INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN BUSINESS & SOCIAL SCIENCES

Vol 16, Issue 10, (2026) E-ISSN: 2222-6990

Environmental Responsibility in Fashion Brand Green Advertising and Sustainability Communication

Weize Feng
Yonsei University-Gil, Heungeop-Myeon, Wonju-Si, Gangwon-Do, South Korea
Email:764574165@qq.com

Mengdi Hu
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Jalan Sultan Yahya Petra, 54100 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Email: humengdi@graduate.utm.my

DOI Link: http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v16-i10/29218

Published Date: 31 October 2026

Abstract

Fashion sustainability communication connects environmental responsibility with decisions about purchasing, garment care, repair, reuse, and disposal. This study investigates how these responsibilities are framed and how advertising-related narratives differ from programme and service explanations. A purposive, genre-balanced corpus comprises 16 official English-language documents from Patagonia, H&M, Levi's, and UNIQLO and their relevant corporate parents. Each brand family contributes two narrative texts and two programme texts. Cleaned passages contain 8,950 alphabetic tokens. Descriptive dictionary counts, document prevalence, contextual reading, and two exclusion checks are combined to distinguish recurring lexical patterns from document-length effects. Care and longevity vocabulary occurs 136 times, while collection and recycling vocabulary occurs 131 times; each appears in 12 documents. Programme texts contain substantially more direct audience address and care-related vocabulary per 1,000 tokens than narrative texts. Qualitative analysis identifies restraint, extended use, circulation, and purchase-linked participation as coexisting frames. Service pages sometimes specify prices, eligibility requirements, and downstream destinations that campaign slogans leave unstated. Removing two historical narratives or the longest document preserves the aggregate prominence of care and collection themes. These descriptive results concern a selected documentary corpus, not advertising effectiveness or audited environmental performance. The article develops a claim–action–evidence framework that connects environmental wording to a specified actor, feasible clothing practice, and appropriately bounded supporting information.

Keywords: Sustainable Fashion, Green Advertising, Brand Communication, Environmental Responsibility, Descriptive Corpus Analysis, Garment Longevity

Introduction

Fashion brands increasingly communicate environmental responsibility through the everyday language of clothing: buying, wearing, caring for, returning, and reusing garments. These verbs matter because they connect a difficult industrial problem to familiar wardrobe practices. They also establish a particular account of responsibility. An advertisement may invite an individual to make a different purchase, retain a garment, or return unwanted clothing, while leaving the organization of production largely outside the message. The question is therefore not simply whether sustainability appears in an advertisement, but which actions become prominent and which actors are expected to undertake them.

The material context makes this distinction consequential. Niinimäki et al. (2020) situate fashion's environmental pressures across production, consumption, and disposal, rather than within a single material choice. More recent industry data indicate continuing growth in material throughput. Textile Exchange (2026) estimates global fiber production at 139 million tonnes in 2025, compared with 132 million tonnes in 2024. These figures cover multiple textile applications and must not be interpreted as clothing production alone. Nevertheless, they show why the language of improvement should be considered alongside questions about overall material scale. An environmentally preferable input and an absolute reduction in resource demand are different propositions.

Green advertising occupies an uneasy position within this context. Its commercial function is to distinguish products and brands, while its environmental message may call for changes that complicate conventional selling. A brand can encourage longer use and still benefit from associations with quality; it can promote collection services while retaining consumers within its retail network. Such combinations do not establish deception. They do create a researchable tension between the environmental behavior requested and the commercial relationship maintained.

Recent studies demonstrate that fashion sustainability discourse is already an established research field. Badhwar et al. (2024) review green marketing and greenwashing in fashion and textiles. Civico and Mattioda (2025) examine the linguistic organization of French ethical-brand communication, while Tao and Ryan (2026), whose article appeared online in 2025, compare sustainability webpages associated with different independent brand ratings. The present study does not claim to introduce discourse analysis to fashion sustainability. Its narrower contribution is to compare the action demanded by a campaign with the division of responsibility elaborated in its official explanation.

The focus is particularly relevant to fashion studies because the proposed actions concern distinct moments in a garment's life. Purchase restraint addresses acquisition; extended use addresses the period of ownership; garment collection addresses the point at which an owner relinquishes an item. Examining these stages together makes it possible to ask whether advertising treats environmental responsibility as a continuing relationship with clothing or as a discrete act completed at a purchase or return point.

Three research questions guide the analysis. RQ1 asks how the selected campaigns frame environmentally responsible action through their verbal messages. RQ2 asks how campaign explanations allocate responsibility between clothing users and brands. RQ3 asks what

tensions arise between the advertised action, the environmental outcome implied, and the evidence needed to substantiate that outcome. These questions are investigated through a purposively selected, genre-balanced collection of 16 official texts from four brand families. The objective is analytical comparison rather than estimating the prevalence of any strategy across the fashion industry.

Literature Review

Sustainable fashion as a relationship with clothing

Sustainable fashion cannot be reduced to the presence of an environmental adjective beside a garment. A clothing product involves choices concerning fiber, textile processing, construction, distribution, use, care, and end-of-use handling. Niinimäki et al. (2020) connect environmental improvement with changes in business models and garment lifetimes. For advertising research, this means that a product claim should be interpreted in relation to the practice it recommends. A message about recycled content concerns an input; a message about repair concerns continued use. Neither statement automatically establishes the environmental performance of the whole product or company.

A garment-life perspective also helps retain the disciplinary focus of fashion research. Durability has physical and experiential aspects. A garment can remain technically intact while becoming undesirable, difficult to fit, or inconvenient to maintain. Conversely, repair, alteration, and attachment may help sustain use beyond the point at which replacement would otherwise occur. This article treats these connections as analytical questions for reading communication, rather than as measured outcomes in the selected cases. It asks whether the advertised practice gives clothing users an intelligible role and whether the brand's corresponding role is visible.

Green advertising and the problem of substantiation

Green marketing can communicate relevant environmental information, but positive environmental language can also outrun the evidence supporting it. Delmas and Burbano (2011) discuss greenwashing through the relationship between environmental performance and positive communication. Their account makes an important distinction for textual research: persuasive wording is observable in an advertisement, whereas actual performance generally requires additional evidence. Badhwar et al. (2024) similarly place misleading environmental representation within the wider fashion and textile context. Consequently, a textual omission may justify a question about substantiation without establishing that a company has acted deceptively.

Fashion advertising is especially suitable for examining claim scope. A statement may refer to one component, one product, an entire collection, or the brand as a whole. Readers may not receive equally clear information about these levels. The relevant analytical issue is whether the wording helps a reader distinguish them. A narrow claim about a specified garment practice should not silently become a broad assurance about corporate sustainability. Conversely, a short slogan should not be evaluated as though it were a complete technical report; its relationship to accessible supporting explanation must also be considered.

The Sustainable Fashion Communication Playbook, developed by the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

(UNEP & UNFCCC, 2023), provides a relevant normative context. It encourages evidence-based communication and a shift away from messages that intensify overconsumption. The present study uses this guidance to inform discussion of communication practice, not as a retrospective legal test for advertisements created before the playbook existed.

