Will Green Remain the New Black? Dynamics in the Self-Categorization of Ethical Fashion Designers

Schiller-Merkens, Simone

Will Green Remain the New Black? Dynamics in the Self-Categorization of Ethical Fashion Designers

Simone Schiller-Merkens [*]

Abstract: *»Bleibt Grün das neue Schwarz? Veränderungen in der Selbstkategorisierung von Ethical Fashion Designern«.* Research on categorization and category dynamics has been rather silent on the role of powerful third parties in the self-categorization of producers. This study sheds light on this question by analyzing dynamics in the self-categorization of designers in the British ethical fashion movement. Their task of self-categorization is particularly complex in a context in which conflicts between aesthetics, morality and the economy still persist. Most of them enter the field as activists. Over time, however, designers stress their moral ideals less in their self-categorization, but put more emphasis on business-related values. Some even switch their self-identities from that of activists or moralists towards identifying as entrepreneurs. In this article, I argue that the designers' dependency relations to a powerful audience member allow us to better understand these dynamics in self-categorization.

Keywords: Category dynamics, self-categorization, self-identity, power, morality, moral market, framing.

1.   Introduction[1]

Fashion is a glamorous world, and for a long time, the idea that morality plays a critical role in it was unthinkable. In the past, fashion and morality were unrelated social arenas whose values were rather perceived as contradictory and incommensurable. In fact, activist producers of organic clothes in the 1970s disapproved of fashion's throwaway mentality and sought to distance themselves from the fashion arena by developing long-lasting basics without any fashionable look (Skov and Meier 2011). This led to a widespread perception of organic clothing as being unfashionable or non-aesthetic. Thus for a long time, creating "green fashion" was seen as an oxymoron. However, the times in which fashion and morality had nothing to do with each other are over. Nowadays, the broader public no longer questions the idea that moral values

like the ones associated with protecting the environment or workers' rights should have a place in the fashion market. Media coverage of sweatshop labor and catastrophic events like the devastating fire in a clothing production facility in Rana Plaza in 2013, which killed more than 1,100 people, brought the lack of morality in fashion supply chains to light.

Yet long before these events, an ethical fashion movement was formed around young fashion designers who wanted to change the immoral practices of fashion production and consumption without having to sacrifice esthetic principles of fashion design. Backed by the support of established fashion designers, social movement organizations, and governmental programs, these ethical fashion activists achieved a place on the agenda of the high fashion scene: in 2006, the British Fashion Council (BFC), the organizer of London Fashion Week, decided to provide a platform for ethical fashion. With a new ethical fashion showcase at London Fashion Week ("Estethica"), moral values now visibly entered the glamorous fashion world. Activist designers who identified themselves with values such as social justice, environmental protection or animal rights entered a social arena that for a long time was only associated with esthetic values (e.g., originality, uniqueness) and economic values (e.g., profitability). Some actors in the fashion arena euphorically claimed that green was becoming the new black (Blanchard 2007), thereby suggesting that morality was beginning to constitute meaning in the market (Fourcade and Healy 2007).

With ethical fashion still an unknown category, the designers now had to explain to the broader audience what they were doing and what kind of products they were offering. In general, categories form part of the broader meaning system that audience members use to make sense of an object and to confer meaning to it (Glynn and Navis 2013; Lounsbury and Rao 2004). Particularly important in the context of this HSR Special Issue is the relationship between categories and valuation. As several papers suggest, convictions about worth are related to categories; some categories are considered to have more worth than others (see also Aspers and Beckert 2011). Being classified as belonging to an unworthy category can have serious material consequences – e.g., when access to necessary resources is denied. Confronted with the new object of ethical fashion, the audience might tend to classify it as belonging to the long-standing category of organic clothing, a classification that would make it difficult for the designers to become accepted members of the glamorous fashion field.

Thus, for ethical fashion designers, the difficult journey of categorizing a thing that would be appealing to a diverse audience of fashionistas, business-minded people and more activist-oriented individuals began. Being activists who aimed to create morally superior alternatives to the existing fashion business, they were inclined to define in moral terms what differentiated their offerings from mainstream fashion. However, relying too extensively on moral values could offend more business-oriented members of the fashion field, many

of whom were important resource providers. They therefore had to ensure that their offerings became classified as fashion – hence, that they were in line with the esthetic and economic principles of the fashion market. Thus, they had to clarify the role of morality in their self-categorization at the same time as providing an account of why they should be considered legitimate members of the fashion field. How did they cope with the critical task of self-categorization in an esthetic market without neglecting the moral cause of their actions? Now that they were embedded in an economic arena, did their self-categorization change over time? And if so, what role did the BFC play as a central audience member in the field?

To address these questions, I started looking into the dynamics of self-categorization on the part of ethical fashion designers who exhibited at London Fashion Week in 2009, 2011, and 2013. Since categorization is a dynamic process (Granqvist and Ritvala 2016; Glynn and Navis 2013; Durand and Paolella 2013; Khaire and Wadwhani 2010), I sought to understand whether the kinds of moral and nonmoral values designers refer to in their self-categorization change over time. Dynamics in categories have to be seen in relation to the social context in which the categorization takes place. Most categorization research therefore refers to the role of audiences (Negro et al. 2010). The audience can influence the development of new categories by opening market opportunities for some categories while blocking it for others. Powerful organizations in particular can structure the life chances of upcoming producers when endorsing their actions and identity claims, thereby signaling their credibility to other members of the field (Tilly 2005). How powerful audience members refer to an emerging category shapes the meaning of that category at the field level. It also acts upon the self-categorization of producers, as it reflects which kind of self-categorization resonates with broader categories in the market. Thus, the way producers self-categorize their offerings needs to be seen in relation to powerful members of the audience who are able to shape collective beliefs about "appropriate" categories, categorical boundaries, and categorical attributes.

Having said this, the aim of this contribution is to understand the role of a powerful third party for the self-categorization of producers. While the categorization literature has focused on the media (Navis and Glynn 2010; Kennedy 2005, 2008; Lounsbury and Rao 2004; Rosa et al. 1999), less is known about the role of other audience members in the self-categorization of producers. Particularly when starting a new venture, producers are dependent on organizations that influence their market opportunities – e.g., by providing them with necessary resources, granting them access to resource providers, or legitimizing their venture (Fisher et al. 2016; Cornelissen and Clarke 2010; Lounsbury and Glynn 2001). New entrepreneurs therefore carefully study what these organizations expect from them, and it is likely that they craft their self-positioning claims in the market according to these supposed demands. While research has

shown that powerful organizations are able to shape categorical boundaries at the field level (Lounsbury and Rao 2004), we do not yet know whether such organizations also play a role in the self-categorization of producers.

In the ethical fashion market, it is the British Fashion Council that holds considerable power as it selects the designers for London Fashion Week, thereby granting them the opportunity to participate in a world-famous fashion event that gains a lot of press coverage and is of great importance for the British economy (Entwistle and Rocamora 2006, 2011). To understand whether this organization could have played a role in the dynamics of ethical fashion designers' self-categorization, I further studied the British Fashion Council's publications in order to explore the kinds of moral and nonmoral values propagated by this organization. Comparing the self-categorization of designers with the cultural material of the BFC then helped me assess the role that a central organization in the field plays in the strategic categorization or self-categorization of producers.

