genderless styles and products.

Fashion is by its very nature an interpreter and a mirror of social changes that, as Eleonora Fiorani states, combines and sews what seems irreconcilable to us: tradition and modernity, past and future, localism and globalisation, social inadequacy and consumerism (Fiorani, 2006, p. 11).

Clothing is not only an essential medium for our daily life but also the barometer and the catalyst for social change. It is both political and cultural action by means of a form of social control manifested in the display of economic and social values, which are generated through specific aesthetic codes; it is capable of indicating “how people in different eras have perceived their positions in social structures and negotiated status boundaries” (Crane, 2000, p. 1). Thus, being this interpreter and mirror of social changes, fashion becomes the lens through which we aim to read the relationship between fashion itself, creativity, design and the female sphere.

“What Women Want” is therefore a question that cannot find a unique and common answer coming from the female and male worlds. To this purpose, it is interesting to note the different prepositions used to connect the word *fashion* with the word *woman*. A fashion *for* women? But what does *for* mean? The making of a garment answers this question since an item of clothing is made *for* someone. A fashion (created or made) *by* women? But even in this case, are we sure that there are a distinct feminine “touch” and a masculine one referring not only to fashion but also to the project in general? Also, we should not forget the large number of women involved in the production and creation of fashion.

## **2. Thesis and Antithesis in Female Fashion History**

Several phases have animated the debate on the evolution of fashion and on the contribution of female creativity in the definition of changes in taste, style and product; phases constantly oscillating between form or function, ornament and minimalism, real and ideal body, femininity and androgyny,

and between creativity achieved through direct manipulation of the material or filtered by the two-dimensionality of the drawing. These opposite categories have been intertwined along the historical path of fashion setting different scenarios and approaches yet never binding the evolution of fashion in general to a unique definition. Indeed, this evolution is not only related to the gender of designers, creative directors, dressmakers or tailors but also to a dialogue that has necessarily included the market; that is, the customers, who after all rule fashion successes and failures by being more and more “activators (and no longer *stupid dupes*) of social, cultural and identity processes starting from significance produced by the market” (Cova, Fuschillo, Pace, 2017, 28).

A series of actions and reactions have contributed to the creation of the abacus of elements, references, shapes and styles that constitute the contemporary vocabulary of women’s wardrobe, together with those changes, often derived from the bottom up (Crane, 2000, p. 14), generated by innovations linked to societal and technological progress, such as the evolution of the transport system from bicycle to car. It is interesting to see how, for example, in the Victorian era “women’s cyclewear became visual shorthand for the *New Woman* who was identified by her desire for progress, independent spirit and her athletic zeal” (Jungnickel, 2018, p. 16).

The unfolding of the history of fashion designers and of the products that have furthered or supported the emancipation of the female body and of the role of women in society traces a narrative that does not follow a linear path of “liberation” but that presents unedited scenarios. It is a history that, for example, witnessed Paul Poiret freeing women from corsets, but loading

them with decorations, ornaments, jewels and feathers; the same Poiret who tightened the female silhouette at leg level with his hobble skirt, which was so loved by his clients yet too tight to allow agile movements – a new torture, but one that women liked so much! It required a woman to make that project real, usable. Indeed, it was Jeanne Paquin who perfected that fashion item by adding “ingenious hidden pleats, so that, although the skirt looked slim, walking was a pleasure” (Steele, 1991, p. 29).

While it is almost taken for granted that the research for practicality and comfort should always be implemented in projects developed by women, one can easily observe that, even on this issue, opinions are not shared. It is enough to compare the methods and approaches of four different women, who are symbols of emancipation not only in the fashion field, to spot their divergent visions: Jeanne Lanvin, Madelaine Vionnet, Coco Chanel and Elsa Schiaparelli.

Jeanne Lanvin, for example, affirmed that “modern clothes need some sort of romantic quality [...] they should not be too prosaic and practical” (Steele, 1991, p. 37). In a period of liberation from the corsets, she presented, meeting with enormous public success, the *robe de style* (Fig. 1), a model of dress inspired by the shapes of the 18th century, featuring volumes that redesigned the feminine silhouette with a tight-fitting bodice and a wide skirt on the hips, supported by a basket structure. A garment that was extremely structured for that period and that reshaped the body to the extent of appearing anachronistic in a period characterised by the emancipation of the female body. In the same years, Madeleine Vionnet – who claimed to be the one who freed women from that *chose orthopédique* that was the corset, and not Poiret – defined more simple and linear silhouettes.



**Figure 1.** House of Lanvin, *Robe de Style*, Autumn/Winter 1926, silk, rhinestones, pearls. © The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.



Rejecting drawing as part of the creative process for being a simplification of reality, Vionnet put in place a new approach, shaping her creations on a scale mannequin (Fig. 2). In this way, working directly with materials, she could better test the most appropriate cut, in order to make the dress follow the shape of the body and not only lean on it; a body that, however, had to be proportioned and well made. Vionnet, in fact, while rejecting to redesign the woman’s body, only designed for a specific type of woman, that is, an ideal woman who could embody a particular idea of eternal beauty (Golbin, 2009, p. 14) – “a woman’s muscles are the best corset one could imagine” (Beucler, 1929, p. 31). But Vionnet also debunked another false myth regarding the fact that women designers design thinking about themselves: the French couturier would have never worn her creations since they were not designed for her who, not wiry, wore only “sack dresses” (Chapsal, 1989, p. 159).

If Vionnet refined, Chanel dressed. If Vionnet celebrated the ideal of beauty of the female body, Chanel celebrated herself. Their personalities and approaches were very different, but represent effectively the multiplicity of design methods and relationships that can be experienced talking about creativity, fashion and women. This complexity is fully expressed by Gabrielle Chanel’s contradictory figure: if on the one hand, she embodied the quintessence of women’s liberation and innovated the abacus of clothing and materials archetypes, inventing sportswear and making jersey elegant (Fig. 3), on the other hand, she never included trousers in her collections, even though she was one of the first women to adopt them, breaking the rules of dressing well.



**Figure 2.** Madeleine Vionnet used a wooden dummy to create her fashion designs, 1930 c. © Apic/ Getty Images.



**Figure 3.** Gabrielle “Coco” Chanel wearing one of her suits in the grounds at Faubourg Saint-Honoré, Paris, 1929. © Sasha/Getty Images.

Also, she considered the miniskirt (the manifesto of women’s emancipation of the Sixties and Seventies brought to the spotlight by Mary Quant) “disgusting and making fun of the old little girls who wore it” (Steele, 1991, p. 50).

In opposition to the emphasis on functionality and simplicity, Elsa Schiaparelli, “the Italian artist who makes clothes”, as Chanel called her, is fully entitled to be part of the debate on women’s creativity in fashion. If for Chanel comfort was the ultimate goal of her fashion approach, for Schiaparelli there was no distinction between clothes and costume, between fashion as a mirror of the everyday life and costume design as a staging, as the theatricalisation of life. For the Italian artist, design was an artistic act that she performed by means of countless collaborations with artists such as Salvador Dalí and Jean Cocteau. Masculine and feminine are not settled here through the comfort of sportswear but through extremely designed and rigorous silhouettes, exaggerated in volumes, decorations and colours (Fig. 4) – an exhibited femininity, theatrical and glamorous, and a “resource used by women (...) in a perennially unequal society” (Dyhouse, 2010, p. 5).

### **3. Fashion Creativities: New Forms of Dialectic Thinking**

Form or function, ornament and comfort, real and ideal body, femininity and androgyny and creativeness achieved through the direct manipulation of matter or filtered by the two-dimensionality of the drawing: these dichotomies regularly return in the debate between fashion and female creativity. Today, we prefer to talk about a dialogue rather than a conflict because, in the complexity of the creative fashion process, “some of the highest forms of creative thinking appear to be dialectical.



**Figure 4.** Elsa Schiaparelli, *Hat shaped like a shoe*, and masculine jacket with an applique in the form of lips, 1937. © Ullstein Bild/ Getty Images .

They often involve processes such as combining and recombining ideas, searching for complementary and coordinating multiple perspectives” (Runco, Pritzker, 1999, p. 551), perfectly reflecting the current fashion landscape. At the beginning of the fashion industry though, very precise statements delineated almost dogmatic fashion assertions (such as those imposed by Poiret, Vionnet, Madame Grès and Chanel in their ateliers). It is only with the evolution of the fashion system and with the passage from couture to *prêt-à-porter* and the related increase of the expansion of the market, that multiple antitheses have been generated, producing endless, contradictory visions and alternate yet simultaneous concepts and styles. Following the spirit of time and place, different forms and styles have taken turns: from the idea of fashion as an aesthetic necessity and the good taste by Biki (Segre Reinach, 2019, p. 26) to the sharpness of Mila Schön’s lines, from Sonia Rykiel’s seductive and charming *vraie femmes*, to Vivienne Westwood’s excessive and citationist political commitment or the basic and essential one of Katharine Hamnett; from Krizia’s fashion “liberated from the rhetoric of *clichés*” (Tutino Vercelloni, 1995, p. 50), to Rei Kawakubo’s sculptures to wear, just to name a few. Different shapes and styles that have often generated very closed categories.

In a certain way, we can affirm that now we are going through a phase of synthesis, in which contradictory concepts are integrated into a dialectical framework, setting projects that do not deny the past but rather that realise new narratives based on it. Creativity, while remaining a personal gesture, is enriched by a broader dialogue among designers within style offices (a melting pot of ideas and creative sharing), but also

by a wider understanding of the contemporary world; it is a feeling that often takes shape from a personal need but which in reality becomes an interpretation of the demands of a precise market segment, just as happened with the Prada phenomenon. The *ugly chic* – as the press labelled it – is the result of the lack in the 1980s market, saturated with over-designed goods, of products that could respond to Miuccia Prada’s style; a style in contrast with “conventional ideas of beauty, of the generic appeal of the beautiful, glamorous, bourgeois woman” (Bolton, Koda, 2012, p. 60). At the time, while fashion was fostering clichés of beauty, Miuccia Prada began her own exploration of the meanings of beauty itself by researching precious materials (such as brocade, furs and embroidery) and combining them with more everyday materials (men’s fabrics, knitwear, cotton and bolts) (Fig. 5) and by working on clothing archetypes such as workwear, uniforms and, above all, those skirts that became her true laboratory of creative experimentation.

A work on archetypes, in this case masculine, was carried out in 2010 by Phoebe Philo, at the time creative director at Céline, with her Five Perfect Trousers collection based on the different wearability of trousers and on their different occasions of use, so to designate the fundamental *bricks* of the wardrobe. With it, a fresh capacity to read the present and to amplify the discourse of one’s personal vision was born: that of a design attitude which has translated and defined some of the most interesting *design actions* of fashion in recent decades. Like the work of Consuelo Castiglioni who, using her instinct as a design tool, in the second half of the Nineties, re-interpreted fur establishing a new aesthetic and creating a process that was the opposite of the one implemented by Chanel.



**Figure 5.** Prada, Autumn/Winter 2004–2005 women collection. A detail of the material mix of furs, embroidery, men’s fabrics, knitwear and bolts. © Patrick Hertzog/Alp/Getty Images.



Indeed, while the French couturier brought poor materials into haute couture, Consuelo Castiglioni at Marni revolutionised the concept of fur, that was not impoverished but redefined into new forms through dyeing, inlaying and hybridisation of materials (Fig. 6). Knowledge of materials and formal experimentation are the design signature of Marianna Rosati, founder and designer of DROME, too. Through her work, she wants to “renew the concept of leather, thinking of it as a fabric, every day and easy-to-use element, without forgetting its natural strength and luxury” (Sanò, 2015, p. 303) (Fig. 7).



**Figure 6.** Marni. Autumn/Winter 2011-2012. A detail of the material mix of furs and neoprene designed by Consuelo Castiglioni. © Chris Moore/Catwalking/Getty Images.

**Figure 7.** DROME. Autumn/Winter 2018-2019. A detail of a leather outfit created by Marianna Rosati using leather as a fabric. © Kristy Sparow/Getty Images.

In this very context, took shape the philosophy and work carried out by Maria Grazia Chiuri, initially in partnership with Pier Paolo Piccioli at Valentino and then alone at Dior, the maison where she is creative director since 2017. Being the first woman to lead the maison since its foundation gives her the opportunity to define and shape her design vision from scratch: Chiuri’s work describes a concept of creativity that is the very essence of projectuality, not only as an abstract romantic idea but also as a real scientific discipline. For her, to be a fashion designer means to give life to a concrete project that has to start with women, to think about women and to design for women, that is, first of all, to understand that women are the ones who choose. At the end of the Second World War, women chose to be forced into the exaggerated forms of Christian Dior’s New Look and, in the Sixties, women chose to wear the miniskirt, as Mary Quant herself claimed: “It wasn’t me or Courrèges who invented the miniskirt anyway, it was the girls in the street who did” (Lyman, 1972, p. 198). Therefore, not the imposition of a male or female vision of femininity, but a choice: in antithesis with the restrictions of war in the first case, in line with the nascent youth movements in the second. Once more, fashion as a mirror of the changes in society.

*We Should All Be Feminists*, the speech given in 2012 at TEDx-Euston by Nigerian-born writer Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie, became a *fashionable* slogan in 2017, having been printed on the T-shirts (Fig. 8) presented by Maria Grazia Chiuri in her first collection designed for Dior. The decision to use this phrase as the opening of her adventure at the French fashion

house was a real programmatic manifesto, meant to reiterate not only the need to define a gender vision of fashion design but also the necessity of understanding how to interpret the present as a “happy feminist”.

Fashion as a communicative interface in connection with the body and with other people, as a productive system and as an economic and political agent increasingly contributes to defining new forms of dresses and bodies. Also, fashion renewed ways of thinking fit into the contemporary debate (and market) of genderless fashion, a debate that has broadened the vocabulary of design possibilities, defining aesthetic and stylistic neologisms, without completely replacing the lexicon built over the years. In fact, if “clothes do not have a gender” (Flaccavento, 2020), it is also true that bodies have gender, they have different peculiarities, shapes and needs, often resulting from cultural, geographical, historical and social constructs, which are rooted in the physicality of the body, subject and object of fashion.

The relationship among the neutrality of clothing, the characteristics of bodies and the ways of thinking and designing of designers – whether men or women – have created precise approaches capable of determining not only new types of products but also new design methods and multiple designs. If on the one hand, the abstraction of the concept of woman – implemented by some female designers such as Rei Kawakubo, Vivienne Westwood and Iris van Herpen, who have made formal and conceptual research their main focus – has triggered design languages that sublimate, celebrate or even re-elaborate the female body; on the other hand, it is often thanks to the vision and creativity of female designers that

some changes occurred, not only of product but of mindset and creative process. It is no coincidence, that the creators of what has been defined *ugly chic* were women - i.e. Miuccia Prada who, in her first fashion show in 1988, brought the Flintstones together with the Jetsons, as *WWD* wrote, and Consuelo Castiglioni with the creation, among other things, of the iconic Fussbett shoes. A label, that of chic with bad taste, that simplifies a broader and more ample concept. The path that Prada and Castiglioni set out was able to formalise a design approach, that did not start from an abstract concept but rather from a personal - almost private - idea of fashion, femininity and beauty. This approach, built on the foundations laid by Schiaparelli, Vionnet, Chanel and Quant, has been able to originate an aesthetic and certain kinds of products that women like; and women like them because by adopting them they are able to achieve that personal, self-referential well-being (understood here in a positive sense), which transcends the eyes of those who, eventually, look at them. This well-being is not necessarily defined through the simplicity of form and comfort but also arises from intricate constructions capable of defining pure aesthetics: an often hidden complexity, with a precise sensitivity for fabrics and chromatic matching, often intentionally audacious. It is no surprise that, especially in the contemporary world, figures such as the already mentioned Miuccia Prada and Consuelo Castiglioni, but also Phoebe Philo, Stella McCartney, Marianna Rosati, Clare Waight Keller, Natacha Ramsay-Levi, Sarah Burton and Maria Grazia Chiuri, have been able to build a direct dialogue with their audience, considering the awareness of the various forms of female body and sensuality.



**Figure 8.** Spring/Summer 2017. The T-shirt “We Should All Be Feminists” shown by Maria Grazia Chiuri during her first collection. © Victor VIRGILE/Gamma-Rapho/ Getty Images.

A difference in approach and style can be defined by contrast. If for Consuelo Castiglioni complexity was hidden among the pleats of apparently simple volumes, for Francesco Risso, at the head of Marni since 2016, complexity means excess and is manifested through deliberately wrong and out-of-scale shapes; hence, the unexpected of Castiglioni becomes the quirky of Risso. If for Phoebe Philo, at the helm of Céline from 2008 to 2017, the design research was characterised by a reinterpretation of historical archetypes, often excessively conceptual, for Hedi Slimane, there since 2018, the fashion project becomes a citation and a recovery of historical imagery re-proposed in an almost *captionical* way; hence, the abstraction of Phoebe Philo, becomes a caption for Hedi Slimane. Then again, if for Gianfranco Ferré, John Galliano and Raf Simons, the vision of Dior is a formal field of experimentation where the creative act becomes excess if not – especially with Galliano – costume, with Maria Grazia Chiuri the gesture of shaping the female body becomes a creative act that, while not losing its structure, defines and follows rather than hiding, concealing, overwriting the body: it is a shift from superstructures to pure and simple structure. Capabilities of interpreting history, of understanding the body and of the *giusta misura* that rarely depreciate and become costume. Capabilities which probably only the design thinking of some women can manage and control.

## References

- Barthes, R. (1983). *The Fashion System*. Hill and Wang.
- Beucler, A. [1929]. Chez Madeleine Vionnet. In P. Golbin (Ed.) (2009). *Madeleine Vionnet*. Rizzoli.
- Bolton, A., & Koda, H. (Eds.). (2012). *Schiaparelli & Prada. Impossible Conversations*. The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Chapsal, M. (1989). *La Chair de la Robe*. Fayard.
- Cova, B., Fuschillo, G., Pace, S. (2017). *Le marche siamo noi: Navigare nella cultura del consumo*. Franco Angeli.
- Crane, D. (2000). *Fashion and Its Social Agendas: Class, Gender, and Identity in Clothing*. University of Chicago Press.
- Dyhouse, C. (2010). *Glamour: Women, History, Feminism*. Zed Books Ltd.
- Fiorani, E. (2006). *Moda, corpo, immaginario. Il divenire moda del mondo fra tradizione e innovazione*. POLI.design.
- Flaccavento, A. (2020). Ma i vestiti hanno sesso. *Vogue Italia*, 837, May, 25.
- Flew, T. (2012). *The Creative Industries: Culture and Policy*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Golbin, P. (Ed.) (2009). *Madeleine Vionnet*. Rizzoli.
- Jones, E. (1955). *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud, Vol. 2*. Basic Books.
- Jungnickel, K. (2018). *Bikes and Bloomers. Victorian Women Inventors and their Extraordinary Cycle Wear*. Goldsmiths Press/ MIT Press.
- Lyman, R. (Ed.). (1972). *Couture: An Illustrated History of the Great Paris Designers and Their Creation*. Doubleday & Co.
- Runco, M. A., & Pritzker, S. R. (Eds.). (1999). *Encyclopedia of creativity, Vol. 1 A-H and Vol. 2 I-Z with indexes*. Academic Press.
- Sanò, F. (2015). Drome. In P. Bertola & V. Linfante (Eds.). *Il nuovo vocabolario della moda italiana* (p. 303). Mandragora.
- Segre Reinach, S. (2019). *Biki. Visioni francesi per una moda italiana*. Rizzoli.
- Simmel, G. [1905]. The Philosophy of Fashion. In D. P. Frisby, & M. Featherstone (Eds.). (1997). *Simmel on Culture: Selected Writings* (pp. 187-205). SAGE Publications Ltd.

Steele, V. (1991). *Women of Fashion. Twentieth-Century Designers*. Rizzoli.

Tutino Vercelloni, I. (1995). *Krizia. Una storia*. Skira.