

Critical Studies in Fashion & Beauty

Volume 11 Number 2

© 2020 Intellect Ltd Introduction. English language. https://doi.org/10.1386/csfb_00012_2

INTRODUCTION

ANNEKE SMELIK

Radboud University Nijmegen

SUSAN B. KAISER

University of California, Davis

Performing fashion

Keywords

COVID
performance
performativity
style
fashion
dress
costume
beauty

The COVID-19 pandemic brings into sharp relief the performative aspect of the way we dress. Those who are fortunate to be working remotely are likely to be conscious of their screen presence, which reveals only the top half or third of the body. Staring at one's own face among many others during the online meetings and classes requires new makeup and dressing routines. Makeup and hair matter, as do tops, but bottoms and shoes take on a diminished importance. Combining nice tops that are in view with sweatpants for the part of the body that (hopefully) no one can see reveals that dress is, after all, performative: we dress not only for ourselves but also for others; for the public gaze. Children, too, are being asked to attend to the public gaze as they learn remotely online. Many schools are asking or requiring online pupils to dress at home as they would if they were in the classroom.

Issues of performativity naturally assume a lower position to life-or-death concerns in a pandemic. And yet, perhaps performativity does play a role in the degree of community spread, particularly when mask-wearing has become politicized with such critical implications for the health and safety of the entire public. The present pandemic moment calls into question the extent to which individuals (a) protect others and themselves by wearing masks (Kaiser and Smelik 2020), and (b) fashion their appearances with an audience in mind. Masks themselves take on a communicative, performative role. When wearing masks in public, makeup below the eyes seems rather pointless. Lipstick, especially, seems counterproductive underneath a mask but relevant on the screen.

But not only are individuals changing ways of dressing during the pandemic, fashion shows have also adapted to these rather unusual times. For the international fashion weeks of autumn 2020, many fashion houses took up alternative ways of presenting their collections, waiving the traditional fashion show with its elite audience of fashion journalists, influencers and celebrities. Some chose to let their shows take place with a limited number of spectators or even without an audience. Under the extraordinary circumstances new forms have emerged. TikTok hosted its own online fashion month to its potential audience of approximately 800 million users, with fashion shows by Saint Laurent and JW Anderson. Other designers, like Prada, chose to livestream their shows. Others perfected the relatively new genre of the short fashion film, reaching a new audience beyond the small public of fashion experts through the use of internet media like YouTube. For example, Dior's A/W 2020 collection by Maria Grazia Chiuri was not only presented in a cathedral-like fashion show, but also with a fourteen-minute mythological fairy tale (directed by Matteo Garrone), while Gucci decided to up the ante by presenting its collection designed by Alessandro Michele as a seven-part miniseries of short films directed by Gus Van Sant, entitled *Overture of Something That Never Ended* (all films are freely accessible on YouTube).

The theme of performance and performativity thus presented itself almost as a matter of course to us for this introduction. This theme did not only percolate from the present pandemic, but also from the articles in this issue. We are pleased to present an array of papers that foster deeper understandings – with contextual evidence – on concepts of style, fashion, dress, costume and beauty. Together, the papers are a reminder that these concepts frequently blur into one another in everyday life: hence, the hyphenated parts and wholes of style-fashion-dress as a complex worthy of joint consideration rather than a series of binary oppositions such as fashion versus dress, style versus fashion and so on (Tulloch 2010, 2016; Kaiser 2012). The papers in this issue not only further contextual understandings of style, fashion and dress – in parts and wholes – but also push us to consider beauty in the complex, as well as to contemplate occasions on which 'fancy dress costume' becomes a special case that merits further interrogation. Reading across the diverse papers in this issue, we find ourselves identifying issues of performance and performativity as connecting themes, blurring the boundaries among concepts of beauty, costume, dress, fashion and style.

Performance, or, the show must go on

The word 'fashion' derives from the Latin *facere*, which means both 'to make' and 'to do' (similar to the French word *faire*). So, already there is a performative element to fashion, involving not only the processes of planning and putting together a look, but also to the idea of an audience. A performance by necessity needs an audience. In fact, it is even one of the definitions of performance, as listed by Marvin Carlson. Firstly, he claims, performance typically implicates a display of skills demonstrated to an audience by a trained or skilled human being (2004: 3). Secondly, the display of skills involves patterned behaviour; someone pretending to be someone other than oneself, which brings consciousness to the performance (2004: 3). The concept of performance has been hotly debated since 'the performative turn' that has been hailed as 'ground-breaking' (Medina 2010: 275) and as a veritable 'theory explosion' (McKenzie 2001: 38). Performance studies involve terrains as diverse as anthropology, sociology, the philosophy of linguistics, theatre studies, and even business and management discourse.