2. Theorizing Self-Categorization in the Light of Powerful Third Parties

Categories are socio-cognitive entities, collectively constructed among producers and the audience, the latter consisting of both the larger public (including consumers) and intermediating audience members who broker between consumers and producers (Rosa et al. 1999; Porac et al. 2001; Khaire and Wadhwani 2010). These different actors "negotiate" an emerging category and its attributes, thereby activating the kinds of attributes that best fit the social context (Glynn and Navis 2013). Such negotiations are often rife with conflicts; hence it is fair to say that categories arise out of political processes in which powerful actors can impose categorical boundaries (Tilly 2005). As an outcome of these processes, categories are necessarily dynamic in nature (Granqvist and Ritvala 2016). Recent research has therefore started to address the question of what drives actors in their categorizations over time. Referring to Durand and Paolella (2013), Granqvist and Ritvala (2016) differentiate three drivers for category dynamics: prototypical similarity, knowledge accumulation, and actors' goals. First, in markets with mature categories, actors are likely to change their self-categorization in order to become similar to and yet different from the prototypical category in the field. Second, when actors gain expertise and accumulate knowledge they may also change how they categorize themselves. Third, actors pursue specific goals and self-categorize accordingly; changes in their aims can therefore also lead to changes in their self-categorization.

This article builds on this research on category dynamics but focuses on an aspect that has not been explored thoroughly: the role of relations to a powerful third party in self-categorization. To be clear, power has not been completely

absent from the categorization literature, but it has existed more as an implicit concept. It is consistently argued that audiences play a key role in determining category boundaries. Vergne and Wry (2014, 68) claim that the "audience directly or indirectly exerts control over the material and symbolic output of category members; and […] can reward or sanction category members." In this respect, members of the audience can be considered powerful. Several studies refer to the power of particular audience members in categorization processes, when, for instance, scrutinizing the role of the media (Kennedy 2008), of high-status actors (Rao et al. 2005), or of incumbent producers (Lounsbury and Rao 2004). Furthermore, implicit reference to power is also being made in the notion of goal-based self-categorization. Self-categorization according to certain goals includes motives like accessing funding or gaining a reputation (Granqvist and Ritvala 2016; Navis and Glynn 2011), and thus motives that point to actors' dependence on resource providers. However, the question of whether these dependency relations to powerful audience members matter at the local level has not yet been explicitly studied. To be more precise, we do not yet know whether a powerful third party can influence the strategic categorization or self-categorization of producers (Vergne and Wry 2014).

In this contribution, I therefore claim that self-categorization dynamics have to be viewed in the light of power/dependency relations. I therein follow Tilly (2005), who argues that the identity claims and their attendant stories, with which actors construct who they are and what they do, "constitute serious political business." What Lounsbury and Rao (2004) showed with regard to categorical boundaries in a mature market becomes particularly important for the self-categorization of new ventures in an emerging market: powerful organizations are likely to shape the boundaries of self-categorization. New ventures are dependent on the inflow of resources and maintain power/dependency relations with organizations that grant them access to these resources. The way the entrepreneurs categorize themselves is consequential (Tilly 2005); it influences their access to resources (e.g., Fisher et al. 2016). This is because their self-categorization helps the audience to classify and evaluate them; it suggests to the audience the kinds of categorical attributes with which the entrepreneurs seek to be associated. In short, self-categorization provides an account of the broader values to which an entrepreneur adheres. Resource providers refer to these category claims in order to judge an organization's worth (Glynn and Navis 2013) and to assess the viability of the venture (Lounsbury and Glynn 2001). We can therefore expect entrepreneurs to carefully watch powerful organizations in the field, and particularly to look for these organizations' value orientations (Cornelissen and Clarke 2010). These provide hints as to which

self-categorization would be resonant in the field and therefore able to attract a beneficial flow of resources.[2]

Thus, I suggest in this article that social relationships to powerful organizations are crucial in self-categorization processes. These organizations provide models for a proper self-categorization that resonates with broader values in the field at the same time that they certify or validate the claims that the actors make in their self-categorization (Tilly 2005; McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly 2001). As such, powerful audience members help entrepreneurial ventures to make appropriate identity claims with which they will be more likely to attain legitimacy in the field. Entrepreneurs perceive the boundaries of an appropriate self-categorization through its various interactions with a powerful organization – for example, when participating in mentoring programs through which they become socialized with the beliefs, norms, and values that guide behavior in the market.

3. Data and Analysis

3.1 Research Setting

The setting for this study is the ethical fashion movement among young designers in the United Kingdom. In general, ethical fashion refers to fashion that is designed, sourced and manufactured in socially and environmentally sustainable ways. One of the founding directors of the Ethical Fashion Forum, the first professional association in the emerging market, defines ethical fashion as follows:

---

[2] The fact that self-categorization is consequential becomes even more apparent when we look at the well-studied ordering role of categories in markets. Research shows that categories act as "sense-making and order-creating devices" (Schneiberg and Berk 2010, 257), also referred to as "default mechanisms to make sense of the world" (Lounsbury and Rao 2004). Since they allow "people [to] make sense of incomplete and imperfect market cues" (Rosa et al. 1999, 65), they are considered crucial to the social order of markets (Khaire and Wadhwani, 2010). As Schneiberg and Berk (2010, 256) summarize, "product categories provide market participants with 'cognitive interfaces' for simplifying complex realities, focusing attention, grouping and comparing products and producers, locating themselves in the world, and orienting themselves toward rivals and trading partners." Research further shows that category conformity helps to build a firm's reputation and legitimize its activities, whereas nonconformity can entail economic losses (Zuckerman 1999). Products that are difficult to classify in terms of existing categories are "difficult to evaluate because they lack clear comparability" (Khaire and Wadhwani 2010, 1282). A firm that fails to fit any recognized category is easily overlooked, dismissed and devalued (e.g., Hsu 2006; Kennedy, Chok and Liu 2012). Thus, classification into a certain market category helps consumers and investors to compare products or firms with one another, to perceive their value, and to make an informed choice.

> When we talk about ethical fashion we are taking into consideration fashion which is socially and environmentally conscious. Social issues may include topics of gender, transparency, fair pay, trade unions and good governance. Environmental issues may include carbon miles, pesticides used in farming, natural and synthetic dying methods, how we dispose of clothing and its effect on the environment, water usage during production and post production of a garment. (Elizabeth Laskar, co-founder and director of the Ethical Fashion Forum)

The ethical fashion movement in the UK became largely visible to the public in 2006 when the British Fashion Council decided to create a special venue for ethical fashion during London Fashion Week, called Estethica. The movement originally emerged from various social spheres. From the moral sphere, social movement organizations like the Environmental Justice Foundation or the Fairtrade Foundation started collaborations with fashion designers or acted as certifying agencies to label their products. Furthermore, a couple of ethical fashion designers started with activist backgrounds. The movement also emerged in part from the esthetic arena of fashion design: various ethical fashion designers had graduated from leading fashion schools like the London School of Fashion, and members of the British high fashion scene like Katherine Hamnett or Vivienne Westwood provided considerable ideational input. Finally, the government also fueled the formation of an ethical fashion movement by its increasing support for a sustainable fashion industry. This culminated in the passage of a Sustainable Clothing Action Plan, which was publically launched at Estethica in 2007.

