PROSPERITY IN ITALIAN FASHION: NETWORKS OF CARE

HOW MICRO AND SMALL ENTERPRISES REDEFINE THE RELATION BETWEEN THE ECONOMIC AND THE SOCIAL

LUDOVICA CARINI
Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore
ludovica.carini@unicatt.it
Orcid 0009-0007-9286-1631

CECILIA CORNAGGIA
Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore
cecilia.cornaggia@unicatt.it
Orcid 0000-0002-0219-537X

SILVIA MAZZUCOTELLI SALICE
Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore
silvia.mazzucotelli@unicatt.it
Orcid 0000-0001-8934-0340

Abstract

The fashion system is notorious for perpetuating inequalities and exploitation, driven by entrenched power dynamics that dictate which ideas and interests prevail. While sustainability often dominates discussions on alternative paradigms (Henninger et al., 2016), care has emerged as a critical perspective, emphasizing processes over outcomes (Franzo, 2023). This approach highlights practices that responsibly manage time, resources, and expertise, fostering positive relationships between people, the environment, and territories. This paper draws on data from *CreAbility*, an ongoing action-research project involving Italian micro and small fashion enterprises, as well as associations and designers known for their social and cultural impact. The project aims to foster networks of practices that promote collaboration and enrich the theoretical debate on fashion's potential to generate social and economic value (Moore et al., 2023). Through periodic focus groups with diverse stakeholders, the study examines the concept of prosperity beyond mere economic gain, exploring how these actors challenge existing hierarchies and contribute to ecological, social, cultural, and economic well-being. The initial findings highlight key aspects for the fashion system to address in order to act as a positive agent of change in the Italian context.

INTRODUCTION: ADDRESSING TERMINOLOGY

TERMINOLOGICAL EXCURSUS

We have long moved beyond the superficial notion that fashion is merely a carefree aspect of consumption, driven solely by the pursuit of pleasure, satisfaction, and aesthetic appeal. Beneath its surface, fashion is deeply entwined in complex social dynamics and power relations on the side of consumption. Moreover, it exposes realities within its production processes that are neither easy to confront nor pleasant to acknowledge. Since industrialisation, fashion has evolved into a mature, labour-intensive industry, characterised by intricate global supply chains with significant consequences for individuals, communities, and ecosystems (Brooks et al., 2017).

Awareness of these issues has grown rapidly over the last decades, fuelled by campaigns such as Greenpeace's *Detox My Fashion*[1] and *Fashion Revolution's Who Made My Clothes*[2] to name just two of the earliest catalysts. The growing attention to the ethical and environmental dimensions of fashion has sparked important debates beyond the industry. However, this increased focus has also led

---

1 The Detox my Fashion campaign was launched in 2011, the link to homepage is available here: https://www.greenpeace.org/international/act/detox/, 21/02/2025.

2 The Who made my clothes? campaign was launched following the Rana Plaza disaster in 2013, the link to the homepage is available here: https://www.fashionrevolution.org/tag/who-made-my-clothes/, 21/02/2025.

to a proliferation of poorly defined terms, creating both opportunities and challenges. It is therefore crucial to use this moment to critically examine the field, refine its terminology, and clarify the key issues shaping both academic discourse and practical interventions.

The academic debate on value-based consumer behaviour is tightly related to Michele Micheletti's definition of *political consumerism*, described as actions taken by individuals who choose producers and products to influence institutions or market practices considered objectionable (Micheletti, 2003). Over time, this concept has expanded to include a broader range of market-oriented actions motivated by various concerns related to both production and consumption (Boström et. al., 2019). Consumers may be driven by political, spiritual, environmental, social, or other factors, and they are highly diverse, with the common factor being their awareness – to varying extents – of the impact of their purchases on the world. Definitions of critical (e.g. Yates, 2011) and ethical (Harrison et al., 2005) consumption often present an idealised view that only partially reflects the complex and heterogeneous motivations behind specific consumption choices, which blend both self-interested and altruistic factors (Stolle & Micheletti, 2013).

