The Handbook of Fashion Studies

Bloomsbury Academic
An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

50 Bedford Square
London
WC1B 3DP
UK

1385 Broadway
New York
NY 10018
USA

www.bloomsbury.com

Bloomsbury is a registered trade mark of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published 2013

© Sandy Black, Joanne Entwistle, Amy de la Haye, Agnès Rocamora, Regina Root, Helen Thomas, and contributors, 2013

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

Sandy Black, Joanne Entwistle, Amy de la Haye, Agnès Rocamora, Regina Root, and Helen Thomas have asserted their right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as Editors of this work.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from action as a result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Bloomsbury or the authors.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: HB: 978-0-8578-5194-9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Typeset by Apex CoVantage, LLC, Madison, WI, USA
Printed and bound in Great Britain

CONTENTS

List of Illustrations ix

Acknowledgments xvii

Contributors xix

Introduction 1
Sandy Black, Amy de la Haye, Joanne Entwistle, Agnès Rocamora, Regina A. Root, and Helen Thomas

SECTION I: FASHION/DRESS AND TIME

Introduction 17
Helen Thomas

1 Fashion and Dress History: Theoretical and Methodological Approaches 23
Lou Taylor

2 Dress, Time, and Space: Expanding the Field through Exhibition Making 44
Greer Crawley and Donatella Barbieri

3 New Fashion Times: Fashion and Digital Media 61
Agnès Rocamora

4 Fashion, the Body, and Age 78
Julia Twigg

SECTION II: FASHION, IDENTITY, AND DIFFERENCE

Introduction 97
Joanne Entwistle

5 Fashion and Class Evaluations 102
Katherine Appleford

6 Gender and Eighteenth-Century Fashion 121
Jennifer M. Jones

7 Lesbian Style 137
Vicki Karaminas

SECTION III: SPACES OF FASHION

Introduction 159
Agnès Rocamora

8 Border Crossings: Fashion in Film/Fashion and Film 164
Paul Jobling

9 The Hidden Spaces of Fashion Production 181
Regina Lee Blaszczyk

10 Fashion: More Than Cloth and Form 197
José Teunissen

11 Markets as Fashion Spaces 215
Patrik Aspers

SECTION IV: FASHION AND MATERIALITY

Introduction 231
Amy de la Haye

12 Investigative Methodologies: Understanding the Fabric of Fashion 235
Philip A. Sykas

13 Looking at Fashion: The Material Object as Subject 268
Alexandra Palmer

14 Anthropology and Materiality 301
Sarah Fee

15 Immateriality 325
Robyn Healy

SECTION V: FASHION, AGENCY, AND POLICY

Introduction 347
Regina A. Root

16 Fashion, Tourism, and Global Culture 353
Jennifer Craik

17 Artisan Enterprise, Cultural Property, and the Global Market 371
Mary A. Littrell and Judy Frater

18 Mapping Latin American Fashion 391
Regina A. Root

19 Secondhand Clothing and Africa: Global Fashion Influences, Local Dress Agency, and Policy Issues 408
Karen Tranberg Hansen

SECTION VI: SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND NEW FASHION

Introduction 429
Sandy Black

20 Technology and Future Fashion: Body Technology for the Twenty-First Century 436
Bradley Quinn

21 XS Labs: Electronic Textiles and Reactive Garments as Sociocultural Interventions 456
Joanna Berzowska

22 Advanced Textiles for Fashion in Science, Literature, and Film 476
Marie O'Mahony

23 Fashion and Science Intersections: Collaborations across Disciplines 494
Philip Sams and Sandy Black

SECTION VII: SUSTAINABLE FASHION IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD

Introduction 517
Sandy Black and Regina A. Root

24 Corporate Responsibility in the Global Apparel Industry: Toward an Integrated Human Rights–Based Approach 523
Marsha A. Dickson

25 Fast Fashion and Sustainability
Margaret Maynard 542

26 Design for Sustainability in Fashion and Textiles
Kate Fletcher 557

27 Fashion and the Design of Prosperity: A Discussion of Alternative Business Models
Simonetta Carbonaro and David Goldsmith 575

Resources Bibliography 595

Index 597

11

Markets as Fashion Spaces

PATRIK ASPERS

INTRODUCTION

Markets have gradually become a more important form of coordination of human resources and activities and have increasingly replaced other forms, such as the reciprocal gift economy, characterized by networks, and organizations (hierarchy), in which decisions are the leading principle. Fashion, characterized by volatility and change, may not appear to have much to do with coordination. However, it takes much coordination and order to experience the "wanton vagaries" of fashion.