This setting is well suited to serve as a "theoretical sample" (Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007) for scrutinizing the dynamics of self-categorization in the light of a powerful third party. Various formerly conflicting social spheres – e.g., morality, esthetics, the economy – all provide cultural resources for the actors' self-positioning. Conflicts between these spheres still persist, as reflected in the following statement:

> It's not more expensive to create beautiful, ethically correct clothing, it's just a lot more of a hassle… You have to make social and corporate responsibility darn sexy to get people to play the game. (Peter Ingwersen, founder of the label Noir)[3]

Not only the variety of cultural resources available for self-categorization but also the perceived conflicts between these frames make self-categorization a complex endeavor, and how the designers act in this situation is an empirical question. It is therefore particularly interesting to further refer to an organization whose dominant brokerage position in the fashion field makes it an exemplary actor for exploring the role of power in self-categorization: the British Fashion Council (BFC). The BFC acts as a cultural broker of the broader values that

---

3   As cited on the website of the Ethical Fashion Forum <http://www.ethicalfashionforum.com/fact-cards/1-times-a-changing> (Accessed March 21, 2017).

pervade the fashion field. From the perspective of the individual designer, this organization holds considerable power. It decides who is granted access to the prestigious London Fashion Week, thereby shaping the fate of ethical fashion designers in terms of their becoming internationally known or not. According to Entwistle and Rocamora (2011), participating in the fashion week is of high symbolic value for designers, and it can ultimately accrue into great commercial success. London Fashion Week reflects the power structure of the fashion field in a nutshell (Entwistle and Rocamora 2006): in the organization of the shows, the participant lists, or the physical separation of spaces. The BFC is the organization that has authority over London Fashion Week. It is therefore a crucial gatekeeper for designers accepted to the fair, since designers thereby gain the opportunity to become visible and legitimate members of the broader fashion field.

3.2 Analytical Approach

The analytical approach in this study combines frame analysis of producer websites with content analysis of further archival material. Scholars have proposed frame analysis as a useful analytical framework for studying categorization (Fiss and Kennedy 2009; Cornelissen and Werner 2011).[4] As I will argue, the importance of frame analysis for categorization research lies in providing an analytical approach to study categorization processes at different levels – in this case, the local level of self-categorization and the broader level of (master) frames available as cultural templates for self-categorization.

In general, frames are internally coherent interpretative schemes that render events meaningful, organize experience, guide behavior, and motivate action (Goffman 1974). Fiss and Kennedy (2009, 7) claim that "frames are used to characterize what it is that's going on in an emerging market." They further underscore the role of existing cultural material in categorization by holding that "many of the frames used by actors to make sense of their particular situations come ready-made and are supplied by society at large" (ibid., 9). Thus we can say that in their self-categorization, actors selectively draw on existing frames to provide meaning to their activities.[5] The frames available for self-

---

[4] There is some debate about whether frame analysis allows one to grasp the habitualized reproduction of categories taking place in mature markets, as its supposed focus is on deliberate framing activities (and hence the deliberate choice of cultural templates for categorization). I do not share this concern. As an analytical technique, frame analysis opens up ways to scrutinize different interpretative schemes in a framing discourse, independently of the question of whether these schemes are followed in habitualized ways or are deliberately applied.

[5] To be more precise, these cultural templates for self-categorization should be conceived of as master frames – broad interpretative schemes that result from the earlier cultural work of various social groups (Snow and Benford 1992; Benford and Snow 2000). Typical master frames revolve around values of social justice, the environment or peace. According to Benford (2013, 723), these master frames "are sufficiently elastic, flexible and inclusive enough"

categorization derive from the different social spheres out of which the new arena emerges (Fligstein and McAdam 2012); in the given case, it includes frames coming from the moral sphere of social movements, the esthetic sphere of fashion design and the economic sphere of a market. These spheres can be analytically conceived of as "value spheres" (Weber 1946; see also Swedberg 2005; Friedland 2013), associated with a characteristic set of values which are reflected in a certain frame. For instance, an ethical fashion designer who self-categorizes with reference to economic values like profit maximization, esthetic values like authenticity and creativity, or moral values like social equality and environmental protection draws on frames from the economic, the esthetic, and the moral sphere.

Combined in self-categorization, frames define the social identity of an actor (Lefsrud and Meyer 2012). Actors use the frames as identity claims to reflect the kind of person they want to be seen as (Glynn and Navis 2013). As such, they locate themselves in broader categories of meaning (Navis and Glynn 2011). Framing oneself with reference to widely accepted frames thus acts as a "potent identity mechanism" in that it helps to construct a resonant account of what the actor claims to be (Navis and Glynn 2010, 1130). By using broader frames in self-categorization, actors tie their identity claims to social values, thereby not only lending legitimacy to their offering but also making it credible and resonant to others (Tilly 2005). An ethical fashion designer who wants to be seen more as an activist and less as an entrepreneur will talk more about values like equality and fairness than about efficiency or profitability, and hence draw more on moral frames than on the business frame and its associated values.

3.3   Data

The data that allow insights into categorization through framing are made up of texts. I drew upon different types of sources, the majority of which are producer websites and BFC reports and press releases.

The first set of texts helped to capture which kinds of frames the designers apply in their self-categorization and hence to scrutinize which role moral and nonmoral values play in their self-positioning in the market. With the aim of understanding the role of power in self-categorization, I focused on ethical fashion designers who had been selected by the British Fashion Council to exhibit at London Fashion Week. In order to trace changes in their self-categorization over time, the sample includes ethical fashion designers of clothes, shoes and accessories who exhibited at the spring fairs in 2009, 2011, and 2013.[6] By downloading the content of their websites in the first quarter

---

so that actors in different social spheres "can successfully adopt and deploy" them in their framing activities. For the sake of simplicity, I refer to them briefly as frames.

[6]   See the Appendix for a list of producers in the sample.

after each fair had taken place, this dataset of 61 actor websites helped me gain insights into the changing role of moral and nonmoral values in the producers' self-categorization.

Assuming that self-categorization is shaped by the values propagated by central audience members, a second set of texts allowed me to explore the kinds of values that are important to the British Fashion Council. I therefore downloaded all publications by the British Fashion Council that are available online, both their reports and press releases. These texts helped me understand the general role of this elite organization in the British fashion industry as well as to scrutinize the kinds of values that this organization communicates. Finally, complementary data from the research project provided insights into the ethical fashion market by reflecting the view of further audience members on the market. This dataset included governmental and media reports, reports on ethical consumerism in the UK, book publications by ethical fashion activists, as well as reports on ethical fashion published by social movement organizations, the London College of Fashion's Centre for Sustainable Fashion, and the Ethical Fashion Forum.

3.4   Analysis

The frame analysis of producer websites proceeded as follows: reading the documents, I coded the types of frames in each sentence.[7] In doing so, I looked for the kinds of issues addressed in the sentence, and started with issues that I knew, from my earlier fieldwork, that most ethical fashion activists seek to address. I coded the *environmental frame* for sentences in which designers refer to issues including environmental problems caused by conventional clothing production and consumption or point to measures to reduce the impact on the environment, such as the use of natural dyes and alternative fabrics (organic cotton, hemp, recycled material, leftover fabrics), local production, eco-labelling, or the consumption of high-quality products with a longer life cycle. I also coded the environmental frame when designers simply mention key words that provide generally known cues to the frame, such as "eco," "green," or "biodegradable." I coded the *social justice frame* when issues are addressed that range from fair working conditions, long-term relationships with manufacturers who are committed to ethical standards, or poor living conditions of workers in developing countries. Key terms associated with social justice, like "fair trade," "ethical," "fair employment," or "fair working conditions" also pointed to this frame. Finally, I coded the *animal rights frame* when issues or key words regarding the well-being and treatment of animals are raised.