Performance can be understood as embodied behaviour that privileges body over speech, presence over absence and praxis over product (Plate and Smelik 2013: 9). As such, it is a highly productive concept for fashion studies. For Diana Taylor, the importance of the concept of performance is first and foremost its emphasis on an 'embodied praxis and episteme' (2003: 17). Because practices and habits are stored in the body, we can understand dressing as an embodied practice that is performed time and again, building 'choreographies of meaning' (2003: 20). As Taylor explains, embodied performance is multi-coded, not only producing many layers of meaning, but also involving different roles for spectators and participants (2003: 49).

Following the creative transformations of the runway show in the late 1990s, when designers started to create 'elaborately orchestrated events that rival theatrical productions', Ginger Gregg Duggan showed the many parallels between the fashion show and performance art (2001: 244). Performance art as it developed from the 1960s onward is known for its avant-garde roots and its radicalism in favouring the transgressive (Goldberg 2001). The anti-establishment aesthetic of performance art is marked by two aspects that are also highly relevant for the fashion show: the presence of the performer's body (the model on the runway) and the liveness of the event. While the focus on issues of embodiment is crucial for understanding any practice of dressing, the other important characteristic of the theatricality of performance, its liveness, is changing rapidly in today's media culture. While for Peggy Phelan (1993) the liveness was still the aspect *par excellence* that gives performance its radical edge and its sense of 'realness', Philip Auslander expresses his fatigue with the 'clichés and mystifications' of the live as magic and real (2008: 2). He argues that in a fully media-tized culture liveness is no longer antagonistically opposed to mediatization (2008: 5). Today, from Instagram to TikTok, and from fashion films to live streams, there are no longer clear-cut divisions between the live and the mediatized, but they are rather parallel forms participating in the same cultural economy.

Performance does not only pertain to art, theatre or the fashion show, but is also a concept to consider the ways in which individuals imagine how they appear to others. Over a hundred years ago, the sociologist Charles Horton Cooley (1902) posed the metaphor of 'looking-glass self' to consider the ways in which individuals develop and contemplate their appearances for an imagined audience:

As we see our face, figure, and dress in the glass, and are interested in them because they are ours [...] so in imagination we perceive in another's mind some thought of our appearance, manners, aims, deeds.

(1902: 152)

Cooley submitted that such imaginations are largely unconscious or taken for granted; he could not have anticipated his looking-glass metaphor in the context of today's technology and social media. Today, Zoom sessions push the metaphor to a new level, as we see ourselves and others at the same time on a computer screen. And it is not only our faces and upper bodies that we see as others see; our backgrounds require staging, too: which book titles are visible behind me? Do they reveal what I mean to express about my perspectives, preferences or politics? What does that art on the wall say about me? How is the lighting? The same kind of conscious staging happens in the selfies that we take, adapt and filter, before posting them on Facebook or Instagram.

The sociologist Erving Goffman (1959) used the metaphor of the stage to characterize presentations of self as performances in everyday life. Like Cooley, he dealt with imaginations of how others see us, but Goffman viewed human imaginations and actions as more intentional and conscious in relation to one's audience (Scheff 2011). As Efrat Tseëlon (2016) has shown, the theatrical metaphor of performance is particularly apt for the study of clothing and appearance. Goffman's notion of a 'front region', the social role that people adopt in society, versus the 'back region', where people relax their looks and behaviour, is intimately connected with the ways we dress. The staged, edited and filtered selfies that we put on Instagram are clearly intended for the 'front region', whereas we are usually reluctant to upload snapshots from the 'back region' when we lounge on our couch in a track suit without any makeup on. Tseëlon warns to not make the mistake of thinking that one stage is more authentic than the other: 'Both are different kinds of stages, with different expectations, and played to different kinds of audience' (2016: 154).

Clothes are an important part of 'impression management', as it has come to be known. In the presence of others, Goffman argues, individuals will try to influence the situation by presenting themselves in a favourable light. In this respect, Goffman makes a difference between the impression that people give intentionally and the impression that they give off unintentionally. We may dress very carefully to make an impression for a Zoom meeting by doing our hair and applying

makeup, putting on a nice top and jewellery, but may give off quite a different impression by getting up in haste showing a pyjama bottom under it. Tseëlon shows that any performance is sustained by normative expectations and tacit rules of embodied presentation, ‘ranging from which body parts can be exposed, or need to be covered’, posture, personal space, style guidelines, formal or informal dress, etc. (2016: 152). As we have argued elsewhere, the face mask is not yet a tacit routine, but is instead challenged by anxieties and ambivalences that highlight how it has become a performance revealing a political standpoint (Smelik and Kaiser 2020).