Fashion sustainability discourse and consumer responsibility

Civico and Mattioda (2025) show how a lexicometric approach can examine the vocabulary and associations through which ethical fashion brands communicate sustainability. Their work supports attention to linguistic selection while also demonstrating why counting environmental words alone is insufficient for the present questions. An analysis of responsibility must consider who is attached to an action and how that action is justified.

Tao and Ryan (2026) identify differences in transparency and approaches to industry problems between groups of fashion firms. Their comparative research is relevant to the relationship between consumer-oriented solutions and corporate disclosure. However, the current study does not reproduce their independent-rating design and cannot assign its four brand families to equivalent performance categories. Instead, it examines how a small set of campaigns constructs a practicable role for a clothing user, and whether that role is matched by a clearly articulated corporate obligation.

Consumer action should not be dismissed as inherently superficial. White et al. (2019) review psychological routes through which marketing can support more sustainable behavior. Their framework also reminds researchers that a communication proposal and an observed behavioral change are different objects of study. An advertisement can make repair or longer wear desirable, but textual analysis alone cannot determine whether recipients change their wardrobe practices. This study therefore uses terms such as invitation, positioning, and implied action rather than claiming that the campaigns caused environmental behavior.

Garment longevity and the conditions of circularity

Klepp et al. (2020) distinguish several measures of clothing lifespan, including years, wears, cleaning cycles, and numbers of users. These measures are relevant to different questions and should not be treated as interchangeable evidence. For this study, the distinction clarifies what a longevity advertisement leaves to be specified. A long period of ownership may include substantial time in storage, whereas repeated use concerns how a garment actually functions in a wardrobe. Consequently, wording that values keeping clothes requires a further question about the kind of longevity being promoted.

Repair research makes the relationship between communication and provision more concrete. Diddi and Yan (2019) identify barriers involving perceived cost, skills, and time in their study of clothing repair. Their findings concern a particular consumer context, but they support examining whether an advertised instruction is practically achievable. The corresponding analytical question is whether a brand describes the resources needed to perform the action it recommends. An appealing invitation to repair becomes more usable when service access, likely costs, and the types of repairs available are explained.

Sandin and Peters (2018) find general environmental support for textile reuse and recycling while identifying circumstances in which anticipated benefits depend on replacement rates

and other system conditions. The communication implication is conditionality: the existence of a collection route is not equivalent to a demonstrated reduction in virgin production. Advertising can describe a process accurately while still leaving its wider consequences unmeasured. This observation informs the distinction between an owner handing over an item and the subsequent system delivering an environmental outcome.

Sailer et al. (2022) combine content analysis and consumer research in their examination of Black Friday-related sustainable fashion communication on Instagram. Their design demonstrates the value of investigating messages and audience evaluations as separate components. The current study retains that separation. It examines which account of responsible clothing practice a message offers, without assuming that environmentally concerned audiences will interpret it uniformly or that a favorable response necessarily implies a change in consumption.

Framing and discursive legitimation

Entman's (1993) framing approach directs attention to how communication makes some aspects of an issue salient, including its definition and proposed response. Applied here, framing helps distinguish messages that foreground buying less, retaining garments, or returning them. The study operationalizes framing through the environmental problem made visible, the action proposed, the actor addressed, and the garment-life stage emphasized. It does not infer audience effects from these textual features.

Van Leeuwen's (2007) account of legitimation provides a complementary way to ask why the proposed action is represented as appropriate. Moral evaluation concerns value-based justification, while rationalization relates action to its purposes and uses. These two categories are most directly useful for the selected material. The analysis also considers authorization and narrative justification where the wording supports them, without assuming that every text must contain every category. A corporate spokesperson's statement is not treated as independent verification merely because a named authority delivers it.

Together, these perspectives connect the language of clothing practice with the justification of environmental responsibility. Framing identifies the recommended route of action; legitimation examines the grounds on which that route is endorsed. This combination supports close reading of short campaign messages while allowing the accompanying explanation to qualify the first impression created by the headline.

Methodology

Research design and the scope of the expanded corpus

The research combines descriptive corpus measures with qualitative comparative discourse analysis. The unit of collection is an official webpage; the unit of quantitative analysis is its cleaned main-text passage. The unit of interpretation is a documented communication practice, such as an instruction to repair, a description of garment sorting, or a purchase-linked environmental appeal. These units are kept distinct. Multiple documents from one brand family are not independent consumers, and a frequency of words is not a count of environmental actions actually completed.

Four brand families were purposively selected: Patagonia, H&M and H&M Group, Levi's and Levi Strauss & Co., and UNIQLO with Fast Retailing. The inclusion of parent-company pages is recorded rather than hidden. Parent-level explanations can describe a broader organizational scope than a retail-brand advertisement, so brand-family differences cannot be attributed solely to the clothing brand. The purpose is contrastive analysis of accessible official communication about garment practices, not a representative survey of fashion companies.

The design balances document numbers across two genres. Narrative texts comprise campaign announcements, advertising explanations, and brand-published editorial accounts. Programme texts comprise service guides, participation pages, and product-use explanations. Each family contributes two documents in each genre, giving eight narrative and eight programme documents. Equal document numbers do not create equal word volumes or identical communicative purposes. The quantitative presentation therefore reports source lengths, document prevalence, pooled frequencies, and a document-weighted alternative.

Table 1
Purposive sampling matrix

Brand family	Narrative	Programme	Total
Patagonia	2	2	4
H&M	2	2	4
Levi's	2	2	4
UNIQLO	2	2	4
Total	8	8	16

Note. Narratives include campaign announcements and editorials; programmes include service, education, and product-use explanations. Parent-company material is identified in the source register.

Source selection and documentary boundaries

Eligible texts are publicly available in English on an official brand or parent-company domain, concern environmental responsibility or a clothing practice relevant to sustainability, and contain retrievable main text. Pure product catalogues, third-party commentary, duplicate regional versions of the same page, full annual reports, and visual or audiovisual material without an analyzed transcript are excluded. Sixteen documents were retained to fill the four-family, two-genre design. This is a purposive sample, not a complete census of every eligible page discovered through web search.

The sources were retrieved on 15 October 2026. Dated narratives span 2011 to 2022; programme pages are analyzed as current snapshots where a publication date is unavailable. A programme may mention a launch date without establishing when its webpage was first published. P01 explicitly contains later editorial updates and is not treated as an untouched original print advertisement. The two earliest narratives, P01 and H01, are retained for conceptual contrast and removed together in a separate sensitivity check. No longitudinal trend is inferred from differences between historical and current pages.

Appendix A identifies every source by a stable analytic ID, title, displayed date or snapshot status, and official URL. Raw HTML and cleaned text were captured during analysis, and cryptographic hashes were computed to distinguish the exact retrieved material from later webpage revisions. This documentation strengthens the retrieval trail, but a URL and hash alone do not guarantee that a future live page will reproduce the captured version. Readers should interpret the reported figures as measurements of the documented extraction, not of whatever version a site may later display.

Cleaning and tokenization

Main-content subtrees were extracted from the retrieved HTML. Navigation, scripts, style instructions, forms, page-level promotional banners, unrelated recommendations, image captions, and publication metadata were removed. Linked phrases embedded in the body were retained as text; destination URLs were documented separately. Main page titles were excluded from the counting passages while internal substantive headings were retained. Short calls to action within the selected content boundary were retained where they were part of the service explanation.