---

[7]   Sentences form the smallest syntactically closed unit in naturally occurring language and are considered the most meaningful unit of analysis in computerized content analysis (Fiss and Hirsch 2005; Weber 2005).

Throughout the analysis, other issues appeared that indicated further frames, both from the moral sphere and from other social spheres: a *global justice frame* which refers to issues associated with globalization (e.g., preserving traditional cultural forms, supporting local communities); a *health frame* with which designers refer to health implications for either workers or consumers (e.g., harmful substances, chemical residues in clothes); a *business frame* that relates to economically relevant issues over the whole fashion supply chain (e.g., sourcing of materials, production facilities, marketing, pricing, distribution outlets, consumers, profits, or commercial success/failure); and a *fashion frame* when designers, for instance, describe their general esthetic approach or the design of their fashion collection ("fabulous," "beautiful," "innovative"), thereby referring to esthetic values of art, creativity and uniqueness that are typical for the sphere of fashion design. The result of the full-text coding of all downloaded websites resulted in sentences allocated to particular frames which then allowed me to assess how often the designers draw on each frame, and whether that changes over time.

Furthermore, I analyzed the content of the BFC's textual material as well as publications by other members of the field operating in the ethical fashion market. For the BFC texts, I sought to understand which kinds of values they emphasize in their publications. I also looked at how they talk about the ethical fashion movement in particular. I read the complementary data to gain a deeper understanding of how different actors see the ethical fashion market. These data also provided a look at how fashion actors position the BFC in the larger fashion field. All coding and analyzing in this study were computer-assisted, using the qualitative data analysis software ATLAS.ti.

4. Results

In this chapter, I start by providing insights into the kinds of moral frames used in designers' self-categorization, since morality primarily motivates them to enter the fashion field. This is also the major category that allows them to differentiate their offerings from conventional fashion. I then go on to describe the cultural framing of the BFC as the leading audience member brokering the dominant value expectations of the fashion market. Finally, I show changes in the designers' self-categorization. I see these changes as a result of their extended exposure to these values and of their general striving to become legitimate members of the market arena.

4.1 Morality in the Self-Categorization of Ethical Fashion Designers

Ethical fashion designers are well aware of the still contested notion of morality in the fashion market. Orsola de Castro, one of the founders of Estethica – and herself a celebrated ethical fashion designer – addresses this conflict directly:

> [We see ourselves] as a kind of major designer force, as a kind of innovation within the industry rather than camping gear. What we showcase here [at Estethica] are not just brands that are here to save the planet. We are here to sell clothes. We aim at the same wardrobes as most of the other traditional designers. (Orsola de Castro, interviewed by Suzy Menkes during London Fashion Week, July 2009)[8]

Cyndi Rhoades, another influential social entrepreneur in the fashion field, expresses comparable concerns:

> We don't want to be pigeonholed as eco fashion; first and foremost it's about good design. I want this whole initiative to move out of being 'green.' It should just be the way that you do business. (Cyndi Rhoades, June 19, 2010, The Daily Telegraph)

Confronted with the conflicts between esthetics, morality and the economy that pervaded the fashion field for such a long time, we cannot expect ethical fashion designers to make ample use of moral frames in their self-categorization. Interestingly though, ethical fashion designers even emphasize moral values in their self-categorization, at least throughout the first years. Indeed, in the early years, most of them claim an identity that strongly builds on moral values. They position themselves as activists who seek to change unethical practices in the fashion industry, or at least as moralists who denounce unacceptable conditions associated with clothing production (see Table 1).[9]

---

[8] The interview is available via <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7Ocp1AF7niY> (Accessed March 1, 2017).

[9] Claiming the identity of an activist means that a designer draws in more than half of all his or her self-categorization on moral frames. As a moralist, he or she applies any of the moral frames more than any of the nonmoral frames – although overall, moral framing still accounts for under half of all framing used in self-categorization. One of the other self-identities in the sample is that of an entrepreneur: a designer positions him- or herself as an entrepreneur when drawing on the business frame in more than half of all framing for self-categorization. Furthermore, the table points to some of the other frames with which self-identity claims become blended, thereby also indicating the extent to which this happens. For instance, activists who blend their claimed moral identity with the business frame have "some" business acumen when they use the business frame in less than 10% of their self-categorization; they have "strong" business acumen when they use it in more than 25% of their framing; and they have "very strong" business acumen when they use it in more than 38% of their overall framing activity. A full list of the designers' self-categorization, including other self-identities (e.g., fashionista) and further information on frame blending, is available from the author upon request.

Table 1: Self-Categorization of Ethical Fashion Designers (Summary of Moral and Business Framing)

2009	2011	2013
32 designers, out of which …	16 designers, out of which …	13 designers, out of which …
-19 position themselves as activists; six of these somewhat refer to, ten of them moderately refer to, and one strongly refers to the business frame; -four position themselves as moralists; each of them also moderately refers to the business frame; -two position themselves as entrepreneurs; one of them also strongly draws on moral frames	- six position themselves as activists; three of these moderately refer to the business frame; -five position themselves as moralists; three of these moderately refer to and two of them strongly refer to the business frame; -two position themselves as entrepreneurs, one of these also draws moderately on moral frames, and the other one draws somewhat on moral frames	- four position themselves as activists; three of these strongly or very strongly refer to the business frame, and one designer also uses the business frame somewhat; -two position themselves as moralists, one of them also strongly refers to the business frame; -three position themselves as entrepreneurs; one of these draws strongly on moral frames, and the other two moderately refer to moral frames

Core to their self-categorization as moral agents are issues like waste reduction, water contamination, upcycling, or organic farming on the one hand; and fair payment, cooperative production systems, education of workers, or poverty reduction on the other:

> In Britain, more than 1 million tonnes of textile waste finds its way into our landfill sites every year, 50% of which is reusable. (Good One)[10]

> Ada has also employed zero waste technology by saving the fabric residue and shredding this to create padding utilised in scarves and shoulder pads. Other fabrics used in the collection include Fair Trade organic cotton. (Ada Zanditon)[11]

> Veja buys cotton respecting fair trade rules and has long term commitments to the cooperatives. Veja offers twice the market price to the Brazilian producers to buy their organic cotton. (Veja)[12]

While social justice and environmental protection are the most important values in self-categorizing as a moral agent, designers also draw on frames related to other moral values. Some designers express their aim of supporting their communities through local manufacturing and preserving the national heritage of textile production knowledge, thereby referring to issues related to globalization and the global justice movement:

---

[10] <http://www.goodone.co.uk> (Accessed April 16, 2009).
[11] <http://www.adaz.co.uk/html_biog.htm> (Accessed April 16, 2009).
[12] <http://www.veja.fr> (Accessed April 24, 2009).

> Through the provision of our training programmes we empower local grass-roots partners [...] supporting UK industries, traditional arts and crafts [...]. Our garments are all produced in the UK, from the grass the sheep graze on to the product in your hands. (The North Circular)[13]

Other designers are deeply concerned with animal rights when, for example, addressing the use of alternatives to leather in vegan shoes or, as in the following example, the living conditions of the animals that provide the wool:

> Our flock of Wensleydale and Shetland sheep comprise mainly of animals that would have been sent to slaughter for being male, missing a pregnancy, being a little lame, being too small, being too old or having imperfections such as a black spot in a white fleece. (Izzy Lane)[14]

These examples show that ethical fashion designers express a variety of moral values when claiming the identity of an activist or a moralist. The quotes further reflect the underlying conflict between morality and the economy, and we can also note how some of the designers present as distant from business-related matters. It becomes clear that they have to resolve a critical tension when positioning themselves in a market arena in which business values dominate.