The concept of *responsible* consumption, defined as a purchasing behaviour that reflects concerns of an ethical, social, or environmental nature (Lim, 2017), is widely used in sociological studies on consumption, but the term originates within the tradition of corporate social responsibility. One of the first authors who employed it was Fisk (1973), who conceptualised it as a mechanism to influence corporate behaviour towards greater accountability, emphasising the rational and efficient use of resources while respecting the individuals involved in the process. As a result, the term has historically been interpreted predominantly in social terms (e.g. Webb et al., 2008; Prendergast & Tsang, 2019).

Lastly, *sustainable consumption* entered international discourse through Agenda 21, the sustainable development framework adopted at the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro (UNCED, 1992; Seyfang, 2009). Initially, the concept of sustainability was primarily concerned with the preservation of environmental resources over time. However, subsequent definitions have expanded this interpretation, incorporating not only the environmental dimension but also social and economic aspects, in alignment with the *triple bottom line* framework proposed by Elkington (2004).

The most recent and arguably controversial aspect of the sustainability paradigm is the cultural dimension, which is sometimes assimilated - or at least incorporated - into social sustainability but is also increasingly considered as an independent *fourth pillar*. Soini and Dessein (2016) highlight the critical role of culture in sustainability, noting that achieving sustainability goals hinges on human actions, behaviours, and perspectives, all rooted in cultural contexts. A significant challenge lies in the normative dimension that this introduces, as values and ways of life must be carefully balanced within the sustainability framework.

This brief excursus cannot ignore that the evolution of concepts and the choice of terminology reflect the times in which they emerge. Thus, we observe the ongoing evolution of the debate, with the introduction of two new terms, care and prosperity, which have increasingly come to the forefront in discussions on production and consumption practices, also in the field of fashion. These two terms evoke a holistic perspective, one that integrates multiple dimensions (ethical, social, environmental, and economic), highlighting their interdependence and promoting a systemic approach that values relationships, processes, and collective well-being over isolated attributes.

CARE AND PROSPERITY

In the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic crisis, an interdisciplinary group of economics and social sciences scholars known as the Care Collective authored *The Care Manifesto: The Politics of Interdependence* stating that: "Care is also a social capacity and activity [...], our individual and collective ability to provide the political, social, material, and emotional conditions that allow the vast majority of people and living creatures on this planet to thrive" (Chatzidakis et al., 2020, p. 6).

Practices of care – as will be further discussed in this paper – are traceable not only within the intimate sphere, but also at the community level; they can be found in the quality of relationships, or in the connection between the work of creative professionals and their sphere of proximity, whether understood as a process of co-creation, inclusion, representation or empowerment.

Ezio Manzini (2022) reflects on whether fashion could play a role in fostering positive change by communicating ideas, encouraging new behaviours, and promoting relationships that steer the industry away from its current destructive trajectory. Ultimately, the aim should not be for fashion to reduce the harm it causes but to become an agent of change towards a *sustainable civilisation* (Manzini, 2022, p. 465).

Moreover, he states that fashion, through its communicative role, can enable practices of care, and through its relational role, it can promote networks of actors actively pursuing change (Manzini 2022). This view aligns with the position put forward by Anneke Smelik that this perspective on fashion is "based on an interwoven community, which promotes collective forms of joy and wellbeing, rather than on the satisfaction of hyper-individualistic desires" (Vaccari, 2022, p. 84).

If we see care not as an abstract concept but as a set of practical manifestations, we are recognising mechanisms that, though often submerged, involve understanding who and what is cared for, by whom, and *why* and *when* they are cared for. Ethics of care emphasises interdependency and relationality in the organisation of labour and market connections. A shift in focus towards a collective dimension, where networks among brands, businesses, stakeholders, and communities are identified, cultivated, and implemented, is not new within the Creative and Cultural Industries (CCIs). It aligns with the concept of *creative clusters* (Cooke and Lazzeretti, 2008), geographic concentrations of creative companies and associated institutions that strengthen each other through competition and collaboration (Gureshidze, 2016, p. 13).