Some pages require narrower, explicit boundaries. P03 includes the trade-in frequently asked questions, beginning with the explanation of how trade-in works and ending before the final shopping promotion. This avoids repeatedly counting eligibility lists displayed in several modules. P04 covers repair videos, repair-guide introductions, and the product-care introduction, ending before unrelated editorial stories. H04 begins with the garment-collection introduction and includes the sorting explanations. Exact repeated long text blocks were retained once to reduce duplication from layout modules. These rules explain why the corpus is a collection of cleaned passages rather than unfiltered whole websites.

Curly apostrophes were standardized and case was ignored. A token is a consecutive sequence of English letters with an optional internal apostrophe. Numerals, currency signs, and punctuation do not contribute to lexical token totals. A contraction remains one token; hyphenated forms contribute their alphabetic components. Counts of numerical claims are therefore recorded separately from lexical frequency. No automatic stemming, sentiment scoring, or grammatical-role assignment was used. The resulting corpus contains 8,950 tokens; the individual passages range from 137 to 1,839 tokens.

Lexical indicators and contextual interpretation

Four non-overlapping sets of exact lexical forms describe acquisition, care and longevity, reuse and redistribution, and collection and recycling. Four additional dictionaries identify first-person plural forms, second-person forms, consumer nouns, and business nouns. Table 2 summarizes their analytical purpose; Appendix B specifies every counted form. The dictionaries are selective indicators rather than complete semantic descriptions. They were fixed before the final count, but they were not preregistered independently of corpus development. This study is consequently descriptive and exploratory.

Table 2
Lexical indicators and interpretation questions

Indicator	Coverage	Interpretive question
Acquisition	Buying and purchasing forms	Whether selection or a transaction becomes salient.
Care and longevity	Wear, repair, mend, care and longevity forms	Whether continued use and maintenance are foregrounded.
Reuse and redistribution	Reuse, resale and donation forms	Whether garments move to another use or owner.
Collection and recycling	Collecting, sorting and recycling forms	Whether return and subsequent processing become salient.
Audience and voice	Four sets of pronoun and role-noun forms	How audiences and organizational actors are linguistically referenced.

Note. Exact counted forms appear in Appendix B. These are lexical indicators; grammatical functions and evaluative direction require contextual reading.

Raw counts are accompanied by occurrences per 1,000 tokens. Document prevalence records the number of texts containing at least one dictionary item. A pooled rate weights longer documents more heavily; the mean of document-level rates gives each document equal weight. Both are considered where the distinction affects interpretation. Neither normalization eliminates differences of genre, scope, or period. The short P04 passage, in particular, can produce a high rate from relatively few occurrences.

Every action family is interpreted in its surrounding context. A purchase word may occur in a prohibition or an invitation; collection may name a product range; worn can describe an object's condition rather than a recommendation to use it longer. Pronouns may refer to a company, a quoted speaker, or a wider collective. Dictionary counts locate these forms but do not settle their meaning. Framing analysis examines the problem, proposed response, accountable actor, and garment-life stage. Legitimation analysis considers the practical and value-based reasons offered for participation.

Specificity comparison and sensitivity checks
The programme texts were compared for concrete routes of participation, operational conditions, and economic terms. These dimensions are reported as a qualitative evidence matrix rather than converted into an unvalidated environmental score. A statement of availability, a repair price, and an eligibility restriction answer different questions; their presence cannot simply be summed into corporate responsibility. The matrix identifies what a reader could learn from the selected passage and does not certify service delivery in practice.

Two exclusion checks address identifiable sample risks. The first removes P01 and H01, the two pre-2020 narratives, leaving 14 documents and 8,063 tokens. The second removes P02, the longest document, leaving 15 documents and 7,111 tokens. These checks ask whether the aggregate ordering of the major lexical families depends on those particular texts. They do

not constitute random-sample robustness tests or establish generalizability. The study reports no inferential significance tests, consumer outcomes, independent environmental audits, or inter-coder reliability coefficient.

Results

Corpus composition and unequal textual weight

The 16 retained documents contribute 8,950 alphabetic tokens after cleaning. Patagonia contributes 3,314 tokens, UNIQLO 2,477, H&M 1,627, and Levi's 1,532. Despite equal numbers of documents, these shares differ substantially. P02 alone contains 1,839 tokens, making it important to distinguish a pooled frequency from a typical document-level rate.

Table 3
Corpus composition by brand family and genre

Brand family	Narrative tokens	Programme tokens	Total	Share
Patagonia	2397	917	3314	37.0%
H&M	771	856	1627	18.2%
Levi's	816	716	1532	17.1%
UNIQLO	1615	862	2477	27.7%
Total	5,599	3,351	8,950	100.0%

Note. All figures refer to cleaned alphabetic tokens. Equal document numbers do not imply equal token volumes.

Narrative passages contribute 5,599 tokens and programme passages 3,351. The first genre therefore accounts for 62.6% of the corpus even though each genre contains eight documents. The finding is methodological as well as descriptive: balancing document numbers is useful but does not balance rhetorical exposure. A long editorial account can include more organizational background and qualifications than a short service page. Presenting both levels prevents one unusually expansive explanation from silently defining the entire brand family's profile.

The distribution of garment-action vocabulary

Across the corpus, care and longevity vocabulary occurs 136 times, equivalent to 15.20 per 1,000 tokens. Collection and recycling vocabulary occurs 131 times, or 14.64 per 1,000. Reuse and redistribution contributes 47 occurrences, and acquisition contributes 29. These totals show the prominence of use and circulation language within the selected corpus. They do not establish that these practices are more common in the companies' operations or that the brands have reduced the number of garments sold.

Table 4
Action-family counts and pooled normalized frequencies

Family	Acquisition	Care and longevity	Reuse and redistribution	Collection and recycling
Patagonia	11 (3.32)	22 (6.64)	7 (2.11)	40 (12.07)
H&M	3 (1.84)	12 (7.38)	17 (10.45)	43 (26.43)
Levi's	9 (5.87)	73 (47.65)	1 (0.65)	2 (1.31)
UNIQLO	6 (2.42)	29 (11.71)	22 (8.88)	46 (18.57)
All	29 (3.24)	136 (15.20)	47 (5.25)	131 (14.64)

Note. Cells give raw counts with occurrences per 1,000 tokens in parentheses. Lexical-family definitions are selective; rates are not environmental performance scores.

Brand-family profiles differ. Levi's has 73 care and longevity occurrences, a pooled rate of 47.65 per 1,000 tokens. H&M has 43 collection and recycling occurrences, a rate of 26.43. UNIQLO contains 46 collection and recycling occurrences and 22 reuse and redistribution occurrences. Patagonia's pooled care rate is relatively low partly because its long circularity editorial discusses production, infrastructure, and business questions beyond individual garment care. The profile is therefore a property of this documentary selection, not a stable measure of brand identity.

Document prevalence provides a complementary view. Both care and longevity and collection and recycling occur in 12 of the 16 texts. Acquisition occurs in seven and reuse and redistribution in nine. Care-related terms appear in all four Patagonia documents and all four Levi's documents, whereas collection and recycling terms appear in all four H&M documents and all four UNIQLO documents. This distribution shows recurrence across documents rather than concentration in a single passage, while retaining the small sample's limitations.