4.2   Business Values Propagated by the British Fashion Council

Throughout all its publications, the British Fashion Council (BFC) prominently addresses values associated with the economic sphere of a market arena. The overall aim of this organization is to support British fashion designers in achieving commercial success, as it claims in its self-presentation as well as in its reports:

> The BFC is committed to developing excellence and growth in a sector that is a significant contributor to the British economy. We nurture, support and promote British fashion talent to a global market. (Website, About)

> Designers should have an appreciation of business. It is important for them to think from a very early stage about putting in place the right business processes. (BFC, Commercialising Creativity Report)

The BFC's dedication to business values like profitability and economic growth has increased over the years, which can be seen in the light of organizational and strategic changes within the organization.[15] When a new chairman took over in 2012, she announced new "strategic pillars" led by experienced members of the fashion industry. These pillars are directly derived from the

---

[13] <http://thenorthcircular.com/about-north-circular>;
<http://thenorthcircular.com/green-credentials> (Acessed March 5, 2011).
[14] <http://www.izzylane.com/shopcontent.asp?type=aboutus> (Accessed April 24, 2009).
[15] The latest report, for instance, puts the economy first. It already starts with the headline: "The UK fashion industry contributes £26 Billion to the UK economy" (BFC, Annual Report 2014-2015).

organization's general aim to help the UK fashion market grow by developing and supporting the business skills of the designers. She describes the vision underlying these pillars as follows:

> We have put in place a vision for the British fashion industry […]: That the designer sector will have at its heart significantly more robust and profitable businesses; that these businesses will attract and secure investment for growth; that as a country and sector we will lead in digital and embrace technology to find new and more efficient ways to engage with a global industry; that we will inspire and support talented future generations to work in the industry through education; that we will protect and grow London and Britain's reputation for creativity, flair and business. (BFC, Annual Report 2012-2013)

To develop the economic success of its designers, the BFC uses a variety of approaches, including a mentoring program in which representatives from the fashion industry assist designers in developing their businesses:

> The key aim is to appoint high profile industry leaders who can work with designer businesses over a two year period, open their contacts book to assist knowledge gaps and share expertise across the business structure. They will also assist the designer in structuring their business, help appoint key personnel and develop essential business disciplines, knowledge and strategy to deliver growth. (BFC, Annual Report 2013-2014)

Various ethical fashion designers have also taken part in such a program:

> A dedicated mentoring programme for Estethica was established in 2009 to develop eco fashion businesses into commercially successful designer businesses. Six of Estethica's designers this year received one to one expert advice and support from one of three industry mentors: brand consultants Susanne Tide Frater, Yasmin Sewell and buying consultant Bev Malik. This initiative received support from the London Development Agency and aims to increase opportunities for ethical designers competing in the mainstream. (BFC, Annual Report 2010-2011)

It is notable that the mentors for ethical fashion designers are all recruited from the sphere of fashion business. The mentors are specialists in branding and sales, and should help designers to develop excellence in business-related matters. No doubt, ethical values like social and environmental sustainability drive the choice of designers for Estethica, but the focus of the BFC's activities is on providing them with business-related know-how, expertise and resources to become economically successful in the mainstream market.

What about values associated with esthetics? As a prominent organization in the fashion arena, esthetic values are not absent from shaping its actions. Design excellence, for instance, is a prerequisite for being selected to showcase at London Fashion Week and, even more so, for winning the prestigious British Fashion Award granted by the BFC. However, creativity at all costs is not being asked for; instead, the design must be considered saleable, something that is particularly secured by the industry advisory board that supports the

BFC "in sourcing, identifying and selecting talent [...] to show at London Fashion Week" (BFC, Annual Report 2010-2011).

The focus on business values becomes understandable when one considers the BFC's role in the fashion field. As the organizer of the main field-configuring event, it unites members of the fashion field, the most important of which are commercial ones. Indeed, commercial organizations are the central players behind the BFC. The council's executive board, which was established for the first time in 2009, consists of industry representatives. It has to report regularly to an industry advisory board. Members of this board not only control for the BFC's cost efficiency but are also involved in selecting the "right" designers for London Fashion Week (whose offerings are considered well-designed *and* saleable). Fashion firms also take part in different programs dedicated to educating fashion designers:

> [M]any of our high street fashion brands support the overall talent pool through their relationship with the British Fashion Council, support and sponsorship of London Fashion Week and contribution to the talent pathway schemes available to young designers from college upwards. (BFC, Future of Fashion Report)

Furthermore, commercial organizations are the major sponsors of London Fashion Week. Not to forget that during London Fashion Week, fashion retailers place orders with an estimated value of over 100 million pounds each season. The BFC's focus on the economy and the commercialization of fashion can be seen in light of its uniting and brokering role in a field that is first and foremost an economic arena. The BFC provides central platforms for field coordination, and it acts as a gatekeeper for individual designers. As such, it exerts considerable power over upcoming designers who seek to form part of that field.

4.3 Entering a World of Business

4.3.1 Blending Values in Self-Categorization

Ethical fashion designers start their ventures in a world in which the moral values that motivate them in the first place are not taken for granted. However, in order to become legitimate and recognized members of the fashion market, it is critical for them to adhere to the business values that are central to the field. To do otherwise, they would risk failing to achieve their activist aim of changing the industry from within. An important step in that direction is to convince the BFC to grant them access to London Fashion Week. As we have learned, dominant in this organization's cultural framing are values associated with the economy, through which the BFC reflects the broader value orientation in the fashion market. In the early years, that dominance of business values is not reflected in the self-categorization of ethical fashion designers. Most of the designers claim an activist or a moralist identity. This does not mean that they completely ignore business values. Instead, designers usually seek to unite both

worlds by blending the moral frames with the business frame in their self-categorization. Indeed, the blending of the business frame with moral frames is a general means to express their belonging to both worlds. A designer is not just an activist in the field but an activist with business acumen who also knows how to run a business firm:

> Veja's fabrication costs are 3 to 4 times higher than other footwear brands because the trainers and bags are produced with dignity. But Veja's 'no advertising' policy makes it possible to sell trainers at a price which is equal to competitors. (Veja)[16]

Blending is common when designers, for instance, describe their aim to develop an alternative business model, one that overcomes the "hostile worlds" perspective (Zelizer 2011) in which economic and moral values are seen as incompatible. The designer Pachacuti, for example, works hard to bring moral values into its business model:

> [O]ur endeavour [is] to redress inequalities in the global fashion industry through demonstrating that it is possible to run a successful retail and wholesale clothing business which benefits the producers and is environmentally sustainable. (Pachacuti)[17]

People Tree makes a similar effort by describing how moral values should delimit the pursuit of the core business value – i.e., profit maximization:

> Fair Trade Organizations trade with concern for the social, economic and environmental well-being of marginalized small producers and do not maximise profit at their expense. (People Tree)[18]

Still, People Tree's privileging of justice over profit-making highlights the challenges of bringing separate social spheres together, and thus, there are designers like Mark Liu who rather seek to balance these values:

> Mark Liu has come up with a solution to reduce wastage as well as manufacture costs, in a unique win-win situation for both the environment and business operation. (Mark Liu)[19]

4.3.2 Changes in the Designers' Self-Categorization

While blending is frequent throughout the whole period, in the early years, the designers put much more emphasis on matters related to morality. Table 2 reflects how the blending of moral frames with the business frame changes over time, using as an indicator the number of sentences in which these frames co-occur.