Fashion in markets implies space, often in physical terms, and in other cases virtual space. This chapter looks at how markets do two things simultaneously: (1) they enable free choice, which is characteristic of markets but is also essential for the logic of fashion, and (2) they send out information on choices made by people. The argument, in a nutshell, is that fashion emulation calls for the free choice of producers and consumers and that these choices are made in marketplaces—spaces of virtual and nonvirtual character. The chapter discusses the observation, diffusion, and constitution of fashion in relation to market spaces. Put in other words: space is an essential dimension of fashion, though often neglected in sociological research.[1] This work is tied to studies of the spatiality of fashion consumption (Rocamora 2009). Moreover, fashion is concerned with more than clothes; it is a profoundly social phenomenon with a very large domain of applicability.

There are obviously some elements that this text does not deal with. This chapter will not deal with the coordination of the fashion industry, a topic that has been researched by others (e.g., Aspers 2010; Hirsch 1992; Kawamura 2004). Following the antiessentialist approach of fashion, the objects themselves will be bracketed out of the analysis. Why some people prefer certain clothes to others is yet another question that is of less importance for the argument made here.

This text uses a sociological perspective and draws on existing research in two fields, fashion and markets, to analyze the role of space. I will analyze fashion spaces—predominantly related to markets—in several steps. The idea of space and spatiality is often seen as physical, but in this chapter I will also look at virtual space. First, I analyze the observation of fashion and the ways in which fashion is constituted in a social space, zooming in on the Internet. I then look at how producers and consumers of garments use market spaces, highlighting the role of choice as essential for both fashion and markets.

OBSERVING FASHION

At the beginning of the twentieth century fashion was largely diffused by means of direct observation. In order to see and learn what was in fashion, a phenomenon then most clearly associated with the upper classes, people had to observe each other, in private interaction, but of course also on the street, in cafés, and in other public spaces. Those who did not, or could not, visit these places had few means to really know what was in fashion and what was not. Prior to the distribution of visual means of information, communication was largely restricted to direct observation. Over the last 100 years, other media—first of all printed media, then television, and more recently the Internet—have provided channels of information that allow observers of fashion to also be located at a distance from the physical setting of the social interaction out of which fashion is produced.

Moving and still pictures of fashion are today important in the fashion industry, for producers and consumers alike. Today, the Internet is the most obvious way to gain access to these pictures. Let us look at an example. People in the industry are frequently surveying the Internet for ideas, to keep track of what their competitors are doing and to keep their own sites updated. Fashion blogs, run by professionals and amateurs, are additional means that cater to the same need. Catwalks, for example, can be seen on the Internet, either live or with some delay. There are several ways in which nonprofessionals and, more important, customers can also use visual means to inform themselves on trends, fashions, and what others are wearing.

Paparazzi are a type of photographers who intrude in the private sphere of celebrities to take pictures for which they get money from the press, which is eager to publish them on the Internet but, above all, in the magazines they oversee. The interaction often strengthens both the celebrity and the photographer, who makes a living by shooting these pictures.[2] However, most would say that this intrusion is a way for common people, some of whom are dedicated fans of the so-called celebrities, to have a glance into both the public and private lives of celebrities. Celebrities are often icons of fashion, and many people are interested in what these trendsetters are wearing.

It is easy to illustrate how the pictures of a celebrity matter for the diffusion and constitution of fashion (Miller 2010). Readers, for example, are told about a picture of the

actress Angelina Jolie, showing what clothes she is wearing. Both the picture and the text provide detailed information the readers can use to find the clothes or look for similar ones. In addition to simply looking at pictures showing what celebrities are wearing, one can "steal the style" of a celebrity. This is facilitated by an additional feature of many Internet sites: hyperlinks. Not only is some information provided on a celebrity's outfit, but the reader is only one click away from the site where it can be purchased. Thereby the photo, taken on a specific date at a certain place where both the celebrity and the paparazzi were, is connecting the items to an electronic point of sale. The viewer can move from a "noncommercial" site to the company selling the item at another website, which may use the very same picture as an advertisement. Sites are also interactive, asking customers to help those who run them to find out what the celebrities are wearing. Among the customers who willingly provide information, it is likely that one will find representatives of the companies that are selling these items. The pictures re-present the space—the town square—where the distant viewer can observe what others are wearing. What can be learned, then, is that the photos are more directly included in the economy.[3]

There are also other means having the same effect as these "fashion peepers" in providing information on fashion. Today algorithms create spaces on the Internet. Algorithms are programmed procedures for solving problems. An algorithm can be programmed to trace what a customer is searching for or to create systems of offers that customers can be expected to use. As a result, Internet users may encounter messages like "Others who looked at this also looked at..." or "frequently bought together," or they may simply be offered something of interest to them, for example, ads. In this way the space around the offers is plastic and individualistic, which is to say that companies can form a virtual bubble and embed customers in it because of what the customers seem to prefer; the alternatives made available to the customer, as it were, are programmed by a customer's past behavior. The process of creating plastic spaces that embed the customer in a commercial virtual space means that differences are largely the result of the machines that interact with humans. These algorithms are indeed market devices (Callon, Millo, and Muniesa 2007), but they cannot be reduced to the intention of one single individual, not even that of the programmer, since they are programmed to evolve in interaction with humans.

CONSTITUTING FASHION

Observation of clothes and use of the Internet do not generate fashion, even if the clothes are in focus. Fashions in dress call for bodies wearing clothes, and minds reflecting on what is worn. In the fashion space of modern market economies, fashion producers make up one necessary component of buying and selling fashion, consumers the other. My point is that the interaction between buyers and sellers is crucial for constituting fashion. When known buyers—characterized as ideal-typical consumers of various types—interact with well-known sellers (e.g., brands), fashion is constituted

(Aspers 2010). Let us look closer at an empirical example to see how this is played out on the Internet.

The well-known artist Katy Perry has made headlines for her music but also for her style. She is followed by many people, and her activities are regularly reported in magazines, often using pictures. Obviously, very few would know about her whereabouts, clothes, and so on unless the media existed. It is by means of reappearing on the Web and in magazines that her style comes to be known to many people. Here are a few representative quotations from the Internet on her style and her clothes:[4] "The news that Katy Perry has become the first celebrity ambassador of the world leading hair styling brand GHD has excited many of the diva's fans just a while back."[5] She has also done some modeling for the Victoria's Secret 2010 Fashion Show, at which she also performed a song. Another piece of information for customers who want to copy her style is a picture of her in May 2011 captioned with the following words:

> Katy Perry was recently spotted out with friends at Australia's Taronga Zoo. Here she is wearing a fabulous Wheels & Dollbaby Dita Rose Embroidered Cardi in Red with Black which you can pick up online for $190.00. The cardigan comes from Wheels & Dollbaby's collaboration with burlesque model Dita von Teese. Katy's sunglasses are the white Ray-Ban Clubmaster which she also wore at JC de Castelbajac's runway show back in March.[6]

These few examples are included to show how labels can become fashionable because icons structure and order the field of fashion (Aspers 2006). Fashion is made, or, put differently, performed, in the public interaction of clothes, brands, and known wearers.

Though this is a result of interaction, and the two sides, buyers and sellers, constitute each other as well as the object, the economic principle of shortage often means that it is the icon that endows the seller (the brand) with status rather than the other way around. In short, there is only one Lady Gaga or Katy Perry, to take two fashion icons, but many brands—all of which are able to produce several garments to be offered to many customers. It is important to realize that this is not explained by the number of people involved but by the relative status of those involved. Though each person has a personal name, a unique body, and a narrative, very few are known enough to fulfill the role as one who endows the other side with status. Essentially only those whose fame reaches beyond a network can further a fashion across spaces and domains in a direct and fast way. Furthermore, if status is the ordering principle, normally one side is endowing the other side with status more than the other way around. If a well-known designer made only one item of a kind, he or she could be endowing the wearer with status. Should, in contrast, the wearer be extremely well known, his or her status will rub off on the designer. It is thus an empirical question which side is offering status to the other, and this depends on their relative status. That status is distributed in this particular case is, of course, above all because Katy Perry has gained a reputation as a singer, and it is her identity with high status in the field of music that explains her influence on fashion. This

is to say that the status order in the field of music brings order to the field of fashion (cf. Aspers 2010).

CHOICE IN MARKETS AND CHOICE OF FASHION

In this section I look at the conditions of free choice needed for fashion to exist. The "free" choice is one central aspect to be discussed. It is shown that the market enables people to choose. In other words, much of what I have discussed so far is played out in a market context. There is, put differently, a similarity between fashion and the market; both imply space and choice. A central point is that fashion is not one choice but the result of very many. Fashion is an unintended consequence, and, moreover, it cannot be organized, though attempts at organization have been observed, for example, efforts to control what colors will become fashionable (Aspers 2010). Fashion is the result of many people's decisions but is not itself the result of a decision. Though many people and organizations have an interest in steering fashion, due to economic or other motives, neither a single actor nor a group of actors can control fashion, not even in a concerted way.

Fashion is often seen as being existentially and emotionally important to human beings. It is seen as a means of expression and as a way to allow individuals to construct and maintain their identities. All this presupposes that people can make choices and thereby uphold differences, which ultimately can be turned into distinctions. The coordination of fashion presupposes choices among alternatives. Fashion, however, does not presuppose markets. If people were allowed to borrow—essentially free of charge—clothes from a storage area filled with different clothes, one could observe trends in fashion. People would borrow different things, and some choices would be deemed to be "in fashion" and others "out of fashion." In this game, here illustrated as a thought experiment, people could simply borrow garments, and money would not have to be involved.

Furthermore, people making clothes for themselves is another way in which, as a first step, difference can be created, which, in a second step, can be turned into distinctions and stratification into "good" and "bad," or "nice" and "not so nice." This social game can be played among girls on a soccer team who have their hair dressed and styled in a certain way, among dog owners who train their pets to do certain things, among hunters who use a certain car model, among academics who cite a certain author, and so on. Fashion is a general phenomenon and is not restricted to clothes (Lieberson 2000). The general logic of fashion, however, is clearly the same regardless of what is subject to fashion.

Nonetheless, in most contemporary forms of social life, when fashion plays a role, money matters. This is not a surprise, since in the contemporary market society, choices are often made using money in markets. This has the consequence that economic stratification, which exists in all societies, makes it easier for some to follow fashion than for others. Before I turn to the notion of choice and the conditions for fashion, I first discuss the attempt to mimic the Western and capitalistic mode of fashion as it was unfolding behind the Iron Curtain. This is, as it were, the negative case, and it is a step to gain a better understanding of fashion and of the central role of choice.

The communist Soviet Union was the main contender for world dominance facing the capitalist system between World War II and 1989, when the fall of the Berlin Wall unleashed the forces that led to the collapse of the totalitarian regimes in the Eastern European countries. Jukka Gronow (2003) has studied the role of fashion in the Soviet system. He finds that the Communist Party wanted to show that its system could offer the citizens of the Soviet Union a life that was as good as those of people living in the capitalist West. The following quote, reported by Gronow, from the secretary of the party organization of the Leningrad clothes-printing factory in 1935, makes this clear: "but who has told [us] that we could not produce a better drawing than foreigners. Comrades, we have to produce our own beautiful drawing which could gratify the demands of a young girl, a child and a middle-aged woman alike" (2003: 97).

To understand the fashion production under the Soviet system one must look at how production was coordinated and what choices users could make. Since the economy was coordinated through the means of organization—that is, a form of social order based on decisions on, among other things, how products are made and how to behave (Ahrne and Brunsson 2011)—free choice was eliminated at several levels, in particular at the levels that concerned the decisions on what to produce. How did it actually happen that some items were produced and not others? Soviet designers launched fashion lines, and real garments were made, but it was the party members who decided what could be produced or not, reflecting the aesthetics of communism. This meant that the actual alternatives that the citizens had were relatively limited in number. The inefficient system, in addition, meant that of those garments that were to be produced only a small fraction actually reached users. In practice, only a few people in Moscow could enjoy these garments. Thus the lack of quality was not the largest problem but rather the supply of goods (Gronow 2003).

Other goods that were seen as luxury goods in the West, like champagne, were produced in abundance in the Soviet Union. The result was that these goods could not be used to make distinctions and, in effect, were not seen as luxury goods at all by the citizens of the Soviet Union. Fashion calls for choice between resources and is facilitated if these resources are scarce, or made scarce (Daoud 2011).

Though these examples are brief and simplified, it is nonetheless clear that it is not the goods themselves that create distinctions, and that alternatives, or, seen from the perspective of users, choices, must exist. Money and other economic means are not necessary conditions for fashion, but they strengthens the capacity for wealthy people to consume things, making distinctions in a conspicuous way, so that others cannot use the same things or have to copy them using other means. Fashion, hence, cannot be the result of organized coordination; it cannot be forced on people, and free choice must exist.

The idea of choice is implicit in Georg Simmel's (1971) and also Thorstein Veblen's (1945) models of fashion. Choice implies alternatives to choose from under the influence of some kind of scarcity. When selecting among alternatives in your wardrobe, you have a choice, though some of the options are not necessarily highly interesting. One may say that this is an

example of choice, but there is no competition, as competition implies agency. To understand the dynamics of fashion choice today, I now look at the role of markets.

THE MARKET AS A SPACE OF CHOICE

The introduction of the market as a coordinated form of fashion implies two things: the notion of choice and the notion of space. I define markets as a social structure for the exchange of rights in which offers are evaluated and priced and compete with one another, which is shorthand for the fact that actors—individuals and firms—compete with one another via offers (Aspers 2011: 4). This definition covers the market both as a place and as a form of exchange characterized by competition.

If one analyzes the concept closer and traces the etymology of *market,* its dual meaning is seen more clearly. The Latin origin, *mercatus,* refers to trade and to place. Another notion, *forum,* should also be mentioned. It refers to a place and more specifically the marketplace. Both, however, refer to public activities. Each market normally has a name, which refers to what is being traded—for example, the market for handmade boots or the market for scarves. Some markets are associated with a certain place, such as the Petticoat Lane market in London, in which garments are traded. A marketplace must not, however, be about one good or service only. A bazaar (Geertz 1978) is a designated area for the trade of many different things. The Petticoat Lane market, however, is not only a marketplace in general but a market, much like many other London markets, with an identity tied to specific objects of trade, namely, garments. In larger shops, prices are announced on tags attached to the clothes, and bargaining is usually not possible. One may try clothes on, and there are many more "rules," some of which may vary between countries, or even market segments, that make up the culture of the market. In essence, most of these defining traits are similar to what one finds in other markets.

CHOICE AND COMPETITION IN MARKETS

I have already mentioned the central role of choice, and due to competition this is a defining trait of markets. Competition, however, takes place on both sides of the market. Not all garment-producing firms that also have an identity (brand) in the market have their own stores, but those that do not are represented in other stores or in larger department stores. The aim of producers competing with different products in markets is to reduce competition, primarily by means of product differentiation and niches. Edward Chamberlin (1948) and later Harrison White (1981) developed market theories that account for the fact that producers try to create niches in markets. By controlling the environment and creating partial monopolies, economic organizations generate identities, and market order follows because of the interaction between the organizations and their buyers. As Alfred Marshall already pointed out, brands—or, as sociologists often say, identities—are central for creating distinctions.

It is, in other words, only the rhetoric of the neoclassical market model that calls for the utterance that "we, as producers, want competition." Reduction of competition enables firms to increase profits and to use the mental space created by their identity to further control their environment. A small difference may be enough for other actors—competitors and buyers—to act on to increase the difference between themselves and to carve out unique identities and market niches. It is only in relation to other producers, all of whom share a collective identity, that firms can be clearly separated from each other and become different. Sellers try to convince potential buyers to choose their clothes. Sellers, moreover, can control what they put out on the market, and they try to convince potential buyers to choose their clothes. Control efforts are central, and advertisement, pricing, and other means can be used, most effectively by the sellers, since they are fewer in number and much more powerful than individual buyers are. The best way for producers to control the environment is to successfully perform fashion, that is, to set the agenda of what is in fashion and what is not.

Though producers can do much to try to affect consumers, it is ultimately the differences perceived by consumers that matter. Producers, put differently, are not in control of their identities. Even though the garments up for sale at any given time may look somewhat similar, it is the variation within the similarity that matters, but it is important that differences matter only in relation to the perceptions of the consumers. It is thus of utmost importance to consider consumers in order to understand how producers act. Consumers can choose from the multitude of options in the available garments. Buyers may be looking for garments that enable them to make distinctions, to comply with or defy the current fashion. Brand-new store-bought clothes, as well as used (acquired from friends or secondhand stores) and homemade clothes, can be considered as options by buyers, but the bulk is made up of new garments bought in stores.

SPATIALITY

The competitive logic of fashion, I have argued, has a clearly spatial component. Spatiality is both constituted by fashion and helps to constitute fashion. How do fashion producers use space? There is research showing that producers gather in industrial districts (e.g., Uzzi 1997). The spatial distribution of garment sellers is the visual manifestation of competition. Each type of seller tends to be concentrated in a particular spatial location. In London, as in Paris or any other large city, stores from the different market segments are located in different places: the luxury shops are concentrated in Bond Street, whereas the large retailers' stores are in Oxford Street. The difference, in terms of physical distance, can be measured in yards (or meters) and may thus be seen as marginal, but the phenomenological distance is significant. It is not uncommon for firms to wait several years to open a shop, until the "right" location becomes available. Not only is the geographic location of importance, but the presence of other stores in the area, or the style of the building of the store, can be of equal importance.

A shopping mall or a certain street may create an identity, enough to bring producers together and facilitate comparisons among producers and consumers alike. To occupy a position, that is, to have a specific store in an area, may be enough to gain an identity as a competitor to the others in the market. This is to say that fashion status, which is concerned with objects that lack a standard of evaluation, rubs off (Podolny 1993).

The consequence is that producers may do much to control the physical environment. In addition, owners of malls, shopping centers, and the like are prone to control which companies they rent space to and which they do not. This meta-control, that is, a form of organization of socioeconomic spaces, is an important way in which the meaning of fashion producers is generated and reinforced.

Carnaby Street is located in London; in reality, it is an area containing several streets that hosts smaller shops with brands with a medium to high fashion profile, including Replay, Lee, Diesel, and Miss Sixty. This "street" has its own website,[7] which shows how the marketplace is organized. Events are organized, such as catwalk shows, and there is a distinct narrative, heralded in a book titled *Carnaby Street: 1960–2010—The Book*. This, to repeat, frames the perception among the producers, creating a "we" that is organized by a private firm, Shaftesbury PLC.

It is thus clear that the public sphere in which fashion and other aspects of social life largely reside is to some extent organized. The company is open to investors about what they do: "We invest in locations close to streets traditionally regarded as prime with the aim of assembling clusters of buildings or villages where we see opportunities to create rental growth." Furthermore, there is a strategy: "An essential ingredient of this strategy is our encouragement of new trading concepts . . . in this way, our villages are a refreshing antidote to what is available elsewhere in increasingly homogenous high streets and shopping centres."[8]

Shaftesbury PLC is explicitly trying to create what I call "consumer districts" (to paraphrase Alfred Marshall's notion of industrial districts). Here is what they say:

> Shaftesbury's strategy is very clear and focused. The Group invests only in those districts within the West End [in London] which have an enduring demand from occupiers and popularity with their customers. Our investments are all close to the unique cluster of shops, restaurants, theatres, cinemas and world class galleries, museums and historic sites, which are the essence of London's West End. These districts all have excellent access to a wide choice of public transport both day and night.[9]

The orchestration of what they call an "antidote" creates homogeneity among the sellers of fashion products, who not only sit next to one another but also next to others selling other products, which nonetheless are of a similar status. The portfolios of firms in these areas are creating the spaces of commerce.[10]

It is clear that fashion sellers of different types are clustered. Stores are concentrated in shopping areas or districts, and frequently the fiercest competitors, such as H&M and

Zara, are located on either side of the same street, but it is of course not the physical layout that is the most important issue here. However, it is only through the concentration of firms with certain identities, and the corresponding status that gives them meaning, that the place becomes meaningful. The narrative of a place can help, but a commercial space is necessarily tied to what is traded. Some garment chains, such as Zara and H&M, are better known than most local areas, and they are increasingly giving meaning to places, rather than the other way around. This means that their shops partly give an identity to a mall, by either being there or not having a shop. Especially well-known brands define the socio-aesthetic status of an area. It is because of this that malls try to attract the "right" firms and labels, some of which are magnets that attract other stores to also establish themselves in the same area.

Fashion companies' stores are physical places that can be used to advertise what they are offering. In addition, billboards and other forms of public advertisement are parts of contemporary cityscapes that serve the same end. It should be mentioned that billboards and advertisements in various magazines are important strategies for firms to send out signals of who they are. However, only some firms use billboards, and from the position of the billboards, firms can transmit their messages to customers. These are attempts by competing firms to affect their environment, which includes the physical environment.

I have so far talked only about the space of stores. The Internet, with advertisements, links, Facebook pages, and other social media, provides other "spaces" where producers watch each other (White 1981). This is an important reflexive arena, easily accessible in the offices of most staff members at firms in this industry. It is simply a shorter "walking distance" to use the Internet than to enter the stores of one's competitors to see what they have coming.

COMPETITION BETWEEN CONSUMERS

I have shown that there is competition in the market between producers. This competition is economic in nature. Is there also competition between consumers? The short answer is that there is fierce competition, or at least rivalry, among consumers as well, but this is not economic competition regarding how to make profit or to avoid buying expensive items. The rivalry is about defining fashion and avoiding being seen as out of fashion, whereby some, perhaps those who do not really take part or who fail to keep up with fashion trends, become only the backdrop to those who are in fashion. The rivalry I look at is primarily of an existential nature. Rivalry among consumers in relation to fashion is about making distinctions. These distinctions can be related to economic capital, but economic capital per se is not exchangeable for fashion. Fashion is a form of symbolic capital (Bourdieu 2001). It is clear that there is no *one* fashion or *one* field of fashion. What I analyze below is the logic of fashion, without offering a full picture of the spatial positions of all consumers in the market and the multitude of

different styles and groups. This means that there are in reality many fields of fashion and many fashions.

Consumers do not care how the firms from which they purchase fashion items do economically. Consumers in markets try, I argue, to get as much fashion as possible for as little as possible. This, obviously, is very different from trying to get garments for as little as possible. Fashion, in contrast to just providing bodily coverage and protection, is about making distinctions. People become something by consuming fashion. Veblen's (1953) notion of consumption resembles this; the consumption has to be seen, by necessity in public places, and it has to be known that the clothes are expensive. Place and style are intimately related, so that the spatial dimension is constituted by this. Several studies testify to how areas are primed by people spending time there (Kawamura 2006) or by those living in an area and their look (le Grand 2010).

The market here operates in favor of this practice of becoming "someone," in at least two ways. The first is that the market space is an arena of display, as was shown. You can show to others where you make purchases, but you can also show what you are wearing to others in public. These two aspects often go hand in hand. Another aspect is that the economic competition between several sellers of fashion in the market provides everyone with information on prices. In the potlatch "economy" (Mauss 2002) destruction of valuable goods was very public, to manifest the position of the head of the clan and the status of the clan itself. Today the prices of goods are public, and the price level of each different brand can be used by actors to uphold and identify distinctions. However, money and price must not per se, as in the case with the potlatch, have anything to do with fashion as a social phenomenon. Money is one aspect of fashion but not the sole reason for distinction; distinctions are culturally and aesthetically rooted. The display of economic wealth drives fashion, and to do as many humanist-oriented scholars do (Vinken 2005) and focus only on the garments is utterly wrong, if one is to understand fashion.

CONCLUSION

Markets are central coordination forms in contemporary society. Fashion can and does exist outside of markets. However, garment fashion, at least today, is intimately connected to markets. The market offers choices for consumers to define themselves. Though it is possible for consumers to make clothes, and to compete to be the first with the latest with one's own products, this comes with demands on social skills and limited choice. The spatiality of fashion markets is a condition for the observation of what people, known and less known, are wearing, but these are also arenas that offer choices to people. The main point in this chapter has been to highlight the role of spatiality for fashion markets. Markets provide an ordered social structure of sellers that enables actors to create identities using the goods from sellers of clothes. Both producers and consumers, as it were, open up the space by differentiation.

Much more can be done to continue the analysis of space, markets, and fashion. The spatiality of diffusion of fashion items, in cities, in countries, and on the Internet, would be a fascinating topic. More generally, the diffusion of fashion—in which space and time are central aspects—is still a theme that is little understood and analyzed.

NOTES

1. Economic geographers have, of course, analyzed the spatial dimension of fashion. This research, however, is often concerned with the spatial distribution of fashion industries (Scott 2000) and less often with specific markets.
2. Most people are celebrities because of what they have done, for example, musicians or actors. Some are known as celebrities only because they are children of a celebrity or because they have appeared on a reality TV show.
3. In the future it can be expected that people will mark items on the pictures, and they may then automatically get information on these items, perhaps making text unnecessary.
4. The idea is not to show where these come from but to give some idea of what type of text is communicated based on her appearances. Sites like http://www.becomegorgeous.com or http://stealherstyle.net are examples of places where one can find similar stories and where fashion is on display.
5. "Katy Perry for GHD Professional Hair Styling," Become Gorgeous, April 12, 2011, http://www.hair.becomegorgeous.com/celebrity_hair/katy_perry_for_ghd_professional_hair_styling-4291.html (accessed August 22, 2012).
6. Pearl, "Katy Perry: Embroidered Red Cardigan," Steal Her Style, May 14, 2011, http://stealherstyle.net/2011/05/14/katy-perry-embroidered-red-cardigan/ (accessed August 22, 2012).
7. Carnaby Street website, http://www.carnaby.co.uk/ (accessed December 26, 2011).
8. Ibid.
9. Shaftesbury PLC, "Shaftesbury's Strategy," http://www.shaftesbury.co.uk/about.php (accessed December 26, 2011).
10. This is not a novel thing to do. Kings and princes have always tried to organize trade and marketplaces—often within the secure realms of their fortresses, which allowed them to tax traders—to gain income.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahrne, Göran, and Nils Brunsson. 2011. "Organization outside Organizations: The Significance of Partial Organization." *Organization* 18: 83–104.

Aspers, Patrik. 2006. *Markets in Fashion: A Phenomenological Approach.* London: Routledge.

Aspers, Patrik. 2010. *Orderly Fashion: A Sociology of Markets.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

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

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2001. "The Forms of Social Capital." In Mark Granovetter and Richard Swedberg (eds.), *The Sociology of Economic Life,* 96–111. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Callon, Michel, Yuval Millo, and Fabian Muniesa. 2007. *Market Devices.* Oxford: Blackwell/Sociological Review.

Chamberlin, Edward. 1948. *The Theory of Monopolistic Competition: A Re-orientation of the Theory of Value.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Daoud, Adel. 2011. *Scarcity, Abundance and Sufficiency: Contributions to Social and Economic Theory.* Göteborg, Sweden: Göteborgs Universitet.

Geertz, Clifford. 1978. "The Bazaar Economy: Information and Search in Peasant Marketing." *American Economic Review* 68: 28–32.

Gronow, Jukka. 2003. *Caviar with Champagne: Common Luxury and the Ideals of the Good Life in Stalin's Russia.* Oxford: Berg.

Hirsch, Paul. 1992. "Processing Fads and Fashions: An Organization-Set Analysis of Cultural Industry Systems." In Mark Granovetter and Richard Swedberg (eds.), *The Sociology of Economic Life,* 363–83. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Kawamura, Yuniya. 2004. *The Japanese Revolution in Paris Fashion.* Oxford: Berg.

Kawamura, Yuniya. 2006. "Japanese Teens as Producers of Street Fashion." *Current Sociology* 54: 784–801.

le Grand, Elias. 2010. *Class, Place and Identity in a Satellite Town.* Stockholm: Department of Sociology, Stockholm University.

Lieberson, Stanley. 2000. *A Matter of Taste: How Names, Fashions, and Culture Change.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Marshall, Alfred. 1920. *Industry and Trade: A Study of Industrial Technique and Business Organization; of Their Influences on the Conditions of Various Classes and Nations.* London: Macmillan.

Mauss, Marcel. 2002. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies.* London: Routledge.

Miller, Claire Cain. 2010. "Selling a Celebrity Look." *New York Times,* February 21. http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/22/technology/internet/22celebrity.html?ref=clairecainmiller (accessed January 2, 2012).

Podolny, Joel. 1993. "A Status-Based Model of Market Competition." *American Journal of Sociology* 98: 829–72.

Rocamora, Agnès. 2009. *Fashioning the City: Paris, Fashion and the Media.* London: I. B. Tauris.

Scott, Allen J. 2000. "Economic Geography: The Great Half-Century." In Gordon L. Clark, Maryann P. Feldman, and Meric S. Gertler (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Economic Geography,* 18–48. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Simmel, Georg. 1971. "Fashion." In Donald Levine (ed.), *Georg Simmel on Individuality and Social Form,* 294–323. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Uzzi, Brian. 1997. "Social Structure in Interfirm Networks: The Paradox of Embeddedness." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 42: 35–67.

Veblen, Thorstein. 1945. "The Economic Theory of Woman's Dress." In Leon Ardzrooni (ed.), *Essays in Our Changing Order,* 65–77. New York: Viking.

Veblen, Thorstein. 1953. *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions.* New York: New American Library.

Vinken, Barbara. 2005. *Fashion Zeitgeist: Trends and Cycles in the Fashion System.* Oxford: Berg.

White, Harrison. 1981. "Where Do Markets Come From?" *American Journal of Sociology* 87: 517–47.