Table 5
Document prevalence of the four lexical families

Family	Acquisition	Care and longevity	Reuse and redistribution	Collection and recycling
Patagonia	2/4	4/4	2/4	3/4
H&M	1/4	1/4	3/4	4/4
Levi's	2/4	4/4	1/4	1/4
UNIQLO	2/4	3/4	3/4	4/4
All	7/16	12/16	9/16	12/16

Note. Each numerator is the number of documents containing at least one counted form. Prevalence does not measure the strength of an environmental claim.

The numbers also identify where qualitative reading is necessary. The acquisition family has fewer occurrences, yet a brief purchase instruction can organize an entire campaign.

Conversely, repeated references to collecting or repairing may describe a service, a garment's condition, or a manufacturing practice. Lexical frequency is therefore used alongside the action frame rather than substituted for it. The analysis does not interpret an environmental message as absent merely because a specific dictionary family receives a zero count.

Genre differences and direct audience address

Programme texts contain 84 care and longevity occurrences, equivalent to 25.07 per 1,000 tokens, compared with 52 occurrences and 9.29 per 1,000 in narratives. This is a difference in descriptive rates, not a tested population effect. Collection and recycling rates are closer: 15.52 for programme texts and 14.11 for narratives. Reuse and redistribution is more concentrated in programme texts, consistent with their role in explaining what an owner can do with an existing garment.

Table 6
Descriptive comparison by communication genre

Indicator	Narrative	Programme
Acquisition	25 (4.47)	4 (1.19)
Care and longevity	52 (9.29)	84 (25.07)
Reuse and redistribution	20 (3.57)	27 (8.06)
Collection and recycling	79 (14.11)	52 (15.52)
Second-person	18 (3.21)	71 (21.19)
Consumer nouns	42 (7.50)	15 (4.48)

Note. Narrative: 8 documents, 5,599 tokens. Programme: 8 documents, 3,351 tokens. Cells give count (rate per 1,000 tokens); no inferential significance test is claimed.

A stronger contrast concerns second-person wording. Programme texts contain 71 second-person forms, or 21.19 per 1,000 tokens; narratives contain 18, or 3.21. Explicit consumer nouns show the opposite direction, with 7.50 per 1,000 in narratives and 4.48 in programme pages. Within this sample, announcements more often describe customers as participants, whereas service explanations more often address a user directly. This pattern is consistent with their different functions, but it should not be taken to prove an intended psychological effect.

The distinction matters for interpreting responsibility. A service page that addresses a reader may provide a practical route of participation rather than shift blame to that person. An announcement that uses corporate pronouns may articulate shared commitment without explaining how to act. Table 7 retains the brand-family counts, while the genre comparison provides a check against treating their different mixtures of voice as a simple ranking of accountability.

Table 7
Selected voice and actor references

Family	First-person plural	Second-person	Consumer nouns	Business nouns
Patagonia	102 (30.78)	53 (15.99)	10 (3.02)	15 (4.53)
H&M	27 (16.59)	2 (1.23)	18 (11.06)	1 (0.61)
Levi's	27 (17.62)	14 (9.14)	4 (2.61)	2 (1.31)
UNIQLO	29 (11.71)	20 (8.07)	25 (10.09)	1 (0.40)
All	185 (20.67)	89 (9.94)	57 (6.37)	19 (2.12)

Note. Brand names are excluded from business nouns. Pronoun referents differ in context; cells give count (rate per 1,000 tokens).

Four frames of environmental participation

Contextual reading identifies restraint, extended use, circulation, and purchase-linked participation as coexisting frames. The purchase-linked frame is particularly visible in the UNIQLO campaign announcement, while other texts foreground care or circulation. The frames are not mutually exclusive brand categories. One brand family can discourage unnecessary acquisition in one text, invite resale in another, and sell products or services through the same wider communication system.

P01 makes acquisition available for reconsideration, while P02 places garment return within a broader discussion of design and infrastructure. Together they show why a restraint headline should not stand in for the full organizational discourse. The analytical relationship is between an audience-facing invitation and the surrounding allocation of producer obligations, rather than between a slogan and an assumed environmental result (Patagonia, 2011; Ram, 2021).

L01 and L02 connect better selection and continued wear with product qualities. L03 and L04 extend that frame through a priced repair offer and an educational programme. The added texts make a distinction between possessing a durable item and being able to maintain it. In this reading, the brand's role includes service or skill provision, while the wearer's role includes continued care. The textual connection does not establish how many recipients actually retain their clothes longer (Levi Strauss & Co., 2021, 2022, n.d.-a, n.d.-b).

H01 and H02 organize participation around returning or transforming unwanted clothing. H03 and H04 supply more differentiated explanations of product use and later handling. The expanded corpus therefore qualifies an interpretation that the family's communication only presents a simple drop-off solution. Its programme texts also acknowledge availability limits and distinct destinations. The appropriate conclusion concerns variation within the selected materials, not a claim that collection achieves complete circularity (H&M Group, 2017, 2020, n.d.; H&M, n.d.).

U02 provides a purchase-linked frame in which campaign participation includes buying specified products, alongside learning and other activities. U01, U03, and U04 instead elaborate repair, continued use, donation, and recycling routes. This contrast shows that

sustainability participation can be organized around acquisition and retention within the same brand family. The commercial and environmental invitations need to be examined together, without assuming that a donated contribution or recycled input establishes the net environmental consequence of an additional purchase (Fast Retailing, 2022a, 2022b; UNIQLO, n.d.-a, n.d.-b).

Specificity in programme explanations

Table 8 compares the eight programme texts. Some passages provide concrete prices, preparation requirements, collection points, or repair routes, while others describe wider production conditions or offer educational resources. These are different kinds of specificity. A fee helps assess access to a service; a statement of technical limits helps bound an environmental claim; a sorting explanation describes where an item may go. None is a substitute for all the others.

Table 8
Qualitative comparison of programme specificity

ID	Participation route	Conditions or economic terms	Interpretive boundary
P03	Mail or owned-store trade-in	Functional condition, exclusions, US scope; USD 7 mail fee	Merchandise credit and inspection are distinguished from unconditional acceptance.
P04	Repair videos and DIY guides	Instructional overview; no service price in passage	An educational route, not evidence that an individual repair was completed.
H03	Product-use and selected service overview	Availability varies by brand, market and partners	Technical and commercial conditions qualify the account of scale.
H04	Store collection and sorting	Reported routes: 63% resale, 24% repurposing/recycling, 3% textile-to-textile, about 10% residual	Percentages are source-reported routing descriptions, not audited here; denominator and reporting period require attention.
L03	Book repair appointment or locate a store	Illustrative starting prices range from USD 5 to USD 30	A concrete offer; location, repair scope, and actual take-up remain separate questions.
L04	Free curriculum, resources and workshops	Youth-oriented programme; selected US and European research discussed	Skill provision supports the invitation but does not establish additional garment wears.
U03	Prepare, drop off, consult, order and collect	USD 5 repair offer; clean and repairable condition; embroidery exclusions	Workflow and eligibility help a user assess feasibility in the selected US context.
U04	Store collection and donation/recycling routes	Cleaning and personal-item instructions; US programme partners	Downstream intentions are described without independently measured replacement effects.