---

[16] <http://project.veja-store.com/en/zero-zero> (Accessed October 5, 2013).

[17] <http://www.panamas.co.uk/about/> (Accessed March 5, 2011).

[18] <http://www.peopletree.co.uk/ifat_standards.php> (Accessed April 16, 2009).

[19] <http://www.markliu.co.uk/about.html> (Accessed April 16, 2009).

Table 2: Co-Occurrence of Moral Frames with the Business Frame in the Designers' Self-Categorization

	2009		2011		2013	
	co-occurrence (no. of sentences	% of moral frame co-occurring with business frame	co-occurrence (no. of sentences)	% of moral frame co-occurring with business frame	co-occurrence (no. of sentences)	% of moral frame co-occurring with business frame
animal rights and business	9	13%	1	4%	2	100%
anti-globalism / local community and business	64	100%	4	14%	14	40%
eco and business	84	18%	45	23%	87	45%
social justice and business	118	38%	58	33%	143	62%
Total	275	31%	108	26%	246	53%

We see that in 2009 and 2011, designers more often draw on moral frames alone – i.e., without also referring to any business value. In 2013, however, in more than half of all uses of moral frames, these frames are combined with the business frame. Thus, over the years, the blending of moral frames with the business frame increases in producers' self-categorization.

Table 3: Self-Categorization of Ethical Fashion Designers Who Participated in More than One Fair

	2009	2011	2013
Ada Zanditon	Moralist (business acumen, strong fashion credentials)	Moralist (strong business acumen, fashion credentials)	Moralist (strong business acumen, fashion credentials)
From Somewhere	Activist (business acumen, strong fashion credentials)	Moralist (business acumen, strong fashion credentials)	(not present at fair)
Good One	Activist (strong business acumen, fashion credentials)	Moralist (strong business acumen, strong fashion credentials)	Entrepreneur (strong moral credentials, some fashion credentials)
Henrietta Ludgate	(not present at fair)	Fashionista (moral credentials, business acumen)	Entrepreneur (moral credentials, fashion credentials)
Makepiece	Activist (strong fashion credentials)	Activist (strong fashion credentials)	(not present at fair)
Pachacuti	(not present at fair)	Activist (business acumen)	Activist (strong business acumen)
Veja	Activist (business acumen)	(not present at fair)	Activist (very strong business acumen)
North Circular	(not present at fair)	Activist (some fashion credentials)	Entrepreneur (moral credentials, some fashion credentials)

The trend towards business issues can also be seen in the self-categorization of designers who exhibited at more than one of the analyzed fairs. Talking more about business issues in self-categorization is common for most of the designers who participated in Estethica several times (see Table 3).

Some of these designers put so much more emphasis on business values over time that overall, the result is a change in their claimed self-identity. The design company Good One is one example of such a change in self-identity. In 2009, the extent to which its founder, Nin Castle, draws on moral frames indicates that she self-categorizes as an activist; then in 2011, drawing less on moral frames, she presents herself as a moralist. Finally, in 2013, she claims an entrepreneurial identity by focusing on business-related matters. The North Circular is another design firm which shifts from an activist to an entrepreneurial identity by giving much more space to issues related to the economic arena of a market. In 2013, they describe themselves accordingly:

> The North Circular launched at London Fashion Week in 2009. Rapidly amassing an impressive portfolio of international stockists and press from Vogue, to I-D, winning British Fashion Council awards and RSPCA good business awards. Founders Katherine Poulton and Lily Cole are both veterans in the fashion industry […]. Their passion for finding new ways of seeing the world, led them to believe in the future for the oldest methods of production. 'We wanted to return value to the hand made product, personalise the process of production, rekindle the relationship between the producer and the purchaser – knitter and scarf wearer, practically and digitally.' (The North Circular)[20]

It seems that they have become familiar with both the values and the jargon of the business world, applying a sophisticated business language that was less present in the first years.

It is also striking that over time, among all designers who are present at Estethica, a smaller portion of them claim an activist or moralist identity (again, see Table 1). While in 2009, nearly three out of four designers position themselves as activists or moralists, in 2013 not even half of all designers do so. Instead, the portion of those ethical fashion designers who claim an entrepreneurial identity increases. Is green likely to become black again? At least in the analyzed period, claiming to be truly green becomes less attractive for members of the ethical fashion movement. What has happened? As I will argue below, the designers' willingness to become part of the fashion business, mediated by the BFC as the central gatekeeper, has led them to change their self-categorization towards a greater emphasis on business values.

---

[20] <http://www.thenorthcircular.com/about-us> (Accessed April 9, 2014).

5.   Discussion

> Perhaps nowhere else are the dynamics of organizational identity and audience assessments more transparent than in the case of new ventures seeking needed resources.

What Glynn and Navis (2013, 1129) generally claim also applies to self-categorization in the ethical fashion market: new ventures change their identity claims in the light of a powerful audience member. Between 2009 and 2013, we see several ethical fashion designers switch their claimed self-identities from that of activists or moralists towards that of entrepreneurs. Designers also pronounce their moral ideals less over time, instead putting more emphasis on business-related values. What makes the designers change their self-categorization? I argue in this article that we have to consider the designers' power/dependency relations in order to better understand the dynamics in self-categorization.

The designers under study have all been selected by the British Fashion Council (BFC) to showcase at London Fashion Week (LFW). The material and symbolic value of being part of this highly visible and prestigious fashion event cannot be underestimated. According to Entwistle and Rocamora (2006, 736), "LFW is a major promotional opportunity for British fashion designers." The designers who are chosen to exhibit at this main field-configuring event are provided with important commercial opportunities: consumption decisions of large buyers are negotiated at the fair, and the fashion critics invited by the BFC to attend the shows contribute to the perception of ethical fashion by the broader public. By granting designers access to this event, the BFC thus exerts indirect control over the resources that become available to members of the ethical fashion category. In this respect, the BFC plays an important catalyst role for ethical fashion in society. Furthermore, the BFC also acts as a gate-keeper for the chosen ethical fashion entrepreneurs. It is itself a highly esteemed and legitimate member of the fashion field, in which it acts as a broker whose guidelines and activities not only reflect the field's dominant beliefs, norms and values but also shape them. Hence, when selecting particular ethical fashion designers for its fairs, it confers legitimacy on them. Legitimacy is a general prerequisite for the survival of new ventures and also a mediator for further economic success (Aldrich and Fiol 1994). Being unknown, new designers lack the credibility that allows them to access and mobilize resources. When a powerful actor in the field supports their activities, however, they are able to overcome the difficulties that entrepreneurs usually face during their founding years.