Importantly, Goffman’s theatrical notion of performance questions the idea of a fixed identity. As Tseëlon argues, ‘he articulated a performative perspective by providing a dynamic definition of identity not as a *state of being* but as *acts of doing*’ (2016: 154, original emphasis). Influenced by the school of sociological thought known as symbolic interactionism (including Cooley), Goffman also departed from it in his tendency to emphasize acting rather than interacting (Blumer 1972). Still, Goffman maintained from symbolic interactionism a sense of the social self as an ongoing process – similar to a process of ‘minding appearances’ when we dress daily (Kaiser 2001). This perspective paved the way for an understanding of identity as fluid and flexible, which links performance to the poststructuralist notion of performativity.

Performativity, or, the flow must go on

Actions and interactions can be seen as mutually constitutive, and together offer ways of thinking through not only structural limitations such as gender norms, but also opportunities for performative agency. Whereas the concept of performance pertains most often to theatre, the concept of ‘performativity’ derives initially from philosophies of language (Plate and Smelik 2013). That is, speech acts are performative: ‘*by saying or in saying something we are doing something*’ (Austin in Bial 2007: 177, original emphasis). Derrida’s theory of deconstruction pushes this idea further with his concept of ‘iteration’, noting how speech is repetitive of what has been said or performed earlier. Language has a citational quality, but in many ways it defers meaning as it highlights differences through endless repetitions (Derrida 1982). Similar to Goffman’s metaphorical use of performance, poststructuralist philosophies of language and identity emphasize *doing* rather than *being*.

The feminist philosopher Judith Butler (1988, 1990) draws on Austin and Derrida to theorize the performative aspects of gender. She argues that gendered bodies are neither essential nor given; instead, they are constitutive. They become enacted and produced through performative acts as something individuals *do* rather than simply as who they *are*.

Further, these performative acts become repetitive in everyday life, and this process of citationality paradoxically offers ‘a window for change and agency’, because ‘every repetition implies the possibility of making a difference’ (Plate and Smelik 2013: 8).

The idea of performative agency has resonated deeply in gender studies and queer studies, because it offers possibilities for change and transformation. Performing bodies can then be seen as having political agency. As both Judith Butler (1993) and Rosi Braidotti (2011) have argued, there is a corporeal dimension to performativity: the body performs in and through speech acts. This foregrounding of the body links the two notions of (theatrical) performance and (speech) performativity. Yet, for Elizabeth Wissinger (2016), it is crucial to keep the two separate and not confuse them. She argues that we cannot understand a gender performance as something that can be changed as easily as ‘donning or doffing a new dress or bespoke suit’ (2016: 289). Butler frames gender performativity in everyday life as an iterative process that becomes ingrained and almost unconscious. In this respect, her view of performativity may be closer to Charles Horton Cooley’s than to Erving Goffman’s. However, she differs from both in her emphasis on the structural or compulsive nature of gender as the ‘forcible citation of a norm’ (1993: 232). Gender is then not as much of a choice as a change in clothing, although it is still more fluid or flexible than fixed or essentialist.

Research in the context of fashion modelling suggests the blurriness between gender performativity and individual performances; male models who are iterative in the process of planning, making and doing straight, gendered appearances are able to ‘drag’ it up when they realize stylists and photographers prefer queerer performances (Entwistle and Mears 2012). The performative aspect of body size and shape has also been analysed through a queer lens (Longhurst 2014; Peters 2014; Barry 2019). Coming from a performance studies perspective, Lynette Hunter notes that even in a formally staged performance, there is an element of performativity: the making in advance, the making in the process of the performance and the ‘quality of not-knowing’ what might happen next when somatic bodies interact with materials and others (2019: 22–25). Performance and performativity may then be seen as intricately interwoven within the field of fashion. As both concepts point to the potential for agency and change within, of course, structural constraints, we prefer to use the active phrase ‘performing fashion’ to bring together the four articles of this issue. Ranging in focus from *haute couture* to costume to beauty to subcultural style, all grapple with the ways in which the process of performing fashion engages embodied ways of knowing, iteration and interaction, as well as action.

Performing fashion: *Haute couture*, costuming, beauty regimens and subcultural style

In the privileged, upper-class world of *haute couture*, as Llewellyn Negrin demonstrates in ‘The dialectical nature of Cindy Sherman’s fashion photographs’, one often-unstated, recent goal in high fashion advertising is to assure viewers that they have cultural capital – following Bourdieu – and ‘get’ the performative irony of Sherman’s simultaneous disavowal of western feminine beauty ideals *and*

her role in promoting fashion. Dressing herself in ways that defy principles of glamour and beauty, Sherman's photographs 'do not disguise their staginess' but rather 'openly declare their artifice', according to Negrin, who also points to the ways in which Sherman blurs the boundaries between art and advertising. As part of Sherman's critique of conventional norms in advertising, she impersonates 'ordinary, unglamorous people', raising questions about whether she is challenging beauty or *haute couture* norms, or both. Negrin's article highlights how performing high fashion enables both/and contradictions. Her performative impersonations also prompt issues of what it means to dress up as one who they are not (see Freitas et al. 1997): a theme in the next article in this issue.

In "I should have known better": Critical reflections on cultural appropriation, race and the role of fancy dress costume', Benjamin Linley Wild also analyses what it means to dress up in a way that appropriates and disavows 'otherness', demonstrating the fault lines in 'communal values'. For example, latent or overt racism becomes manifest in some 'fancy dress costumes', with 'blackface' illustrating one of the worst-case scenarios. Wild defines fancy dress costume as 'a performative form of dress, imaginative and incongruous, worn for a discrete occasion and limited time that disrupts the place of the individual within the social and political ideologies of a specific community' (this issue). Wild points to evidence against a binary opposition between self and sociocultural identity work in the planning and wearing of fancy dress costume, and argues instead for the ways in which costumed identities represent a negotiation between self and society. As in Negrin's analysis of Cindy Sherman's fashion photography, Wild considers how 'laughter disarms' through the visual embodiment of irony and parody. However, whereas Cindy Sherman's work challenges hegemonic beauty norms, fancy dress costume may in fact reinforce hegemonic ideologies such as racism and misogyny.

To what extent do everyday beauty regimes and style-fashion-dress become performative? In 'Dina Torkia's *Modestly*: Beauty work, autobiographical habitus and the modest fashion influencer', author Lee Barron points to the ways in which vlogger Torkia not only offers the book *Modestly*'s readers beauty and hijab advice, but also melds this advice with her own autobiography and changing habitus. Having attained an international status as a British Muslim fashion and beauty vlogger and hijab stylist, Torkia came to the authorship of *Modestly* as a seasoned performer of beauty, style and modesty alike. She was accustomed to recording her appearance and performing makeup application and hijab wrapping techniques to accentuate hegemonically 'beautiful' facial features, such as shaping a more oval face by situating the hijab on the sides of one's cheeks. In many ways, her performativity and habitus, as outlined in the book and analysed by Barron, are a counterpoint to Cindy Sherman's resistance to hegemonic beauty norms. Yet Torkia and Sherman both share a reliance on capitalism through fashion industry advertising and/or endorsements; their performativity – albeit in very different forms – pays off. Adding to the drama of Torkia's autobiography is a final twist that we will not mention here to avoid a spoiler alert.

The performance of style, Nina Cole argues, is always in process. In ‘Scenarios of style: An exploration of subcultural research as embodied practice in Los Angeles’s vintage Jamaican music scene’, she shows how style, politics and everyday life are intimately intertwined. Bridging fashion and performance studies, Cole fleshes out a theory of practice as she draws on Diana Taylor’s *scenario* paradigm to explore how style constitutes and re-constitutes subcultural life. She herself has been involved in Los Angeles’s 1960s Jamaican revival music scene as ‘Nina Reggaedelic’. Working from an embodied epistemology as well as fieldwork, she shows how style in subcultures involves ‘ambiguity and change alongside commitment and tradition’. To illustrate ‘scenarios of style’ within her larger project, Cole offers the case study of Ernesto Arce, an Angeleno scene participant since the late 1980s, who describes himself as a ‘veteran rude boy’, ‘rebel journalist’ and ‘mid-century mod’. His performance of a subcultural style highlights key facets of Los Angeles’s Jamaican revival scene combined with transatlantic *rudie* culture. For Arce, subcultural style became a lifestyle, influencing not only his aesthetic preferences, but also informing his political motivations and understanding of social realities.

A dress rehearsal

Bridging performance studies and fashion studies opens possibilities for understanding the interplay between agency and structure, acting and interacting and identity and ‘identity *not*’. The latter concept emerged from two questions in a larger project on issues of style and identity in the late 1980s and 1990s; more than 300 informants with diverse subject positionings responded to two questions regarding ‘least favorite clothing’ and ‘groups one intentionally avoids dressing like’ (Freitas et al. 1997). Many of the informants were quite emphatic about who they were *not*, as compared with their greater difficulty in articulating who they *were* at the time of the interviews; however, there were some openings that nuanced these binary oppositions in time and space, pointing to the possibility of identity ambivalences that complicate either/or approaches to identity and fashion (Davis 1992; Freitas et al. 1997). Further, *nots* can be turned into (*k*)*nots*, or power-related entanglements across identities (Kaiser and McCullough 2010). In this issue, especially in the cases of Cindy Sherman’s artistic renderings of dressing unlike herself or ‘fancy dress costumes’, stylistic expressions of identity *nots* may be seen as fleeting and experimental, and yet these expressions may be telling: why go to the trouble?

We have suggested that the phrase ‘performing fashion’ helps to capture the both/and dynamics of performance and performativity and cuts across the papers in this issue. Whether performing like Cindy Sherman for high fashion branding, dressing up in fancy dress costume, vlogging like Dina Torkia or developing a subcultural style like Ernesto Arce, both politics and aesthetics are at play. The body is not a submissive object to be draped in accordance with the dictates of the social or cultural

field, but rather dressing is an active embodied practice as Joanne Entwistle and Elizabeth Wilson (2003) have argued. Identity as an embodied practice needs to be reiterated and reinvented on a daily basis. We can thus recognize the bodily practice of dressing as *performing* identities, non-identities and the entanglements between the two (Kaiser and McCullough 2010). Every day again we perform who we are, shifting among different roles such as teacher, colleague, mother, friend, lover and so on. Further, some contexts such as high fashion advertisements or costume parties may draw out opportunities to articulate ambivalence, if not outright difference or 'other than' in a transitory way. The intertwined yet separate notions of performance and performativity point to the ephemeral nature of the practice of dressing and issues of beauty, costume and style. At the same time, they are an important reminder of processes of identity and difference. The lens of performing fashion makes us realize that, in the end, identity is perhaps not much more than an endless dress rehearsal.

References

- Auslander, Philip (2008), *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture*, 2nd ed., New York and London: Routledge.
- Barry, Ben (2019), 'Fabulous masculinities: Refashioning the fat and disabled male body', *Fashion Theory*, 23:2, pp. 275–89.
- Bial, Henry and Brady, Sara (eds) (2007), *The Performance Studies Reader*, 2nd ed., New York and London: Routledge.
- Blumer, Herbert (1972), 'Action vs. interaction: *Relations in Public – Microstudies of the Public Order* by Erving Goffman', review, *Society*, 9, pp. 50–53.
- Braidotti, Rosi (2011), *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*, 2nd ed., New York: Columbia University Press.
- Butler, Judith (1988), 'Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory', *Theatre Journal*, 40:4, pp. 519–31.
- Butler, Judith (1990), *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, New York and London: Routledge.
- Butler, Judith (1993), *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'*, New York and London: Routledge.
- Carlson, Marvin (2004), *Performance. A Critical Introduction*, 2nd ed., New York and London: Routledge.
- Cooley, Charles Horton (1902), *Human Nature and the Social Order*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Davis, Fred (1992), *Fashion, Culture and Identity*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, Jacques (1982), 'Différance', in *Margins of Philosophy* (trans. A. Bass), Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Duggan, Ginger Gregg (2001), 'The greatest show on earth: A look at contemporary fashion shows and their relationship to performance art', *Fashion Theory*, 5:3, pp. 243–70.
- Entwistle, Joanne and Mears, Ashley (2012), 'Gender on display: Performativity in fashion modeling', *Cultural Sociology*, 7:3, pp. 320–35.
- Entwistle, Joanne and Wilson, Elizabeth (eds) (2003), *Body Dressing*, Oxford and New York: Berg Publishers.
- Freitas, Anthony, Kaiser, Susan, Chandler, Joan, Hall, Carol, Kim, Jung-Won and Hammidi, Tania (1997), 'Appearance management as border construction: Least favorite clothing, group distancing, and identity ... not!', *Sociological Inquiry*, 67:3, pp. 323–35.
- Goffman, Erving (1959), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, London: Penguin.
- Goldberg, Rosa Lee (2001), *Performance: From Futurism to the Present*, 3rd ed., London: Thames and Hudson.
- Hunter, Lynette (2019), *Politics of Practice: A Rhetoric of Performativity*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kaiser, Susan B. (2001), 'Minding appearances: Style, truth, and subjectivity', in J. Entwistle and E. Wilson (eds), *Body Dressing*, Oxford: Berg, pp. 79–102.
- Kaiser, Susan B. (2012), *Fashion and Cultural Studies*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Kaiser, Susan B. and McCullough, Sarah Reboloso (2010), 'Entangling the fashion subject through the African diaspora: From *not* to (*k*)*not* in fashion theory', *Fashion Theory*, 14:3, pp. 361–86.
- Kaiser, Susan B. and Smelik, Anneke (2020), 'Materials and materialities: Viral and sheep-ish encounters with fashion', *Critical Studies in Fashion & Beauty*, 11:1, pp. 9–19.
- Longhurst, Robyn (2014), 'Queering body size and shape: Performativity, the closet, shame and orientation', in C. Pausé, J. Wykes and S. Murray (eds), *Queering Fat Embodiment*, New York and London: Routledge, pp. 13–26.
- McKenzie, Jon (2001), *Perform or Else: From Discipline to Performance*, New York and London: Routledge.
- Medina, Jose (2010), 'The performative turn and the emergence of post-analytic philosophy', in Rosi Braidotti (ed.), *After Poststructuralism: Transitions and Transformations. The History of Continental Philosophy*, vol. 7, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 275–305.
- Peters, Laura Downing (2014), 'You are what you wear: How plus-size fashion figures in fat identity formation', *Fashion Theory*, 18:1, pp. 45–71.
- Phelan, Peggy (1993), *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*, New York and London: Routledge.
- Plate, Liedeke and Smelik, Anneke (eds) (2013), 'Introduction', in *Performing Memory in Art and Popular Culture*, New York and London: Routledge, pp. 1–22.
- Scheff, Thomas J. (2011), 'Looking-glass self: Goffman as symbolic interactionist', *Symbolic Interaction*, 28:2, pp. 147–66.

- Smelik, Anneke and Kaiser, Susan B. (2020), 'The politics and aesthetics of face masks', *Intellect News, The COVID Files*, 7 October, <https://www.intellectbooks.com/the-politics-and-aesthetics-of-face-masks>. Accessed 10 December 2020.
- Taylor, Diana (2003), *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Tseëlon, Efrat (2016), 'Erving Goffman: Social science as an art of cultural observation', in A. Rocamora and A. Smelik (eds), *Thinking Through Fashion: A Guide to Key Theorists*, London: Bloomsbury, pp. 149–64.
- Tulloch, Carol (2010), 'Style–fashion–dress: From black to post-black', *Fashion Theory*, 14:3, pp. 273–303.
- Tulloch, Carol (2016), *The Birth of Cool: Style Narratives of the African Diaspora*, London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Wissinger, Elizabeth (2016), 'Judith Butler: Fashion and performativity', in A. Rocamora and A. Smelik (eds), *Thinking Through Fashion: A Guide to Key Theorists*, London: Bloomsbury, pp. 285–99.

Suggested citation

Smelik, Anneke and Kaiser, Susan B. (2020), 'Performing fashion', *Critical Studies in Fashion & Beauty*, 11:2, pp. 117–128, doi: https://doi.org/10.1386/csfb_00012_2

Contributor details

Anneke Smelik is Katrien van Munster professor of Visual Culture at the Radboud University Nijmegen (Netherlands). She has published widely in the field of fashion, cinema, popular culture and cultural memory. Her latest books are *Delft Blue to Denim Blue: Contemporary Dutch Fashion* and *Thinking Through Fashion: A Guide to Key Theorists*. She is co-editor of the journal *Critical Studies in Fashion & Beauty*.

E-mail: a.smelik@let.ru.nl

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1333-3544>

Susan B. Kaiser is professor in the Departments of Design and Gender, Sexuality and Women's Studies at the University of California, Davis. She has published widely in critical fashion studies, textiles and clothing, cultural studies, and feminist studies. Her books include *The Social Psychology of Clothing: Symbolic Appearances in Context* and *Fashion and Cultural Studies*.

E-mail: sbkaiser@ucdavis.edu

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6031-5157>

Anneke Smelik and Susan B. Kaiser have asserted their right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the authors of this work in the format that was submitted to Intellect Ltd.