Note. Summaries refer to the captured passages in Appendix A. Prices and rules are market-specific source statements. The matrix is not a validated rating scale.

The distinction between accessibility and accountability is particularly useful. A call to participate can be actionable while its environmental outcome remains uncertain. Equally, an admission of technical constraints can clarify the scope of a programme even if it is less promotional than an unqualified promise. The comparison therefore evaluates whether the explanation supplies information relevant to the proposed practice, rather than rewarding uniformly positive language or treating every limitation as evidence of failure.

The matrix also exposes a methodological hazard of expanding datasets. Service pages contain details that advertising announcements often omit, but such differences may be expected from genre. Adding them makes the organizational account more complete without turning them into advertisements. The revised scope is consequently green advertising and associated sustainability communication. The sources remain separated by function, and their combined analysis concerns how a message is elaborated across official textual channels.

Checks for historical and long-document dependence

Removing P01 and H01 reduces acquisition frequency from 3.24 to 2.48 per 1,000 tokens. Care and longevity remains more frequent than collection and recycling, at 16.37 and 14.01, respectively. Removing P02 produces corresponding rates of 18.00 and 14.48. The broad prominence of use and circulation themes therefore does not depend entirely on either the two historical narratives or the longest editorial document.

Table 9
Exclusion checks for aggregate lexical patterns

Subset	Docs	Tokens	Acquisition	Care	Reuse	Collection
All documents	16	8950	3.24	15.20	5.25	14.64
Without two historical narratives	14	8063	2.48	16.37	5.46	14.01
Without longest document P02	15	7111	3.80	18.00	5.77	14.48

Note. Action-family values are occurrences per 1,000 tokens. The historical exclusion removes P01 and H01; the length exclusion removes P02. These checks assess selected-document dependence, not population robustness.

The checks also show why stability should be described narrowly. The gap between categories changes, and the exclusions alter the balance of brands and genres. The analysis cannot infer that the same pattern would hold in a different randomly sampled corpus. A document-weighted alternative gives care and longevity a mean rate of 20.84 and collection and recycling 15.40, preserving their aggregate ordering while changing their magnitudes. Agreement in this ordering supports the descriptive synthesis, but not an environmental performance ranking.

Lexical coverage and alternative wording

A zero count is particularly informative when compared with the wording of H02. The care and longevity dictionary returns zero for that document, although the announcement explicitly encourages keeping garments in use for as much time as possible. Its phrasing falls outside the exact forms selected for the dictionary. The result demonstrates a boundary of lexical coverage rather than a contradiction in the source. A thematic reading can identify a longevity invitation that a restricted vocabulary list does not capture. This is why the study retains contextual interpretation alongside numerical tables and does not equate a zero with conceptual absence.

The example also explains why post hoc dictionary expansion requires care. Adding a new term after observing a particular text could improve coverage while changing the comparison in ways that favor that source. A stronger subsequent design would develop and validate a broader dictionary on separate material, then apply it to a held-out collection. Here, the exact lists and document-level counts remain visible so that readers can assess their limitations. The analysis reports the observed indicator without claiming that its categories fully exhaust the vocabulary of responsible clothing practice.

Length creates a related interpretive issue. P04 contains five care and longevity terms in 137 tokens, whereas P02 contains eight in 1,839. The shorter passage consequently has a much higher normalized rate even though its absolute count is lower. This difference is intelligible because a repair-guide overview concentrates on a narrow task, while an editorial discusses multiple organizational questions. Reporting raw counts, rates, prevalence, and genre together helps preserve that distinction. A high density of care vocabulary can indicate topical concentration without demonstrating greater responsibility, stronger evidence, or a more effective campaign.

Discussion

Environmental responsibility as a relationship between actors and practices

The analysis addresses RQ1 by identifying four coexisting action frames and RQ2 by showing how each attaches a consumer role to a corresponding, though differently elaborated, corporate role. The central interpretation is that environmental responsibility in these cases is relational. It is constructed through who can act on a garment, at what point, with what support, and toward which stated outcome. This shifts attention from the mere presence of environmental vocabulary to the organization of practical obligations.

Entman's (1993) framing approach helps explain the selectivity involved. By emphasizing a particular decision, a campaign makes one route of response prominent. A garment-life reading adds a fashion-specific dimension: the same environmental concern can be organized around acquisition, ownership, or relinquishment. These are not interchangeable opportunities. Each requires different capabilities from users and different forms of provision from companies. A strong comparative analysis should therefore preserve the differences between them rather than collapse them into a generic measure of green messaging.

The findings also support a qualified understanding of consumer responsibility. An individual instruction may be appropriate when the proposed action lies within a user's control. However, the environmental process often depends on conditions beyond that individual's

reach. A wearer cannot independently ensure garment repairability, obtain an unavailable service, or verify downstream sorting simply by acting responsibly. Communication becomes more accountable when it identifies where consumer agency ends and organizational responsibility begins.

Connecting commercial value with environmental meaning

The relationship between commercial and environmental meanings is not adequately described by assuming that one necessarily cancels the other. Quality, continued use, and retained garment value can provide persuasive reasons for choosing a brand. They can also be relevant to more sustained ownership. The unresolved issue is whether the advertised meaning is translated into a clothing practice and whether that practice produces the intended outcome. This article identifies that issue without claiming to settle it through textual evidence.

Van Leeuwen's (2007) distinction between moral evaluation and rationalization is useful here. An action can be presented as the right thing to do, as an instrument for a practical environmental purpose, or both. Keeping these justifications separate helps identify where a value statement requires additional explanation. The desire to participate in a responsible fashion culture does not by itself establish how a specific garment practice reduces impact.

This interpretation complements recent linguistic studies while maintaining a different analytical scale. Civico and Mattioda (2025) examine lexical patterns across ethical-brand communication; Tao and Ryan (2026) compare rated groups of firms. The present study contributes a campaign-and-programme distinction between the audience-facing instruction and the distribution of responsibility in its paratext. Its selected corpus permits close examination of this relationship but cannot establish whether the observed frames are more characteristic of particular market segments.

Material throughput and the scale of advertised improvement

Recent industry data provide context for interpreting green advertising without determining the performance of the sampled brands. Table 10 uses the 2026 Textile Exchange report's estimates for both 2024 and 2025 so that the comparison remains within one reporting edition. Global fiber output increased by approximately 5.3%, while polyester output increased by approximately 6.2%. These are cross-application material figures and do not isolate fashion advertising, apparel demand, or the four brand families analyzed here.

Table 10
Global material context from the 2026 reporting edition

Indicator	2024	2025	Change
All fibers	132	139	5.3%
Polyester	77.7	82.5	6.2%
Recycled polyester	9.4	9.7	3.2%
Cotton	25.4	25.7	1.2%
Cotton from certified programmes	8.4	9.4	11.9%

Note. Volumes are million tonnes. Source: Textile Exchange (2026). Changes are calculated from rounded figures. Categories overlap, cover multiple textile applications, and do not measure the sampled companies' performance.

The distinction between absolute quantity and relative improvement matters for message design. A larger quantity of recycled input can coexist with faster growth in total output. A communication claim about a preferred material therefore needs to specify whether it concerns a product attribute, the composition of inputs, or an absolute reduction in environmental burden. The industry figures illustrate the need for such distinctions, but they cannot establish that any particular campaign caused production growth or that an individual brand's material strategy failed.

This contextual comparison also helps connect the four action frames. Restraint asks about the volume of acquisition, retention asks about the services obtained from an existing garment, and return asks about the handling of material after an owner relinquishes it. Each addresses a different potential intervention. The strategic question is whether communication explains how the selected intervention relates to the company's wider material commitments, rather than allowing a narrow practice to represent transformation of the entire clothing system.

A claim–action–evidence framework for fashion communication

RQ3 concerns the relationship between advertising language and substantiation. The study proposes a claim–action–evidence framework as an interpretive and practical tool. A claim states the environmental improvement being communicated. An action identifies the clothing practice and the actor capable of undertaking it. Evidence specifies what would justify connecting that action to the claimed result. These three elements should refer to compatible boundaries: evidence about one collection service, for example, should not be used as an unqualified assurance about all company products.

For a longevity message, the claim should identify whether it concerns physical durability, repairability, or actual extended use. The requested action might involve retaining an item, following care guidance, or using repair services. Corresponding evidence would need to fit that claim, such as an appropriate durability assessment, service information, or research on use duration. These are proposed communication requirements, not outcomes measured in the selected campaigns.

For a garment-return message, the action should be accompanied by a clear account of accepted items and subsequent handling. Evidence of collection volume answers a different question from evidence of reuse or recycling outputs. For a restraint message, company obligations should be articulated alongside consumer restraint so that reduced purchasing is not presented as an exclusively individual duty. The framework does not require every detail to fit inside a slogan. It requires a clear path from the slogan to proportionate explanation.

This proposal is compatible with UNEP and UNFCCC's (2023) emphasis on evidence-based fashion communication. It also preserves an important boundary from greenwashing research: a disclosure gap is a reason to investigate, while a conclusion about deceptive

conduct requires a stronger evidential basis. The framework is offered for subsequent testing rather than presented as a validated measurement instrument.

Table 11
Claim–action–evidence framework

Frame	User action	Organizational provision	Evidence boundary
Acquisition restraint	Reconsider an additional purchase	State corresponding producer obligations	Evidence must distinguish consumer intentions from company production choices.
Continued use	Wear, care for, or repair a garment	Provide applicable product information and usable services	Distinguish physical durability, ownership duration and actual wears.
Circulation	Return, reuse, donate or recycle	Explain acceptance and downstream routes	Separate collection volume, sorting outputs and environmental consequences.
Purchase-linked participation	Buy specified products or services to participate	State the contribution mechanism and claim scope	A donation or recycled attribute does not by itself establish net impact reduction.

Note. Author-proposed framework informed by the documentary analysis and cited literature. It is not an environmental audit or validated scale.

Table 11 translates the framework into questions that a fashion brand could apply before releasing a campaign. It deliberately separates the evidence needed for a product claim from evidence of subsequent consumer use or system outcomes. The questions are proposed design checks, not a validated scoring scale. Their purpose is to make the relationship between an attractive instruction and a supportable environmental explanation more explicit.

Implications for fashion brands and fashion education

For fashion brands, the analysis suggests beginning a green advertising brief with a garment practice rather than an environmental mood. A useful brief specifies what the audience can do, what the company will provide, and what information supports the benefit. This approach can connect communication more closely with garment construction, product care, repair provision, and end-of-use arrangements. It also encourages communication teams to consult the people responsible for those processes before expressing broad environmental assurances.

For fashion education, a text-centered assignment can remain closely connected to the discipline without requiring image analysis. Students can compare how campaign language describes material value, product longevity, wardrobe decisions, and brand obligations. The exercise becomes stronger when a proposed environmental message is checked against the actual characteristics of the clothing or service being communicated. Such an assignment integrates brand communication with product knowledge instead of treating discourse analysis as an isolated study of grammar.

For future empirical work, the analysis identifies specific outcomes that should be distinguished. Ad recognition, favorable brand evaluation, service participation, delayed replacement, and environmental improvement are different dependent variables. White et al. (2019) provide a wider behavioral basis for investigating why an invitation succeeds or fails, but the present textual findings cannot establish those effects. Subsequent research could examine which combinations of claim specificity and corporate commitment help recipients understand responsibility accurately.

A further practical implication concerns coordination inside the fashion business. The person writing a campaign may have access to a collection total while lacking information about sorting outcomes, or may receive a durability description without knowing the conditions under which it was assessed. The framework turns these gaps into concrete requests for information. Product development can clarify construction and material boundaries; service teams can explain repair access; sourcing and sustainability teams can identify the evidence supporting a claim. This coordination can improve the precision of the message before it reaches a consumer.

It also helps fashion researchers distinguish communication quality from communication volume. A longer explanation is not necessarily more accountable if it repeats broad aspirations. Conversely, a concise instruction may be useful when it links directly to a clearly bounded service or product claim. The relevant assessment concerns the fit between the proposed clothing practice and the information needed to perform and evaluate it. This principle is particularly useful for comparing campaigns of unequal length without rewarding verbosity or assuming that a high lexical count establishes stronger environmental responsibility.

Limitations and future research

The expanded corpus improves documentary breadth but remains small and purposive. Four texts per brand family cannot represent every campaign, product category, or market. Equal genre counts do not ensure comparable rhetorical purposes or token volumes. The narrative category includes both announcements and editorials; the programme category includes retail services, education, and parent-level product-use explanations. These distinctions are documented and considered interpretively, but they cannot be fully controlled with 16 sources.

Historical scope is another constraint. The older narratives and current programme snapshots do not constitute repeated observations of the same campaign under constant conditions. P01 contains editorial updates, and undated pages may change after retrieval. The exclusion checks examine particular dependencies rather than establish a historical trend. Future research could define a fixed publication window, sample comparable channels within each market, and preserve authorized source versions for independent reanalysis.

The lexical dictionaries are selective and exploratory. They omit unlisted synonyms and cannot establish grammatical agency or the referent of a collective pronoun. Short documents produce unstable normalized rates, while long editorials can dominate pooled counts. Providing individual figures, prevalence, genre comparisons, and sensitivity checks helps make these risks assessable but does not eliminate them. Independent annotation could

examine whether other readers assign the same frames and interpret qualifications similarly; no inter-coder coefficient is claimed here.

Finally, official programme statements are not independent confirmation of programme outcomes. Prices and conditions describe the captured page and selected market, not every store worldwide. Participation quantities, material-volume estimates, consumer survey claims, and environmental impacts have different denominators and evidential requirements. Reception research, service-use observation, and independent product or process data would be needed to examine whether the advertised practices occur and generate the outcomes that audiences may infer.

Conclusion

The expanded analysis examines 16 official documents from four fashion brand families, with equal document numbers across narrative and programme genres. Its 8,950-token corpus contains recurring language of care, longevity, collection, recycling, and redistribution. The prominence of care and collection vocabulary remains after excluding the two earliest narratives or the longest document, although individual rates and sample composition change.

The main interpretive finding is that environmental responsibility is distributed across communication functions. A campaign can make a clothing practice attractive, while a service or programme page explains its route, cost, eligibility, and limits. Restraint, extended use, circulation, and purchase-linked participation coexist rather than define fixed types of brand. Their environmental implications depend on the relationship between the requested action, organizational provision, and appropriate outcome evidence.

The claim–action–evidence framework connects these elements without treating promotional language as proof of performance. For fashion research, the contribution is a transparent text-centered design that combines source documentation, descriptive counts, genre separation, and contextual interpretation. For practice, it encourages brands to explain how participation works and what the supporting evidence actually establishes. The conclusions remain documentary and exploratory; they do not measure consumer change, certify company sustainability, or establish an industry-wide distribution of discourse strategies.

Appendix A Source register

All sources were retrieved on 15 October 2026. A snapshot label means that no reliable webpage publication date is assigned. Launch dates mentioned inside a text are not substituted for publication dates. The register identifies the counted document, while the references provide conventional bibliographic entries.

Table 12
Official source register and extraction identifiers

ID	Source details and cleaned-text identifier	Tokens
P01	Don’t buy this jacket, Black Friday and the New York Times Advertising explanation; 25 Nov 2011; updated notes https://www.patagonia.com/stories/planet/activism/dont-buy-this-jacket-black-friday-and-the-new-york-times/story-18615.html Cleaned-text SHA-256: 6ce50bc801174bfc1c6bcd4d7a573c1b3e11829340bcf598a554e828584a72ef	558
P02	Our quest for circularity Editorial narrative; 10 Mar 2021 https://www.patagonia.com/stories/planet/our-footprint/our-quest-for-circularity/story-96496.html Cleaned-text SHA-256: 79cae0217cc6c1139632f5878eaabb6c6dd6b32b63898a2b8e6524fb7ea3d253	1839
P03	Trade in Patagonia clothing and gear Programme FAQ; Snapshot 15 Oct 2026 https://www.patagonia.com/trade-in/ Cleaned-text SHA-256: 28615792c011a918a6c3f5b8d9d3641291ceb9a7da3486283e81751e39eb7ac3	780
P04	Product care and repair Repair guide overview; Snapshot 15 Oct 2026 https://www.patagonia.com/repairs/ Cleaned-text SHA-256: d440f96adba4f200d04678ce1a0cd3a6c2a357f79cda0280f72e76d4337504fd	137
H01	H&M Bring it campaign Campaign announcement; 25 Jan 2017 https://hmgroup.com/news/hm-bring-it-campaign/ Cleaned-text SHA-256: fd240a3b895d85c66859fea83548f041ccc26646134046b4e47d558071369189	329
H02	Recycling system Looop helps H&M transform unwanted garments into new fashion favourites Campaign announcement; 8 Oct 2020 https://hmgroup.com/news/recycling-system-looop-helps-hm-transform-unwanted-garments-into-new-fashion-favourites/ Cleaned-text SHA-256: 8f4a4b0c0b4b7176fa2a4f253fc7fbc0279975bd25b6503cbc7543568274f395	442
H03	Product creation and product use Programme overview; Snapshot 15 Oct 2026 https://hmgroup.com/sustainability/product-lifecycle/product-creation-and-use/ Cleaned-text SHA-256: 16bb4c819109a99a7048e42bc6b612f8b02c0c41c52e46207b8c41ff20e71d60	545

ID	Source details and cleaned-text identifier	Tokens
H04	Garment collecting Programme guide; Snapshot 15 Oct 2026 https://www2.hm.com/en_hk/sustainability-hm/services/garment-collecting.html Cleaned-text SHA-256: e8b1fd4cdd0b5d297715365c277828355c02ec6366e7b625d25bb1397973f71b	311
L01	Levi's launches Buy Better, Wear Longer campaign Campaign announcement; 22 Apr 2021 https://www.levistrauss.com/2021/04/22/levis-launches-buy-better-wear-longer-campaign/ Cleaned-text SHA-256: ac0b602f5075a454eb76d410d11d4e49d36315c82cdc58478eb6f28cc39d0575	496
L02	Levi's launches Buy Better, Wear Longer 2.0 Campaign announcement; 21 Sep 2022 https://www.levistrauss.com/2022/09/21/levis-launches-buy-better-wear-longer-2-0/ Cleaned-text SHA-256: 245e8eb6c4e1b150cd420767736c5dd9f4046a3b7b56adb319177ae660706227	320
L03	Repair at the Levi's Tailor Shop Repair service guide; Snapshot 15 Oct 2026 https://www.levi.com/US/en_US/features/repair-tailor-shop Cleaned-text SHA-256: d01ed3c643cd7932c980159113943d899c10eac1c4241c126c0e81d683193b9c	187
L04	Levi's Wear Longer Project Education programme; Snapshot 15 Oct 2026 https://www.levistrauss.com/wearlongerproject/ Cleaned-text SHA-256: c04da88d1f8e351da143144c2a5a5ab29e0283e987b0273ca8b4b2b60eaa1f9f	529
U01	UNIQLO launches RE.UNIQLO STUDIO in London Regent Street Store Programme announcement; 9 Sep 2022 https://www.fastretailing.com/eng/group/news/2209091300.html Cleaned-text SHA-256: 098d26ada38fcd632727a604708a8cda79682a4670c6184c6af07346e25a9b2b	643
U02	UNIQLO launches JOIN THE POWER OF CLOTHING Campaign announcement; 29 Jun 2022 https://www.fastretailing.com/eng/sustainability/news/2206291100.html Cleaned-text SHA-256: 08fec12425aa6777e84acb3d11d486849006bfc600805495fba89f1cdb2fd925	972
U03	RE.UNIQLO STUDIO Service guide; Snapshot 15 Oct 2026 https://www.uniqlo.com/us/en/special-feature/sustainability/re-uniqlo-studio Cleaned-text SHA-256: 8bd9886c5cab83c6944f85ecae0c470d43cd40ec494106a324a194d5dab8495a	479

ID	Source details and cleaned-text identifier	Tokens
U04	RE.UNIQLO Programme guide; Snapshot 15 Oct 2026 https://www.uniqlo.com/us/en/special-feature/sustainability/re-uniqlo Cleaned-text SHA-256: 1b82704a5ac623dd50d0cc9aaabdd74cbb2daf98dcd3500324571a302548f75a	383

Note. N and P classifications correspond to narrative (IDs ending 01–02) and programme (03–04). Retrieval date: 15 October 2026. Hashes identify the cleaned passages and are not evidence that a future live page is unchanged.

Appendix B Exact lexical dictionaries

Each dictionary counts only the listed lowercased forms, after apostrophe normalization. A lexical form belongs to one action family. These lists are not exhaustive semantic ontologies and should not be interpreted as evidence that unlisted concepts are absent.

Table 13
Exact-form dictionaries

Indicator	Counted forms
Acquisition	buy, buys, buying, bought, purchase, purchases, purchasing
Care and longevity	wear, wears, wearing, worn, rewear, rewearing, repair, repairs, repaired, repairing, mend, mends, mended, mending, care, caring, durability, durable, longevity, longer
Reuse and redistribution	reuse, reuses, reused, reusing, resale, resell, resells, reselling, secondhand, donate, donates, donated, donating, donation, donations
Collection and recycling	recycle, recycles, recycled, recycling, collect, collects, collected, collecting, collection, collections, sort, sorts, sorted, sorting, landfill, landfills
First-person plural	we, us, our, ours, we're, we've, we'll, we'd
Second-person	you, your, yours, you're, you've, you'll, you'd
Consumer nouns	customer, customers, consumer, consumers
Business nouns	company, companies, business, businesses

Note. Apostrophes are standardized before counting. Forms are counted exactly; no stemming or semantic expansion is applied.

Appendix C Document-level lexical results

The table reports raw lexical-family counts for every retained document. Token totals provide denominators for independent checks of the normalized frequencies used in the main text. The reported figures refer to the extraction boundaries and exact dictionaries documented in this article.

Table 14

Document-level action-family counts

ID	Tokens	Acquisition	Care	Reuse	Collection
P01	558	9	4	1	3
P02	1839	2	8	6	28
P03	780	0	5	0	9
P04	137	0	5	0	0
H01	329	0	0	2	15
H02	442	0	0	0	6
H03	545	3	12	9	4
H04	311	0	0	6	18
L01	496	4	12	1	2
L02	320	5	11	0	0
L03	187	0	15	0	0
L04	529	0	35	0	0
U01	643	0	17	6	12
U02	972	5	0	4	13
U03	479	1	11	0	2
U04	383	0	1	12	19
Total	8,950	29	136	47	131

Note. Care abbreviates care and longevity; reuse abbreviates reuse and redistribution; collection abbreviates collection and recycling. These raw counts reproduce Tables 4–6 and 9 when combined with their stated denominators.

References

Badhwar, A., Islam, S., Tan, C. S. L., Panwar, T., Wigley, S., & Nayak, R. (2024). Unraveling green marketing and greenwashing: A systematic review in the context of the fashion and textiles industry. *Sustainability, 16*(7), Article 2738. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16072738

Civico, M., & Mattioda, M. M. (2025). Framing sustainability in ethical fashion: A lexicometric analysis of French brand communication. *ZoneModa Journal, 15*(1), 137–152. https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2611-0563/21929

Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The drivers of greenwashing. *California Management Review, 54*(1), 64–87. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64

Diddi, S., & Yan, R.-N. (2019). Consumer perceptions related to clothing repair and community mending events: A circular economy perspective. *Sustainability, 11*(19), Article 5306. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11195306

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication, 43*(4), 51–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x

Fast Retailing. (2022a, June 29). *UNIQLO launches JOIN THE POWER OF CLOTHING, a campaign supporting action for a better world*. https://www.fastretailing.com/eng/sustainability/news/2206291100.html

Fast Retailing. (2022b, September 9). *UNIQLO launches RE.UNIQLO STUDIO in London Regent Street Store*. https://www.fastretailing.com/eng/group/news/2209091300.html

H&M Group. (2017, January 25). *H&M Bring it campaign*. https://hmgroup.com/news/hm-bring-it-campaign/

H&M Group. (2020, October 8). *Recycling system Looop helps H&M transform unwanted garments into new fashion favourites*. https://hmgroup.com/news/recycling-system-looop-helps-hm-transform-unwanted-garments-into-new-fashion-favourites/

H&M Group. (n.d.). *Product creation and product use*. Retrieved October 15, 2026, from https://hmgroup.com/sustainability/product-lifecycle/product-creation-and-use/

H&M. (n.d.). *Garment collecting*. Retrieved October 15, 2026, from https://www2.hm.com/en_hk/sustainability-hm/services/garment-collecting.html

Klepp, I. G., Laitala, K., & Wiedemann, S. (2020). Clothing lifespans: What should be measured and how. *Sustainability, 12*(15), Article 6219. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12156219

Levi Strauss & Co. (2021, April 22). *Levi's launches "Buy Better, Wear Longer" campaign*. https://www.levistrauss.com/2021/04/22/levis-launches-buy-better-wear-longer-campaign/

Levi Strauss & Co. (2022, September 21). *Levi's launches "Buy Better, Wear Longer" 2.0*. https://www.levistrauss.com/2022/09/21/levis-launches-buy-better-wear-longer-2-0/

Levi Strauss & Co. (n.d.-a). *Repair at the Levi's Tailor Shop*. Retrieved October 15, 2026, from https://www.levi.com/US/en_US/features/repair-tailor-shop

Levi Strauss & Co. (n.d.-b). *Levi's Wear Longer Project*. Retrieved October 15, 2026, from https://www.levistrauss.com/wearlongerproject/

Niinimäki, K., Peters, G., Dahlbo, H., Perry, P., Rissanen, T., & Gwilt, A. (2020). The environmental price of fast fashion. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment, 1*, 189–200. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-020-0039-9

Patagonia. (2011, November 25). *Don't buy this jacket, Black Friday and the New York Times* [Webpage includes editorial updates for 2022]. Retrieved October 15, 2026, from https://www.patagonia.com/stories/planet/activism/dont-buy-this-jacket-black-friday-and-the-new-york-times/story-18615.html

Patagonia. (n.d.-a). *Product care and repair*. Retrieved October 15, 2026, from https://www.patagonia.com/repairs/

Patagonia. (n.d.-b). *Trade in Patagonia clothing and gear*. Retrieved October 15, 2026, from https://www.patagonia.com/trade-in/

Ram, A. (2021, March 10). *Our quest for circularity*. Patagonia. https://www.patagonia.com/stories/planet/our-footprint/our-quest-for-circularity/story-96496.html

Sailer, A., Wilfing, H., & Straus, E. (2022). Greenwashing and bluewashing in Black Friday-related sustainable fashion marketing on Instagram. *Sustainability, 14*(3), Article 1494. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031494

Sandin, G., & Peters, G. M. (2018). Environmental impact of textile reuse and recycling: A review. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 184*, 353–365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.02.266

Tao, Y., & Ryan, M. (2026). Washing dirty laundry: A corpus linguistic analysis of fashion firms' webpage sustainability discourse. *International Journal of Business Communication, 63*(4), 1456–1490. https://doi.org/10.1177/23294884251336358

Textile Exchange. (2026). *Materials market report 2026*. https://textileexchange.org/knowledge-center/reports/materials-market-report-2026/

UNIQLO. (n.d.-a). *RE.UNIQLO*. Retrieved October 15, 2026, from https://www.uniqlo.com/us/en/special-feature/sustainability/re-uniqlo

UNIQLO. (n.d.-b). *RE.UNIQLO STUDIO*. Retrieved October 15, 2026, from https://www.uniqlo.com/us/en/special-feature/sustainability/re-uniqlo-studio

United Nations Environment Programme & United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (2023). *The sustainable fashion communication playbook: Shifting the narrative*. https://wedocs.unep.org/handle/20.500.11822/42819

van Leeuwen, T. (2007). Legitimation in discourse and communication. *Discourse & Communication, 1*(1), 91–112. https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481307071986

White, K., Habib, R., & Hardisty, D. J. (2019). How to SHIFT consumer behaviors to be more sustainable: A literature review and guiding framework. *Journal of Marketing, 83*(3), 22–49. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242919825649