All this being said, it is clear that the BFC plays a central role for ethical fashion designers. As a leading audience member able to reward or sanction ethical fashion designers, we can assume that designers orient their cultural self-positioning in the market along the lines reflected by this organization. The

values propagated by the BFC indicate to designers what is expected from them in the fashion market, and to which values they should adhere in their self-categorization in order not only to be invited by this organization but also to be considered legitimate members of the broader field. Designers learn about the values in the market in several ways, and the BFC acts as the central mediator in the process. They participate in the fairs, programs and workshops organized by the BFC, where they become increasingly socialized with the beliefs, norms, and values in the fashion market. They also learn about them through BFC's publications, in all of which the core values of the market are dominant. As I have described, the BFC is deeply committed to supporting designer *businesses*, and its emphasis on business values becomes even more pronounced over time. The increasing role of business values in ethical fashion designers' self-categorization can thus be seen in the light of the cultural framing of the organization that is able to shape their success in the market. Here, resonance is an important driver for their self-categorization (Granqvist et al. 2013; Granqvist and Ritvala 2016; Navis and Glynn 2011), as designers strive to achieve resonance between their own framing and the framing of a powerful audience member.

What about the other drivers for dynamics in self-categorization that the categorization literature suggests? Do they help us to further understand the cultural shift in ethical fashion designers' self-categorization? To start with, literature on prototypical similarity would propose that the designers have tried to self-categorize according to a prototypical category (Durand and Paolella 2013). However, in the period under study, the ethical fashion market was in its formative years; a prototype had not yet emerged. While a professional actor in the field sought to promote a clear definition of what ethical fashion means,[21] producers disagreed on the kinds of attributes that should designate the emerging category. Some producers focused only on attributes like social justice, others on attributes associated with environmental concerns. Some saw these attributes as necessarily related – claiming, for instance, that the use of organic cotton is not sufficient to belong to the ethical fashion category but that values of social justice should also guide activities throughout the whole supply chain. Thus, given the lack of a prototype, prototypical similarity cannot provide insights into the case.

Categorization studies further show that the accumulation of knowledge shapes categorization over time (Granqvist and Ritvala 2016; Khaire and Wadhwani 2010; Rao et al. 2005). Actors gain new knowledge through their ongoing experiences in a new arena and therefore "continually reframe extant market categories […] and generate new boundaries across them" (Durand and Paolella 2013, 1105). The strategic act of self-categorization is thus shaped by

---

[21] See the definition by the Ethical Fashion Forum in part 3.

an actor's life experiences (Swidler 2001). Many ethical fashion designers start with a background in the moral sphere of social movements. They come to the arena with an activist agenda for social change, and their emphasis on moral values in self-categorization can be seen in the light of this agenda. Through their continued experiences in the fashion market, they accumulate new knowledge about what is appropriate and legitimate conduct in a market. And the BFC helps them to grow – by mediating their contact to buyers at LFW – so that the designers increasingly face the demand to "behave as a business" (BFC, Commercialising Creativity Report 2014, 7), both in their negotiations with buyers but also in their own organizations where they are now forced, for instance, to employ a workforce, manage production units, or implement a sales and distribution strategy. All this adds to their life experiences in the business sphere, making it more likely that they strategically position themselves with reference to the respective frame. Thus, the accumulation of knowledge can complement our understanding of why designers change their self-categorization over time. However, this driver alone would be insufficient to understand their strategic positioning in the market given that it remains silent on the role of dependency relations to a powerful audience member for dynamics in self-categorization.

Finally, studies have recently shown that actors' specific goals drive their categorization activities. Granqvist and Ritvala (2016, 213) note in this respect that "the key aspect of market categories is that they are domains of economic activity where outputs are produced and sold, with the aim of making profit, or to survive." Hence, these aims are important to an understanding of categorization dynamics. According to this view, ethical fashion actors would use self-categorization as a means to achieve certain goals. For instance, knowing that in order to become known to a larger public or to gain a reputation they depend on support from the BFC, the designers would strategically position themselves in ways that resonate with this organization's cultural framing. Specific goals and interests would then have shaped their self-categorization. Here again, the social relations to a powerful brokering organization are fundamental to understanding why ethical fashion designers start focusing on particular kinds of values in their self-categorization and identity claims. Thus, while goal-based categorization certainly adds to our understanding of the changes in ethical fashion designers' self-categorization, it does not directly address power/dependency relations.

6.   Conclusion

With this study I aim to show that power/dependency relations are central to understanding dynamics in self-categorization. While the notion of power has implicitly pervaded recent research on categorization and category dynamics,

this study more clearly points to the role of relations to a powerful audience member for the self-categorization of new ventures. It thereby sheds light on an undertheorized topic in the literature on category dynamics – namely the role of a powerful third party for the strategic categorization of producers (Vergne and Wry 2014; Granqvist and Ritvala 2016).

On a broader scale, this study also contributes to questions of morality in markets. The case reflects the special issue's view on markets as moralized entities that are not opposed to but constituted by moral economies (see also Weber et al. 2008; Fourcade and Healy 2007). Indeed, moral orders nurture the market under study: moral values are cultural resources that allow moral entrepreneurs to define themselves; these values form a central part in their claims on who they are and what they do. Thus this study adds to the literature that opens the "black box of morality in markets" (Fourcade and Healy 2007, 305; see also Aspers 2011), also by looking into the dynamics of morality in markets. It shows that the perceived "value" of moral values in markets can change over time: in the case of ethical fashion, morality seems less and less to be perceived as an appropriate category for positioning oneself in the market arena. Why do activists who are intrigued by the idea of building a moral alternative to the conventional firm lose faith in morality as a central element that constitutes their identity? In this contribution, I have suggested that dependency relationships with the conventional economic arena help us to understand the resurgence of an economic valuation regime, even in a moral market that was started as a deeply moral project. Actors in the ethical fashion market made themselves dependent on support from organizations in the conventional market that are core representatives of an economic logic. Developing in the shadow of the conventional market can play a role in increasingly delimiting the constitutive value of morality in the moral market. Future research on different kinds of moral markets will provide further insights into the question of whether it is the fate of all moral markets to become less moralized over time, or whether some moral markets – possibly those with fewer relations to the conventional arena – are able to maintain a central constitutive role of morality in the market.

References

Aldrich, Howard E., and C. Marlene Fiol. 1994. Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation. *The Academy of Management Journal* 19: 645-70.

Aspers, Patrik. 2011. *Markets.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Aspers, Patrik, and Jens Beckert. 2011. Value in markets. In *The worth of goods: Valuation and pricing in the economy*, ed. Jens Beckert and Patrik Aspers, 3-38. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Benford, Robert D. 2013. Master frame. In *The Wiley-Blackwell encyclopedia of social and political movements, Volume II*, ed. David A. Snow, Donatella della Porta, Bert Klandermans and Doug McAdam, 723-4. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 611-39.

Blanchard, Tamsin. 2007. *Green is the new black: How to change the world with style.* London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Cornelissen, Joep P., and Jean S. Clarke. 2010. Imagining and rationalizing opportunities: Inductive reasoning and the creation and justification of new ventures. *Academy of Management Review* 35: 539-57.

Cornelissen, Joep, and Mirjam Werner. 2011. *Framing and categorization in sensemaking and institutional persistence and change*. Paper presented at the 27th EGOS Colloquium, July 6-9, in Gothenburg, Sweden.

Durand, Rodolphe, and Lionel Paolella. 2013. Category stretching: Reorienting research on categories in strategy, entrepreneurship, and organization theory. *Journal of Management Studies* 50: 1100-23.

Eisenhardt, Kathleen M., and Melissa E. Graebner. 2007. Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal* 50: 25-32.

Entwistle, Joanne, and Agnès Rocamora. 2006. The field of fashion materialized: A study of London Fashion Week. *Sociology* 40: 735-51.