In fashion, while competition has often been a driving force, forms of cooperation have long existed. Today, we see a growing emphasis on collaborative approaches that contribute to mechanisms of power redistribution. The main challenge lies in the inherent protectiveness surrounding the creative aspects, both material and immaterial. However, as demonstrated by the experience of collectives, adopting a different business model or embracing diversity in terms of ideals and practices does not preclude the creation of a network in which members can inspire and support one another. Such practices enhance opportunities within the collective and lead to positive spillover effects such as shifting competi-

tion away from an individualistic form of rivalry.

This study aims to explore how networks of actors within the fashion system can develop models aligned with paradigms that reimagine prosperity beyond traditional economic metrics. These networks have the potential to position fashion as a transformative force, capable of questioning its own trajectory and promoting a more inclusive and sustainable vision of progress.

To investigate this phenomenon, we focus on *CreAbility: Creativity for Capacity Building*, an initiative aimed at tackling systemic challenges within the Italian Creative and Cultural Industries (CCIs). By addressing issues of influence, control, and authority, the networks involved illustrate the potential of fashion to generate both social and economic value (Moore et al., 2023).

These initiatives challenge traditional notions of prosperity by emphasizing the civic and humane dimension of sustainability (Manzini, 2022), fostering mindful communities, supporting diversity, and collective growth. CreAbility serves as a critical case study for assessing whether and how such frameworks contribute to a network of care capable of reshaping the future of fashion and its role within the broader CCI ecosystem.

METHODOLOGY
BACKGROUND:
THE *CREABILITY* PROJECT

CreAbility: Creativity for Capacity Building is a project[3] aimed at empowering Italian cultural and creative professionals by equipping them with skills and tools to thrive in a rapidly evolving landscape shaped by digital innovation and sustainability imperatives.

The challenges faced by creative firms, cultural organisations, artisans, and artists across Italy - particularly in adapting to the digital and green transitions while contending with shifting financial support for the cultural sector - have been well-documented. Since the early 2000s, scholars have highlighted the precarious nature of cultural and creative industries, emphasizing the need for innovative approaches to ensure their sustainability (Throsby, 2001). Similarly, Flew and Cunningham (2010) argue that capacity-building initiatives must address both the economic potential and the

---

3   The project is financed by the Italian "Piano Nazionale di Ripresa e Resilienza" (National Plan for Recovery and Resilience - PNRR). Project website in Italian available here: https://www.creability.it/, 21/02/2025. For a description of the project in English see here: https://centridiricerca.unicatt.it/modacult-la-ricerca-creability, 21/02/2025.

societal value of cultural and creative industries.

CreAbility addresses these challenges by promoting entrepreneurial strategies that advance inclusivity and sustainability within the cultural and creative sector, with a specific focus on fashion, craft, and urban design. The initiative employs a comprehensive approach based on training, mentoring, and networking; this approach aligns with the findings of scholars like Potts et al. (2008), who highlight networking within creative industries as a crucial mechanism for enhancing collaboration, innovation, and adaptability. The project's research design reflects insights into the transformative potential of culture and creativity in addressing societal and economic challenges (Pratt, 2012). By linking cultural practice to sustainable development, *CreAbility* provides a foundation for scholars to reconceptualize prosperity within the creative sector, advocating for a shift from transactional economic models to a more holistic, relational understanding of growth (Moore et al., 2013).

The *CreAbility* networking model strategically involves hubs – key nodes within already existing networks – and affiliated organisations to map and interconnect ecosystems that share common sets of values across the fashion, craft, and art/design sectors nationwide. These stakeholders include small entrepreneurial ventures, self-production initiatives, hobbyists, and both formal and informal institutions and associations whose activities transcend financial returns. By aligning their practices with the principles of circularity, transparency, and community empowerment, these realities introduce the caring approach into the public sphere (Tronto, 2013).

Over two years, *CreAbility* will bring together a range of stakeholders - cultural centres, universities, municipal authorities, professional networks, and cultural agencies - to strengthen Italy's cultural and creative industries (CCIs). The initiative will offer tailored educational courses focused on digital transformation and sustainability, equipping participants with essential technical and strategic skills. At the heart of this effort is *CreaNet*, a platform for networking, training, and mentoring, designed to foster collaboration and knowledge-sharing within the cultural community.

The project will systematically implement research and evaluation activities using a qualitative and participatory approach, focusing on the perspectives and experiences of cultural and creative practitioners. This methodology is academically significant as it enables an in-depth exploration of the context-specific challenges and opportunities within the sector, while ensuring the co-production of knowledge. Actively involving practitioners aligns with participatory research principles, fostering inclusivity and contextual relevance. This approach also enhances the applicability and sustainability of the project's outcomes by fostering stakeholder ownership and engagement, critical for the longevity of capacity-building initiatives (Reason & Bradbury, 2001). Grounding the research in real-world dynamics generates insights that are both theoretically robust and practically actionable, reflecting key findings from studies on effective practices in cultural and creative industries (Belfiore & Bennett, 2007; Pratt, 2012).

THE PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH METHOD

Participatory research has gained prominence in qualitative social inquiry due to its emphasis on collaboration and inclusivity (Bergold, 2007; Bergold & Thomas, 2010). Unlike traditional methods, it involves individuals whose lived experiences are central to the study. These research collaborators work alongside academics in the planning, execution, and interpretation of the research (Bergold & Thomas, 2012), leading to the negotiation of research objectives that blend academic inquiry with practical application. Recognized as a complex and multifaceted approach (Arnstein, 1969), participatory research is rooted in the belief that research should not be a one-sided endeavour. Instead, it seeks to empower participants and generate practical insights that foster positive social change, benefiting both researchers and participants alike through a mutually advantageous knowledge-production process.

Central to many participatory research projects is the use of focus groups, which offer a structured yet flexible space for participants to engage in dialogue and collectively explore various aspects of the research (Bergold & Thomas, 2010). *Culturally responsive focus groups* are particularly valuable as they ensure diverse perspectives are respected, creating an inclusive and empowering research environment. These focus groups not only facilitate in-depth discussions but also provide a safe space for participants to express their views,

fostering a collaborative and equitable research process (Rodriguez et al., 2011).

The *CreAbility* project exemplifies the participatory research approach by actively engaging project stakeholders[4] throughout the research process. Collaboration in this framework goes beyond data collection, encompassing ongoing reflection, analysis, and continuous evaluation of the knowledge generated. Central to the project is the integration of inquiry with action, where project hubs not only share and discuss challenges but also explore potential solutions and strategies to address them. This dual focus on reflection and action guarantees that the research yields both intellectual insights and practical outcomes. By working together to identify problems and develop solutions, participants take ownership of the research process and its real-world implications.

Between July and November 2024, *CreAbility* conducted three Culturally Responsive Focus Groups (CRFGs). Initially facilitated by the research team, meaning the authors, the hubs gradually assumed a more active role over time. They began recruiting participants and independently facilitating the discussions, demonstrating the growing autonomy of the hubs. This shift underscores the participatory nature of the project, reflecting the increasing ownership and engagement of the hubs in the research process. The structured discussions aimed to identify common themes and enable comparisons across sectors, allowing participants to reflect on both shared experiences and diverse perspectives.

Though the participants represented the fashion, crafts, and urban design sectors, for the purposes of this article, we will focus on the CRFGs relevant to the first. The criticism that the fashion industry has faced for its detrimental environmental impact and lack of diversity underscores the importance of exploring more sustainable and equitable practices. By delving deeper into the perspectives gathered from the focus group discussions, the authors aim to uncover strategies and recommendations to guide the development of more responsible and inclusive fashion-related initiatives.

---

4   The project involves three different categories of stakeholders: the official partners are the research organisations that have contributed to the project and benefit from the funding, the hubs are entities that are - formally or informally - at the centre of networks and communities, and finally there are the beneficiaries of the capacity-building actions, i.e. companies, associations, individual designers.

ANALYSIS

During the first focus group conducted with stakeholders involved in the project, the research team facilitated a session to enable participants to discuss the meanings of care and prosperity. A writing activity was proposed in which each participant was asked to share one or more words (up to three) that described each term in the practical context of their daily operations or organisations.

The brainstorming session on care proved to be more immediate, with a clearer convergence around the association between care and attention. When it came to prosperity, participants required more time to reflect on the words they wanted to contribute. There was less consensus and more requests for clarification. This suggests that the topic may have been less explored within the organisations involved and/or that the term is less commonly used in the language of the participants.

Still, participants expressed appreciation for the opportunity to discuss these terms among themselves, and they all agreed that the term sustainability is often controversial, ambiguous, and overused in various discussions and contexts.

In the words of one of the participants:

"In academia, when courses related to sustainability are mentioned, it often becomes a bit of a reiteration of the same concept, which by now should be the sine qua non condition for doing things – that is, you simply cannot not be sustainable! So, let's move beyond that. Let's consider other values that underpin sustainability."

CARE AND ATTENTION

The association between care and attention underscores the profound connection between these two concepts as already noted by Manzini (2022): "Care, therefore, implies an intrinsically artisanal approach: doing things taking the required time, giving them the required attention [...]" (p. 464).

From the discussion among the participants in the CRFG, it is apparent that care is far from being merely a mechanical action; it demands deep engagement, heightened awareness, and continuous monitoring. Attention functions as an indispensable tool for providing care, enabling the perception and effective response to the needs, emotions, or challenges of the recipient. Without attention, care risks becoming superficial, perfunctory, or even inadequate.

Furthermore, care can be understood as a form of mindful attention that transcends physical tasks to encompass emotional and cognitive involvement. This perspective is particularly relevant in the context of initiatives such as *CreAbility*. Here, attention extends beyond practical responsibilities to include emotional attentiveness, such as active listening and the recognition of non-verbal cues. It is noteworthy that listening emerged as the second most frequently proposed term during participant discussions, highlighting its perceived centrality in the practice of care.

In addition, attention also involves a commitment to fostering dignity in the ways work is approached and practiced. This extends care into the realm of ethical action, ensuring that all forms of engagement—whether practical, emotional, or intellectual—respect the intrinsic value and humanity of those involved.

The convergence of care as a practice of attentively supporting the individual, promoting dignity through empathy, and fostering connections within the community and society, was clearly expressed in the words of one of the participants:

"*Over the years, we have seen the lives of the people who work with us change drastically; people who have joined the communities where they live, who have been able to have a rental contract, who have been able to get a diploma, a driving license, in some cases to buy a car, in a very virtuous case to buy a house, or to reunite with their families. Women over 55 who had worked for a lifetime in a company, who lost their job, who have disabilities, who through this job got back in the game and reactivated a whole series of autonomies and today they lead a more self-sufficient life than they could have imagined before.*"

Attention, therefore, becomes a tangible expression of respect and recognition of value. By dedicating time, focus, and presence to those they work and collaborate with, fashion realities demonstrate a genuine commitment to others, underscoring the importance they place on interpersonal and professional relationships. This emphasis on attentiveness serves as a powerful indicator of an organisation's ethos and its dedication to fostering meaningful connections with very tangible consequences (Tab. 01).

PROSPERITY AND WELLBEING

As outlined in the introductory framework, prosperity involves creating conditions where all individuals have equal access to opportunities, resources, and the means to contribute to and benefit from both economic and social progress. This broader view connects prosperity directly to well-being, emphasizing that it requires the flourishing of individuals across economic and social dimensions, leading to improved quality of life, social equity, and sustainable development. The results from the focus group echo these principles and align with the interpretation provided by Smelik (Vaccari, 2022).

The semantic analysis of the focus group transcriptions reveals that the participants also used other terms like *collective well-being*, *growth for all*, and *community networks* to describe their commitment to prosperity. These references highlight the interconnected nature of prosperity, where social cohesion, inclusion, and the sustainability of communities and resources are central. The table's findings further support this, underscoring the importance of shared growth, social equity, and a quality of life that is both sustainable and accessible to all.

These insights strengthen the idea that true prosperity goes beyond economic gains, emphasizing the need for equitable distribution to ensure that everyone can thrive within a connected, supportive environment (Tab. 02).

It was emphasised that the logic of collective well-being does not necessarily align with a short-term profit-driven perspective:

"*It is essential to be able to communicate what we do, as essential as offering products that are well-made [...] In this world we live in, it is crucial to be able to communicate our values, to convey what we do, our vision, our mission. Even if people do not directly become consumers of our products, they become consumers of ideas, consumers of values, of visions. This is equally important to me, because these fosters hope for the future.*"

Word or expression proposed for "Care"	Occurrences
Attention	12
to oneself, others, the animal world, and the environment	1
to the context	1
to others, to what surrounds us	1
to the community	1
to complexity	1
Listening	5
to the need of the beneficiaries	1
and dialoguing	1
Empathy	2
Commitment	2
Accountability	1
Putting people first	1
Harmony	1
Equity	1
Interactions	1
Networking	1
Community	1
Proximity	1
Enhancement of territorial diversities	1
Avoid superficiality	1
Specificity	1
Avoid superficiality	1
Specificity	1
Dedicate time	1
Long-term planning	1

Tab. 01

Word or expression proposed for "Prosperity"	Occurrences
Wellbeing	4
Collective	1
For all	1
broad and socially inclusive	1
Growth	3
For all	1
Of the society as a whole	1
Common	1
Sharing	2
Project-based	1
Plurality	1
Diversity	1
Enhancement of specificities	1
Networks among communities	1
Development of communities in a territory	1
Territorial network between public and private sectors	1
Quality of life	1
Ensure the possibility of choice	1
Ensure future prospects	1
Facilitate interactions	1
Good relationships between parties	1
Self-sustaining actions	1
Replicability	1
Regeneration of places	1

Tab. 02

COMMON GROUNDS AND CULTURALLY RELEVANT NARRATIVES

As oThe initial CRFG established a shared language, essential for effective communication and collaboration. It was conducted with representatives from the hubs, while the subsequent two were open to participants identified both by the research team and – primarily – by the hubs themselves. This approach ensured a balanced mix of veteran members, who actively contributed to all three sessions, and new voices and perspectives that enriched the community and ongoing discussion.

After agreeing on key terms, the second focus group focused on care and attention in project communication and website imagery, emphasizing inclusive representation, particularly of BIPOC individuals, aligning with Lyson's findings on fostering collective identity in community activism (Lyson, 2014). These discussions underscored the importance of adequately portraying all partners to promote diversity and inclusivity. The third focus group

explored collective growth, prioritizing vulnerable community members such as the elderly, individuals with disabilities, and those facing mental-health challenges.

The sequential analysis of the three focus groups revealed that as *CreAbility* evolved into a familiar and trusted space, discussions became more dynamic, with participants actively sharing diverse perspectives rooted in their experiences. This indicates that the methodology fostered open exchanges, enriching dialogue and promoting the articulation of divergent views. The freedom to express authentic opinions not only underscored the dialogic nature of the process but also surfaced culturally relevant narratives. By encouraging inclusivity and equity, the discussions cultivated a sense of belonging and agency among participants.

Furthermore, these findings, particularly given the project's emphasis on smaller actors, point to potential empowerment within a sector dominated by large players. *CreAbility* functions as a bridge, enabling smaller stakeholders to participate in the broader narrative and ensuring diverse perspectives are heard. While such initiatives may not entirely address systemic inequalities, they offer valuable tools for empowerment, contributing to a more balanced and equitable fashion ecosystem. In this respect, *CreAbility* reflects what Aiken (2017) describes as community-based initiatives that challenge entrenched power structures and advocate for social justice.

CONCLUSIONS: CULTURAL VALUES AND CIVIC PRIDE

The *CreAbility* project was founded on three key concepts: inclusion, prosperity, and sustainability, each tailored to fit its unique context. Inclusion is not limited to ensuring participation but also involves creating accessible tools and spaces that celebrate diversity and promote equal opportunities. Central to this is actively engaging with community voices, incorporating their feedback, and adapting solutions to meet their needs.

Prosperity is redefined beyond material wealth, focusing instead on a holistic sense of well-being encompassing economic, social, and cultural dimensions, with community at its core. Within *CreAbility*, prosperity involves fostering creative, technological, and social skills that empower participants and prepare them for future challenges. It also entails supporting initiatives that create jobs, enhance quality of life, and boost the local economy.

Sustainability, often overused as a buzzword, holds a deeper meaning in *CreAbility*. It signifies a commitment to long-term thinking, where resources are used responsibly with future generations in mind. This concept extends beyond environmental practices to include products and services that foster a culture of responsibility and social awareness, embedding sustainable values within everyday practices.

The preliminary results appear promising, aligning with both the direction identified in the literature and the expectations of the research team. When asked to define their work in three words, participants highlighted principles that transcended the mere creation and transmission of cultural values. Their responses underscored broader concepts such as social cohesion, community bonds, and collective solidarity, reflecting a deeper commitment to civic responsibility and societal well-being. Notably, the hubs emphasized values rooted in social and communal benefits, such as belonging, shared ideals, and civic pride, over personal gains. These efforts illustrate the bridge-building role discussed earlier, where smaller, unconventional actors gain platforms to amplify their narratives and strategies of resistance.

In conclusion, by encouraging collaborative cultural creation, *CreAbility* promotes inclusivity and facilitates the exchange of collective wisdom, ultimately challenging traditional hierarchies. This reframing seems to expand the potential for fashion to drive meaningful societal change. While it may not fully resolve the inherent challenges outlined earlier, introducing alternative narratives into the fashion system fosters a shift toward greater inclusivity, making it a more dynamic and constructive space than before.

CAPTIONS

[Tab. 01] Occurrences of each word or expression suggested in answer to the prompt "What is Care in the context of the activities promoted within your organisations". Entries in the table are grouped based on similar meanings. Italicized words or expressions specify aspects of the corresponding term in plain text.

[Tab. 02] Occurrences of each word or expression suggested in answer to the prompt "What is Prosperity in the context of the activities promoted within your organisations". Entries in the table are grouped based on similar meanings. Italicized words or expressions specify aspects of the corresponding term in plain text.

REFERENCES

Aiken, G. T. (2017). The politics of community: Togetherness, transition and post-politics. Environment and planning A, 49(10), 2383-2401.

Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. Journal of the American Institute of planners, 35(4), 216-224.

Belfiore, E., & Bennett, O. (2007). Rethinking the Social Impacts of the Arts. International Journal of Cultural Policy, 13(2), 135-151.

Bergold, J. (2007). Participatory strategies in community psychology research—a short survey. In A. Bokszczanin (Ed.), Poland welcomes community psychology: Proceedings from the 6th European Conference on Community Psychology (pp.57-66). Opole: Opole University Press.

Bergold, J., & Thomas, S. (2012). Participatory research methods: A methodological approach in motion. Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung, 191-222.

Boström, M., Micheletti, M., & Oosterveer, P. (2019). (eds.). The Oxford handbook of political consumerism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brooks, A., Fletcher, K., Francis, R. A., Rigby, E. D., & Roberts, T. (2017). Fashion, Sustainability, and the Anthropocene. Utopian Studies, 28(3), 482-504.

Chatzidakis, A., Hakim, J., Litter, J., & Rottenberg, C. (2020). The care manifesto: The politics of interdependence. Verso Books.

Cooke P. and Lazzeretti L. (eds), (2008), Creative cities, Cultural Clusters and Local Economic Development. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.

Elkington, J. (2004). Enter the triple bottom line. In A. Henriques & J. Richardson (Eds.), The triple bottom line: Does it all add up? Assessing the sustainability of business and CSR (pp. 1-16). Earthscan.

Fisk, G. (1973). Criteria for a theory of responsible consumption. Journal of marketing, 37(2), 24-31.

Flew, T., & Cunningham, S. (2010). Creative industries after the first decade of debate. The Information Society, 26(2), 113-123.

Gureshidze, N. (2016). Cultural policies of creative clusters: A short review. Journal of Social Sciences, 5(1), 13-17.

Harrison, R., Shaw, D., & Newholm, T. (2005). Introduction. In The Ethical Consumer. (pp. 1-8). London-Thousand Oaks-New Delhi: SAGE.

Lim, W. M. (2017). Inside the sustainable consumption theoretical toolbox: Critical concepts for sustainability, consumption, and marketing. Journal of Business Research, 78, 69-80.

Lyson, H.C. (2014). Social Structural Location and Vocabularies of Participation. Rural Sociology, 79: 310-335.

Manzini, E. (2022). Fashion as diversity and care. Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy, 18(1), 463-465.

Micheletti, M. (2003). Political Virtue and Shopping: Individuals, Consumerism, and Collective Action. New York: Palgrave.

Moore, H. L., Davies, M., Mintchev, N., & Woodcraft, S. (2023). Prosperity in the Twenty-First Century: Concepts, models and metrics. UCL Press.

Prendergast, G. P., & Tsang, A. S. (2019). Explaining socially responsible consumption. Journal of Consumer Marketing.

Potts, J., Cunningham, S., Hartley, J., & Ormerod, P. (2008). Social network markets: A new definition of the creative industries. Journal of Cultural Economics, 32(3), 167-185.

Pratt, A. C. (2012). The cultural and creative industries: Organisational and spatial challenges to their governance. City, Culture and Society, 3(4), 245-250.

Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (2001). Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice. SAGE Publications.

Rodriguez, K. L., Schwartz, J. L., Lahman, M. K. E., & Geist, M. R. (2011). Culturally responsive focus groups: Reframing the research experience to focus on participants. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 10(4), 400–417.

Seyfang, G. (2009). The New Economics of Sustainable Consumption: seeds of change. Palgrave Macmillan.

Soini, K., & Dessein, J. (2016). Culture-sustainability relation: Towards a conceptual framework. Sustainability, 8(2), 167.

Stolle, D. & Micheletti, M. (2013). (eds.) Political consumerism: Global responsibility in action. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Throsby, D. (2001). Economics and Culture. Cambridge University Press.

Tronto, J. C. (2013). Caring democracy: Markets, equality, and justice. New York: New York University Press.

UNCED (1992) Agenda 21: The United Nations Program of Action from Rio. New York: U.N. Publications.

Vaccari, A. (2022). 'Fashion Matters' by Anneke Smelik. A Lecture Series on Sustainability, Posthumanism and New Materialism, Università Iuav di Venezia, 2nd-30th March 2022. ZoneModa Journal, 12(2), 83-85.

Webb, D. J., Mohr, L. A., & Harris, K. E. (2008). A re-examination of socially responsible consumption and its measurement. Journal of business research, 61(2), 91-98.

Yates, L. S. (2011). Critical consumption: Boycotting and buycotting in Europe. European Societies, 13(2), 191-217.