Entwistle, Joanne, and Agnès Rocamora. 2011. Between art and commerce: London Fashion Week as trade fair and fashion spectacle. In *Negotiating values in the creative industries*, ed. Brian Moeran and Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen, 249-69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fisher, Greg, Suresh Kotha, and Amrita Lahiri. 2016. Changing with the times: An integrated view of identity, legitimacy, and new venture life cycle. *Academy of Management Review* 41: 383-409.

Fiss, Peer C., and Paul M. Hirsch. 2005. The discourse of globalization: Framing and sensemaking of an emerging concept. *American Sociological Review* 70: 29-52.

Fiss, Peer C., and Mark T. Kennedy. 2009. *Market framing and the creation of online advertising exchanges*. Paper presented at the 25th EGOS Colloquium, July 2-4, in Barcelona, Spain.

Fligstein, Neil, and Doug McAdam. 2012. *A theory of fields.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fourcade, Marion, and Kieran Healy. 2007. Moral views of market society. *Annual Review of Sociology* 33: 285-311.

Friedland, Robert. 2013. God, love, and other good reasons for practice: Thinking through institutional logics. In *Institutional Logics in Action, Part A*, ed. Michael Lounsbury and Eva Boxenbaum, 25-50. Bingley: Emerald.

Glynn, Mary Ann, and Chad Navis. 2013. Categories, identities, and cultural classification: Moving beyond a model of categorical constraint. *Journal of Management Studies* 50: 1124-37.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience.* Boston: North Eastern University Press.

Granqvist, Nina, Stine Grodal, and Jennifer L. Woolley. 2013. Hedging your bets: Explaining executives' market labelling strategies in nanotechnology. *Organization Science* 24: 395-413.

Granqvist, Nina, and Tiina Ritvala. 2016. Beyond prototypes: Drivers of market categorization in functional foods and nanotechnology. *Journal of Management Studies* 53: 210-37.

Hsu, Greta. 2006. Jacks of all trades and masters of none: Audiences' reactions to spanning genres in feature film production. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 51: 420-50.

Kennedy, Mark T. 2005. Behind the one-way mirror: Refraction in the construction of product market categories. *Poetics* 33: 201-26.

Kennedy, Mark T. 2008. Getting counted: Markets, media, and reality. *American Sociological Review* 73: 270-95.

Kennedy, Mark T., Jay I. Chok, and Jingfang Liu. 2012. What does it mean to be green? The emergence of new criteria for assessing corporate reputation. In *The Oxford handbook of corporate reputation,* ed. Michael L. Barnett and Timothy G. Pollock, 69-93. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Khaire, Mukti, and R. Daniel Wadhwani. 2010. Changing landscapes: the construction of meaning and value in a new market category: Modern Indian art. *Academy of Management Journal* 53: 1281-304.

Lefsrud, Lianne M., and Renate E. Meyer. 2012. Science or science fiction? Professionals' discursive construction of climate change. *Organization Studies* 33: 1477-506.

Lounsbury, Michael, and Mary Ann Glynn. 2001. Cultural entrepreneurship: Stories, legitimacy, and the acquisition of resources. *Strategic Management Journal* 22: 545-64.

Lounsbury, Michael, and Hayagreeva Rao. 2004. Sources of durability and change in market classifications: A study of the reconstitution of product categories in the American mutual fund industry, 1944-1985. *Social Forces* 82: 969-99.

McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. 2001. *Dynamics of contention.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Navis, Chad, and Mary Ann Glynn. 2010. How new market categories emerge: Temporal dynamics of legitimacy, identity, and entrepreneurship in satellite radio, 1990-2005. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 55: 439-71.

Navis, Chad, and Mary Ann Glynn. 2011. Legitimate distinctiveness and the entrepreneurial identity: Influence on investor judgments of new venture plausibility. *Academy of Management Review* 36: 479-99.

Negro, Giacomo, Özgecan Kocak, and Greta Hsu. 2010. Research on categories in the sociology of organizations. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* 31: 3-35.

Porac, Joseph F., José Antonio Rosa, Jelena Spanjol, and Michael Scott Saxon. 2001. America's family vehicle: The minivan market as an enacted conceptual system. In *Path Dependence and Path Creation*, ed. Raghu Garud and Peter Karnoe, 213-42. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rao, Hayagreeva, Philippe Monin, and Rodolphe Durand. 2005. Border crossing: Bricolage and the erosion of categorical boundaries in French gastronomy. *American Sociological Review* 70: 968-91.

Rosa, José Antonio, Joseph F. Porac, Jelena Runser-Spanjol, and Michael Scott Saxon. 1999. Sociocognitive dynamics in a product market. *Journal of Marketing* 63: 64-77.

Schneiberg, Marc, and Gerald Berk. 2010. From categorical imperative to learning by categories: Cost accounting and new categorical practices in American manufacturing, 1900-1930. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* 31: 255-92.

Skov, Lise, and Janne Meier. 2011. Configuring sustainability at fashion week. In *Negotiating values in the creative industries*, ed. B. Moeran and J. S. Pedersen, 270-93. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Snow, David A., and Robert D. Benford. 1992. Master frames and cycles of protest. In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, ed. Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller, 133-55. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Swedberg, Richard 2005. *The Max Weber dictionary: Key words and central concepts.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Swidler, Ann. 2001. *Talk of love: How culture matters.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tilly, Charles. 2005. *Identities, boundaries, and social ties.* Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Vergne, Jean-Philippe, and Tyler Wry. 2014. Categorizing categorization research: Review, integration, and future directions. *Journal of Management Studies* 51: 56-94.

Weber, Klaus. 2005. A toolkit for analyzing corporate cultural toolkits. *Poetics* 33: 227-52.

Weber, Klaus, Kathleen L. Heinze, and Michaela DeSoucey, M. 2008. Forage for thought: Mobilizing codes in the movement for grass-fed meat and dairy products. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 53: 529-67.

Weber, Max. 1946. *From Max Weber,* ed. Hans Heinrich Gerth, and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press.

Zelizer, Viviana A. 2011. *Economic lives: How culture shapes the economy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Zuckerman, Ezra W. 1999. The categorical imperative: Securities analysts and the illegitimacy discount. *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 1398-438.

Appendix

List of Producers in the Sample (Designers of Clothes, Shoes and Accessories Exhibiting at Estethica during London Fashion Week)

February 2009	February 2011	February 2013
Ada Zanditon	Ada Zanditon	Ada Zanditon
Anatomy	Antonello	Beautiful Soul
Antonello	Ciel	Bottletop
Article 23	Dr Noki	Good One
Beyond Skin	Emesha	Henrietta Ludgate
Butcher Couture	From Somewhere	Katrien van Hecke
Ciel	Good One	Liora Lassalle
Del Forte Denim	Henrietta Ludgate	Lost Property of London
Elena Garcia	Junky Styling	Mich Dulce
Eloise Grey	Luflux	Pachacuti
Enamore	Makepiece	Phannatiq
From Somewhere	Max Jenny	The North Circular
Good One	Pachacuti	Veja
House of Tammam	Partimi	
Ivana Basilotta	Study NY	
Izzy Lane	The North Circular	
Makepiece		
Mark Liu		
Mia		
Minna		
Nahui Ollin		
Nina Dolcetti		
Numanu		
People Tree		
Prophetik		
Raeburn		
Reet Aus		
Rita Hraiz		
Samant Chauhan		
Sonya Kashmiri		
Stewart and Brown		
Veja		

Other articles published in this Special Issue: