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1. PROLOGUE

This document effectively works as a montage inasmuch as it is a collection of various thoughts, ideas and arguments brought together to create a composite whole. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2000: 6) these various elements “shape and define one another, and an emotional, gestalt effect is produced”. In what follows, the contributions from a series of published papers intermingle despite their different motivations, contexts, and outputs: “points of view and style collide, switch back and forth, co-mingle”, (Denzin 2001: 29). Montage also incorporates polyphony, as different voices vie for attention. To this end, I have incorporated elements from these papers, personal reflections on them, assessments of the work by those using them for their own purposes, and, ultimately, I attempt to situate the whole within the context of current literature. Montage presumes active readers, encouraging them to draw a series of interpretations that build one upon the other (Levitt-Jones and Lathlean 2007). Such interpretations emerge largely from “associations among the contrasting images that blend into one another” (Denzin and Lincoln 2000: 6), and, as such, your role in this endeavour is not without import. Naturally, I will be attempting to structure those interpretations through my craft such that we all arrive at a shared understanding of my contribution. Finally, montage blurs the line between cause and effect (Denzin 2001), as any sense of linear temporality fades into the background.

The core papers included here as evidence of my contribution include:


In outlining this contribution these papers are supported by a number of others included in my full bibliography (Appendix 5).

The contributions I outline cover three main areas of endeavour: critical marketing, interpretivism, and embodiment. The first of these, critical marketing, leaves its traces in five papers (O’Malley and Patterson 1998; Patterson and Elliott 2002; Patterson and O’Malley 2006; de Coverly et al. 2008; Patterson and Schroeder 2010). I put forward an understanding of marketing as a participative venture, offering both mundane and extraordinary consumer experiences, but equally concerned with its social impact. Here, I delineate an alternative vision for marketing, one that might release us from the shackles of Kotlerite analysis, planning and control. I call into question some of the key tenets within the discipline. Nonetheless: “modem marketing knows where it is going (or believes it does) and takes a dim view of anyone bold enough to challenge the route it has chosen” (O’Malley and Patterson 1998: 829).

The second contribution, on interpretivism, also circulates around three key areas: the importance of interpretive researchers adhering to the axioms of interpretivism, the requirement within this paradigm for researcher reflexivity, and the centrality of narrative to our work. Four papers incorporate these elements (O’Malley and Patterson 1998; Shankar and Patterson 2001; Patterson and O’Malley 2006; Patterson and Schroeder 2010). To an extent this work presages the development of Consumer Culture Theory (CCT) as a disciplinary banner within consumer research. Further, it functions as a call to arms in the pursuit of a more literary representation of consumer research and has been used routinely in narrative work by others within the discipline (Brown 2005; ; Patterson and Brown 2005; Jafari et al. 2013).

The final contribution comes in terms of establishing embodiment as a core concern of consumer research. Although it appears as the ultimate endpoint in the trajectory of my research career to date, it has always been present in the shadows of my earlier
work. Once again this theme is oriented around three elements: an anti-cognitivist stance, the representation of bodies, and the agency of bodies. Here, these elements find their primary expression in two papers (Patterson and Elliott 2002; Patterson and Schroeder 2010). This stream of research is beginning to have an interdisciplinary impact as the ideas are taken up not just within consumer research, but also within the sociology of the body.

Documents of this nature are inevitably linear in their organisation. I have treated my contribution thematically and, in a sense, it appears as though the themes emerge in a relatively direct fashion. Section 2 outlines my contribution in respect of critical marketing. Section 3, concerned with interpretivism, seems to come into view only as a result of the preceding critical foundation. Section 4, on embodiment, unfolds as a logical conclusion of the entire body of work. Nonetheless, the papers used throughout, appear and disappear, crosscut, and circulate. They present a collection of images that ideally offer up a coherent whole centred on the establishment of an embodied interpretive consumer research. Section 5 presents a conclusion of sorts, attempting one last time to tie the various pieces of the work together.

Appendix 1 includes the papers for consideration in this submission. Appendix 2 documents the written statements of those who have worked with me on my joint publications. Appendix 3 summarises the contribution of each of the collaborating authors. Appendix 4 documents the citations found for each of the papers included in the submission. Appendix 5 presents a full bibliography of all my published work.
2. CRITICAL MARKETING

If we admit that human life can be ruled by reason, then all possibility of life is destroyed.

Into The Wild (2007)

Critical marketing is a slippery concept, but it has been captured in a positive sense by Tadajewski and Brownlie (2008: 9) as incorporating “theoretical pluralism, methodological pluralism and boundaries delineated by a commitment on three fronts: ontological denaturalisation, epistemological reflexivity and a non-performative stance”. That is, critical marketing recognises that marketing incorporates systems of meaning that encourage consumers to view the world about them in particular ways that also defend the dominant interests of our consumer society. Indeed, marketing ideology has transformed society with consumption establishing itself as the new dominant social paradigm (Kilbourne et al. 1998) and the “culture of the customer” reframing organisational life (Du Gay and Salaman 1992). The critical marketing project also necessitates a commitment by researchers to reflexivity. We must abandon the idea of an aboriginal ‘reality’ which might be apprehended by the effective marketing researcher through the successful deployment of ‘valid’ research instruments. Instead, we should embrace subjectivity and the wondrous interpretations it brings to light. Finally, the output of critical marketing is not the pursuit of managerial relevance (Tadajewski and Brownlie 2008), but thick descriptions of consumer experience and practice.

In a reaction against Kotlerite implementation, planning and control I sought early on to establish my critical credentials. To this end, Vanishing Point (O’Malley and Patterson 1998) acknowledges the very real trajectory that I experienced as an early-career academic; at first confined within the walls of mainstream marketing, then exposed to a more critical viewpoint, before later taking on the mantle of interpretive consumer researcher. The paper lays bare the journey that I had been taking to that point, and, more interestingly, signals the kind of academic I was to become. Its appearance in print confirmed my status as a scholar with a critical bent. The substance of my contribution in this paper is an alternative vision for marketing that emerges from work I had been doing on the effect of postmodern thought on the
discipline (see Patterson 1998), and from an increasingly crystallised understanding of consumption; both of which lead inevitably to the questioning of marketing’s key tenets and which Woodall (2007: 1286) positions within a new ‘radicalised literature’:

Venkatesh (1989) set in train a newly radicalised literature that presaged a total marketing rethink. With Brown (1993, 1994, etc.) its most prolific commentator the postmodern ‘camp’ argued that marketing’s broadly structuralist foundations were no longer viable. Its key articles of faith were roundly critiqued (e.g. Hackley, 2001; O’Malley and Patterson, 1998; Robson and Rowe, 1997) and all concurred that the “generic concept of marketing has become a geriatric concept of marketing” (Brown 2002: 317).

Contributions, though, are funny things. Writing about Vanishing Point (O’Malley and Patterson 1998) in a retrospective printed fours years after the initial publication (O’Malley and Patterson 2002: 62-63), I argue:

In Vanishing Point we are adamant that the paper is less about denigrating the mix and changing the marketing mindset than it is about working out our own personal hang-ups.

“The victimisation of the mix management paradigm in this paper may be more meaningful in terms of being cathartic and liberating than it is in terms of vilifying the ‘model’ itself.”

Of course, statements like this are used as much for rhetorical effect as anything else. Secretly we did want to change how marketing academics, at least European ones, thought about our discipline. Despite all our protestations, we held fast to the humanist chimera that is progress. Typically, our desires have gone largely unsatisfied. Nonetheless, the paper does appear to have had an unsettling effect. Colleagues often remark how much they enjoyed the paper, yet it rarely gets cited. We both cling to the vain hope that this lack of citation is evidence of the paper’s focus on restoration. That is, there is little in Vanishing Point that is truly innovative. The paper instead seeks to collate the many criticisms of the mix, supporting the whole enterprise with the metaphor of the road movie. Should people wish to criticise the mix they can call upon the other, more venerable papers that we cite. The metaphor served our purposes well but is of little use to others. As I said, we cling to vain hope.

Furthermore, in the past four years we have had the opportunity to subject vast numbers of students to our thoughts on the mix. Many are energised by the prospect of working outside the box; others simply walk out of our lectures, copies of Analysis, Planning and Control held tightly in their hands. It seems that some of the world is not quite ready for a mixless marketing.

Vanishing Point also lays the foundation for how I engage with consumer research. In particular, it represents my first foray into the deployment of reflexivity and stylistic narrative forms. Specifically, it is constructed around the rhetorical device of the road movie as a means of establishing the journey that I and the discipline of marketing are
on, and as a way of underpinning my breaking free from the mainstream (O’Malley and Patterson 1998: 830):

We utilise the road metaphor, in the guise of road movie, to signify the critical journey upon which we as individuals and as members of the marketing Academy must now embark. “Theory is a product of displacement, comparison, a certain distance. To theorise one leaves home”, (Clifford 1989: 177). Home is associated with attributes of warmth, safety, comfort and familiarity. In contrast, leaving home, particularly for a long or uncharted journey, connotes danger, excitement, discomfort, insecurity, adventure, discovery and hope. Home represents stasis and fixity; the road - movement, mobility, fluidity and provisionality. To go on the road is to break out of the patterned routine of everyday life, that’s why it’s liberating”, (Eyerman and Lofgren 1995: 62).

The paper also evidences a degree of anti-cognitivism, arguing instead for a more experiential approach to the work that we do. This anti-cognitivism leads me to choose the body as a locus for much of my subsequent research on consumers. The unpredictable body, the enemy of reason (Burkitt 1999), suits me well and becomes a fertile hunting ground for my academic obsessions (see Patterson and Elliott 2002; Patterson and Schroeder 2010).

In Vanishing Point I point towards the potential of a more creative, experiential, open, flexible, participative and reflective marketing (O’Malley and Patterson 1998). Of particular interest to me here are the participative and experiential dimensions of marketing and consumption. Participation draws marketers and consumers together into mutually beneficial exchanges that invite the consumer to provide increasingly significant inputs and, in so doing, dismisses the artificial boundaries between production and consumption. Experiential marketing is the product of a recognition within consumer research (Holbrook and Hirschman 1982) that consumers are as much if not more interested in use as they are in acquisition. In the paper, I indicate too that marketing needs to reflect upon its societal impact, for it is after all a societal enterprise.

2.1. Participative

In suggesting that the alternative version of marketing should be participative, I draw on my earlier work on direct and relationship marketing (see O’Malley et al. 1997; O’Malley et al. 1998; Patterson et al. 1997; Patterson 1998). I am interested in how
consumers and organisations come together in the co-production of offerings. Here then are the seeds of an idea that was to be played out elsewhere as ‘prosumption’ (Ritzer and Jurgenson 2010), ‘value co-creation’ (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004) and ‘service dominant logic’ (Vargo and Lusch 2004). Recently, my ideas on these issues have solidified around an interest in a brand of consumer agency certainly not captured in the mainstream characterisations offered in the managerial literature, for as Peñaloza and Venkatesh (2006: 307) argue:

> While such characterisation endows consumers with more subjectivity and agency than its predecessor, consumers nevertheless remain subordinated to firm interests.

While I have championed consumer agency in the vast majority of my work, the privileging of consumer agency within CCT has been roundly criticised (see Askegaard and Linnet 2011). Nonetheless, the academic pursuit of consumer agency has been enlightening in the face of so much managerially-oriented marketing theory. Landmark breakthroughs made in consumer research (for example, Holt, 1995; Schouten and McAlexander, 1995; Murray, 2002) through subjective, situated, context-specific accounts of consumption, would suggest that adopting a perspective far removed from the search for agency might be a hasty decision.

My concerns with the potential of relational approaches have also led me to consider the use and, to a degree, misuse of the ‘marketing as relationships’ frame (see Patterson and O’Malley 2006; O’Malley et al. 2008). In Brands, Consumers and Relationships (Patterson and O’Malley 2006) in particular, I examine the extension of the relational frame into the field of branding. My key contribution here is that I establish a strong foundation for questioning whether the interpersonal relationship metaphor is an appropriate basis for understanding the interaction between consumers and the brands they use (Poulsen and Wooliscroft 2012). Further, the use of the relationship metaphor is predicated on the use of another metaphor within the branding literature; the ‘brand personality’ metaphor (Patterson 1999). In this way the relationship metaphor is being overstretched within this domain (Valta 2013). As we claim in the paper (Patterson and O’Malley 2006:14):
many advocates have forgotten that it is a metaphor that is being used. BCRs have been
reified and researchers have treated them as though they really were interpersonal
relationships ... The reification of BCRs has led to an almost exclusive emphasis on
concepts from SET in their description and explication. However, there are a number of
conceptual difficulties associated with transferring concepts from the interpersonal
literature into commercial situations. For example, discussions of trust (particularly in
marketing) suggest that it is generally relevant only in situations involving vulnerability.

I make a strong case, which other authors take up, for a greater understanding of
how brands might provide the fulcrum around which social relationships can be
constructed (see Hellman 2010; O’Sullivan et al. 2011). Thus, a brand facilitates
relationships between people rather than being a relational partner in itself (Cova
1997). Moreover, in this paper I highlight the centrality of narratives to brands and the
maintenance of brand community. In this sense every brand is a story, the product of
firm and consumer narratives (Patterson and O’Malley 2006: 16-17):

From the perspective of the organisation, a brand-centred community provides the ideal
audience for origin myths that create a sense of heritage and bolster shared notions of
authenticity ... Furthermore, the tales members of these communities tell about the brand
serve as ‘moralelegories’ ... cautionary moral anecdotes that help these consumers acquire
and manipulate brand meanings through processes of integration ... and that allow
members to differentiate themselves from other consumers of the brand.

2.2. Experiential

In an alternative to the information processing approach to understanding consumers,
Holbrook and Hirschman (1982) suggest that consumers are often motivated by the
pursuit of fantasies, feelings and fun. From a consumer culture perspective
experiences are generally considered to possess the potential for personal
transformation, a peculiarly American and romantic view (Abrahams 1986). This focus
on personal transformation has driven the search for epiphanic, extraordinary
experiences within the discipline. Thus, the key understanding of experiences brought
to bear on consumer research has been the concept of flow (Csikszentmihalyi 1997).
Certainly, flow emerges from extraordinary activities that incorporate the coming
together of personal skill and the challenge. However, flow experiences are rare in the
extreme. In contrast, I have been more concerned with understanding the
multiplicities of consumer experience, drawing together where possible, both the
extraordinary and the mundane. In *Hidden Mountain* (de Coverly et al. 2008) I address our everyday experience with the waste produced by our consumption. So mundane is this experience that it has received little attention in the marketing and consumption literature (Wiese and Sherman 2011). Thus, a major contribution of this paper is that it focuses attention on disposition processes so often overlooked. Perry et al. (2010: 77) acknowledge this contribution by highlighting how the paper:

> examines our relationship with waste through the attitudes that people have toward its production, and the “systemic smoothing mechanisms” that we use to keep waste “out of sight and out of mind” ... The authors contend that to conceal the unacceptably huge amount of waste that the society creates, a variety of mechanisms have arisen through which waste is “rendered invisible.” These mechanisms include human socialisation against waste, the role of rubbish bins, and the work of garbage collectors.

Indeed, this “technological framework which limits as much as possible the physical engagement between people and their waste” (Bradshaw and Canniford 2010: 109) effectively means that our experience of the detritus of consumer culture may actually be construed as a lack of experience.

In *Borderlines* (Patterson and Schroeder 2010) I shift attention to the experience of women who become heavily tattooed, and thus hold in tension the transgressive nature of this form of consumption (Hackley et al. 2012) and the everyday experiences of these women. The paper illuminates and complicates the relationship between heavily tattooed women and mainstream beauty culture suggesting how these women are able to re-appropriate their bodies, so often the target of objectification, and use them as the basis of agency (Waterhouse 1993). I position tattooed female bodies as transgressive, docile and abject. They are transgressive in that they seek to establish alternative notions of what is aesthetically pleasing and what is beautiful. However, breaking free of the smothering inscriptions of patriarchy is difficult and many tattooed women feel the need to balance their tattoos by creating looks that otherwise adhere to normalised ideals of feminine beauty. Finally, tattooed female bodies may also be characterised as monstrous and abject. They are at once abhorrent and fascinating, attracting the gaze and challenging it. They are liminal, existing on the border but not respecting it (Johnston 1996), questioning the distinction between beauty and repulsiveness (Patterson and Schroeder 2010: 257):
the body work engaged in by heavily tattooed women may see them inhabit a space both beyond and contained by the confines of normal beauty culture, simultaneously transgressive and deferential. These women are often caught in the contradiction identified by Jagger (2000), whereby at the moment of self-production they are self-monitoring and docile.

2.3. Concerned with Social Impact

In *Negotiating Masculinities* (Patterson and Elliott 2002) I consider the impact of marketing on contemporary body culture. The vast majority of literature in this domain suggests that the institutions of marketing, acting primarily through the processes of marketing communication and advertising, promote particular ideologies that have a deleterious effect on our relationship with our bodies and, as a consequence, with each other. *Negotiating Masculinities* is at the forefront of an emergent stream of consumer research that complicates these issues by addressing the social construction of gender identities (Brownlie and Hewer 2007), and by setting the agenda for studies of masculinity in advertising (Patterson and Elliott 2002: 236): the more evident use of female bodies in advertising and the lack of attention paid to representations of male bodies in academic studies are consequences of the power of hegemonic masculinity and the Cartesian dualisms on which it depends. In a sense, there has been a general acceptance that masculinity, unlike femininity, remains in some way unconstructed ... the last two decades have been witness to a number of marketing-led forces with significant import for the construction of male identities. At a fundamental level, there has been a growing feminisation of hegemonic masculinity, designed to encourage greater male participation in consumption activities and with the added benefit of protecting patriarchy. Furthermore, we have observed a dramatic increase in the number of representations of male bodies in marketing communications ... intended to improve marketing effectiveness through adding value to otherwise neutral products and services. The result is that, now, more than ever, men are being encouraged to gaze upon images of other men and, thus, the gaze, as it is traditionally conceived, is being turned in upon itself.

In the paper I contend that the increasing representation of male bodies in the media encourages men to be anxious about their masculinity, to gaze upon and covet specific ideals of masculine embodiment, and to work towards achieving such ideals for themselves using the materials at their disposal from the market. Indeed, Thompson and Holt (2004: 314) build on the paper to argue:
The perpetually anxious nature of masculinity and men's reliance upon symbolic props has become axiomatic in the men's studies literature. Consumer culture provides a plethora of powerful masculine icons that men can vicariously consume. According to Norman (2011) *Negotiating Masculinities* establishes how the mesomorphic male body, in particular, is being commodified and eroticised. In this way, marketing encourages men to view their bodies as works in progress; sites of identity management (Schroeder and Zwick 2004) that require the liberatory intervention of marketplace commodities (Evans 2006). However, unlike much of the previous work in this field, *Negotiating Masculinities* opens up a space for consumer agency. Rather than viewing men as victims of conformity to ideologies of masculine embodiment, the paper underlines how body work allows men to take control not only of their bodies, but also of their lives, by empowering them as reinstated, knowledgeable agents. Further, according to Elliott and Elliott (2005) *Negotiating Masculinities* moves beyond studies that assume that advertising is a linear communication process in which audiences understand and acknowledge messages uniformly and uncritically. In contrast with work within the mainstream, I acknowledge that audiences are likely to adopt one of a number of possible strategies of interpretation from dominant readings, to negotiated and oppositional readings (Hall 1980). These issues are taken up again in later work on the representation of femininity in advertising (see Patterson *et al.* 2009).

The ideologies of marketing and consumption also figure prominently in *Hidden Mountain* (de Coverly *et al.* 2008). Here, I identify that the logic of capitalism requires us to consume in ever increasing quantities and at an ever increasing rate. To achieve this the waste produced by our consumption must be rendered invisible and our consumption made tolerable. In this way waste is treated “as if it were literally immaterial, as if it existed in a world apart from the one we inhabit in our daily, routine lives” (O'Brien 1999: 262). Interestingly, the ideologies promulgated by marketing and the associated smoothing mechanisms used to hide waste away do affect consumers in the sense that they find it increasingly difficult to articulate their experience of waste.
3. INTERPRETIVISM

There is truth, and there are lies, and art always tells the truth. Even when it’s lying.  
*Being John Malkovich* (1999)

Interpretive consumer research has always been manifested as a rag-tag bunch of disparate epistemological and methodological approaches (Cova and Elliott 2008). Although the genesis of the interpretive consumer research project is usually attributed to a group of American researchers (e.g. Belk *et al.* 1988; 1989) on what became known as the Consumer Behaviour Odyssey (Shankar and Patterson 2001), even this history has been the subject of some debate (see Tadajewski 2006). The situation takes an even more confusing turn with the launch of Consumer Culture Theory (Arnould and Thompson 2005) which by its very nature serves to camouflage the multiplicity of approaches taken within consumer research. This comes despite the fact that Arnould and Thompson (2005) recognise that attempts to establish a common theoretical vernacular smack of modernist conceptions of science. All this variability in understanding, complicated further by its relativistic ontology (Shankar and Goulding 2001) inevitably leads to criticisms of interpretive research.

Nonetheless, I have always been proud to call myself an interpretive consumer researcher and much of my work has taken up its various concerns. Specifically, I have on numerous occasions defended the axioms of interpretive consumer research and the means which which we justify our work in relation to them. I have also engaged routinely with the various forms of reflexivity, subjectivist and discursive, that interpretivism entails. Finally, I have been preoccupied throughout my research career with narrative - from the narrative structure of my work to the use of narrative methodologies to pursue consumer narratives.
3.1. Axioms

As an interpretivist I am routinely called upon to position myself. Such positioning is not, or at least should not be, a simple process of characterising ‘us’ in the margins versus ‘them’ in the mainstream. And yet for many that is exactly what being an interpretivist entails; justifying claims to ‘truth’ in relation to the dominant positivistic paradigm. In contrast, I am concerned in Interpreting the Past (Shankar and Patterson 2001) with how we as interpretive researchers should focus on justifying our work solely in respect of the axioms of interpretivism as laid out by Hudson and Ozanne (1988, see Figure 1). Although progress in this field has been made, it does tend to be slow. As Davies and Fitchett (2005: 273) stridently claim:

Current debates concerning the legitimacy of different research approaches may be less likely to adopt the oppositional tone that characterised much of this earlier discussion but acknowledgement of divisions and boundaries between research programmes nevertheless continues to feature regularly in respected journals.

Indeed, while I might allude to a mainstream, and even suggest that such a mainstream possesses certain (positivistic) qualities, the ‘plenitude’ of which Grant McCracken speaks renders such dichotomous thinking problematic. Interpretive consumer research is populated by a number of factions/cultures each vying for recognition. Thus, while I may at times claim membership of the interpretive consumer research culture, that membership is loose and not untroubled. Still, I exhibit some solidarity and loyalty with others making similar claims. This, in turn, influences how I imagine, execute, and write my research. At the same time, however, I problematise this membership because I don’t appear to be the same kind of interpretive researcher as others (see Shankar and Patterson 2001). In this guise I transgress. I break with the conventions of my interpretivist forebears. This is not a denial or a rejection of what has gone before as much as it is a call to arms, a challenge to adapt and change, an exhortation to explore new possibilities. As an academic in a business school, doing interpretive work on consumers automatically positions me as something of a deviant. Thus, I am constantly called upon in formal and informal ways to justify my work and in doing so I create a variety of narratives that simultaneously position me as transgressive and docile, out of the fold and in it.
Hudson and Ozanne (1988) outline the differences between interpretivist and positivist approaches in terms of ontological, axiological and epistemological dimensions. In *Interpreting the Past* (Shankar and Patterson 2001) an historical examination of interpretive work to date highlights that though early interpretive researchers had made some strides they had tended to measure the worth of their research against post-positivistic criteria, and thus they failed to adequately live up to the assumptions of interpretivism. Specifically, they adopted Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) four parallel criteria for assessing the ‘trustworthiness’ of qualitative research: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. This finding was disappointing, though not necessarily surprising given that as Tadajewski (2006: 169) confirms:

> the requirement that knowledge is subject to social certification has potential publishing and career implications for those wishing to promote oppositional discursive regimes to the ‘intellectual hegemony of positivism’ (Shankar and Patterson 2001: 485).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Interpretive</th>
<th>Positivist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontological</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Reality</td>
<td>Socially constructed</td>
<td>Objective, tangible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holistic</td>
<td>Fragmentable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td>Divisible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Social Beings</td>
<td>Voluntaristic</td>
<td>Deterministic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Axiological</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overriding Goal</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemological</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge generated</td>
<td>Idiographic</td>
<td>Nomothetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time-bound</td>
<td>Time-free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-dependent</td>
<td>Context-independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of causality</td>
<td>Multiple, simultaneous shaping</td>
<td>Real causes exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research relationship</td>
<td>Interactive, co-operative</td>
<td>Dualism, separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No privileged point of observation</td>
<td>Privileged point of observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hudson and Ozanne (1988: 509)
Further, as Bradshaw and Brown (2008: 1408) identify:

Such reflections tempt us to reinterpret the original motivations of Belk and his co-workers. It is arguable that the group was less interested in challenging existing research methods – in fact they needed to familiarise themselves with new modes of inquiry beforehand – than with launching a credible alternative to the mainstream. In that sense it might be speculated that the original motivation was in fact to de-stabilise the power structure of the discipline. With this idea in mind it is interesting to reflect on the attraction and excitement of new ideas and notional paradigm shifts (Shankar and Patterson 2001).

In personally pursuing the axioms of interpretivism I have been much informed by Alvesson and Kärreman (2000) who provide a classification of research approaches which are sensitive to the linguistic turn and which differ in terms of their views on the issue of representation, the central issue in their research, and in terms of the researcher’s primary task (Figure 2). In view of the kind of interpretive work that I engage in, their classification serves to effectively position my research as literary data construction.

Figure 2: Research Approaches Sensitive to the Linguistic Turn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grounded Fictionalism</th>
<th>Metaphoric Data Construction</th>
<th>Literary Data Construction</th>
<th>Discursive Pragmatism</th>
<th>Discursivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View on Representation</td>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>Skeptical</td>
<td>Skeptical</td>
<td>Skeptical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperfectly Possible</td>
<td>Imperfectly Possible</td>
<td>Text Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>through Figurative Means</td>
<td>through Narrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Issue in</td>
<td>Deconstruction</td>
<td>Metaphors</td>
<td>Writing Style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discourse-Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discursive Interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher’s Primary</td>
<td>Critique</td>
<td>Imaginative Interpretations</td>
<td>Production of</td>
<td>Reconstructing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Persuasive Accounts</td>
<td>Vocabularies-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted From Alvesson and Kärreman (2000: 144)
Such a classification acknowledges the natural slippage which occurs during data collection and writing such that any ‘reality’ can only be ever loosely and imperfectly represented (Alvesson and Kärreman 2000). The construction of the research text becomes my main focus and, while data collection is not abandoned, the focus is on how the data may be used to construct a persuasive and interesting research tale. Alvesson and Kärreman (2000: 146) continue:

Empirical material is fitted into and subordinated to a mode of writing research. The fictional and rhetorical qualities of the research product become paramount. Genres of writing, norms of producing a text, efforts to persuade and establish authority through various rhetorical devices guide the processing and use of empirical materials in the final text.

In *Vanishing Point* (O’Malley and Patterson 1998) the various arguments are marshalled through the narrative device of the road movie. Following Czarniawska (1998) I am inclined to use the term device as it is, at one and the same time, purposeful and artful. It also has a tendency to be idiosyncratic, thereby allowing for greater flexibility in meeting the demands of the research. Such devices also appear elsewhere in my work, for example three skin metaphors in *Borderlines* (Patterson and Schroeder 2010), and Homer’s Odyssey is used in *Interpreting The Past* (Shankar and Patterson 2001: 493-494):

Homer too is a master of representation. The Odyssey begins in medias res. Rather than opening the story with the culmination of the Trojan War, Homer begins midway through Odysseus’ journey. Odysseus describes the intervening years in the fabulous stories told to the Phaeacians later in the epic. This allows the poet to achieve several things: he can immediately engage the interest of an audience already familiar with the plot; provide narrative space for a long and evocative flashback later in the text, and; quickly provide a description of the changes that have taken place since the end of the war.

Rhetorical devices also became the object of study for some of my research as I explore the use of the relationship metaphor in *Brands, Consumers and Relationships* (Patterson and O’Malley 2006; see also O’Malley et al. 2008).

These issues are important, for, as we have learned, marketing and consumer researchers have long tended to give greater consideration to data collection and less to how those data are represented (Stern 1998). The inevitable result is a body of work that often works to exclude audiences rather than engage them.
3.2. Reflexivity

In addition to the standpoint reflexivity (Denzin 1997), or sensitivity to the social construction of reality that interpretivism naturally demands, it is also incumbent upon the interpretive researcher to engage with subjectivist reflexivity. As Denzin (1989a: 12) suggests, “interpretive research begins and ends with the biography and self of the researcher”. Here, I, as author, am obliged to examine myself as a legitimate subject of study, making plain to readers the personal impact of the research in respect of how it changes who I become (Foltz and Griffin 1996). The explicit placement of myself in the text, using my experiences as topics for inquiry, the acknowledgement of my role in constructing it, and the intentional revelation of my epistemological assumptions (Ruby 1980), enables readers to better judge the merits of my research (Watson 1994).

In *Vanishing Point* (O’Malley and Patterson 1998) the journey to a critical and alternative marketing begins with a serendipitous visit to a colleague’s home where the bookshelves are stacked high with critical works. In *Borderlines* (Patterson and Schroeder 2010) years of personally collecting tattoos and hanging out in tattoo parlours become the backdrop for an exploration of tattoo culture and, by extension, Consumer Culture Theory. Furthermore, being reflexive makes plain the very natural doubts which I as a researcher experience in the course of my research endeavours. The purpose here is to enable the reader to identify with me by making me seem accessible and human, for “[w]ho can identify with the all knowing author?”, (van Maanen 1995: 136). In this way, reflexivity may help to strengthen the persuasive appeal of my research texts.

We can also acknowledge a discursive reflexivity that suggests that scholarly writing is simply a way of staging truth effects (Alvesson and Kårreman 2000). In this respect it is important for me to make clear to the reader how my text captures the phenomena under investigation, despite its construction by me. For example in *Borderlines* (Patterson and Schroeder 2010: 257) I suggest:
It is to these three relationships between femininity, skin and consumption that we now turn. In so doing we deploy the three metaphors of skin as container, skin as projection surface, and skin as cover to be modified. The metaphors are used here as framing devices enabling us to view these relationships from a particular vantage point. But metaphor is never neutral. It always highlights some elements of a phenomenon while hiding others. Nonetheless, the metaphors considered here are useful in that they also overlap with the motivations for tattooing outlined by Sanders (1989). As such they are not simply theoretical devices but also effectively work to organise the lived experience and practice of individuals.

Proponents of the canonical style would have us believe that language use is secondary to observation and reason (Hassard 1994), and, as such, research texts are objective accounts of the facts (Alvesson and Kärreman 2000). As Coffey et al. (1996: 3.1) submit:

The separation of rhetoric from logic in the creation of modern disciplinary knowledge parallels a number of other, equally fundamental, separations and dichotomies. It established the possibility of an observer armed with a neutral language of observation (since untouched with rhetoric) and thus allowed for the elementary distinction between that observed and the observed.

Thus, my text is simply a “contested [claim] to speak ‘the truth’ about the world”, (Fox 1995: 1), and, as De Cock (2000) suggests, these arguments provide mounting support for the assertion that we academics persuade our audiences primarily through the utilisation of specific narrative forms. Nonetheless, as Hackley (2003: 1338) reaffirms, such issues remain relatively unexplored within the marketing canon:

The shortcomings of the popular marketing textual genre are sometimes noted by marketing academics in critical papers (e.g. in O’Malley and Patterson 1998; citing Grönroos 1994; Holbrook 1995; Robson and Rowe 1997).

The discussion and mobilisation of discursive reflexivity has appeared with greater frequency within the consumer research literature. Here, scholars seem to have a degree more freedom to evidence these issues and the ultimate result is that they spur on those working within the field (Bode and Østergaard 2013: 176).

The history of pre-CCT and current CCT scholarship is interspersed and driven forward by self-reflective, critical, alerting and demanding texts. These texts are contextual junctions of mythologising the past and writing the future (Shankar and Patterson 2001).
3.3. Narrative

Wrestling with notions of discursive reflexivity naturally leads to a focus on narrative in research. According to Bruner (2004) we seem to have no other way of describing “lived time” save in narrative form. In their simplest sense, narratives are “mental models” whose defining property is their unique patterning of events over time (Cherrier 2005). They are not necessarily grounded in fact but are a representation of experiences encoded with symbolism and meaning (McAdams and Ochberg 1988). The stories we tell about our lives allow us to construct the experiences we live through (Schiffrin 1996) and offer a method of understanding these experiences and communicating them to others (Bruner 1990).

As such, in adopting a narrative approach I treat interviewees as ‘agents of meaning’ (Macdonald 2001), where their experience is vital in allowing them to create sufficient depth in their narratives. Here, interviews and casual conversations become sites of narrative production (Czarniawska, 2004). Moreover, narratives of identity change over time, constantly evolving to incorporate new experiences. For example, in *Borderlines* (Patterson and Schroeder 2010: 262) I tease out the fluidity of identity and its associated narratives:

> notwithstanding modern methods of tattoo removal, tattoos are viewed as permanent marks in the skin thus defying change, effecting a degree of continuity ... and anchoring the self ... tattoos are used to question and ameliorate the uncertainty of the future and the confusion engendered by the postmodern fragmentation of identity.

> However ... the practice of tattooing may, in fact, only serve to reinforce postmodern fragmentation given that tattoos are generally open to multiple interpretations and their legibility is never guaranteed. Indeed, the substance and meanings of tattoos may even change across time and context for those who bear them. Designs merge into each other, new designs are added, some are covered up, some altered, and the narratives that surround them evolve.

In this way a narrative approach also lends the research a degree of verisimilitude by offering a means by which to capture and represent the essence of consumers’ stories and to place the reader in the middle of those experiences, almost presenting them with a first-hand view of proceedings. For Denzin (1989b: 83-84), verisimilitude
refers to “truthlike statements that produce for readers the feeling that they have experienced, or could experience, the events being described.”

For example, in Borderlines (Patterson and Schroeder 2010) I make use of the narratives of heavily tattooed women who are required on an almost daily basis to justify what they have done to their bodies. Their justifications are fabricated through narratives of personalised meaning around their tattoos. Similarly, the context to this paper incorporates a cultural history of tattooed women that also pulses with a variety of narratives around spectacle, conformity and resistance. Importantly, the decision to focus on consumer narratives is not just a textual strategy but a conscious effort to incorporate the consumer’s voice. As Sparkes (1995: 159) contends:

No textual staging can ever be innocent. Whose voices are included in the text, and how they are given weight and interpreted, along with questions of priority and juxtaposition, are not just textual strategies but are political concerns that have moral consequences. How we as researchers choose to write about others has profound implications, not just for how readable the text is but also for how the people the text portrays are ‘read’ and understood.

As alluded to earlier I have also used narrative structures within my work to draw the reader in. These narratives are now considered to be central to the operations of interpretive and even qualitative work (Jafari et al. 2013). Brown (2005: 222) makes use of Interpreting the Past (Shankar and Patterson 2001) to conclude that narrative data and narrative storylines are beginning to establish a concrete presence within the discipline:

The legitimisation of fiction is thus well underway and, while the marketing academy is in no rush to abandon the fruits of its scientistic labours, there is no doubt that studying stories is much more acceptable than before.

Indeed, Brown also recognises that my justification for narratology in the paper is itself presented as an heroic narrative (2004: 328):

Avi Shankar and Maurice Patterson (2001) have applied narratological methods to the rise of the interpretive research tradition, creatively construing it as a series of crises, climaxes and resolutions.
4. **EMBODIMENT**

Let me tell you... don’t you look at those illustrations too long, because they’ll come alive and they’ll tell you stories.

*The Illustrated Man* (1969)

At 11:05 on Wednesday 23rd October 2013, I am a 44-year-old male worried about being a 44-year-old male. Too attached to culinary delights and potation, the appearance of my body looms particularly large in my daily thoughts. I have no great difficulty in seeing the direct connection between my consumption activities and my body. My heroic failure to curb these consumption activities accounts for the ever increasing waist measurement of my jeans, the rather sad looking pouch that hangs down over that waist, the poor state of my complexion, the amalgam receptacles that are my teeth, and the inability of my lungs to take in what by any normal standards would be a healthy volume of air. At times this list of my corporeal deficiencies seems endless. I live in vain hope of recapturing the ‘athletic’ body of my youth. Marketers, for their part seem only too keen to provide support for such futile dreams. Over the years I have also decorated my body with a succession of tattoos. My stock narrative explanation for these artworks is that they represent an effort to affirm my Celtic heritage. However, as a multitude of tattoo parlours spring up in secondary locations off the high street, I come to the sad realisation that my tattoo may affirm nothing more than the fact that I am a slave to fashion.

There is an increasing realisation that embodiment represents a fulcrum around which processes of identification revolve and Turner (1992) uses the term ‘somatic society’ to signify the body’s growing importance. Nonetheless, following Shilling (1993) we might refer to embodiment as having been an ‘absent presence’ within our discipline. That is, the corporeality of consumption has always been lurking in the shadows. If nothing else, embodiment has acted as consumer research’s Other, the irrational, emotive and impulsive flip side of the rational, information-processing consumer (Longhurst 1995).

The institutions of consumer culture are deeply implicated in our embodiment in that marketers have always profited from the sale of products and services associated...
with our bodies (Joy and Venkatesh 1994), and indeed the successful management of body projects requires the intervention of a range of marketplace commodities from dietary products to gym services. Moreover, marketing communications are primarily responsible for the constitution of bodily ideals (Thompson and Hirschman 1995): they promote the latest version of the body beautiful (Sturrock and Pioch 1998); they encourage consumers to be “actively concerned about the management, maintenance and appearance of their bodies”, (Shilling 1993: 5), and; they teach consumers how to work towards the idealised bodies they covet (Finkelstein 1997).

My interest in embodiment emerges from my focus on experiential consumption and the anti-cognitivist stance this entails. Early work in this domain centres upon the representation of bodies in advertising and consumers’ interpretive strategies. Later I move away from problems of representation to consider the agency of bodies.

4.1. Anti-Cognitivism

“To ignore the body in any discourse on consumption is to accept a very restrictive view of social reality”, (Firat and Venkatesh 1995: 258). And yet, until relatively recently, the body has not figured significantly in consumer research. Hirschman (1993) and Thompson et al. (1989) both highlight the pervasive and problematic nature of the machine and container metaphors in consumer research. For (Hirschman 1993: 544), machines:

act but do not emote; they make decisions but do not feel the consequences. When the machine metaphor is used to characterise human beings, we risk losing sight of the other significant aspects of being human.

In Negotiating Masculinities (Patterson and Elliott 2002: 231-232) I delineate the reasons why the body has not figured as prominently in consumer research as it should and underline why bodies are important:

The legacy of Cartesianism has been the equation of humanity with the rational mind. Bodies, on the other hand, are nothing more than automatons, machines acting as containers for the non-spatial mind. Bodies are seen as corrupt and flawed, requiring the
liberatory intervention of rationality acting through science and technology ... the notion of embodiment helps to overcome this artificial division between body and mind. Embodiment straddles the nature/culture, mind/body divide and neatly captures the dialectical relationship between both ... We ‘are’ bodies and we ‘have’ bodies such that they do not simply exist ‘in themselves’ but become the subject of enterprise, interest and reflection ... To this end, our bodies represent unfinished projects, works-in-progress of central importance in our lives. Moreover, they are not simply controlled by social relations, but also underpin, intensify and change those relations.

In an effort to overcome the effects of Cartesianism, and to establish the importance of the body to consumer research, I have been influenced by the work of Arthur Frank (1991: 48–49) in viewing ‘the body’ as constituted by discourses, “cognitive mappings of the body’s possibilities and limitations”; institutions, the places and contexts in which discourses occur, and; corporeality, the obdurate physicality of the body. Thus, in Negotiating Masculinities (Patterson and Elliott 2002) I take due consideration of the discourse of hegemonic masculinity, the context of male lifestyle magazines which is a major outlet for this discourse, and the ability, or lack thereof, of men to mould their bodies to approximate the ideals on show (see also Patterson et al. 2009 for similar issues around emphasised femininity).

4.2. Representing Bodies

In accessing the reaction of audiences to advertising depictions of bodies early work (e.g. Peterson and Kerin 1977; Simpson et al. 1996) employs a series of experiments to determine the effects on attitudes. Many such studies continue to assume, despite the weight of critical evidence, that advertising is a linear communication process in which audiences understand and acknowledge messages uniformly and uncritically. In truth, as Bulmer and Buchanan-Oliver (2004: 2) contend:

Different audiences bring different cultural competencies to their readings [of advertising] and not everyone employs the same codes in interpreting communication.

The result is that advertisements are open to a host of alternative interpretations and may exhibit both synchronic and diachronic polysemy. Synchronic polysemy occurs when an advertisement “means one thing to one group of consumers and something different to another”, (Puntoni et al. 2010: 52). Meanwhile, diachronic polysemy
incorporates “a multiplicity of meanings during advertising reception, when advertising polysemy occurs in the same individual — such as on first viewing an ad, or viewing an ad on repeated occasions”. Thus, a more fruitful avenue has been the inclusion of reader response analyses of advertising (Borgerson et al. 2006; O’Donohoe 2000). In Negotiating Masculinities (Patterson and Elliott 2002: 238) I begin to tease out the nature of reader response in this context:

male spectators are unlikely to adhere strictly to the conventions of the male gaze. Rather, such a gaze represents just one of a variety of subject positions which men can adopt ... The suggestion, therefore, is that gender identities are complex and multi-dimensional, and undergo a process of constant negotiation and renegotiation ... For example, a gay male reader may engage in fetishistic scopophilia, recognising images as perfect examples of gay iconography ... and submitting himself to them fully. At other times, the same reader, wishing to retain some semblance of control, may experience narcissistic identification, enjoying the images but using them to his own ends. Still at other times, with the aim of reinforcing his male “rationality”, this reader may pursue a greater degree of voyeuristic detachment and reject the images out of hand.

This work is taken up by later by Elliott and Elliott (2005: 16) who conduct a study of the responses of young men at a British university; they find:

In an attempt to maintain a masculine persona, the respondents in this study rejected or disassociated themselves with images that did not fit masculine traits. By accepting an image that was feminine, they could risk breaking culturally established gender codes and allow suspicions of homosexuality ... The other negative theme that emerged was "gender stereotyping", where male respondents labelled consumption and body consciousness as female traits or female problems ... Several of the respondents evinced a disassociation with muscular body ideals, but they also displayed an association with normal bodies and were very aware of marketing ploys. They seemed to pride themselves on this fad and were quick to voice their independence and ability to resist advertisers’ ‘tricks’.

Yet another fundamental limitation of previous work on the representation of gender identities in advertising is that such representations are generally held to function in the manner of a gender script, actively creating and reinforcing gender identities (Schroeder and Borgerson 1998). This stream of research indicates that those who internalise advertising messages on physical appearance are most likely to report concern for eating (Han 2003), engage in social comparison with the bodies being represented in advertising (Richins 1991; 1995), and, as a consequence, experience negative body images, feelings of insecurity, diminished self-confidence (Grogan and Wainwright 1996), and possible long-term health implications (Martin and Gentry 1997).
Currie (1997) challenges the conceptualisation of advertising as a gender script and suggests that the work it spawns assumes that advertising works almost like a magic bullet, whereby “bad images produce bad attitudes and behaviours” (Walters, 1995: 3, cited in Currie 1997). Currie argues, following Smith (1990), that gender identity is an everyday accomplishment mediated by gender discourses but not determined by them.

I take up these issues primarily in Negotiating Masculinities (Patterson and Elliott 2002). Here, I propose that changes in the social environment are redefining what it means to be a man (Bakewell et al. 2006; Martins et al. 2008). In an effort to open up markets for male grooming and fashion, advertisers are encouraging men to take responsibility for the way they look, to treat their bodies as works in progress requiring the liberatory intervention of marketplace offerings. Borrowing from Negotiating Masculinities (Patterson and Elliott 2002), Östberg (2010: 54) reiterates that contemporary Western culture encourages men:

> to gaze at other men either for pleasure or for anxiety-evoking contrast, and ... changing representations of the male body make men increasingly aware of, and dissatisfied with, bodies that do not meet various cultural ideals.

But the reception of advertising representations by audiences is not uncritical. Following Hall (1980) and Hirschman and Thompson (1997) I suggest that “when the [male] gaze is turned on itself, men are more likely to move through a range of responses such as rejection, identification and desire” (Patterson and Elliott 2002: 241). I acknowledge the ability of advertising to furnish us with polysemic texts, allowing us to adopt multiple subject positions, negotiated and renegotiated over time and in particular social contexts (Östberg 2010; Norman 2011). Such a position underlines the agency of the audience in its relationship with advertising.

This kind of work, like much research on embodiment across the social sciences is driven largely by poststructuralist interests. As a reaction against modernism and Cartesianism, poststructuralism brings the body back into focus. According to (Williams and Bendelow 1998: 135), poststructuralism:
abandon[s] any notion of a core-abiding subjectivity and instead seek to celebrate the corporeal intimacies and affective dimensions of social life.

However, such interests tend to be cerebral, esoteric and ultimately disembodied (Davis 1997). Burkitt (1999: 2) stridently argues:

Discursive constructionism … has difficulties in dealing with human embodiment and also, therefore, with the multi-dimensional way in which we experience reality … we are not just located in the world symbolically; nor do we experience reality purely through the text … embodied persons are not simply constructs, but are productive bodies … communicative bodies … powerful bodies [and] thinking bodies.

Thus, although discursive theories have helped to foreground interest in the body, their ability to adequately deal with embodiment remains limited. This is particularly true in respect of underlining, not just what bodies mean, but what they can do.

4.3. The Agency of Bodies

The body remains our most immediate means of interacting with the world (Lewis 2000). Joy and Sherry (2003) reiterate that while the body has been the object of some investigation in consumer research, much of this work has approached the body wholly as an outcome of social processes. Joy and Sherry (2003) argue that a more comprehensive treatment of the body should incorporate analyses of embodied agency and, in such a move, they mine a rich seam of work within the social sciences. For Hepworth (2004: 125) “embodied agency requires physical competencies of the body through which the self is socially expressed”. Indeed, the body is fundamental to understanding the means by which the subject is agental (McNay 2000). For example, while those who modify their bodies are often considered dupes, submitting to gender discourses (Pollock 1988), they are, in fact, able to operate within body culture in such a way as to maximise their potential (Reischer and Koo 2004).

Perhaps the most comprehensive work in this field has been carried out by Nick Crossley (2004; 2005; 2007) for whom:
‘The body’ is an object in practices of modification. It is reflectively thematised and worked upon. But it is equally a subject or agent in such practices. Embodied agents work upon themselves, upon their own embodiment, in body modification projects. The ‘I’ that is aware of ‘my body’ (qua embodied ‘me’) is my (active and changing) body. Moreover I modify and maintain myself, qua body, by way of bodily activities or ‘reflexive body techniques (2004: 37).

These body techniques are reflexive in that the agent utilises the environment around her for the express purpose of working upon her body. These are techniques of the body and for the body, making use of both bodily effort and embodied competence (Crossley 2005).

My work in this area has focused primarily on the body techniques of heavily tattooed women. In Borderlines (Patterson and Schroeder 2010; see also Larsen et al. 2014) I identify how the body work engaged in by these women sees them inhabit a space that is both within and beyond the confines of normal beauty culture. These women are transgressive in that they seek to establish alternative notions of what is aesthetically pleasing and what is beautiful. According to De Mello (1995: 74):

> Women are working to erase the oppressive marks of a patriarchal society and to replace them with marks of their own choosing which contest patriarchal power.

Tattooing also offers different cultural critiques than some body projects (Sweetman 2013: 354):

> Tattooing and related forms of body modification can be argued to differ from other forms of contemporary body project, their lack of easy revisibility perhaps indicative of a rejection of the ideology of social mobility, which practices such as ‘keep fit’ vigorously pursue (Patterson and Schroeder 2010).

Moreover, I use the body techniques of tattooed women to critique body projects as they are currently framed within consumer research. There is no disembodied mind here calculating the potential exchange value of body modifications. Rather bodies submit themselves to the practice, change from blank canvas to work of art, further invigorate the practice of tattooing and gradually change our understandings of tattooing and feminine beauty (Patterson and Schroeder 2010: 255):

> Tattoos do refigure the body, shifting identity into liminal zones between subject (of the tattoo, of identity) and object (of the gaze, of social stigma).
EPILOGUE

In putting this document together I have collected a series of thoughts, outputs and implications from a body of work that spans 15 years. It is the product not just of my labours, but of those who have collaborated with me along the way. It introduces a number of key themes that signpost the directions I have taken and that situate my work within the extant literature. The published works included here inform each of the contributions I have identified, contributions that range from the theoretical to the methodological. This work has been taken up and valued by my peers within the discipline, but has also crossed disciplinary borders to leave its mark on other disciplines. This impact is evidenced in Appendix 4. Further, my research experiences fuel my teaching by enhancing my understanding of a wide range of disciplinary issues and providing relevant examples of the complex problems facing contemporary consumers and organisations. Thus, my research also helps promote ‘credibility’ and ‘enhanced knowledge currency’ with students (Lindsay et al. 2002).

Within the discipline of marketing and consumer research the published works detailed here serve to promote a critically-informed, and embodied interpretive consumer research. In terms of specific contributions I have outlined three key areas of endeavour, each with three core elements. **Vanishing Point** (O’Malley and Patterson, 1998) offers a thorough critique of the dominant version of marketing founded upon the marketing mix. In so doing it underlines the importance of moving forward with a conception of marketing that is participative, experiential and cognisant of its social role; issues that are taken up in my subsequent work (Patterson and Elliott 2002; Patterson and O’Malley 2006; de Coverly et al., 2008; Patterson and Schroeder 2010). **Interpreting the Past** (Shankar and Patterson 2001) assesses the field of interpretive consumer research, tracing the movement away from post-positivism towards more truly interpretive endeavours. Here, I also champion the use of narrative and rhetorical devices which are to be found elsewhere in my work (O’Malley and Patterson 1998; Patterson and O’Malley 2006; Patterson and Schroeder 2010). In **Negotiating Masculinities** (Patterson and Elliott 2002) I establish the body as a core concern with contemporary consumer culture and problematise the Cartesian
character of traditional consumer research which privileges the consuming mind to the detriment of the body. In *Brands, Consumers & Relationships* (Patterson and O’Malley 2006) I put forward a critique of relational approaches to branding theory, undermining the use of the brand as personality metaphor and the related brand as relational partner metaphor. *Hidden Mountain* (de Coverly et al. 2008) is the first paper within the field to properly theorise our relationship to waste. We submit that our everyday experience of waste is such that we are encouraged to avoid it, to keep waste in its place — out of sight and out of mind. In *Borderlines* (Patterson and Schroeder 2010) I explore the double-sidedness of skin, its ambiguity and ambivalence. As a result of this paper I have been invited onto an international research collaborative working on skin (see [http://www.skinterlocutors.com](http://www.skinterlocutors.com)). Through this lens, I examine the relationship between identity and consumption and throw into question many of the received ideas concerning embodied identity within Consumer Culture Theory.

These works document my growth and development as a researcher. Further, taken together they contribute significantly to the body of knowledge with marketing and consumer research.
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It's mid afternoon and the sun is blazing a trail across the blue sky. You've got the sweet aroma of tar in your nostrils and a sudden hunger to take to the road. Don your shades and sit in your car. Wind the top down, start your engine and come with us on a journey. Our travels will take us past some pretty familiar territory. In particular, we'll pay a visit to that most popular of tourist attractions, the mix management paradigm. But don't worry - you'll also get the chance to go off-road.

Easy Rider

"A man went looking for America and couldn't find it anywhere."
(Ad copy for Easy Rider)

Picture the scene. You're lost in the wilds of Ireland, the map stopped making sense about an hour ago and you haven't seen a signpost in miles. Up the road towards you comes a native and you seize upon the opportunity to ask directions. You inquire about the best route to your chosen destination and you are met by a response that fills your heart with lead: 'Well, I wouldn't start from here'. In writing this paper our better judgement tells us we shouldn't start from here, but this is where we are and so we'll have to make the best of it.

An Indian mystic, M. N. Chatterjee once said - if you don't know where you're going, any road will get you there (Atkinson, 1994). Modern marketing knows where it is going (or believes it does) and takes a dim view of anyone bold enough to challenge the route it has chosen. Despite this, "...the marketing profession still appears to lack influence", (Whittington and Whipp, 1992, p53). Even within the wider academic community it has been noted that we are in the midst of some form of 'mid-life crisis' (Brown, 1995a). Marketing has reached a crossroads (Wilson and McDonald, 1994), and as such, it seems particularly timely and appropriate for us to re-evaluate our goals and achievements. Indeed, one role of the marketing scholar could be that of a cartographer (Kavanagh 1994; Gummesson 1997): re-considering marketing's underpinning paradigms and philosophies; re-charting the marketing landscape; unearthing myths; re-

1 Correspondence: Lisa O'Malley, Cardiff Business School, University of Wales College of Cardiff, Aberconway Building, Colum Road, Cardiff, CF2 3EU. Tel: (01222) 874000, Ext: 5842. e-mail: omalleyl@cardiff.ac.uk

ISSN0267-257X/98/080829+22 $12.00/0 ©Westburn Publishers Ltd.
presenting reality; developing innovative road maps and outlining alternative routes. In this paper we chart the development of and evaluate one of marketing's underpinning paradigms, the mix management paradigm, in an effort to identify our current position and to sketch possible directions for the future. The choice of the mix management paradigm is predicated simply on the fact that we are familiar with it and its limitations; it provides the fuel for our journey.

We utilise the road metaphor, in the guise of road movie\(^2\), to signify the critical journey upon which we as individuals and as members of the marketing Academy must now embark\(^3\). "Theory is a product of displacement, comparison, a certain distance. To theorise one leaves home", (Clifford, 1989, p177). Home is associated with attributes of warmth, safety, comfort and familiarity. In contrast, leaving home, particularly for a long or uncharted journey, connotes danger, excitement, discomfort, insecurity, adventure, discovery and hope. Home represents stasis and fixity; the road - movement, mobility, fluidity and provisionality. "To go on the road is to break out of the patterned routine of everyday life, that’s why it’s liberating", (Eyerman and Löfgren, 1995, p62). The mix management paradigm (4Ps) represents home for many marketers, and the road - the difficult and potentially fruitless journey for an alternative guiding paradigm.

Modern marketing knowledge is not neutral, but is overwhelmingly associated with the values of North American culture (Dholakia et al., 1980). There is a deep resonance here with the road movie. As a film genre, the road movie is quintessentially American and it doesn’t travel particularly well to this side of the Atlantic. Equally, many commentators have called into question the ability of the marketing mix to travel outside the USA (Grönroos 1994; Gummesson 1987; Hakansson 1982).

It may seem that the marketing mix is an easy target, ripe for criticism and condemnation, and that the road's destination is fixed, ending as it will in the victimisation of the mix. However, it is important to remember that "the journey's the thing, and anyone who thinks differently is just wasting gas", (Atkinson, 1994, p16). The victimisation of the mix management paradigm in this paper may be more meaningful in terms of being cathartic and liberating than it is in terms of vilifying the 'model' itself. Furthermore, the journey provides for the possibility of serendipity, the making of chance discoveries both about ourselves and about the phenomenon we call marketing.

\(^2\) One of the reviewers provides a valuable insight here by highlighting Fellini’s observation that "young people don’t make love any more, they make movies". Fellini was discussing, after Eco and Barthes, the loss of the ‘real’, of disappearing origins and innocence and the extraordinary power of visual modes of representation. Although we have not made this connection explicit, the paper does, by accident rather than by design, underline the utility and dynamism of inter-textuality.

\(^3\) There is a parallel literature which draws connections between travel and postmodernism. While this literature was beyond the scope of the present article some readers may find it of interest. In beginning this journey you may wish to consider Brown and Turley. (1997).
Leaving Normal

"I woke up as the sun was reddening; and that was the one distinct time in my life, the strangest moment of all, when I didn’t know who I was - I was far away from home, haunted and tired with travel."

Jack Kerouac (1957) On The Road

Taking to the road represents, in some ways, a rite of passage, a movement from childhood to adulthood, a means of proving ourselves. It is a stepping out from the comfortable embrace of home onto a road laden with ambiguities; escape and arrival, danger and hope. We are shaped by our travels to the extent that we become strangers to ourselves and yet in some sense we find out who we are. In leaving home to learn about life and about the mysterious ‘Other’ we also learn about ourselves (Belk, 1997). Furthermore, the journey affords us the opportunity to explore new versions of ourselves (Eyerman and Löfgren, 1995), protected by the ‘anonymity of the road’.

It is often only in retrospect that the traveller can identify precisely the start of any journey, particularly when that journey is metaphorical rather than literal. For us the preparation for this journey began a long time ago when we chose to study marketing, and more recently when we chose to teach marketing. However, this journey only truly began in 1993. A chance meeting at a marketing conference led not only to a valued friendship, but also to a gradual changing of our world views through being exposed to a more critical perspective on marketing thought. Serendipity also played its part. A job move and the development of new marketing courses meant that both of us needed to read more widely and to consider how to present debates on marketing thought to students. Throughout this process we began to challenge our own positions, thoughts and perspectives, and this was, initially at least, difficult and uncomfortable. Indeed, rather than ‘getting somewhere’ we seemed to be fast losing our way. As the journey continued, however, we began to find the terrain liberating: reaching the end of the road became less of an issue and knowing exactly where we were going became unimportant. Somewhere along the way we seemed to rediscover why we had become marketing academics and, simultaneously, we began to consider what we might do to make the rest of our journey more fruitful.

The journey initially involved taking our students on excursions to marketing ideology, epistemology, the commodification of marketing knowledge, late modernity and postmodernity among other destinations. To our surprise we found that not only were the dominant perspectives in these areas being challenged, but they were in some cases losing ground in the face of growing opposition. Furthermore, our students seemed to find the trips exhilarating and enjoyable. Therefore, it seemed timely for us to formally journey forth, to represent the ideas of colleagues and to expose our own ideas; to leave ‘normal’.

The journey is also a symbol of freedom and escape (Cohen and Taylor, 1992), a breaking away from the monotony of the everyday lives we lead.
However, a total separation from what has gone before is difficult to accomplish. In *Easy Rider*, Wyatt's helmet and bike are emblazoned with the American flag and the journey in search of freedom is financed by the sale of cocaine; the money in the gas tank evidence of the travellers' containment by the capitalist system (Cohan and Hark, 1997). In this paper we fail to wholly relinquish our grip on the language and baggage of modern marketing. Although this represents a criticism of what is to come, it is only to be expected. "Because crossing boundaries is a frightening experience... In order to provide some sense of continuity, bringing or acquiring possessions that symbolise the homeland is a common occurrence" (Belk, 1997, p33).

*Having received directions from the friendly though incomprehensible Irishman, you set off once more in search of civilisation. The best part of an hour along the way you come to a fork in the road. Your spirits are lifted as you notice that here, finally, is a signpost which points to your destination. Alas, there is a second signpost highlighting an alternative route to the same terminus. As you go quietly insane you choose the former route for no other reason than it was the first you happened to notice.*

**Faster Pussycat! Kill! Kill!**

The conception of modern marketing as an applied discipline is also the result of taking a fork in the road, a fact which is often forgotten given that it happened over forty years ago. That is, marketing as a pattern of knowledge did not suddenly emerge in the late 1950s, nor did it simply evolve from earlier production and sales orientated eras (Fullerton 1988; Jones and Monieson 1990). Rather, early marketing thought was conceived as a field of applied economics which might better explain market and distributive forces than could neoclassical economics (Benton 1987; Jones and Monieson 1990). In re-traveling this historical road, there may be opportunities for us, both as individuals and as a discipline to choose the road less travelled, and that, as Robert Frost once said, might make all the difference.

The philosophical position of early marketing scholars was heavily influenced by the historical approach to economics, and as such "they were concerned with and acted in response to pressing social issues rather than reasons of business urgency" (Benton, 1987, p419). Managerial implications were a primarily unintended by-product of this early work, but as the century progressed they became increasingly important. The catalyst for this shift in emphasis can no doubt be attributed to an expansion of large scale enterprise, an increase in the numbers of affluent buyers (Benton, 1987), and widespread employment of marketing techniques in industrialised societies (Fullerton 1988).

Jack Kerouac's best selling novel *On the Road* (1957) effectively "captured the great sense of relief that marked post-war American society and culture, a need to make up for lost time at war, a need to consume, as quickly as possible, all the good things that life had to offer" (Eyerman and Løfgren, 1995, p58). However, in
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realism the economic system was in danger of collapse, and therefore during the 1950s in particular, the prevailing economic dilemma in the USA centred on how to ensure that consumption continued to meet increasing production capacity (Packard, 1957). As a result, there was a great need to formalise marketing, to guarantee that it worked every time. Brown (1996, p254) refers to this as "the abandonment of its intuitive, seat-of-the pants style wisdom, for a more elevated, professional, progressive and suitably scholarly ethos". This, in turn, led to a demand for marketing education (Fullerton, 1988), and as a result, pedagogic considerations began to focus upon "the extension, refinement, and evaluation of marketing as an organisational or management technology rather than on macro level social issues, concerns, and problems" (Benton, 1987, p420). This shift in philosophical position is encapsulated in the mix management paradigm.

Borden (1964) is credited with formalising the study of marketing within a managerial focus, which emphasised the planning, implementation and control of marketing. Borden created the marketing mix based on the earlier ideas of Culliton (1948) who envisaged the marketer as a mixer of ingredients. This approach takes marketing to be a management function, within which the marketer manipulates mix variables in order to satisfy customers and make a profit. The emphasis implicit in the mix management approach is on profit maximisation, as a consequence of the micro-economic paradigm on which it is based (Anderson, 1982). The basic unit of analysis is a transaction in a competitive market, with fully integrated firms controlling virtually all the factors of production (Arndt 1979; Thorelli 1986).

However, Borden's 'concept' was considered too long and unwieldy. Consequently, much as Russ Meyer reduces the complexities of the road movie into its main constituents of sex, violence, money, speed and power (Stringer, 1997), many authors began to develop more succinct re-presentations of key marketing variables that could be more easily remembered and thus applied (Frey 1961; Howard 1957; Lazer and Kelly 1962; McCarthy 1960). Of all the mixes proposed only McCarthy's 4Ps has survived and it has become the authorised route or 'received view' (van Waterschoot and Van den Bulte, 1992).

Despite damning, if intermittent, criticism the marketing mix continues to form the foundation upon which the vast majority of research output and textbooks in marketing are based (van Waterschoot and Van den Bulte, 1992). Proponents of the marketing mix vindicate its hallowed status by underlining its utility for pedagogic purposes and by proclaiming the lack of a viable alternative. However, Brown (1993, p24) states that "the propagation of debatable concepts [in marketing] - even with all the appropriate health warnings and assurances of achievements to come - is counterproductive at best and pernicious at worst". Kuhn (1970) suggests that in times of paradigm crisis such debates are likely to emerge regarding fundamental issues.

Weekend

Despite being the prevailing paradigm in marketing (the mother road), the mix
management approach has attracted much criticism from a theoretical standpoint. Borden's original concept included 12 variables which were not intended to be either a comprehensive or an exhaustive list. Disregarding Borden's acceptance of the limitations of the mix, McCarthy later reduced the mix elements to the more manageable Product, Price, Place and Promotion. "Reduced to 4Ps, the mix gained in elegance and simplicity, but lost its substance and validity", (Gummesson, 1994, p8). Undaunted, McCarthy, Kotler, and others of their ilk, have continued to propound the simplified formula.

Kent (1986) argued that the marketing mix does not amount to either a 'theory' or a 'model' in the usual sense, and indeed it seems that this was never the intention (Borden, 1964). Grönroos (1994) argues that a list cannot be considered a valid way of defining a phenomenon; it never includes all relevant elements, it does not fit every situation, and it becomes obsolete. Furthermore, van Waterschoot and Van den Bulcke (1992) employed Hunt's (1991) criteria for evaluating classification schemata and concluded that the scheme has important theoretical limitations. In particular they propose that the properties that are the basis for classification have not been identified, the categories are not mutually exclusive and, there is a catch-all sub-category that is continually growing (i.e. sales promotions). Thus, it seems that contrary to our assumptions, the mix management paradigm is not sufficiently robust as a basis for academic research. However, we may rest easy in the knowledge that although it lacks theoretically stable foundations it is a viable method of operationalising the marketing concept. Or is it?

The marketing concept is in itself problematic (Houston, 1986) and has been referred to as the 'Achilles' heel of the discipline', (Brownlie and Saren, 1992, p34). Difficulties lie in resolving the 'philosophy' of marketing with the 'function' of marketing. As a philosophy, the marketing concept advocates a customer orientation (Drucker, 1954). However, implementation of the marketing concept provides complications (Piercy, 1992) and there have been strong calls for it to be replaced (Brownlie and Saren 1992; McDonagh and Prothero 1996). Despite the debate surrounding the concept, it remains the underpinning philosophy of marketing. However, one of the fundamental criticisms of the mix management approach is that it is inconsistent with the marketing concept (Dixon and Blois 1983; Grönroos 1994; Gummesson 1987). This may be particularly true in terms of customer orientation, and company-wide integration of effort.

In terms of customer orientation, "the marketing concept ...calls for most of the effort to be spent on discovering the wants of a target audience and then creating goods and services to satisfy them", (Kotler and Zaltman, 1971, p5). However, far from being concerned with a customer's interests, the view implicit in the 4Ps approach implies that the customer is somebody to whom something is done rather than somebody for whom something is done (Dixon and Blois, 1983). The managerial approach to marketing therefore concentrates on the seller, and subordinates the customer to a passive as opposed to a pivotal role (Grönroos, 1994). Rather than the function of marketing being dynamic and market-oriented, it is instead a rather clinical, production oriented approach
It also seems that the formalisation of marketing in terms of four Ps does not augur well for company wide integration of effort. Indeed, Kent (1986) further criticises the managerial approach, on the basis that it emphasises structure over process. This approach to implementing the marketing concept favours the manipulation of a mass market through the tools of the marketing mix (Gummesson, 1987). Because it is a managerial approach, marketing departments were created with full responsibility for the marketing function (Webster, 1992). Such a position is clearly in stark contrast to Drucker’s (1954, p36) statement (from which the marketing concept evolved) that “concern and responsibility for marketing must permeate all areas of the enterprise”.

Within the managerial framework, there is an inherent assumption that the firm is independent of its environment (Anderson and Soderlund, 1988). Thus, the main marketing problems concern the allocation of resources to activities formulated in terms of product, price, place and promotion. Webster (1992) argues that although this view may have been appropriate when firms controlled (or attempted to control) all factors of production and distribution, it is clearly less so today, as firms compete, not as individuals, but as participants in networks of firms (Ford, 1990). The network approach recognises that the firm cannot manipulate its environment but it must work within the constraints set in a broad sense, firms are now less concerned with owning and controlling all sources of supply and distribution than was the case in the 1970s and 1980s (Webster, 1992). We now recognise that flexibility is a key issue for companies, and thus the focus is changed from internal parameter activities to exchange and positioning activities in networks (Ford 1990). The mix management paradigm fails to accommodate this shift in perception.

Because the mix management paradigm views the seller as active and the buyer passive (Grönroos, 1994), and because it assumes markets to be homogeneous, buyers and sellers have generally been studied as separate entities (Ford 1980; Hakansson 1982). On this basis, Arndt (1983) criticised the microeconomic theory underlying the mix management approach for its inability to provide sufficient tools for analysing exchange structures and processes, both within and between organisations. Indeed, “if we limit our attention to the study of single, isolated exchanges we ignore much of the heart of what we call ‘marketing’ “, (Houston and Gassenheimer, 1987, p10). The assumption that markets are homogeneous has also been labelled an unrealistic generalisation (Anderson and Soderlund, 1988). Today many markets are heterogeneous, and thus the formulation of standardised programmes is further complicated in reality (Grönroos, 1994).

One response to overcoming the limitations of the four Ps has been to offer various extended lists (cf. Baumgartner 1991; Booms and Bitner 1981; Collier 1991; Dull et al. 1995; Judd 1987; Kotler 1986; Mindak and Fine 1981; Nickels and Jolson 1976; Renaghan 1981; Vignali and Davies 1994). However, given that almost all additions are forced to begin with the letter P, Gummesson (1994) argues that this traffic jam of reformulations has not contributed significantly to
the development of the paradigm. Indeed, given the nature of some of the proposed additions it is not improbable that words such as propaganda, panacea or even plankton could be added to the list assuming some vague marketing meaning could be attributed to them. In any case, Rafiq et al. (1995) have highlighted the astonishing (and worrying) fact that marketing academics in the UK and Europe consider the 7Ps framework used in services marketing 'too complex'.

**Natural Born Killers**

The American Marketing Association (1988) reminds us that "the academic constituency bears a heavy responsibility for defining and shaping what is known about marketing". Financial and political pressures to remain competitive in the educational marketplace have had, and continue to have, important implications for the way we teach, and increasingly for what we teach. As such, the market mechanism has forced many educators to give the organised tour, to espouse the accepted philosophy, and to only point out to students the tourist attractions which have been sanitised and preserved. Given that the 4P perspective is widely acclaimed in terms of its pedagogic utility, this aspect of its use appears worthy of re-view.

The mix management paradigm almost exclusively dominates marketing education (van Waterschoot and Van den Bulte, 1992). Indeed, Robson and Rowe (1997, p654) describe one of the latest crop of marketing texts as "a collection of vaguely positivistic clichés, carefully wrapped to deliver yet another act of piracy on the four Ps". Given the preceding discussion on the theoretical validity of the paradigm, and further given that criticisms of this approach have already received attention within the academic literature (although this has been limited), this lack of integration into our courses does not auger well for the process of educating our students. The fact remains that the 4Ps is a handy mnemonics, easy to teach and easy to remember. "In marketing education, teaching students to use a toolbox has become a totally dominating task instead of discussing the meaning and consequence of the marketing concept and the process nature of marketing relationships". (Grönroos, 1994, p6).

In looking at marketing courses (modules), publishers will point to an increasing trend toward voluminous, glossy texts replete with transparencies, cases, model answers, exam banks and multi-media support. In this sense, marketing textbooks standardise what we teach. Such texts tend, on the whole, to be far more prescriptive than scholarly, a factor which Holbrook (1995) and Grönroos (1994) attribute to the machinations of the publishing industry. "The role of the mass market - in textbooks, as elsewhere - is to erode, to eviscerate and to emasculate the excellence of whatever it controls". (Holbrook, 1995, p651). Furthermore, given the current pressures to engage in academic research, publication, and consultancy, while consecutively coping with increasing student numbers, the time available for teaching preparation (sleeping, eating and living) continues to dwindle. Thus, it is increasingly difficult to return to first principles,
to up-date lectures, incorporate new research findings, or to correct the pre-packaged, simplified realities espoused by many of the standard texts. One solution to this problem might be to encourage students to make greater use of original articles in their learning, to take to the road themselves. However, the mix management paradigm also thrives on the racing circuits of academic publication, tended to jealously by those paragons of pit lane maintenance, academic reviewers. That is, the review process has also attracted considerable criticism as a vehicle for the dissemination of marketing knowledge (Brown 1995b; Brownlie and Saren 1995; Carson 1995; McDonagh 1995).

The marketing literature tends to reinforce the values of reviewers and editors (McDonagh, 1995) and continues to propagate many of the dominant thoughts, theories, paradigms and epistemologies of the marketing discipline. Thus, even where students and practitioners venture away from the organised tours of the textbooks, marketing discourse retains its public face of fixed grins, and its 'can do' ethos (Brown, 1995a). As a result, marketing students are protected from the perils of marketing debate; they are told that marketing is mechanically sound, that its engine parts are in perfect working order, that these parts can be transplanted so that other sectors can experience the marketing dream. In other words, they are exposed to the propaganda of the marketing phenomenon. Perhaps it is now time that marketing students be allowed to come to their own conclusions, and we as educators, surely have a responsibility to accommodate this.

Wild At Heart

"The importance of a marketing paradigm or method is in the eye of the beholder", (Vink, 1992, p221). However, it is clear that the effectiveness of traditional marketing methods are increasingly being questioned in business boardrooms (Pearson, 1994). Indeed, it has been recognised that "...the ideological resources of marketing are neither exclusive nor credited", (Whittington and Whipp, 1992, p60) and the discipline is in danger of being consigned to the hard shoulder. Therefore, and in a final effort to justify its existence, it seems appropriate to consider the utility of the mix management paradigm in respect of its practical adequacy. Such analysis would also reveal the extent to which we have equipped students with the knowledge they need to survive in the business sector.

As outlined earlier, the functional organisation of marketing has resulted in the creation of marketing departments, and this, according to Gummesson (1991) has largely absolved non-marketing personnel of any responsibility for marketing. This is problematic because non-marketers often interact with the customer far more frequently, and have a greater impact on customers' perceptions of satisfaction than do 'full-time' marketing personnel (Grönroos 1994; Gummesson 1991; Hakansson 1982). As such, Webster (1988) suggested that marketing can no longer be the responsibility of a few specialists. This questions the future of the marketing department (function) as we know it.
Furthermore, personnel within the marketing department have further subdivided areas of responsibility based upon individual products and brands (Kent, 1986). This approach ignores the possibility that a single customer may purchase more than one product/brand, and clearly identifies that the emphasis within the prevailing paradigm is that of a product focus, rather than the customer focus from which it apparently derives its raison d'être.

The mix management framework was formulated within a very specific environment where there existed a large consumer market, and a well-developed infrastructure, which may well have been suited to a standardised approach to marketing (Gronroos, 1994). In services and industrial markets the infrastructure is, more often than not, decidedly different to the mass market environment from which the mix evolved. In industrial markets, buyers are not homogeneous and thus are unsuitable for a standardised approach to marketing (Anderson and Soderlund, 1988). Similarly, services marketers argue that the marketing mix approach is inappropriate because of the unique characteristics of services (Fisk et al., 1993). In particular, the mix offers no guidance in dealing with 'people as evidence' (Shostack, 1977), or in managing the interactive nature of the service encounter (Gummesson, 1987).

The managerial approach to marketing assumes that the firm is a large divisionalised, hierarchical, functional organisation (Webster, 1992). The global competitive environment has changed significantly in 40 years, resulting in a move towards more flexible organisational forms in order to facilitate customers' changing needs and environmental conditions (Webster, 1992). As a result, Badaracco (1991) proposes that the traditional view of the firm having a clear boundary between it and its environment is inappropriate since that boundary has all but disappeared, so drawing suppliers and customers nearer and making them 'partners' in the business process. These new organisational forms emphasise partnerships, multiple types of ownership, team-work, co-operation and sharing (Webster, 1992). The marketing mix paradigm has therefore become too limiting to marketing situations where relationship building is important (Gronroos, 1991), as is the case when firms engage in collaborative alliances, develop and manage supply chains, and out-source key functions.

The mix management paradigm also assumes that the marketer possesses control over the mix variables, whereas in practice this may not be the case (Pierry, 1986). Indeed, some mix variables are "seen less as 'decision' variables but more as variables over which only a degree of control can be exercised", (Kent, 1986, p148). For example, the distribution and product development functions are often beyond the remit of marketing. Similarly, price is not entirely within marketing's domain, while much of the promotion (communication) function is increasingly being undertaken by external specialists.

In the era of postmodernity, consumers reject the planned efforts of marketers. They use products for their own purposes as much in an effort to define themselves in society as for the functional offerings of the products themselves (Bocock 1993; Douglas 1982; Lannon 1995). Postmodernism dictates that products cannot be wholly controlled by the producer as the consumer
becomes actively involved in co-creation (Cova, 1996). Equally, the postmodern tribe is inherently transient and mutable. They defy any attempts to be treated as homogeneous groups. "They exist in no other form but the symbolically and ritually manifested commitment of their members" (Cova, 1996, p19). But this commitment is itself impermanent. "We are moving towards a society without fixed status groups in which the adoption of styles of life (manifest in choice of clothes, leisure activities, consumer goods, bodily dispositions) which are fixed to specific groups have been surpassed", (Featherstone, 1987, p55). Furthermore, in contemporary markets "it is not to brands that consumers will be loyal, but to images and symbols, especially to images and symbols that they produce while they consume", (Firat and Venkatesh, 1995, p251). In Wild At Heart, Sailor Ripley proclaims that his snakeskin jacket symbolises his individuality and his belief in personal freedom.

Increasingly, organisational dominance is being challenged. It seems that "the consumer finds his/her liberatory potential in subverting the market rather than being seduced by it", (Firat and Venkatesh, 1995, p251). The standardised and rigid approach embodied in the mix management paradigm would seem to be ill-suited to such a dynamic and difficult environment.

**Mad Max III: Beyond Thunderdome**

Having undertaken this review, we would tend to agree with Baker (1997, p7) that "in retrospect it is difficult to see how the marketing management model built around McCarthy’s 4 Ps became established as the dominant paradigm". Just like Route 66 its utility has now largely been surpassed. Even in consumer markets the mix management paradigm is now seen to have lost much of its potency (Brady and Davies 1993, The Economist 1994). Marketing requires a radical change of approach and thus, the time has come to travel another road. The consumer "calls for an experienced based marketing that emphasises interactivity, connectivity and creativity", (Cova, 1996, p20). Thus, we must eschew the beguiling but limiting simplistic approaches we currently use, and recognise that consumption is a complex phenomenon. We must come to terms with the fact that our grip on the nature of consumers was never that firm and indeed that consumer society has moved on. We must acknowledge that the consumer is no longer just the recipient of the offering, but instead plays a major role in creating the offering.

"As an applied discipline, academic marketing to a large extent caters to its client market of decision makers in business, and these decision makers are orientated toward marketing better marketing decisions", (Vink, 1992, p222). Although it may possess intuitive appeal, if the marketing mix does not assist practitioners marketers in making better marketing decisions then there seems no logical reason to continue to promote it as a managerial tool. The problem however, is that we the academic community have become institutionalised into only one way of understanding, describing, and dealing with marketing issues. We have been coerced into unidimensional thinking, and consequently we have
been prevented from adopting other, potentially more useful approaches. Ironically, we have been so successful at ‘marketing marketing to non-marketers’ that many other disciplines have also been exposed to, and fallen foul of this ‘great lie’.

Death Race 2000

“Every now and then when your life gets complicated and the weasels start closing in, the only real cure is to load up on heinous chemicals and then drive like a bastard from Hollywood to Las Vegas”.

Hunter S. Thompson (1973) Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas

Given the dramatic changes occurring in the marketing environment, long-term adherence to the current paradigm will leave us bereft of the solid foundations (Baker, 1995) we so dearly covet. In writing this paper we may have propagated the myth that the mix exists, but in attempting to re-present a comprehensive (but nonetheless subjective) critique we as authors acknowledge our reaching the end of this particular road. The marketing mix is a myth. Theoretically, it has no foundations. Pedagogically it no longer serves a useful purpose, and practically it has been surpassed in many instances by more dynamic approaches to marketing. That the myth lives on can no doubt be attributed to circular and self-fulfilling discourses between academics and practitioners (cf. Brownlie, 1997). We propose that the mix has now reached its vanishing point, and we argue that marketing requires a new paradigm. For us as authors remaining on this road is no longer tenable, it takes us nowhere, and the journey is repressive. Similarly, hitting the road with alternative ‘mixes’ offers little hope for us, particularly because this can never hope to embrace the interactive, co-creation, integrative, and dynamic nature of marketing today.

In leaving home we take heart from the fact that something new and exciting might lie beyond the next curve in the road. We also take inspiration from others who have testified to the existence of an exciting landscape out there which is largely untouched by marketing hands. We cannot say that we are charting new territory, though we do attempt in the latter part of this paper to collate the maps, charts, blueprints and sketches of previous travellers. In venturing forth, we recognise that “whatever might be found on the road, it won’t resemble any universal truth, it will elude those explicitly searching for it, and it won’t be easy to tie down and bring home” (Atkinson, 1991, p17). Re-viewing the mix has been easy, it is a well travelled route and we have, for a while at least, been in the driver’s seat. As for the landscape of the future, we are far less certain, but believe that it is likely to contain reference to a genre of marketing that is:

Creative

In postmodern society there is little time for substance, just for image. “The real, for all practical purposes, is, at the level of surface, glossed; everyday
experiences its representation", (Denzin, 1991, p124). Images are exciting and as we are increasingly exposed to them through advertising's omnipresence (Elliott and Ritson, 1997) reality seems to have very much lost its appeal. Like the road, images offer the tantalising opportunity of escape from the drudgery of reality and allow us to regress to childhood dream-worlds thereby freeing the potential of our imaginations (Belk, 1996). In so doing, images offer us hope, "the very essence of human existence", (Kasper, 1994 cited in Belk, 1996). This is what lends them substance. Thus, an emphasis on form and style is necessitated (Brown 1995c; Firat and Shultz 1997) which means that marketing will have to rediscover the creative side it lost as a result of countless scientifically administered stonings and beatings.

The emphasis on form and style places ever more importance on how, as educators and scholars, we might re-present the ideas of others and ourselves. As such, "legitimate areas for inquiry include our assumptions about acceptable compositional forms and textual organisation; assumptions about acceptable styles of written expression and representation in journals and books; and embedded norms regarding presentational practices [wherever] ...we are required to perform our marketing knowledge", (Brownlie and Saren, 1997, p154). Our re-presentations must incorporate an engaging simplicity constructed of sensations, emotions and visions, which entice rather than persuade our audiences and provide them with the repertoire of resources with which to draw their own conclusions. Instead of researchers we become critics, connoisseurs and communicators (Kavanagh, 1994), our journeys become playful and fun rather than serious quests for knowledge, and we delight in travelling new roads, for "transgressing boundaries is a hallmark of creativity", (Zerubavel, 1991, p117).

**Flexible**

Rather than being rigid and uncompromising, contemporary marketing needs to be flexible. "The costs and time-scale of investment in Fordist production have become colossal, while the logic of high output and lower unit costs has been pushed to the point where vast quantities of goods have to be sold with decreasing margins. This has to be accomplished in the context of increasingly saturated consumer markets and of ever faster turnover in fashions, tastes, trends... The response to this situation is reckoned to be 'flexibility' ", (Slater, 1997, p189). Furthermore, as organisations increasingly participate in networks they must accept the need for adaptation which occurs when one network participant alters its processes to accommodate another (Håkansson, 1982). Hallen et al. (1991) suggest that adaptation is a means by which organisations can develop trust and solidify the relationship between them. Complicating the situation even further, postmodern society openly embraces chaos and disorder. Chaos is considered to be the natural state and instability and fluidity are acknowledged and accepted (Firat and Shultz, 1997). Additionally, a distinct lack of commitment to either grand or singular projects and a fragmentation of markets, media and life experiences is in evidence. Consumers are content to adopt many, brief, simultaneous and often incompatible positions before moving
quickly on to the next project. If marketing is to be able to work within a society characterised by such phenomena it will need to be malleable and capable of adapting quickly to changing circumstance.

Experiential

Contemporary consumers exhibit a distinct desire to experience the moment. Furthermore, there is greater pressure than ever for these experiences to be tantalising and exciting. "Whereas people used to talk about the consumption of goods and services, we now tend to talk about product 'experiences'", (Slater, 1997, pp193-194). Hence, marketing must seek to engage consumers, to present them with new and challenging experiences. This places ever more importance on the service element of organisational offerings and as a consequence on what might be labelled 'internal marketing' (Foreman and Money, 1995). In an effort to provide consumers with valuable experiences there is an increasing focus in personnel terms on factors such as commitment, social skills, sincerity and emotional warmth (Hochschild, 1983). Research in marketing will also need to take greater account of the experiential aspect of consumption (Holbrook 1996; Holbrook and Hirschman 1982; O'Donohoe 1996) at the expense of traditional information processing and problem solving approaches.

Open

Postmodernity embodies a situation in which "individuals must, by force of circumstances, choose, construct, maintain, interpret, negotiate, display who they are to be or be seen as, using a bewildering variety of material and symbolic resources", (Slater, 1997, p84). Thus, "there is no fashion: there are only fashions", "no rules only choices" and "everyone can be anyone". (Ewen and Ewen, 1982, pp249-251). This is what van Raaij (1993) refers to as 'pluralism' and Brown (1995c) as 'plurivalence'. The acceptance of a dominant style loses credence and is replaced by the tolerance of many styles. Marketing too will need to be open, tolerant and accepting of difference. Singular approaches must be abandoned in favour of those which recognise the diversity and complexity of contemporary society.

Interactive

Marketing should provide a means through which organisations and consumers can interact in a meaningful way. This is made possible primarily through the initiation of a meaningful dialogue between both parties. Dialogue must enable the consumer to participate actively in the communications process; simply making purchases is not evidence of consumer participation in dialogue (O'Malley et al., 1997). "New media have made interaction possible...and have even turned the dialogue round. The initiative is now with the consumers", (Miles, 1991, p150). However, while the capabilities for interactivity may already exist, there remains little evidence as yet to indicate that marketers are truly embracing the concept.
Participative

In an effort to truly satisfy customers' needs, marketing should allow the consumer to play an active role in creating the offering itself. Marketing, under the mix management paradigm, often leaves the customer unsatisfied. That is, there is a difference between what each customer really wants and what the company is offering. This has been referred to as the 'customer sacrifice gap' (Gilmore and Pine, 1997). Increasingly, it is being recognised that it may be possible (and profitable) to customise products/services to meet the needs of individual consumers. Indeed, this is seen as a major opportunity to add value to the offering. Collaborative customisation (Gilmore and Pine, 1997), refers to situations in which the organisation and the customer work in tandem to design a product truly tailored to the customer's needs. This can be made possible by the interaction and connection between organisations and their customers.

Connective

Dialogue may also help to build bonds between organisations and consumers, to bring them together in a relationship which is mutually beneficial; it connects them. One feature which will be paramount in building such bonds is trust. Trust is seen to be an antecedent of commitment and co-operation, in that when a supplier is trusted, the trustor is more committed to and intends to stay in any relationship which has developed between them (Doney and Cannon 1997; Morgan and Hunt 1994; Anderson and Narus 1990; Dwyer et al., 1987). While there is some controversy as to whether organisations can be the target of trust, as Doney and Cannon (1997) point out, research suggests that people can develop trust in public institutions (Lewis and Weigert 1985) or organisations (Morgan and Hunt, 1994), as well as in individuals. Trust is earned when managers (organisations) treat all stakeholder groups fairly and where they demonstrate 'consistency' and 'openness' over time (Sonnenberg, 1994).

Cognisant of its Social Role and Social Consequences

To maintain legitimacy and to re-create ideological resources we must become cognisant of the social role and consequences of marketing. For much of this century our social role has been represented as serving to encourage consumption and simultaneously legitimise the pursuit of maximum profits by private corporations (Benton, 1987). Ideologically, this position has been pursued on the basis that fidelity to the marketing concept will enhance quality of life and societal welfare. Indeed, Lazer (1969, p5) conceived marketing's social role as overcoming consumer resistance to consumption in order to ensure continued economic growth and expansion: "American consumers still adhere to the many puritanical concepts of consumption, which are relevant in an economy of scarcity, but not in an economy of abundance. Our society faces a task of making consumers accept comfortably a life of relative leisure and luxury...". In this way, marketing activities were seen to enhance consumers' quality of life thereby serving the public interest.
However, this assertion has been undermined. Consumption is not ultimately sustainable, and indeed brings with it distributive inequalities and environmental degradation (cf. Benton 1987; Dixon 1992; Kilbourne et al., 1997). Since marketing aligned itself almost exclusively with the managerial classes in the 1950s, societal issues have been repressed and, have been left to social theorists and macromarketers to consider. Although the latter may seem to be an obvious bridge between managerial and social issues, treatment of macromarketing issues has been either ignored or distorted in marketing texts (Dixon, 1992).

Micromarketers need to re-embrace these substantive issues, not simply for their own sake, nor indeed in any effort to increase consumption of ethical, responsible or environmentally friendly products and services. Rather, we should embrace these issues because the system as we know it is ecologically unsustainable (Kilbourne et al., 1997) and if unchecked will, inevitably, implode. As such, marketing may again have an important social role to play, one which is predicated upon marketers' abilities to discourage consumption for its own sake and so encourage sustainability.

Paris, Texas

"From its beginnings, the road movie was constituted around nostalgia: nostalgia for a sensed loss of freedom or missed opportunity", (Eyerman and Löfgren, 1995, p68). We marketing academics are faced by the harsh reality of missed opportunity. To a large degree we have failed to live up to our early potential. Eschewing Enlightenment ideals, this has been a journey not of progress but of restoration. Much like Wender's Travis, we seek to find ourselves in the past, to rediscover our long forgotten promise.

Fellow travellers, our journey is now at an end and yet it is only just beginning. For us personally, the time has come to leave the safety and fixity of the mix management paradigm and set off in search of a new paradigm, or perhaps, given postmodern conditions of fragmentation and chaos, several new paradigms. In order for our future travels to be productive we as students, practitioners and academics must be willing to embrace change and welcome new ideas with an open mind. In the meantime, we must recognise and make evident the role of critical subjectivity. We are now faced with some difficult choices. As George Hanson (Jack Nicholson) affirms in Easy Rider: "Talking about it and being it, that's two different things. I mean it's hard to be free when you're bought and sold in the marketplace".
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Using the metaphor of Homer’s Odyssey, this paper provides a characterization of the development of interpretive consumer research. Initially this development is shown to have been circumscribed by the machinations of positivism. However, following the disruptive influences of postmodernism/post-structuralism, issues such as methodological pluralism, reflexivity and representation are considered to signify the way forward to an interpretive consumer research with confidence in its axioms.

Exeter University

Nottingham University

Proem

Truths are illusions of which one has forgotten that they are illusions. Nietzsche 1873/1995: 92

Sing to me of the man, Muse³, the man of twists and turns driven time and again off course, once he had plundered the hallowed heights of Troy. Many cities of men he saw and learned their minds, many pains he suffered, heartsick on the open sea, fighting to save his life and bring his comrades home. But he could not save them from disaster, hard as he strove – the recklessness of their own ways destroyed them all, the blind fools, they devoured the cattle of the Sun and the Sungod blotted out the day of their return. Launch out on his story, Muse, daughter of Zeus, start from where you will – sing for our time too. Homer 1: 1-12

¹ Avi Shankar, Department of Management, School of Business and Economics, Exeter University, Exeter, EX4 4PU
² Maurice Patterson, Nottingham University Business School, Jubilee Campus, Wollaton Road, Nottingham, NG8 1BB
³ The Muse, daughter of Zeus and goddess of culture, is summoned at the beginning of the epic poem, because she alone can make known the truth about past events (Jones 1998). Thus, the story acquires the mantle of history.
In this paper we use the metaphor of Homer’s *Odyssey* to trace the journey of Interpretive Consumer Research (ICR) home and our own personal journey as interpretive researchers to maturity. There are two major journeys taken in the *Odyssey*: Telemachus departs Ithaca in order to establish his identity, while Odysseus must return there to do so (Jones 1998). For Telemachus the journey involves a stepping out from the comfortable embrace of home into a world laden with ambiguities; withdrawal and arrival, youth and maturity, danger and hope. Odysseus, however, makes the arduous trek home in order to reclaim his family and kingdom. Our Odyssey is, like Homer’s therefore, both a journey away from and towards home. Our use of Homer’s epic is blatant and not a little ironic. Epic narratives such as this are, after all,agentic (rational and masculine) as opposed to communitarian (emotive, feminine and humanitarian) (McAdams 1993). Furthermore, the epic remains an established style (Jeffcut 1993) that “totalises understanding, creating authority and legitimacy for a certain attempt at providing the truth or a good interpretation” (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000: 169).

We begin with a characterisation of ICR as a prisoner, ensnared in the beguiling embrace of positivism. The story of how ICR came to be in Calypso’s prison is now part of the received wisdom of the discipline and, thus, our intention is not to repeat what has already been articulated in the pages of the *Journal of Consumer Research* (e.g. Arnold and Fischer 1994; Firat and Venkatesh 1995; Hudson and Ozanne 1988; Murray and Ozanne 1991), and various texts (e.g. Brown 1995a). Rather our aim is to recount the nature of ICR’s incarceration on Ogygia and to indicate how, provided Hermes turns up, the remainder of the journey to Ithaca might progress. In so doing, our critique will utilize the theme of intellectual hegemony. The dominant position within consumer research has been, and still is, occupied by positivism and its variants. However, this position has been questioned consistently within consumer research since the mid 1980s (e.g. Anderson.

---

4 For those of you who were fortunate (some may suggest unfortunate) to have benefited from a classical education, you will recall that Homer’s *Odyssey* recounts Odysseus’ heroic return to Ithaca from the Trojan wars. Odysseus makes the arduous journey home via Ismarus, the Land of the Lotus Eaters, Polyphemus’ cave, Aeaea, the homes of the Laestryonians and the Cimmerians, Thrinacia and finally washes ashore on Ogygia, the island of Calypso. Trapped for seven years in Calypso’s prison (and, of course, in a sexual affair), Odysseus is eventually freed by Hermes and, in disguise, travels home. The first journey in the *Odyssey*, however, is undertaken by Telemachus, Odysseus’ son, a journey which begins a process of maturation from well-meaning, naïve boy, to a confident, competent figure of authority. Interestingly, when we first see Odysseus he is weeping on the beach at Ogygia, displaying emotions somewhat alien to a heroic figure. In the *Odyssey*, the Gods represent spiritual guides, although they sometimes support and sometimes thwart the efforts of the hero.
We have subsequently experienced a period of negotiation between dominant (positivistic) and oppositional (interpretive) forces. We now appear to be in a position whereby the dominant forces have ‘negotiated away’ some of their dominance whilst ultimately maintaining the status quo. This is not unusual, for hegemonic discourses are not static constructions and they change in order to recuperate their ideology by making it more adaptable to contemporary conditions and, thus, more able to accommodate counter-hegemonic discourses. In other words, while Calypso\(^5\) appears to have fallen in love with interpretive consumer research, positivism is still the order of the day on Ogygia.

A resultant of the prevailing hegemony, outlined above, forms the basis for the next theme in our critique: the idea of an axiom as an undemonstrated or indemonstrable “basic belief” (Lincoln and Guba 1985: 33). Axioms\(^6\) are consistent with Kuhnian paradigms and represent the beliefs of the community of researchers who operate within any given paradigm (Anderson 1983). Guba and Lincoln (1998) defined a paradigm as:

...a set of basic beliefs...it defines for its holder the nature of the ‘world’, the individual’s place in it and the range of possible relationships to that world and its parts. The beliefs are basic in the sense that they must be accepted simply on faith; there is no way to establish their ultimate truthfulness. If there were, philosophical debates...would have been resolved millennia ago.

It is our assertion that the early vanguard of interpretive consumer researchers did not fully accept, or (as is more likely) were not allowed to fully accept, their epistemological beliefs as axiomatic. The primary manifestation of this, we believe, lies in how they subsequently sought to validate their insights. However, as we hope to show, as the interpretive agenda gathered pace these issues began to be debated and partially resolved. Table 1 outlines the basic beliefs of the interpretive and positivistic approaches to consumer research.

---

\(^5\) Calypso, from kaluptō, is associated with concealment. At various times in the Odyssey Odysseus is forced to conceal his true identity. The arguments being put forward here suggest that ICR too has had to conceal its true identity.

\(^6\) The prevailing axiom with Homer’s Odyssey is that of xenia, a bond of solidarity manifesting itself, interestingly, in the exchange of goods and services between strangers (Jones 1998: vii).
Table 1: Assumptions of the Interpretive and Positivist Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Interpretive</th>
<th>Positivist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontological</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of reality</td>
<td>Socially constructed</td>
<td>Objective, tangible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holistic</td>
<td>Fragmentable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td>Divisible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of social</td>
<td>Voluntaristic</td>
<td>Deterministic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beings</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Axiological</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overriding goal</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemological</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge generated</td>
<td>Idiographic</td>
<td>Nomothetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time-bound</td>
<td>Time-free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-dependent</td>
<td>Context-independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of causality</td>
<td>Multiple, simultaneous shaping</td>
<td>Real causes exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research relationship</td>
<td>Interactive, co-operative</td>
<td>Dualism, separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No privileged point of observation</td>
<td>Privileged point of observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hudson and Ozanne (1988: 509)

Ogygia: A (Hi)story

In the nights, true, he’d sleep with her in the arching cave – he had no choice – unwilling lover alongside lover all too willing...But all his days he’d sit on the rocks and beaches, wrenching his heart with sobs and groans and anguish, gazing out over the barren sea through blinding tears. Homer 5: 170-175

During the early 1980s consumption was re-conceptualized by interpretivist researchers as a tripartite concept that involved acquisition, usage and disposal. There was a concomitant transformation in the guiding metaphor, from consumers as information processors to consumers as emotional pleasure seekers (Holbrook and Hirschman 1982; Holbrook 1995). Alongside this revised conceptual understanding, methodological breakthroughs occurred, exemplified, interestingly enough, by the seminal contributions of a group of American researchers on the Consumer Behavior Odyssey (e.g. Belk et al. 1989; Belk et al. 1988). Using Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) text, Naturalistic
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Inquiry, they traveled the highways and byways of America, immersing themselves in the field, exploring the mundane and everyday. Given consumer research’s ancestral heritage in the social sciences, and the interpretive turn that the social sciences had experienced (Rabinow and Sullivan 1979), Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) tome provided much of the theoretical rationale required for these consumer researchers to pursue their work. We will call this phase in the development of interpretive consumer research, ICR1. ICR1 advocated the following: naturalistic ethnographic inquiry methods, emergent designs, multiple sites, purposive sampling, cross-context testing for transferability, depth and intimacy in interviewing, triangulation of data across researchers and data collection media, and triangulation of interpretation across researchers (Belk et al. 1989). The main problem associated with ICR1 is the way that these researchers and those that followed them (e.g. Hill 1991) legitimated their insights as valid knowledge (Holt 1991). Holt’s (1991) criticisms, which we believe are attributable to the intellectual hegemony of positivism, focus on “two main issues”. First, those working within ICR1 implemented, in a modified form, Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) four parallel criteria for assessing the ‘trustworthiness’ of qualitative research. These criteria are parallel because they are the qualitative version of quantitative criteria: internal validity is replaced by credibility (do our interpretations agree with the subject’s?), external validity with transferability (can we generalize our interpretation?), reliability with dependability (given that the measurement instrument is a researcher, are interpretations consistent?) and objectivity with confirmability (are data grounded interpretations free of bias?).

Epistemologically, therefore, these interpretivists had not accepted their assumptions as axiomatic, and were thus engaged in “an attempt to merge interpretive consumer research with positivist criteria” (Holt 1991: 59). Second, the consequence of this, methodologically, was the emergence of the belief that so long as researchers were rigorous in their methods (for example, by using member checks, triangulation, cross-context testing etc.) the results of their research would be trustworthy, and, the chances of it being accepted for publication in positivistic dominated journals like the Journal of Consumer Research were likely to be improved (Holt 1991). We would also add that methodological rigour is a key feature of positivism and its variants and, therefore, it is hardly surprising that positivistic editors sought methodological rigour in any potential interpretive usurper. Researchers in the positivistic tradition, however, have already accepted as axiomatic their philosophical positions. Debate about what constitutes ‘good’ research is

7 The journey of the Consumer Behaviour Odyssians, although not a true Odyssey in the Homeric sense, does exhibit some parallels with the Greek epic in that Homer’s work also celebrated the ordinary and the everyday (Jones 1998).
thereby reduced to methodological issues (sampling accuracy, reliability and validity of measures, etc.). Moreover, as Anderson (1983, 1986) has pointed out, the knowledge claims of researchers in the positivistic tradition in no way guarantees them any privileged access to ‘the truth’, even if we believed that such a thing called ‘the truth’ existed.

A logical consequence of the pioneering work of researchers in the tradition of ICR\textsubscript{1} was the emergence of ICR\textsubscript{2}. This next phase in the development of interpretive consumer research saw the emergence of work characterised by an emphasis on philosophy rather than method; that is, conceptual work focusing on the explication of the ontology and epistemology of interpretive consumer research rather than empirical work. Such work includes: the critical relativism of Anderson (1986); an introduction to hermeneutics from Arnold and Fisher (1994); Hirschman’s (1986) elaboration of humanistic inquiry for marketing research; Hirschman and Holbrook’s (1992) attempt to describe the richness of different interpretive perspectives; a general introduction to interpretive consumer research by Hudson and Ozanne (1988); the implications of Critical Theory for consumer research by Murray and Ozanne (1991); the linguistic turn in the social sciences and its implications for marketing research by O’Shaughnessy and Holbrook (1988), and; the existential-phenomenology of Thompson et al. (1990). By and large and to varying degrees, all these researchers share the common, basic beliefs outlined in Table 1. However, although undeniably advancing the interpretive cause, we suggest that one side effect of this explosion in interpretive philosophy was to undermine the credibility of positivistic consumer research (Brown 1995). So, contrary to Holbrook and Hirschman’s (1982: 139) conciliatory call, rather than ‘enriching’ they were, in fact, ‘supplanting’ positivistic consumer research. As Anderson (1983, 1986) has eloquently argued, the philosophical position of positivism in consumer research is unsustainable given the insights that scholars of the philosophy of social science had been suggesting for decades. Moreover, given that in positivism there is essentially only one ontological position and one epistemological position, ICR\textsubscript{2}, with all its variants, ontologically and epistemologically, must have indeed been a significant disturbance. We suggest that this fact in some way diluted the credibility of interpretive work in the eyes of those in charge of the dissemination of new ideas. For those in charge of the dissemination of consumer research to a wider public (editors of journals who were mostly positivists), ICR\textsubscript{1} was acceptable because in a sense it was quasi-positivistic. ICR\textsubscript{2} and the work that stems from it, however, elevated academic discourse from methodology to the other paradigmal questions of ontology and epistemology and severely threatened the philosophical beliefs of positivists. We subsequently witnessed a ‘spirited debate’ (Hunt 1991) between its proponents and opponents (e.g. Anderson
Interpreting the Past, Writing the Future

1986; Calder and Tybout 1987; Hunt 1991), a negotiation between dominant and oppositional forces played out in the pages of the *Journal of Consumer Research*. By the mid-1990s, we had, in effect, moved from one way of doing consumer research (positivism) to two ways (positivism + ICR₁) and on to multiple ways (positivism + ICR₁ + ICR₂). Interpretive consumer research no longer had to justify its insights in relation to positivism; rather, it had to do so in relation to other forms of interpretive research. We had reached a position whereby we had ‘competing paradigms’ (Guba and Lincoln 1998) within interpretive consumer research. Furthermore, whilst the philosophical underpinnings of ICR were being advanced, concurrent empirical work was appearing, which we shall label ICR₃.

ICR₃ is characterized, broadly speaking, by two types of work. First, we have work that advances ICR₂ empirically, whilst recognizing the important aspects of ICR₁. Good examples include the numerous ethnographies that have appeared in the *Journal of Consumer Research*. These early ethnographies, including those overtly using the methods of ICR₁, were essentially realist in nature. That is, they implicitly claimed to faithfully represent the reality, as evidenced by their use of member checking (Holt 1991). Examples include Hill’s (1991) ethnographic study of the homeless people’s possessions, Celsi et al.’s (1993) exploration of skydiving and Arnould and Price’s (1993) white-water rafting. Interestingly, Hill (1991: 300) acknowledges that his method “in no way ensure[s] valid results”, yet he still goes on to deploy it without further discussing why this may be the case. By the time we get to Schouten and McAlexander’s (1995) exemplary ethnography of New Bikers epistemological issues did not even warrant a mention. In other words, the methodology had been fully accepted. This raises a potentially important point. No methodology is perfect; what matters are the insights that may be gained. Other ethnographies appealed more to Geertz’s (1973) interpretive anthropology that drew on hermeneutical and phenomenological interpretive perspectives (Guba and Lincoln 1998) and Critical Theory. Peñaloza’s (1994) study of Mexican immigrants is an example of this type of study in which a specific concern is to address the relationship between the researcher and the researched.

Second, we have the work that advances ICR₂ empirically but is less naturalistic or ethnographic in its outlook, exemplified by the considerable output of Craig Thompson. Drawing primarily on existential-phenomenology and the phenomenological interview, and subsequent interpretation using hermeneutics, Thompson and his collaborators have done much to advance the cause of ICR₃ (e.g. Thompson et al. 1990; Thompson et al. 1994).
Hermes

You are our messenger, Hermes, sent on all our missions. Announce to the nymph with lovely braids our fixed decree: Odysseus journeys home – the exile must return.

Homer 5: 33-35

More recently, the insights derived from ICR$_2$ and ICR$_3$ have been challenged by the emergence of postmodernism and post-structuralism (e.g. Firtat and Venkatesh 1995; Brown 1995a), contributions that have set interpretive consumer research free to journey once more to Ithaca - ICR$_4$. Although American academics tended to treat these two 'posts' as part of interpretive consumer research, the undisputed and prolific postmodern provocateur par excellence, Steven Brown, clearly discriminates between interpretive and postmodern/post-structural perspectives (Brown 1995a, 1995b). He suggests that interpretive consumer researchers may have appropriated the postmodern banner as a means to enhance their intellectual credibility.

Both interpretive and postmodern perspectives share a contra-scientific agenda in eschewing a realist ontology in favour of one that is relativistic. As Brown (1995a: 142-143) comments, relativism contends that:

although an external world may exist ‘out there’, it is impossible to access this world independently of human sensations, perceptions and interpretations. Hence, ‘reality’ is not objective and external to the observer but socially constructed and given meaning by human actors. What counts as knowledge about this world is relative to different times, contexts and research communities. Relativism holds that there are no universal standards for judging knowledge claims...

Interpretive and postmodern perspectives differ, however, in that epistemologically interpretive consumer researchers are still essentially realists whereas postmodernists are relativists. That is, we interpretivists believe we can access knowledge of a perceived world (through interviewing,

---

8 Hermes, the messenger, carries with him the staff, which he uses to herd the dead along and which has the ability to put people to sleep (Jones 1998). Some would argue that postmodern theory also possesses these peculiar abilities.

9 Hermes is the boundary god, the god of liminal spaces, “of transitions from one place to another and of exchanges and transfers (so, god of herdsmen, thieves, and later, traders)”, (Jones 1998: 49). Postmodern theory is also liminal in that it marks a major departure in the approaches of many disciplines. Of course, while many continue to struggle with the enigma that is postmodernism, postmodernists themselves contend that the debate is over, it was a necessary evil, and we should all now write differently (Calás and Smircich 1999).
ethnography etc.), whereas postmodernists argue that this is impossible because they question the very existence of a free thinking subject in the first place (Brown 1995a, 1995b). Rather postmodernists, and especially post-structuralists (e.g. Elliott and Ritson 1997), suggest that the ‘subject’ is created by and through language and thus any knowledge they have of the world is “unreliable, dispersed, fragmented, pre-existing and an epiphenomenon of language” (Brown 1995a: 172). The disappearance of the ‘subject’ has profound implications for any researcher attempting to carry out empirical work. Indeed a major criticism of postmodernism is its anti-empirical stance, but postmodernism is more of a cultural critique than a set of research procedures.

Thus far, we have treated postmodernism and post-structuralism as the same thing, although Elliott and Ritson (1997) suggest they are not. They point out that post-structuralism attempts to provide a systematic means by which to empirically examine cultural phenomenon that have material as well as symbolic importance, and point to the methodologies of critical ethnography and discourse analysis as examples. In Table 2, we attempt to summarize the key implications of each of the phases that we have outlined.

**To Phaeacia**

No need, my unlucky one, to grieve here any longer, no, don’t waste your life away. Now I am willing, heart and soul, to send you off at last.

Homer (5: 177-179)

From the brief (hi)story that we have presented, a number of themes emerge, drawn primarily from the liminal space created by postmodern/post-structural thought, that we will use as signposts to guide us on our future journey to Ithaca. These themes include methodological pluralism, the relationship between the researcher and the research, and the representation of research texts. We suggest that these themes are the inevitable consequence of accepting our paradigmatic positions as axiomatic. We intend to devote the rest of this paper to a discussion of the last two of these themes, but before we do so, a word on methodological pluralism.

---

10 After Hermes has left Ogygia, Calypso makes one last effort to hold onto her man. Promising immortality and agelessness, things the gods do not give away lightly, she hopes that Odysseus will remain. But our hero longs for home and eventually sets sail in a makeshift craft. Alas, its not all plain sailing from here and Odysseus is washed ashore on Phaeacia, naked as the day he was born, and forced in the short-term to conceal his identity once more.
Table 2: An Interpretation of the Development of Interpretive Consumer Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Possible limitations</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICR₁</td>
<td>Naturalistic Inquiry Ethnography</td>
<td>Quasi-positivistic, trustworthiness criteria.</td>
<td>Keep methodological focus on naturalistic inquiry, emergent design and purposive sampling. Rethink assessment criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR₂</td>
<td>Philosophical Agenda - Relativism</td>
<td>Competing paradigms</td>
<td>Accept a relativistic position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermeneutics</td>
<td>Which paradigm?</td>
<td>How is reality constructed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistically, individually, socially? Maybe all three?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phenomenology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR₃</td>
<td>Empirical Contexts Interpretive</td>
<td>Researcher as story teller</td>
<td>Methodological pluralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ethnographies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phenomenological interviewing</td>
<td>Non-naturalistic settings Individualistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermeneutic circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liminal</td>
<td>Postmodern</td>
<td>Anti-empirical therefore little empirical support.</td>
<td>Linguistic construction of reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>Perspectives</td>
<td>Axiological implications.</td>
<td>There is no truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contra-scientific, Relativistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-historical construction of reality through language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-structural perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple competing claims to the truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>language/discourse, power/ideology,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conflict/resistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR₄</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In upholding a relativistic ontology and constructivist epistemology, methodologically the only tenable position is to concurrently accept methodological pluralism. If we accept that there is no privileged access to a truth then methodological pluralism will enable us to access multiple and
possibly competing claims to that truth.\footnote{There are also competing claims to truth represented in the \textit{Odyssey}. The tales of Circe, the Sirens and the Sun God, for example, borrow more than heavily from the travails of Jason and the Argonauts (Jones 1998). Thus, is Jason the ‘real’ hero of these stories or is it Odysseus, and is Odysseus claiming these tales as his own in order to impress the Phaeacians?} Multiple ways of collecting data, regardless of whether the data is collected ethnographically or by phenomenological interviewing, for example, will enable us to build up multiple and possibly more holistic representations of the consumption experiences of our participants and collaborators.

By drawing on the work of Rosenau (1992), it is possible to suggest a form of ‘affirmative postmodernism’, which abstracts ideas from postmodern theory, without slavishly suggesting that there is no truth. Rather, we reject “the notion of a universal truth, [but] accept the possibility of specific local, personal and community forms of truth” (Kvale 1995: 21). Ultimately, all we can hope to achieve are “microhistories - local always provisory and limited stories” (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000: 148). To borrow from Geertz (1973), the researcher becomes a storyteller. However, we must be mindful and sensitive to the issue that as interpretive researchers all we are able to offer is an interpretation not the interpretation. Never is there only one story. Multiple meanings, for example, are inherent in post-structuralism and we agree with Barthes’ (1977) description of language’s inevitable ‘overflows, leaks, skids, shifts, slips’. What we represent is, therefore, only ever our interpretation. As Alvesson and Sköldberg (2000: 5) comment:

Consideration of the fundamental importance of interpretation means that an assumption of a simple mirroring thesis of the relationship between ‘reality’ or ‘empirical facts’ and research results (text) has to be rejected. Interpretation comes to the forefront of the research work. This calls for the utmost awareness of the theoretical assumptions, the importance of language and pre-understanding, all of which constitute major determinants of interpretation.

**Telemachus\footnote{Odysseus represents a behavioural ideal to which Telemachus must aspire and which he must accomplish for himself. Certainly, as authors, we have aspirations to reach the dizzy heights of ICR’s key protagonists. Whether we can actually live up to these aspirations remains a matter for debate.}**

But I’ll be lord of my own house and servants; all that King Odysseus won for me by force.

\begin{flushright}
Homer 1: 455-456
\end{flushright}
In addition to the ‘standpoint reflexivity’ (Denzin 1997), or sensitivity to the social construction of reality, outlined in the previous section, as interpretivist researchers we are also engaged in ‘subjectivist reflexivity’: positioning our selves in our research texts (see O’Malley and Patterson 1998), using our experiences as topics for inquiry (see Shankar 2000), and acknowledging that writing is simply a means to staging truth effects. Naturally, such activities have long been criticized for amounting to little more than narcissism or scholarly masturbation. However, such a challenge conceals the false distinction drawn between our personal and scientific selves, selves that are irrevocably intertwined (Bruner 1993; Denzin 1997). As Morgan (1998: 657) indicates:

While we are encouraged to make distinctions between scholarly activity and ‘real life’, in practice this is not a distinction that holds up to close examination. [Reflexive writings]… present a…vision of the world within which distinctions between the public and the private or between the scholarly and the personal become blurred if not entirely obliterated.

Nonetheless, reflexivity must be undertaken with care for it can degenerate into self-indulgence. For Ruby (1980: 155):

To be reflexive is not only to be self-conscious, but to be sufficiently self-conscious to know what aspects of self it is necessary to reveal to an audience so that they are able to understand the process employed, as well as the resultant product, and to know that the revelation itself is purposive, intentional, and not merely narcissistic or accidentally revealing.

Thus, although reflexivity continues to be viewed as relatively controversial, it does maintain the possibility for providing rich insights and fostering “a sensitisation that takes advantage of one’s dual consumer-researcher role”, (Gould 1995: 721). We believe that the onus is on us as researchers to develop these reflective skills and build them into the interpretive process. Pre-understanding (Vorverständis), the presuppositions, experiences and interests which we as interpretivists bring to the process of understanding, assumes greater importance, and (self) reflexivity becomes increasingly fundamental in sensitizing ourselves to our pre-understandings. This suggests to us that before we can ever hope to understand others, we first must understand ourselves. As Denzin (1989: 12) suggested, “interpretive research begins and ends with the biography and self of the researcher”.

As we have argued, one way in which this reflexivity can manifest itself is in the ‘authorial stance’ adopted (Stern 1998a; Wallendorf and Brucks 1993),
and this is the subject of the final section. Of course it would be self-defeating to ‘reason’ for the explicit inclusion of the author in the text without actually following the argument through to its ‘logical’ conclusion. Like Telemachus before us, we remain very much naïve youngsters setting out on a journey of discovery and hope, leaving behind the relative security of our Ithacan home to return there in maturity. Our initial contact with the outside world has led us to the belated observation that we have been socialized into an implicitly positivistic worldview, beguiled by Calypso’s comforting charms. Moreover, the brash fearlessness of youth allows us to criticize the contributions of our intellectual forebears, and to square our shoulders and glare at the world, convinced of the inevitability of our project. Time will, no doubt, judge our confidence to have been misplaced, but in the meantime we journey forth, eager to converse and debate with the hero(ines) of our discipline.

Demodocus

The herald returned and placed the vibrant lyre now in Demodocus’ hands, and the bard moved toward the centre, flanked by boys in the flush of youth, skilled dancers who stamped the ground with marvellous pulsing steps as Odysseus gazed at their flying, flashing feet, his heart aglow with wonder.

Homer 8: 295-299

Taking interpretivism’s assumptions as axiomatic brings to the fore issues of representation, the linguistic turn and narrative approaches to knowledge. Consumer research is not alone in addressing these themes as evidenced by recent contributions in sociology (Atkinson 1992; Bruner 1988, 1991; Lash 1990), cultural anthropology (Clifford and Marcus 1986; Geertz 1988; Marcus and Fischer 1986), organization studies (Alvesson and Kärreman 2000; Czarniawska 1998; De Cock 2000; Jeffcut 1993; Van Maanen 1988, 1995), and economics (McCloskey 1994). What the work of these authors suggests is that the process of writing, styles of representation and narrative strategies are certainly important if not the central components of academic papers (De Cock 2000), for it is these components that we use to stage credible truth effects (Alvesson and Kärreman 2000). To paraphrase Calás and Smircich

13 Believed to be a representation of Homer himself and thus the source of theories on Homer’s blindness, Demodocus is the blind singer of epic poems on Phaeacia and provides both entertainment and, with the help of the Muse, objective proof of Odysseus’ heroic standing.

14 Homer too is a master of representation. The Odyssey begins in medias res. Rather than opening the story with the culmination of the Trojan War, Homer begins midway through Odysseus’ journey. Odysseus describes the intervening years in the
(1999: 652), for us as interpretive researchers “...[t]he issue becomes how to articulate the operations of [positivistic] knowledge without being caught in unreflective representational webs that hint of [positivism]”’’. Alas, many of us continue to devote most of our energies to data collection rather than to how those data are represented (Stern 1998a). Indeed, even papers dealing with issues of representation adhere closely to the ‘canonical style’. The result is a body of work that often operates not to engage our audiences but to exclude them through a process of mystification (Morgan 1998): by elevating method over substance; by treating models and theories, rather than the phenomena they are trying to describe, as objects of wonder, and; by using esoteric and convoluted language.

As interpretivists we must accept that there is no aboriginal reality to which consumer research refers and thus, “the representation of reality should be seen to be less and other than the reality to which it refers”’, (De Cock 2000: 603). We should also strive to represent our work in such a way that it stands in opposition to the hegemonic discourse of positivism/logical empiricism. Our aim then is an edifying discourse (Rorty 1980), which, in decentring authors (Putnam 1996) and being strange and unusual, serves to make reading an interesting, satisfying and co-creational pursuit. Readers are, after all, central to this whole concern given that it is they who bring meaning to our work. As Stern (2000: 63) indicates: “The meaning of the text is conceptualized as a function of the interpretive strategies used by the reader”. The notion of multiple subject positions points to active consumption of texts such that readers need not necessarily take on board our intended meanings as authors. The polysemic nature of language dictates that readers may interpret texts in a whole host of ways: conventional readings, negotiated readings and oppositional readings (Hall 1980). “What makes one take up a position in a certain discourse rather than another is an ‘investment’...something between an emotional commitment and a vested interest, in the relative power (satisfaction, reward, pay-off) which that position promises (but does not necessarily fulfill)”, (De Lauretis 1987:16). Hollway (1984) argues, through a reconceptualization of Foucault, that power is the motivating factor in encouraging people to make investments, although that motivation may be unconscious or irrational. It is through such means, therefore, that hegemonic discourses maintain their dominance in the long term.

As De Cock (2000) acknowledges, these arguments provide mounting fabulous stories told to the Phaeacians later in the epic. This allows the poet to achieve several things: he can immediately engage the interest of an audience already familiar with the plot; provide narrative space for a long and evocative flashback later in the text, and; quickly provide a description of the changes that have taken place since the end of the war.
support for the assertion that academics persuade their audiences primarily through the utilization of specific narrative forms; the epic, of course, being one of the most popular. On this basis there is no real distinction between positivist and interpretivist accounts, between science and fiction, for we are all in the business of fashioning persuasive accounts, accounts which are necessarily artistic constructions (Van Maanen 1995). Third-person realist narratives, therefore, simply constitute a literary style with which many of us are comfortable (De Cock 2000), and which provides the illusion that we are presenting objective accounts of the facts (Alvesson and Kärreman 2000; Barry and Elmes 1997a; Kilduff and Mehra 1997). As Barry and Elmes (1997b: 843) forcefully outline:

The classical scientific reporting style is safe because of its familiarity and predictability - it’s everywhere, a kind of linguistic McDonalds that lets us guess the burger’s shape and makeup most every time. By following this ‘canonical style’, we implicitly affirm our allegiance to the Church of Science, thereby increasing our chances of acceptance (if not redemption). It cajoles us into thinking that our research is ‘pure’, uncontaminated by our personal histories. And we can publicly poke away at one another without risking defamation, accusations of sentimental posturing, or anecdotal obfuscation.

More fundamentally, “our claims to knowledge are situated”, (Sherry 2000: 277). We are embedded in a social context (Calás and Smircich 1999) such that our writing is contextual, rhetorical, institutional, political and historical (Clifford 1986). As authors, therefore, we can no longer assert ignorance or innocence of the rhetorical influence of our writings (Czarniawska 1998). Our papers represent only a minority of voices; principally our own and to an extent those of the legions contained in our bibliographies. Our research should seek to overcome these difficulties by challenging the dominance of the authorial voice15 (Barry and Elmes 1997; Stern 1998b) and by offering multiple representations of the key research themes. Our aim should be polyphonic texts (Bakhtin 1984), which place the researcher explicitly in the text, in dialogical authorship with her or his subjects (Barry and Elmes 1997a; Bruner 1993). In helping us along the way, Alvesson and Kärreman (2000) provide a classification of research approaches which are sensitive to the linguistic turn and which differ in terms of their views on the issue of

15 Personally, we tend to disagree with our alter egos, the transparent author, on this point. As distanced, rational, objective authors we honestly believe that the task of authorship is difficult enough, hampered as it is by reviewers, editors and the like. Challenging our dominance in the one area where we do hold some control smacks of shooting oneself in the foot.
representation, the central issue in their research, and in terms of the researcher’s primary task (Table 3).

### Table 3: Research Approaches Sensitive to the Linguistic Turn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grounded Fictionalism</th>
<th>Metaphoric Data Construction</th>
<th>Literary Data Construction</th>
<th>Discursive Pragmatism</th>
<th>Discursivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View on Representation</td>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>Sceptical</td>
<td>Sceptical</td>
<td>Sceptical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imperfectly Possible through</td>
<td>Imperfectly Possible through</td>
<td>Imperfectly Possible within</td>
<td>Text Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figurative Means</td>
<td>Narrative Techniques</td>
<td>Carefully Constructed Areas</td>
<td>Discourse-Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Issue in Research</td>
<td>Deconstruction</td>
<td>Metaphors</td>
<td>Writing Style Text</td>
<td>Discursive Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imaginative Speculation</td>
<td>Production of Persuasive Accounts</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher’s Critique</td>
<td>Construction of New Theoretical Ideas</td>
<td>Imaginative Interpretations</td>
<td>Reconstructing Vocabularies-Settings Relations</td>
<td>Vocabularies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Task</td>
<td>Construction of New Theoretical Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher’s Primary Task</td>
<td>Construction of New Theoretical Ideas</td>
<td>Imaginative Interpretations</td>
<td>Reconstructing Vocabularies-Settings Relations</td>
<td>Vocabularies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Theoretical Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted From Alvesson and Kärreman (2000: 144)

### To Ithaca?

Royal son of Laertes, Odysseus, master of exploits, hold back now! Call a halt to the great leveler, War – don’t court the rage of Zeus who rules the world!

Homer 24: 595-597

In this paper we have constructed an interpretation of the travails of interpretive consumer research. This story depicts the movement of interpretive consumer research from its quasi-positivistic roots to the mythical kingdom that is ICR. Along the way we have recognized the importance of postmodernism/post-structuralism in effecting a schism between ICR and positivism, and alluded to the possibilities afforded by the adoption of methodological pluralism, reflexivity and a focus on representation. We hope our characterisation has been both engaging and informative, and we urge you to join us on our journey.

For far too long, we, as interpretive consumer researchers, have not been allowed to accept as axiomatic our beliefs about the world that we research. The relativistic ontology and constructivist epistemology that we purportedly uphold, allied to the limited and provisory nature of the interpretations that we construct, suggest that the only contribution that we can ever make as interpretive consumer researchers is to attempt to illustrate through thick
description (Geertz 1973) and understand through systematic interpretation (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000) whilst acknowledging our role as researchers and our ‘being in the world’. Once we achieve this, then we can more fully embrace the futility of attempting to predict and control or generalize the complex social worlds that we research. Once we have accepted this, then interpretive consumer research can settle down once more, like Odysseus, and become master of all he surveys.
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Negotiating Masculinities: Advertising and the Inversion of the Male Gaze

MAURICE PATTERSON* and RICHARD ELLIOTT†

This paper seeks to underline the negotiated character of male identities by demonstrating the means by which lifestyle magazine advertising has caused men to gaze upon images of their own bodies and by outlining the implications of this inversion of the male gaze. The paper begins by delineating the unfinished nature of our bodies and their role in identity projects. It then charts the emergence of men’s lifestyle magazines in the UK and their position in the representation of male bodies. Next, the paper outlines the traditional understanding of the male gaze and identifies how that gaze is being inverted by the advertising images contained in men’s lifestyle magazines. The paper then explains how men can adopt multiple subject positions in their consumption of such advertising and what the implications of this are for the negotiation of male identities. Finally, conclusions are drawn and recommendations made for further research.

INTRODUCTION

“Our association of the body with ‘efficient machines’ has crept into our culture...It has created a modern body type in the machine’s image—what one commentator has called ‘techno-body’. The techno-body ideal, for men, and increasingly for women, is the ‘lean, mean machine’: a hairless, overly muscled body, occasionally oiled, which very much resembles a machine.” Kimbrell (1993: 249)

“Everybody’s plastic—but I love plastic. I want to be plastic.” Andy Warhol (1968)

Identities are composites of multiple and sometimes contradictory subjectivities that materialize as a result of specific discourses. As such, identity is properly viewed as fluid; a process of negotiation between these various subjectivities (Saco 1992) that helps us generate an awareness of who we are, to position ourselves in relation to others and to function in the society (Nixon 1997). In the establishment and maintenance of the “necessary fictions”, that are our identities (Nixon 1997), our bodies act as tableaux upon which we inscribe many symbols and to which we attach many meanings. Turner (1996) indicates, however, that this notion of bodies, as conveyors of social meaning and symbolism is just one of the many traditions in their conceptualization. Others view bodies as sets of social practices (see Goffman 1971; Mauss 1979), or as signs which articulate systems of power (see Laqueur 1990; Turner 1995).

Of particular significance to this research are the distinctions drawn between mind and body. The legacy of Cartesianism has been the equation of humanity with the rational mind (Burkitt 1999). Bodies, on the other hand, are nothing more than automatons, machines acting as containers for the non-spatial mind. Bodies are seen as corrupt and flawed, requiring the liberatory intervention of rationality acting through science and technology.
(Hirschman 1990; Slater 1997). Both Thompson et al. (1989) and Hirschman (1993) highlight the pervasive and problematic nature of the machine and container metaphors in consumer research. Machines “act but do not emote; they make decisions but do not feel the consequences. When the machine metaphor is used to characterize human beings, we risk losing sight of the other significant aspects of being human”, (Hirschman 1993; 544). Interestingly, the notion of embodiment helps to overcome this artificial division between body and mind. Embodiment straddles the nature/culture, mind/body divide and neatly captures the dialectical relationship between both (Williams and Bendelow 1998). We “are” bodies and we “have” bodies such that they do not simply exist “in themselves” but become the subject of enterprise, interest and reflection (Crossley 2001). To this end, our bodies represent unfinished projects, works-in-progress of central importance in our lives. Moreover, they are not simply controlled by social relations, but also underpin, intensify and change those relations (Shilling 1993; Burkitt 1999).

Bodies have has long held a position of importance in general, within society, and in particular within a variety of disciplines. In Europe during the nineteenth century the emergence of disciplines such as phrenology, forensic science and sexology evidenced an increasing fascination with bodies (Waterhouse 1993). Anthropology also afforded the human bodies greater significance during this time due, in the main, to the impacts of philosophical anthropology, discussions of the relationship between nature and culture, social Darwinism and the part played by bodies in public symbolism within pre-modern societies (Turner 1991).

Turner (1992) has coined the term “somatic society” to signify the growing importance of bodies as a locus for investigation, an importance driven by contemporary discourses within the feminist movement, bio-politics and studies of consumer culture (Shilling 1993; Williams and Bendelow 1998). However, research in marketing and consumption has been relatively slow to tackle the issue of embodiment (Joy and Venkatesh 1994; Thompson and Hirschman 1995), despite the fact that, for some time, practitioners in marketing have been making vast profits through the sale of products and services associated with our bodies, and by reinforcing contemporary body culture (Shilling 1993; Williams and Bendelow 1998). However, research in marketing and consumption has been relatively slow to tackle the issue of embodiment (Joy and Venkatesh 1994; Thompson and Hirschman 1995), despite the fact that, for some time, practitioners in marketing have been making vast profits through the sale of products and services associated with our bodies, and by reinforcing contemporary body culture (Shilling 1993; Williams and Bendelow 1998).

The advertising industry has long made particular use of the symbolic properties of bodies, both male and female, in compelling its audiences to consume. With its “discourse through and about objects”, advertising enables consumers to portray a sense of who they are through product preferences, lifestyles and taste cultures (Slater 1997: 152). In essence, advertising supplies consumers with embodied symbols and meanings that they can appropriate and utilize to their own ends. Furthermore, through the representation of bodies, advertising actively creates and reinforces gender identities (Schroeder and Borgerson 1998). However, the study of advertising’s influence upon gender identities has tended to suffer from a number of specific deficiencies (Sandikci 1998). Most studies continue to assume, despite the weight of critical evidence, that advertising is a linear communication process in which audiences understand and acknowledge messages uniformly and uncritically. Such studies also presuppose that gender identities are monolithic, there being only one masculinity and one femininity, and, that these identities are fixed and exist outside of representation (Nixon 1997). Moreover, while the representation of female bodies has been a fundamental part of the advertiser’s armory for many decades, sexualized portrayals of male bodies have a much more recent history (Kibby and Costello 1999). As such, the impact of such representations on male identities deserves greater research attention.

This paper seeks to underline the negotiated character of male identities by demonstrating the means by which the male gaze has been inverted and by delineating the implications of this inversion. Specifically, the paper takes as its point of focus the representation of male bodies in men’s lifestyle magazines. Such representations, it is
argued, force men to look upon themselves, thus inverting the traditional male gaze. Furthermore, the ability of men to take up multiple subject positions has implications for the ways in which men construct their identities (and bodies). In dealing with these issues the paper loosely follows Frank (1991: 48–49) in viewing “the body” as constituted by corporeality, the obdurate physicality of the body; discourses, “cognitive mappings of the body’s possibilities and limitations”, and; institutions, the places and contexts in which discourses occur. Beginning with a consideration of the unfinished nature of our bodies and their role in identity projects, the paper then charts the emergence of men’s lifestyle magazines in the UK and their position in the representation of male bodies. Next, the paper outlines the traditional understanding of the male gaze and identifies how that gaze is being inverted by the advertising images contained in men’s lifestyle magazines. The paper then explains, how men can adopt multiple subject positions in their consumption of such advertising and what the implications of this are for the negotiation of male identities. Finally, conclusions will be drawn and recommendations made for further research. In doing so, the paper argues for greater acknowledgement of embodiment within studies of consumption and greater recognition of the part played by marketing in the construction of gender identities.

**BODIES AS PROJECTS**

“My shoulders seem like a clothes hanger. I mean that as a compliment. They’re very delicate. Think of the Golden Gate Bridge, which also tells you how handsome my tan is. My chest is bony. My stomach’s so flat I sometimes joke I was born without entrails. My cock and balls are my own business. My ass has a permanent haze over it, like San Francisco or a dance floor. I can’t see it. I only see images it suggests, say a Faberge egg, the North Pole or a half-open door. My legs are reliable, to be unpicturesque for a moment.” Cooper (1989: 27)

Central to the development of identity in consumer culture is the notion of bodies as projects. Bodies are not accepted as given; rather, they are malleable, capable of being transformed and reconstructed. “Treating the body as a project... [involves] individuals being conscious of and actively concerned about the management, maintenance and appearance of their bodies”, (Shilling 1993: 5). Therefore, given appropriate levels of industry and “body work” (Featherstone 1991) bodies may be re-created to reflect a desired appearance. Furthermore, this re-creation or transformation is achieved through the judicious use of commodities, with identity and the self being increasingly connected with and dependent upon the consumption of goods (Giddens 1991; Bocock 1993; Shilling 1993; Synnott 1993; Firat and Venkatesh 1995). Indeed, as consumer society evolves, and people are defined less and less by their work roles, identity projects are increasingly tied to the internalization of commodities through consumption (Frank 1991; Holt 1995; Baudrillard 1988; Williams and Bendelow 1998). As a result of commodification, bodies are ascribed exchange-value, that is, they seem to possess physical capital (Shilling 1993). Building on the work of Pierre Bourdieu and Norbert Elias, Shilling (1993) argues for a link between bodily development and status. Within particular social fields, bodily attributes, such as aesthetic qualities, are ascribed certain value and function as capital (Crossley 2001), which may be subsequently converted to economic, cultural and social capital. Moreover, this value increases, the closer those bodies approximate to a social field’s normalized ideals (Featherstone 1991). Thus, men and women are persuaded to devote their energies to improving their bodies, thereby maximizing their exchange value (Wernick 1987) and “[w]e can begin to see how bodily attributes function as currency, securing further rewards and serving as a valuable resource”, (Crossley 2001: 107). Such commodification is supported by the body-maintenance industry where youth, beauty, health and fitness become sources of physical capital (Featherstone 1987; 1995).
Wolf 1991; Williams and Bendelow 1998). Furthermore, in the creation of exchange-
valuable bodies, the body maintenance industry emphasizes the importance of diet and
exercise. Thus, failure to meet with normalized ideals of body image is indicative of the
inadequacy of the self and its consumption (Foucault 1979; Bordo 1993; Slater 1997).

The institutions of consumer culture are themselves central in the constitution of bodily
norms (Englis et al., 1994; Thompson and Hirschman 1995; David and Johnson 1998;
Stuhldreher and Ryan 1999), promoting images of the body beautiful (Sturrock and Pioch
1998), instructing consumers in the creation of image and self-representation (Finkelstein
1997), and encouraging them to take responsibility for the way they look (Featherstone
1991). Early in its history, advertising began to create a discourse of self-improvement
centered on needs and desires, in which images of idealized bodies were used to entice
people to buy the new products and services on offer (Pollay 1986). In the last fifty years or
so, advertising has steadily bombarded its audience with images of perfect bodies, against
which they can compare their own. It has been suggested that representation of idealized
bodies can usefully be employed by a variety of organizations as a means of increasing
marketing effectiveness. Apparently, images of physically attractive bodies can have a
dramatic influence on the exchange decision, and, can transfer value to neutral products
(Caballero et al., 1989).

As such, embodiment represents a point of convergence for the consumer, the commodity
and the commodity’s image (Annesley 1998). In other words, consumers’ bodies are the
products of labor (body work) that necessitates consumption and the use of consumer goods,
and simultaneously, through visualization, their bodies act as advertisements for such labor.
Indeed, the visualization of bodies is crucial in their commodification because, by generating
a desire to consume, it invigorates the process of production (Annesley 1998).

While advertising is the most obvious form of such visualization, it is not the only one. The
representation of bodies is central in the entertainment industry (especially cinema and
television), sport, pornography, but more fundamentally in the presentation of our bodies in
everyday life. “Instead of reading these elements in straightforward terms as a product of the
commercial logic that ‘sex sells’, they can be interpreted, more specifically, as a
manifestation of the heightened emphasis on the visual in late twentieth-century society and,
on a wider level, as an expression of the intensified levels of commodification generated by

MALE LIFESTYLE MAGAZINES AND MALE BODIES

“At first I was confused by what passed for love in this world: people were discarded because they were too old
or too fat or too poor or they had too much hair or not enough, they were wrinkled, they had no muscles, no
definition, no tone, they weren’t hip, they weren’t remotely famous. This was how you chose lovers. This was
what decided friends.” Ellis (2000: 480)

In response to a rise in feminist critiques of the malestream, the 1980s witnessed the birth
of the “new man”, a sensitive soul in touch with his feminine, emotional side. Here was a
less traditional masculinity that allowed men to become involved in the feminine worlds
of parenthood and housekeeping and yet seemingly retain the power of masculinity (Segal
1993). Moreover, during this time, it became acceptable for men to pay greater attention
to their health and physical appearance. Kimmel (1987) asserts that this preoccupation
with male body images was the result of three fundamental social trends: increasing
participation in the public sphere by women leading to a “muscular backlash” as typified
by the movies of Sylvester Stallone and Arnold Schwarzenegger, where the “actors often
resemble an anthropomorphized phallus, a phallus with muscles, if you like”, (Creed
the decreasing importance of the productive role to masculine identities and its substitution by body-related consumption, and; the decreasing stigmatization of gay men and the emergence of the stereotype gay macho bodybuilder (Shilling 1993). The emergence of male lifestyle magazines coincided with these changes in masculinity and provided the perfect opportunity for advertisers to take advantage of a largely untapped market. Heretofore, exploiting the young male market had been considered problematic due to the fact that consumption and shopping were deemed to be part of the feminized sphere of life and incompatible with masculinity (Chapman 1988; Mort 1988; Nixon 1992; Fischer and Bristor 1994).

Feminists were soon to realize, however, that for all their work, they had helped create a form of masculinity imbued with even greater privileges and power over women. Women, after all, “must give up their femininity in the appropriation of male jobs and power, but men who embrace the feminine become more complete”, (Donaldson 1993: 652). The malestream also had its problems with “new man”. Consumption traditionally produced the feminine consumer as a spectacle, fodder for the male gaze (Nixon 1992). As the 1980s progressed, men’s bodies began to appear with increasing frequency in men’s lifestyle magazines (Jackson 1994), thus creating a situation in which men were almost constantly being encouraged to gaze upon other men. As Mort (1988: 194) outlined: “Young men are being sold images which rupture traditional icons of masculinity. They are stimulated to look at themselves—and other men—as objects of consumer desire. They are getting pleasures previously branded taboo or feminine.” Major changes were at work here, changes that appeared to contradict the movement of western masculine body politics away from the powerful laboring body and brute strength. In essence, the male body was being separated from conceptions of it as a “body-for-use” and was fast becoming a body for display (Benson 1997).

Advertisers were acutely aware of the threat posed to men by an increasingly vocal women’s movement. They also understood the uneasy position that their own representations of male bodies put many men in. Their response, therefore, was the introduction of the “new lad”; a man’s man, all bulging muscles and raging testosterone, who maintained a keen interest in his appearance. Although advertisers were still encouraging men to take pleasure from male bodies, the images they presented were now counteracted in the editorial content of lifestyle magazines (Rutherford 1988: 38). Here, a more traditional male perspective, the macho personality constellation (Mosher and Sirkin 1984), was offered where women were viewed as sexual objects, violence was glorified and extreme sports were typical masculine pursuits. Moreover, throughout these changes material success and economic power remained central to the forms of masculinity represented (Collier 1992). For Connell (1987), such representations serve to bolster hegemonic masculinity, for patriarchal power fundamentally depends upon the construction of a hypermasculine ideal. However, Hanke (1992: 197) astutely notes that hegemonic masculinity is not a static construction. Rather, the changes described above have worked by “recuperating patriarchal ideology by making it more adaptable to contemporary social conditions and more able to accommodate counter-hegemonic forces.” Thus, the increasing feminization of hegemonic masculinity is a means by which it can align itself more closely with consumer society and protect its self-designated dominance.

The depiction of female bodies in advertising has a long history (Simpson et al., 1996) and, as a consequence, there has been tremendous attention paid by academics to representations of the female form in the mass media (e.g. Richins 1991; Bloch and Richins 1992; Bonner et al., 1992; Myers and Biocca 1992; Englis et al., 1994; Martin and Gentry 1997; Sandikci 1998; Hogg et al., 1999). In contrast, there has been much less interest in the depiction of the male bodies in advertising (Kolbe and Albanese 1996), a fact that cannot be explained simply
by the more recent emergence of male body images in advertising. Rather, the more evident use of female bodies in advertising and the lack of attention paid to representations of male bodies in academic studies are consequences of the power of hegemonic masculinity and the Cartesian dualisms on which it depends. In a sense, there has been a general acceptance that masculinity, unlike femininity, remains in some way unconstructed (Holmlund 1993). As Nash (1996: 153) argues “...to continue to study the representation of women without considering the representation of men elides the cultural investment expended in display of the male and reinforces the apparent effacement of masculinity as a social construction”. Thus, empirical work investigating the representation of male images in advertising remains limited and has focused largely on the roles that men portray rather than on male bodies themselves (e.g. Lysonski 1991; Wiles et al., 1995; Massé and Rosenblum 1988). Such portrayals have been shown to change over time in response to critical cultural events (e.g. war, feminism and patriotism) (Wolheter and Lammers 1980).

In terms of research that directs attention specifically to male bodies, Kolbe and Albanese (1996) do suggest that the bodies depicted in magazine advertising are not representative of the male population. Furthermore, this study indicates that there is some evidence for the objectification of male bodies in advertising. A study by Patterson and England (2000) also identifies a relatively uniform depiction of male bodies within lifestyle magazines, where the audience is routinely presented with mesomorphic (strong, muscular and hard) male bodies, hypermasculine in their iconography. The depiction of ectomorphs (thin and lightly muscled) was limited mainly to the advertising of clothing, where products may look more attractive on the slimmer, taller man. Endomorphs (soft and round) were rarely utilized and, where they were, tended to be the object of humor.

Thus, the last two decades have been witness to a number of marketing-led forces with significant import for the construction of male identities. At a fundamental level, there has been a growing feminization of hegemonic masculinity, designed to encourage greater male participation in consumption activities and with the added benefit of protecting patriarchy. Furthermore, we have observed a dramatic increase in the number of representations of male bodies in marketing communications (Simpson et al., 1996; Dotson 1999), intended to improve marketing effectiveness through adding value to otherwise neutral products and services. The result is that, now, more than ever, men are being encouraged to gaze upon images of other men and, thus, the gaze, as it is traditionally conceived, is being turned in upon itself.

INVERTING THE GAZE

“Although undoubtedly there are many sophisticated new tools and techniques available that produce fast visual improvements, it is neurotic to become obsessive about one’s appearance, just as it is a sign of neurosis to neglect it.” D’Amato (1992: 92)

Much of the work conducted in respect of the male gaze makes reference to Laura Mulvey’s seminal work within film studies. Mulvey (1975) combines psychoanalytic and feminist perspectives in her analysis of images of women within mainstream film. This analysis constructs women within film as passive objects of the male gaze. According to Mulvey (1988), Freud considered the gaze to be a phallic property, borne of a desire to control the object of that gaze. Thus, for Mulvey, the male gaze is firstly voyeuristic, rational, distanced, sadistic, controlled and controlling, seeking to exercise power over its object (Neale 1983; Saco 1992). The application of Mulvey’s work to the current context becomes possible because of the influence of cinema upon our everyday lives. As Denzin (1995: 1) suggests, cinema increasingly governs how we, as individuals, look, and what we see: “The
postmodern is a visual, cinematic age; it knows itself in part through the reflections that flow from the camera’s eye. The voyeur is the iconic postmodern self. Adrift in a sea of symbols, we find ourselves, voyeurs all, products of the cinematic gaze.”

As part of the voyeuristic gaze, male spectators may experience narcissistic identification with the images of male bodies being depicted in lifestyle magazines. According to Mulvey (1975: 12) “the spectator identifies with the main male protagonist... [whose] ...characteristics are not those of the erotic object of his gaze, but those of the more perfect, more complete, more powerful ideal ego conceived in the original moment of recognition in front of the mirror”. Narcissistic identification, therefore, allows the male spectator to retain a sense of power and control, for through such an identification, the spectator is able to integrate the desirable meanings or values (Holt 1995) assigned to the bodies and transferred to the consumer goods being depicted (Hirschman and Thompson 1997). Thus, through such self-extension practices (Belk 1988) the spectator incorporates hypermasculine ideals into his own identity that invariably serve to support his patriarchal power. Moreover, male viewers may strive to reinforce their individuality and autonomy by rejecting a particular image in its entirety, instead, acting as bricoleurs, playing around with meanings and symbols derived from specific aspects gleaned from a variety of different images. Here, they “use the images conveyed [in advertising] as a visual department store of symbolic possibilities that can be tried on, adopted, altered, or discarded in keeping with their desired self”, (Hirschman and Thompson 1997: 54).

Mulvey’s (1975) arguments work to position the spectator as almost always male and heterosexual (Saco 1992). Thus, when men are encouraged to look upon the same rather than the other, when the male gaze is turned in upon itself, voyeurism becomes problematic. As a result, in an effort to protect themselves, male audience may pursue what Hirschman and Thompson (1997) refer to as critical interpretations of male-directed advertising that utilizes images of male bodies. Such interpretations invariably involve strategies for deconstructing and rejecting the messages being conveyed. Deconstruction allows the audience to undermine these advertising messages by highlighting the economic rationale and the intentions that underpin them (Hirschman and Thompson 1997). Others will reject these advertisements out of hand as attempts “to force consumers to conform to arbitrary aesthetic standards, to abrogate personal freedom and their authentic self identities in order to consume in a socially condoned way”, (Hirschman and Thompson 1997: 51). In short, the pleasure derived by men from looking at images of other men may induce “homosexual panic” (Elliott et al., 1995; Hopkins 2000) and critical interpretations thus seek to reaffirm men’s heterosexuality. Furthermore, advertisers themselves may be cognizant of such forces to the extent that their focus on strength and muscularity may be designed principally to ward off feminine affect (Steinman 1992).

For Mulvey (1975: 14) the male gaze may also be fetishistic: “fetishistic scopophilia builds up the physical beauty of the object, transforming it into something satisfying in itself.” Although, as Neale (1983) points out, Mulvey is adamant that “physical beauty” is interpreted as a female trait, the fetishistic gaze may also be applied to situations in which the male spectator looks upon other men. In terms of the analysis provided by Hirschman and Thompson (1997), the fetishistic gaze is likely to result in motivational interpretations of advertising depicting male bodies. Here, male bodies are raised to the level of the spectacle (Saco 1992) and spectators are inspired by them and aspire to be like them. Although these idealized images might generally be regarded as unattainable, spectators often suspend disbelief in an effort to accept such bodies as a possibility for themselves (Hirschman and Thompson 1997).

However, adherence to Mulvey’s (1975) interpretation of the gaze has been criticized in more recent feminist analyses. As Nash (1996) indicates, the voyeuristic gaze need not be
necessarily controlling and oppressive. Indeed, those operating within the position of the desired object can generate a sense of empowerment and pleasure from that position. More to the point, Mulvey’s (1975) second form of looking, the fetishistic gaze, amounts to masochism or passive submission to the object (Rodowick 1982). “Mosochism... uncouples the male from both sadism and masculinity. This uncoupling signals a shift from the notion that identity is relatively fixed to the idea that identity is fluid precisely because it is a process involving multiple subject positionings”, (Saco 1992: 30). Thus, male spectators are unlikely to adhere strictly to the conventions of the male gaze. Rather, such a gaze represents just one of a variety of subject positions which men can adopt (Steinman 1992). “Recent studies of mainstream film as well as pornography suggest that looking does not produce static positions of identification, distance, voyeurism, narcissism or fetishism but movement between these possible spectator positions for women and men”, (Nash 1996: 158). The suggestion, therefore, is that gender identities are complex and multi-dimensional, and undergo a process of constant negotiation and renegotiation (Sandikci 1998). For example, a gay male reader may engage in fetishistic scopophilia, recognizing images as perfect examples of gay iconography (Dotson 1999) and submitting himself to them fully. At other times, the same reader, wishing to retain some semblance of control, may experience narcissistic identification, enjoying the images but using them to his own ends. Still at other times, with the aim of reinforcing his male “rationality”, this reader may pursue a greater degree of voyeuristic detachment and reject the images out of hand. In this way, the belief that male identity is monolithic and unconstructed loses credence, and, we must accept that there are many masculinities and that representation produces a host of relatively fluid subject positions. “Many gazes and many pleasures: supervising, controlling, malefic, investigative, destructive, self-protective, clinical, erotic, indifferent, self-constructive,” (Denzin 1995: 49).

The question remains as to what might be the possible effects of male-directed advertising depicting idealized male bodies. Recourse to the literature within marketing on representation of female bodies would seem to suggest that the effects are likely to be negative. Consumers of such advertising are “left with haunting images of perfection and wealth and the increasingly desperate realization that they will never achieve the idealized state depicted”, (Richins 1991: 71). Moreover, idealized images of male bodies may cause consumers to engage in social comparison (Lasch 1979; Richins 1991) with possible long-term health implications (Martin and Gentry 1997), while negative body image can lead to feelings of insecurity and diminished self-confidence (David and Johnson 1998). However, in looking at the possible effects of such advertisements, we must remember that representations of male bodies are likely to have varied effects depending on the age, sexuality, class and ethnic background of the audience. Furthermore, the arguments presented above with respect to multiple subject positions points to active consumption of advertising such that male spectators need not necessarily emulate idealized body images slavishly. The polysemic nature of advertising texts (Ritson and Elliott 1999) dictates that male spectators may interpret the messages conveyed by that advertising in a whole host of ways. Conventional readings, made according to dominant-hegemonic codes (Hall 1980), may cause male audience members to subscribe to the notion that acceptance of the idealized bodies on offer, best protects patriarchal power. Conventional readings such as this are likely to occur because of the investments made by these men in hegemonic masculinity. Discourses, such as patriarchy, work only if they recruit subjects (Woodward 1997). That is, they succeed only if, through the process of interpellation (Althusser 1971), subjects recognize themselves in the subject position being represented and consequently invest in it. However, for Althusser, there is little opportunity for agency and self-determination on the part of the subject (De Lauretis 1987). “What makes one take up a position in a certain
discourse rather than another is an ‘investment’… something between an emotional commitment and a vested interest, in the relative power (satisfaction, reward, pay-off) which that position promises (but does not necessarily fulfill)”, (De Lauretis 1987: 16). Hollway (1984) (cited in De Lauretis 1987) argues, through a reconceptualization of Foucault, that power is the motivating factor in encouraging people to make investments, although that motivation may be unconscious or irrational. Because investment in hegemonic masculinity affords men certain tangible benefits, recruitment to this subject position is made all the more easy. Fundamentally, these benefits amount to male privileges in the worlds of family, education, welfare, work, politics, culture and leisure (Weedon 1997) and thus the possibility for conventional readings is strengthened.

Reading according to negotiated codes (Hall 1980), will probably result in narcissistic identification and personalizing interpretations (Hirschman and Thompson 1997). Here, male audience members will adopt some of the advertisers’ intended meanings but will adapt them to suit their own purposes. Finally, reading according to oppositional codes is likely to result in the outright rejection of intended meanings. Such oppositional readings may be brought about by the belief that patriarchal power is best protected by the repudiation of desire and the affirmation of a distanced, rational masculinity. “The crucial point here is that a spectator’s willingness to step into a privileged subject position is at least in part dependent upon [his] way of reading”. (Saco 1992: 31).

However, the difficulty with these arguments is that in subscribing to the notion that identities are socially constructed, there is a tendency for them to become disembodied, a product of discourse alone. Yet, an entirely constructionist explanation of gender is just as problematic as a naturalistic one (Connell 1995). “Bodies…are not simply to be read as ‘texts of culture’, passively reflecting the values of their society…[people] themselves draw upon these ideas, make them body”, (Benson 1997: 143). Nixon (1997) argues, following Foucault, that “technologies of the self” are the means by which individuals put discursive subject positions into practice. Therefore, we may derive insights into these technologies through the investigation of care, consumption and leisure activities. Furthermore, since dominant conceptualizations of masculinity and femininity become embodied, embodiment can fuel the drive of hegemonic masculinity and the oppression of women (Shilling 1997). If, through conventional readings of advertising representations, men pursue hypermasculine ideals and become “stronger”, and women pursue feminine ideals, then we eventually reach the position where, in terms of embodiment, women are “the weaker sex” (Connell 1987; Shilling 1997). We must also remember that because there exists a number of different masculinities, the representation of hypermasculine ideals also serves to subordinate other forms of masculinity (Nixon 1997). Crucially, however, the very nature of embodiment imposes physical limits on the degree to which individuals may actualize body ideals. In this way, technologies of the self become relevant only to the few privileged ones (McNay 1994). For those within society who are ageing, sick, disabled or dying, consumption offers little in terms of bodily salvation (Williams and Bendelow 1998).

EMBODIMENT, DISCOURSE AND RESISTANCE

“Let’s face it, the human body is like a condominium apartment. The thing that keeps you really enjoying it is the maintenance. There’s a tremendous amount of daily, weekly, monthly and yearly work that has to be done. From showering to open heart surgery, we’re always doing something to ourselves. If your body was a used car, you wouldn’t buy it”. Seinfeld (1995: 29)

Against these totalizing Foucauldian perspectives, adopting Merleau-Ponty’s positioning of our bodies as our “point of view in the world” (Merleau-Ponty 1962: 5) in combination with
critical realist theory enables us to take a more optimistic approach to the possibility of resistance by the “creative consumer”. Merleau-Ponty (1962: 3) aims to “re-establish the roots of the mind in its body, and in its world, going against doctrines which treat perception as a simple result of the action of external things on our body as well as against those which insist on the autonomy of consciousness”. He thus sets up a dialectical relationship between bodies and selves, which allows us to explore how these interact as we pass through time and space. This focus on action as embodied as well as social, leads us to a core issue in contemporary social theory, the materiality vs. discourse debate.

Radley (1995: 5) sets out to re-establish bodies as sources of freedom against the powers of discourse, pointing out that “physical existence is brought, bound and gagged, on to the center stage of social theory in order to indicate the primary role of discourse”, and that “from this position, discourse as the agent of signification is both everywhere and nowhere.” Radley (1995) maintains that a focus on the lived experience of the expressive power of bodies leads to a recognition of the elusory possibilities of bodies. Through such concepts as “dumb insolence” (which incenses because it cannot be directly countered because it is not of the same order as the power that it subverts), bodies elude discourse because they signify in ways that discourse cannot adequately embrace, and “has the grounds for configuring an alternative way of being that eludes the grasp of power” (Radley 1995: 9). However, there are limits to the possibilities for resistance via empowerment, that are offered by extra-discursive phenomenological perspectives, because we must give adequate weight to the material components of social reality. Critical realism (Bhaskar 1989: 4) maintains that while “social structures are dependant upon the consciousness which the agents who reproduce or transform have, they are reducible to this consciousness. Social practices are concept-dependant; but contrary to the hermeneutical tradition in social science, they are not exhausted by their conceptual aspect. They always have a material dimension.” This should not be taken assuming that objectified social structures are always constraining on the subject, for “social structures are a necessary condition for intentional social activity...they should be seen as the very basis for enabling human activity” (Joseph 2000: 186).

**BODY CONSCIOUSNESS AND PERFORMANCE**

“Soul and body, body and soul—how mysterious they were! There was animalism in the soul, and the body had its moments of spirituality. The senses could refine, and the intellect could degrade. Who could say where the fleshly impulse ceased, or the psychical impulse began?” Wilde (1993: 56)

Moving from the philosophical level of analysis to the implications for consumer research, we need to introduce the concept of levels of consciousness in relation to bodies. Crossley (1995) has suggested that the work of Goffman (1971) on the “presentation of self in everyday life” can provide empirical examples of the movement through time and space posited by Merleau-Ponty. Entwistle (2000) suggests that Goffman also makes a bridge between the structuralist/post-structuralist analysis of social order and the lived experience of our bodies. Goffman’s (1971: 81) dramaturgical metaphor for lived experience identifies “private” and “public” as modes of being, which together constitute our identity: “to be a given kind of person is not merely to possess the required attributes, but also to sustain the standard of conduct and appearance that one’s social grouping attaches thereto”. This focuses our attention on the context of embodied experience because we develop a repertoire of “faces”, which we utilize in front of different audience. Tseelon (1995: 52) has carried out a number of studies exploring women’s lived experience of “performance” and concluded that a key issue is the “complex mode of consciousness” in which women pay more or less attention to their appearance depending on different levels of body consciousness, which in
turn relates to social and cultural context. Although Berger (1972) has suggested that consciousness of bodily appearance is fundamentally gendered due to the objectification of the female body, Tseelon (1995) argues that her data suggest that men are equally capable of being objectified by women as social and cultural norms change, and that this process may assist the feminist emancipation project. What is needed now, is to extend the empirical study of body consciousness and the performance of everyday life to men, as we believe that the changing representations of male bodies may have profound implications for gender relations and the role of consumption phenomena in this process.

CONCLUSIONS

“Ah—here was one. Man. Thirties, it said. Nicely-shaped head, seeks sincere woman for relationship. Nicely-shaped head? Hmm. He looked at his reflection in the window. Could you call it nicely-shaped? Or was it more on the lumpy side? No, receding hairline was more like it, and he wasn’t going to put that into any advertisement.” Shearer (1997: 11–12)

Recent analyses have come to view identity as a process rather than as a product (Jenkins 1996). Woodward (1997: 45) contends, following Lacan (1977) that “[h]aving first adopted an identity from outside the self, we go on identifying with what we want to be, but which is separate from the self, so that the self is permanently divided within itself” and thus, constantly in a state of transition. The process of identity, as we have shown, involves movement through and negotiation of multiple subject positions in which each of us has different levels of investment. “The dual nature of identity—its concomitant presentness and becomingness—derives from these endless mediations and is what makes identity fluid: at once defined and redefined, at once real and (re)presented”, (Saco 1992: 24).

The negotiation and renegotiation of male identities is made all the more possible by the increasing visualization of male bodies in advertising and the media. These institutions of consumer culture provide men with both templates for their body/identity projects and, facilitate their experience of multiple subject positions through the production of polysemic texts. Furthermore, the process of identity management is fuelled by commodification and concomitant self-extension practices.

Hegemonic masculinity is changing in order to maintain its privileged position, it must adapt to meet the demands of contemporary society and to ward off the threat posed to it by an increasingly powerful and vocal women’s movement. Such an adaptation has involved the increasing feminization of masculinities (Barthel 1994), as men are encouraged to partake in the carnival of consumption, to become concerned about their appearance, to get in touch with their emotions, and as male bodies become objects for display subject to the male gaze. The inversion of the male gaze, in particular, poses difficulties for the construction of the gaze as inherently male and heterosexual. The arguments forwarded in this paper suggest that the male gaze is just one of the number of subject positions that men (and women) can adopt. Moreover, when the gaze is turned in upon itself, men are more likely to move through a range of responses such as rejection, identification and desire. These responses, and the subject positions to which they relate, are associated in turn with the manner in which men read advertising texts.

This paper has implications for the study of consumption and identity, for it foregrounds the importance of embodiment and consumption to identity projects. As we have outlined earlier, explicit consideration of embodiment within marketing and consumption studies has been relatively sparse. To paraphrase Longhurst (1995: 99): marketing literature has not “led to the body simply being absent and the mind present. Rather it is as though the body has acted as [marketing’s] Other. . .Reason is not the whole story of masculinism: in order to
establish rationality, there must be a contrast with the irrational. Disciplinary knowledge can define itself through its own ability to know only if there are others who are incapable of knowing”. The lack of attention paid to bodies in consumption owes much to the traditional view within marketing of the consumer as a problem solver and the limited consideration paid to consumption activities beyond purchase. In this way, consumption activities were centered on the mind of the consumer and divorced from their corporeality. Thus, “[t]he rational, objective, detached human mind, as the seat of truth, knowledge and wisdom, has constantly struggled to free itself from the ‘shackles’ of the human body and the slimy desires of the flesh”, (Williams and Bendelow 1998: 1). Unpredictable bodies, ruled by emotions and passions, are depicted as the enemy of reason (Burkitt 1999), an anathema to the consuming subject at the center of the modernist project (Firat and Shultz 1997).

Specific consideration is also required within consumer research, not just because the representation of female bodies has received far more attention, but also because there is a distinct need to understand the role of consumption and the institutions of consumer culture in the construction of male identities and the buttressing of hegemonic masculinity. We need to dispense with the belief that masculinity is unconstructed, and we need to understand just what it means to be a man in contemporary society.
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Introduction
Over the past decade there have been a number of calls within the branding literature for a consideration of brand–consumer relationships (BCRs) and, certainly, it appears that the term relationship is fast infiltrating the branding vernacular. Such calls are not without foundation and there are a number of factors which provide a strong rationale for them. First, relational approaches to marketing thought remain fashionable and, thus, the relationship concept is being applied in all manner of situations. This fashionability is derived in part from the intuitive appeal of the relationship concept to us as human beings and in part from the perceived utility of the relational approach in answering some particularly vexing marketing questions. Second, some commentators (for example, Blackston, 1993) have underlined the supposed failure of brand image research to provide concrete assistance to brand management programmes in terms of predicting consumer behaviour. These commentators suggest that a focus on BCRs offers a solution in this regard. Third, the brand personality concept and the attendant anthropomorphisation of brands facilitate the notion of BCRs through the utilisation of social exchange theory (SET). This is a logical extension of the idea of a brand personality: if brands have personalities we can treat them as people; if they are people then we can have relationships with them. Fourth, the branding literature has been concerned with the issue of loyalty for over forty years (see Cunningham, 1966; Guest, 1964 for early examples), an issue which is also of central importance to relationship marketers. Finally, brand management has long been at the forefront of marketing practice and it is not unusual, therefore, for brand managers to be concerned about the means by which they might protect their assets from the effects of a turbulent commercial environment. Relationship marketing (RM) views long-term relationships with customers as a stabilising element that supports the mastering of such challenges (Juttner and Wehrli, 1994).

Meanwhile, at the same time as relational approaches are colonising the branding literature, a number of commentators are suggesting that their uncritical acceptance within marketing thought is dangerous and in need of remedy (for example, Hibbard and Iacobucci, 1999; O’Malley and Tynan, 1999). Particular attention has been paid to the problems posed by the various domain extensions which RM has undergone; to the suitability (or lack thereof) of SET in explaining commercial ‘relationships’; and to the difficulties posed by the process of metaphoric transfer.

First, in terms of domain extensions, relational approaches to marketing had their genesis in interaction-intensive contexts such as business-to-business and high-contact service markets. The observed value of relationships here drove attempts to implement similar ideas in mass consumer markets (for example Dwyer et al., 1987), where they had once been deemed inappropriate.

Relationships have become very popular in the branding literature as a result of the general focus on relationships in marketing and on the so-called anthropomorphisation of brands where human qualities and personalities are projected on to brands. However, the use of the interpersonal relationship metaphor within the branding realm is not without its problems. This paper reviews the emergence of the literature on brand consumer relationships, considers problems with the concept and suggests opportunities for future development.

More critical appreciation of the roles of brands in our lives points towards a brand community perspective that acknowledges the network of connections between a brand’s various publics. This perspective avoids the pitfall of stretching the interpersonal relationship metaphor too far and provides a strong foundation upon which brand managers can build.
due to the limited nature of interpersonal contact in this context (see Grönroos, 1994; Barnes, 1995). Because relationships essentially develop between people, the importance of this point cannot be overestimated (O’Malley et al., 1997; Fournier et al., 1998). The application of relational approaches in mass markets has continued to gather momentum despite routine calls to reassess their validity.

Second, although numerous theories of interpersonal relationships exist (see Sheaves and Barnes, 1996), SET became the prime resource for marketing researchers. The focus on SET becomes self-explanatory when we consider that, in making sense of social interaction, sociologists looked to theories of the market for suitable concepts and began to treat interpersonal exchanges as if they were market exchanges. Interpersonal exchanges, like market exchanges, were thought to be dependent upon the successful exchange of rewards (Homans, 1950; Blau, 1964) and interaction occurred when the rewards of exchange outweighed the costs (Thibaut and Kelley, 1959). SET is therefore entirely consistent with the notion of the market (Hartsock, 1983; Fischer and Bristor, 1994) and its fundamental axioms are consistent with self-interest seeking and a calculative approach to interaction and exchange. As a result, it is no surprise that SET language and concepts (trust, commitment, mutual benefit, etc.) resonated strongly with marketing researchers, or that the models of relationship development that employ SET have gained strong empirical support (for example Anderson and Narus, 1984). Nonetheless, SET has its limitations in describing commercial relationships, particularly where those relationships involve little interpersonal contact (O’Malley and Patterson, 2005).

The process of metaphoric transfer, where concepts are borrowed from a source domain (interpersonal relationships) and applied to a target domain (commercial interaction), inevitably foregrounds some elements and hides others. Despite the range of potential relationships that could have been used including collegiate relationships: parent/child, prisoner/prison guard (see Iacobucci and Ostrom, 1996) there has been a tendency within marketing to focus almost exclusively on the basic level of marriage or spousal relationships (Hunt and Menon, 1993). This particular mapping has been fraught with contradictions in that the concepts borrowed from the source domain are consistent with market exchange, while the values borrowed are more closely aligned with communal exchange (Sheaves and Barnes, 1996; O’Malley and Tynan, 1999). These contradictions are highlighted when we consider that SET views marriage as a ‘restrictive trade agreement. The two individuals agree to exchange only with one another, at least until such time as the balance of trade becomes unfavorable in terms of broader market considerations’ (McCall, 1966, pp. 197–8). However, in contrast, in communal relationships ‘the assumption is that each individual is concerned about the welfare of the other; the exchange of benefits is based on the needs of the other, not on the anticipation that benefits will be received in return’ (Sheaves and Barnes 1996: 225). Thus, the elements that constitute the frame ‘marketing as relationships’ combine a theory of relationships based on self-interest seeking (SET) and values from an antithetical communal perspective, that is, Judaeo-Christian understandings of marriage (Tynan, 1997). The resulting frame, although apparently insightful, ignores many of the accepted conventions associated with the use of metaphor. The reason for the disjuncture identified here between theory and values is that this particular set of values possesses much rhetorical power. A communal perspective positions marketing as helpful and fair, an approach involving harmonic connections (Smith and Higgins, 2000). Interestingly, despite such problems the relationship-oriented view of contemporary marketing has had a dramatic influence on understandings of branding and brand management.

This paper aims to build upon these understandings in order to provide a review and critique of the extant literature on BCRs. In so doing, the paper traces the emergence of the BCR concept, utilises critiques of relational approaches to problematise our current understanding of BCRs, and identifies some alternative understandings of how brands fit into people’s lives.

**Explicating the Brand–Consumer Relationship**

Although discussions of marketing relationships are now widespread in the literature and, as we have seen, some (apparently ill-conceived) domain extensions are being criticised, a number of authors propose that further extensions of the
concept may yet be appropriate. For example, Fournier (1998, p. 343) suggests: 'despite increased acceptance and relevance, it can be argued that the relationship perspective has been vastly under-utilised in the marketing literature'. In this way, Fournier (1998) attempts to legitimise the application of relational concepts to the branding literature and, as such, builds upon early discussions of BCRs (for example, Blackston, 1992a, 1992b, 1993), and subsequent examinations of the concept (for example, Hess, 1996; Moriarty et al., 1996; Palmer, 1996).

Aaker (1997) credits Max Blackston with the original development of the BCR concept. Blackston (1993, p. 114) proposes a focus on BCRs as a means of overcoming the limitations of brand image research which has 'a notoriously limited ability to explain consumers' historic behaviour let alone provide any predictive power'. For Blackston (1992a, p. 80) 'a brand relationship is a logical extension of the idea of a brand personality', and in investigating mass-market brands he compares the BCR to a relationship between a doctor and patient. In extending his analysis to corporate brands, traditional concepts from SET such as trust begin to emerge. Furthermore, Blackston (1992a, 1992b) makes explicit the link between BCRs and RM. This linking of BCRs to SET and to RM has had the effect of opening the conceptual floodgates. Consequently, Palmer (1996), and Dall’Olmo Riley and de Chernatony (2000) both elucidate the complementary nature of research on commercial relationships and research on branding. The crux of Palmer’s (1996, pp. 233–4) position is that ‘it can be argued that individuals have an underlying need for an emotional bond with high-involvement products that they buy. Brand development and relationship development are complementary and substitutable strategies towards this bonding’. Dall’Olmo Riley and de Chernatony (2000, p. 140) propose that ‘the concept of the brand has evolved from a name given to differentiate a firm’s products, to that of a relationship based on trust’. This evolution is predicated on the fact that brands possess meaning for consumers above and beyond their functional characteristics, they have personalities described in much the same way as human personalities, and, thus, we can have relationships with them. Aaker et al. (2004, p. 2) go further by suggesting that brand personality characteristics influence the nature of BCRs. Drawing from SET they infer that sincere brands positively effect relationship strength, engender trustworthiness and dependability, and support relationship growth. Exciting brands, on the other hand, tend to be considered less worthy of long-term relationships though excitement remains an important trait in intimate relations.

Fournier (1998) recognises that for a BCR to exist the brand must be a living entity because relationships exist between active and interdependent partners. The whole idea of imbuing brands with life (see King, 1973; Cooper, 1979; Lannon and Cooper, 1983) is itself underpinned by metaphorical reasoning (Hanby, 1999). That is, if brands were living entities, they would have personalities, would grow and develop over time and, therefore, it would be possible to have relationships with them. However, personification of the brand is insufficient for the brand to be considered a legitimate relational partner (Fournier, 1998). Rather, brands need to be anthropomorphised, or humanised, in order for people to have relationships with them (Ambler, 1999; Fournier, 1998). While brands can be animated through brand characters or are somehow possessed by the spirit of past or present others, complete anthropomorphisation of the brand involves imbuing it with human qualities such as emotion, thought and volition. Fournier (1998) argues that marketers perform this transmogrification through their everyday activities, particularly those conducted under the rubric of interactive marketing. Such activities ‘can be construed as behaviours performed by the brand acting in its relationship role’ (Fournier, 1998, p. 345), thereby qualifying the brand as a legitimate and reciprocating relational partner.

The conceptual leap made here is that BCRs can be treated as if they were interpersonal relationships, and Fournier (1998, p. 344) takes these ideas to their logical conclusion in attempting to establish ‘a grounded and fully articulated relationship-based framework for the study of consumer–brand interactions’. Fournier’s work goes beyond simple conceptualisations of BCRs as being predominantly close, committed and long-term. Rather she expands extant conceptualisations to incorporate different types and levels at which BCRs might exist. Fournier and Yao (1997) make explicit reference to their use of the interpersonal relationship
metaphor in analysing the bonds between consumers and the brands they use. Furthermore, although they acknowledge their failure to test the relevance of the relationship paradigm against other perspectives, they do call for the abandonment of research on brand loyalty in favour of relational perspectives. Fournier (1998) also elucidates the elements of brand relationship quality in an effort to further highlight the similarities between interpersonal relationships and BCRs. As such, Fournier (1998, pp. 363–364) identifies six key constructs that suggest strong BCRs: love and passion, ‘a rich affective grounding’; self connection, ‘the degree to which the brand delivers on important identity concerns, tasks or themes, thereby expressing a significant aspect of self’; interdependence, ‘frequent brand interactions … and heightened intensity of individual interaction events’; commitment, ‘the intention to behave in a manner supportive of relationship longevity’; intimacy, ‘elaborate knowledge structures’; and brand partner quality, ‘the consumer’s evaluation of the brand’s performance in its partnership role’. There is no doubt that Fournier’s work is both compelling and insightful. She effectively demonstrates that consumers avail themselves of interconnected webs of brands that contribute to ‘the enactment, exploration, or resolution of [their] centrally held identity issues’ (Fournier, 1998, p. 359).

**Critiquing the Brand–Consumer Relationship**

That brands have meaning for consumers over and above their physical functional characteristics has been accepted in the marketing literature at least since Gardner and Levy’s (1955) seminal article in *Harvard Business Review*. Indeed, in a consumer society, brands become part of the non-verbal language of social communication to the extent that their consumption is routinely implicated in and connected with identity and the self (Elliott and Wattanasuwan, 1998). With its ‘discourse through and about objects’, advertising enables consumers to portray a sense of who they are through brand preferences, lifestyles and taste cultures (Slater, 1997, p. 112). Thus, the symbolic value of brands may be used by consumers to establish membership of social groups, to signal aspirations of group membership, or to point toward differentiation from other consumers. Many of us even attach sacred meanings to some of the brands we use. Belk et al. (1989, p. 16, citing Cornfeld and Edwards, 1983) refer to quintessential objects, rare and mysterious and unequivocally right such as the Mont Blanc Diplomat pen, the Swiss Army knife and Dom Perignon champagne. Many contemporary brands have achieved iconic status (Holt, 2004). These brands appear to resonate deeply with a culture and tend to come from lifestyle categories such as food and drink (for example, Bisto, Guinness), clothing (for example, Vivienne Westwood) or cars (for example, Lamborghini). When brands come to possess such meaning for consumers it is easy to see how we might describe the connection between consumers and brands as relationships. And relationships is what they are. But, are they the same as interpersonal relationships?

When Blackston (1992a, 1992b, 1993) argues for the consideration of BCRs he is essentially championing the employment of one metaphor (the interpersonal relationship metaphor) based on the existing employment of another metaphor (the brand as personality metaphor). On one level this stretching of the metaphor makes perfect sense, revolving as it does around the anthropomorphisation of brands. However, on another level we must question the extent to which brand personalities are the same as human personalities. The brand personality construct has much face validity, with researchers and consumers equally comfortable with the idea that brands possess such qualities. Patterson (1999, p. 419) defines brand personality as ‘the consumer’s emotional response to a brand through which brand attributes are personified and used to differentiate between competing offerings’. Given the fact that consumers infuse brands with personalities, it is largely held that as a result, consumer personalities and brand personalities should reflect one another. This is not necessarily the case, but there may be some degree of fit between the two if, as Lannon (1992, p. 12) states, ‘brand choice is the direct manifestation of a set of personal values’. Brand personalities, therefore, are emotional projections used to simplify brand choice decisions across a range of product categories. Compiled by the consumer through direct experience of the brand, through exposure to marketing communications, through packaging, and even through observation of what kind of people use the brand and the occasions and situations in which it is used, brand personality essentially represents a shorthand for the brand’s attributes and
associations. As such, brand personality, although described in similar terms, is unlikely to be the same as human personality. As Bengtsson (2003, p. 154) stridently indicates: ‘although consumers may attribute anthropomorphous characteristics to brands, this does not necessarily imply that sociopsychological theories of interpersonal relationships [such as SET] are adequate to represent consumers’ relation to their brands’. Moreover, the brand as living entity metaphor (Hanby, 1999), the root metaphor to which brand personality belongs, is only one of two dominant metaphors in the branding literature. The other, brand as lifeless manipulable artefact, does not fit well within the BCR schema. Furthermore, according to Hanby (1999) the choice of which branding metaphor an organisation should subscribe to depends on the organisational metaphor with which the organisation identifies; mechanistic or organic. For mechanistic organisations the brand as living entity metaphor is untenable and, as such, a focus on BCRs is misguided.

Blackston (1992a, 1992b) interprets the interpersonal metaphor at the level of a doctor–patient relationship. Although Blackston may not himself recognise this, a doctor–patient relationship is a particular type of interpersonal relationship; namely, a ‘formal’ or ‘role’ relationship (Hinde, 1979). As such, Blackston’s conceptualisation is very different from the close personal relationships such as marriage implicitly relied upon by the majority of relationship researchers. Role relationships are task-specific, and in the example employed by Blackston (1992a) the doctor–patient relationship centers on attempts by one to cure the other (Hinde, 1979). Thus, Blackston (1992a, 1992b) may have hit upon an interesting idea, but one that has not received explicit attention. That is, in the conceptualisation of BCRs as doctor–patient relationships the consumer is positioned as unhealthy or lacking in some manner, while the brand is viewed as the means by which the consumer is saved or cured. Furthermore, in choosing a role relationship, the emotional attachment between consumers and brands which other authors (e.g. Fournier, 1998; Gordon, 1996; Restall, and Gordon 1993) hope to capture through the personification of brands is largely inappropriate.

The interpersonal relationship metaphor has been useful in that it has emphasised the positive elements associated with exchange. Depending on the exact relational perspective adopted these could include adaptation, flexibility, sharing, trust, intimacy and protecting the interests of the partner. The metaphor has also been useful in terms of offering a new perspective on the brand–consumer interface and demanding that the focus of research be extended beyond single, isolated exchanges (Houston and Gassenheimer, 1987). This has required the adoption of a more holistic perspective best illustrated in the work of Fournier (1998). However, Aggarwal (2004, p. 89) cautions that ‘given…obvious differences between social relationships and consumer–brand relationships, it is important for researchers to not overextend the relationship metaphor when studying consumer behaviour’. The use of a metaphor is also subject to certain limitations (Arndt, 1986). First and foremost, it ‘always emphasises some aspects, de-emphasises others, and hides still others’ (Van den Bulte, 1994, p. 413). While the interpersonal relationship metaphor has highlighted the long-term nature of exchange and the positive characteristics of ensuing relationships, it has resulted in only a partial truth. In many ways the metaphor is too powerful. That is, many advocates have forgotten that it is a metaphor that is being used. BCRs have been reified and researchers have treated them as though they really were interpersonal relationships (Bengtsson, 2003). The reification of BCRs has led to an almost exclusive emphasis on concepts from SET in their description and explication. However, there are a number of conceptual difficulties associated with transferring concepts from the interpersonal literature into commercial situations. For example, discussions of trust (particularly in marketing) suggest that it is generally relevant only in situations involving vulnerability. However, as Cowles (1997) suggests, the existence of population and organisational level safeguards (that is, legislation, warranties, guarantees, returns policy, etc.) reduces consumers’ vulnerability in commercial situations.

Consideration of BCRs may be further questioned because of their implicit emphasis on the individual and his or her dyadic interactions. While this focus on the dyad has been insightful where both parties to that dyad have agency, it may be less so when one party is a conceptual entity managed by a corporation for its own gain. In other words, while the consumer may act and react, ‘a brand
cannot respond in an individual manner to a request from a consumer and therefore lacks an important attribute that characterises human relationships’ (Bengtsson, 2003, p. 114). Indeed, Bengtsson (2003) argues that the lack of any real reciprocity on the part of the brand has problematic consequences for Fournier’s (1998) facets of brand relationship quality and, in particular, for love and passion, interdependence, commitment, and intimacy. The brand may also be considered an outcome of the efforts of a number of actors: brand owners, brand managers, users, celebrity endorsers and marketplace purveyors. Such an understanding suggests that for brands to possess real value their meanings must be shared. Furthermore, the meanings of brands are works in progress, constantly acted upon by the brand’s various publics. Individual dyads are interesting but not particularly insightful, because, when meaning must be shared, this unit of analysis is too small, too limiting and too parochial. Indeed, this is demonstrated by the majority of brand building activities taking place in mass media environments rather than through direct consumer communications. Moreover, the move from dyad to network signalled a maturing of the emerging relationship literature (Ford, 1990). It recognised that a focus upon individual dyads obscured understanding of the wider notion of networks. Networks are where strategic insights can be truly materialised, and where competitive advantages can be gained and sustained (Thorelli, 1986). Thus, while a focus on BCRs may have intuitive appeal, it detracts from the importance of the wider coalition of production and consumption communities.

Brands and Communities

In recent years academic treatments of consumption activities have begun to move away from a focus on the individual to considerations of the communal. Enduring communities have been variously labelled as ‘consumption communities’ (Boorstin, 1973), ‘subcultures of consumption’ (Schouten and McAlexander, 1995), ‘cultures of consumption’ (Kozinets, 2001), ‘brand communities’ (Muñiz and O’Guinn, 2001; McAlexander et al., 2002), and ‘brand cults’ (Belk and Tumbat, 2005). More temporary communities have been referred to as ‘social collectives’ (Greenwood, 1994), ‘neo-tribes’ (Cova, 1997), and ‘life-mode communities’ (Firat and Dholakia, 1998). What is particularly interesting from the perspective of branding is the linking value that brands provide to individuals seeking to become part of these new communities. Recent conceptualisations of these communities within marketing owe a huge debt to Cova’s (1997, p. 307) argument that, in contemporary consumer society, brands should be considered as objects used to facilitate social interaction: ‘The system of consumption is not always perceived as first and using the social link, but often as second, and in service of the social link: the link is more important than the thing’. At the core of this argument is the acceptance that ‘relationships with objects are never two-way (person–thing) but always three-way (person–thing–person)’ (Bengtsson, 2003, p. 157, citing Belk, 1988).

These communities neatly capture the notion that people have relationships with other people and that brands may become a fulcrum around which such relationships are constructed. The Harley Owners Group (HOG) is one of the earliest examples of the brand providing such linking value (Schouten and McAlexander, 1995; Fournier et al., 2001). Through such conceptualisations there is no longer any need to stretch the interpersonal relationship metaphor and, as Muñiz and O’Guinn (2001, p. 427) point out: ‘developing a brand community could be a critical step in truly actualising the concept of RM’. Here, meanings no longer reside so much in the brand as in the social links that people form as a result of using the brand. ‘Sustained interpersonal interactions can lead to relationships that transcend mere common interest in a brand and its applications’ (McAlexander et al., 2002, p. 43). These meanings are likely to be derived from the key elements of communal interaction (Muñiz and O’Guinn, 2001, p. 43): consciousness of kind, ‘the intrinsic connection that members feel toward one another, and the collective sense of difference from others not in the community’; shared rituals, which ‘contain the drift of meanings ... set up visible public definitions ... and social solidarity’; and moral responsibility, ‘a felt sense of duty or obligation to the community as a whole’.

There are an increasing number of descriptive studies detailing the nature of such communities: Sun’s Java Center community (Williams and Cothrel, 2000); in-line skating (Cova and Cova, 2001); Macintosh user groups (Belk and Tumbat, 2005); Star Wars fans (Brown et al., 2003); and Nutella (Cova and Pace, 2005). Taken as a whole, these
communities are expected to provide a raft of benefits for the organisation: they positively affect brand equity; they create a solid base of loyal, enthusiastic and forgiving consumers; and they provide many opportunities for up-selling and cross-selling (Muniz and O’Guinn, 2001; McAlexander et al., 2002). Of course, it may be difficult for every brand to foster the development of community. Rather, brands that perform well in this regard tend to be characterised by an aura of religiosity (Schouten and McAlexander, 1995; Kozinets, 2001; Belk and Tummers, 2005; Muniz and Schau, 2003), utopianism (Kozinets, 2003; Brown et al., 2003), authenticity (Kozinets, 2001; Brown et al., 2003), and a preponderance of narratives (Kozinets, 2001; Brown et al., 2003; Muniz and Schau, 2005).

Religiosity has been a prominent theme in consumer research ever since Belk et al.’s (1989, p. 13) exposition of the sacred in consumer behaviour: ‘that which is regarded as more significant, powerful and extraordinary than the self. Sacred occurrences may be ecstatic; they are self-transcending.’ While there is little doubt that consumers may imbue consumption objects themselves with sacredness, there is also religiosity to be found in rituals associated with the object (Schouten and McAlexander, 1995), in the membership of a community of shared belief (Schouten and McAlexander, 1995; Kozinets, 2001), and in the martyrdom and sacrifice associated with devoting oneself to a brand that may be stigmatised by the mainstream (Kozinets, 2001; Muniz and Schau, 2005). More importantly, such devotion underlines ‘the very clear and resilient need humans have to believe in something or someone outside mundane reality’ (Muniz and Schau, 2005, p. 739). In a consumer culture brands may replace traditional religions as the site of our identity and life-goal investments (Kozinets, 2001).

Brand-centred communities may also be typified by their endeavours to open up a utopian space in the chaos of the contemporary world. Utopianism stiches ‘impossibility and dreaminess together with deep motivational power and desire’ (Kozinets, 2001, p. 73). But utopianism is not merely an escape into fantasy; rather, it enables consumers to engage with reality and to situate themselves within that reality (Geoghegan, 1987, cited in Maclaran and Brown, 2001). That is, the utopian has the ability to both transform and subvert, and its power ‘lies in its challenges to the status quo’, (Maclaran and Brown, 2001, p. 376). Moreover, the subversive power of the utopian helps consumers within these communities to draw contrasts between their sense of communalism and the more individuated world outside (Kozinets, 2003).

The search for authenticity may be a defining characteristic of contemporary consumer culture given the inauthenticity that abounds in that culture (Brown et al., 2003). Authenticity may be indexical and/or iconic but it is never inherent in the consumption object itself (Grayson and Martinec, 2004). Rather, authenticity is in the eye of the beholder and its shared perception within a consumption community represents the workings of an idiosculture: ‘a system of shared knowledge, beliefs, behaviours, and customs shared by members of an interaction group … [which] can be employed to construct a social reality’ (Fine, 1979, cited in Belk and Costa, 1998, p. 232). Linked as they are with self and social identity, powerful brands must carry an aura of authenticity if they are to be used as a marker of differentiation within the mass market. For Holt (2002, p. 83) these ‘brands must be disinterested; they must be perceived as invented and disseminated by parties without an instrumental economic agenda, by people who are intrinsically motivated by their inherent value. Postmodern consumers perceive modern branding efforts to be inauthentic because they ooze with the commercial intent of their sponsors.’

Finally, these brands also tend to be characterised by particular narratives. In essence every brand is a story in and of itself (Twitchell, 2004), and these stories are the culmination of interactions between the organisation and consumers; what the brand management literature distinguishes as brand concept (Park et al., 1986) and brand image (Patterson, 1999). From the perspective of the organisation, a brand-centred community provides the ideal audience for origin myths that create a sense of heritage and bolster shared notions of authenticity. ‘Brands like Airwalk and Patagonia rest their laurels on their street credentials among the most discerning skateboarders and mountain climbers. Any product that has a credible historical or subcultural story to tell seems to be telling it’ (Holt, 2002, p. 83). Furthermore, the tales members of these communities tell about the brand serve as ‘morallelegories’ (Brown et al., 2003).
cautionary moral anecdotes that help these consumers acquire and manipulate brand meanings through processes of integration (Holt, 1995), and that allow members to differentiate themselves from other consumers of the brand.

**Conclusion**

This paper has suggested that the focus on BCRs as close, emotional and committed relationships is a direct consequence of the employment of the interpersonal relationship metaphor primarily at the basic level of marriage. This results in the implicit acceptance of normative ideals regarding marriage being transferred to consumers’ interaction with brands. Although other interpersonal relationships have been acknowledged, for example Blackston’s (1993) reference to doctor–patient (role relationships) and Fournier’s (1998) recognition that relationships may reflect task or duty rather than emotion, formality rather than informality, imbalance rather than equality, hostility rather than conviviality, and force rather than choice, all have been eschewed in favour of the more beguiling and appealing use of marriage. Rather than advancing understanding of the connections between consumers and brands, most work has served only to legitimise further use of RM terminology and concepts in the branding arena.

The paper acknowledges that brands possess meanings above and beyond those of a functional nature, and accepts the notion that we project personalities onto those brands that are salient to us. However, the paper cautions against using these arguments to propound a focus on BCRs and the attendant use of SET.

More critical appreciation of the roles of brands in our lives points towards a brand community perspective that acknowledges the network of connections between a brand’s various publics. This perspective also avoids the pitfall of stretching the interpersonal relationship metaphor too far and provides a strong foundation upon which brand managers can build. In particular, the paper highlights how brand meanings may derive from the very nature of communal interaction and underlines the tools such communities use to construct personalised brand meanings.

For managers, the major lesson to emerge from this work is that consumers are the ultimate arbiters of brand meaning. As such, managers need to pay close attention to how customers themselves define their various connections with the brand. If consumers truly view these connections as relationships, managers need to be wary of unthinkingly adopting an RM frame to understand them. Rather, they must adequately analyse the nature, characteristics and boundaries of those relationships and act accordingly. If, on the other hand, consumers view these connections in terms of communal interaction with other consumers, then managers need to identify how best to facilitate that interaction without overtly intruding upon it. This work suggests that the fostering of brand narratives, particularly those centring on authenticity, sacredness and utopianism is a useful place to start.
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This article considers the neglected area of disposition, the nature of our relationship with waste. Marketing tactics are complicit in a throwaway culture, so how can we better theorize our relationship to waste? The authors submit that to maintain control, we are encouraged to keep waste in its place—out of sight and out of mind. This is achieved through systemic smoothing mechanisms such as our socialization against waste, the role of trash cans, and the work of garbage collectors. By exposing the detritus of consumption, the “waste mountain,” a macromarketing analysis helps us confront the systemic avoidance of waste. As such, this constitutes an initial contribution to marketing as social engagement and also to future policy development. We connect the rendering invisible or hidden aspect of waste to what Bauman has termed the *economics of deception* prevalent within consumer society.
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**Acquisition, Consumption and Disposition**

*Consume:* 1. To take in as food; eat or drink up.  
2a. To expend; use up.  
b. To purchase (goods or services) for direct use or ownership.  
3. To waste; squander.  
4. To destroy totally. 1

Despite Jacoby’s (1978) call for consideration of the full cycle of consumption, research in marketing has largely ignored disposition processes. Exceptions include examinations of the antecedents of disposal decisions (e.g., Arnould, Price, and Zinkhan. 2002; DeBell and Dardis 1979; Hanson 1981; Jacoby, Berning, and Dietvorst 1977), including the effect of perceived value on such decisions (Hibbert and Horne 2002), attitudes toward recycling (e.g., Alvitt and Berger 1993; McCarty and Shrum 1993; Thogersen and Grunert-Beckmann 1997), the implications of reverse marketing channels (Fuller and Allen 1996; Zikmund and Stanton 1971), and consumer responses to disposable containers (Marquardt, McGann, and Makens 1974). Although consumer culture theory (Arnould and Thompson 2005) has engendered a more insightful treatment of the full cycle of consumption, including disposition (see Belk, Sherry, and Wallendorf 1988; Sherry 1990), the general lionization of consumption by interpretive researchers may have marginalized disposition even further. Consumption is, after all, currently conceptualized as a sacred process to be celebrated, a cornerstone in the construction of identity (McKay 1997). Disposition, on the other hand, is far more secular and mundane.

Limited though the study of disposition is, the disposal of waste is marginalized even further. However, the waste produced by consumption is not only relevant, providing as it does a tangible record of that consumption (De Graff, Wann, and Naylor 2001), it is also vitally important to understanding the complete consumer experience. The treadmill of consumption produces not only a constant flow of waste but also endless decisions about the value of consumption objects and what to purchase or discard (Dyer and Maronick 1988; Granzen and Olson 1991; Schwenker and Cornwell 1991; Singhal 1991). These decisions are often based on socially and culturally constructed criteria, leaving the value of our
possessions eternally in flux. Moreover, these criteria are easily manipulated by macro political phenomena, which script our behavior. This article addresses some of these concerns. It explores our relationship with waste and examines the important interface between societal infrastructures and consumer attitudes.

In our examination of waste, we remain mindful of the significance of consumption practices to the relations between individuals (Dolan 2002). Dolan argues that the Gramscian logic of hegemony is a good way to acknowledge the many interconnected ideological systems that coexist within any particular social system. This article helps readers reflect on such assertions by focusing on waste. Put simply, capitalism maintains control not just through violence and political and economic coercion but also through a hegemonic culture in which the values of the middle classes become the commonsense values of all.

It can be argued that Gramsci’s theory suggests that subordinated groups accept the ideas, values and leadership of the dominant group not because they are physically or mentally induced to do so, nor because they are ideologically indoctrinated, but because they have reason of their own. (Strinati 1995, 166)

A consensus culture developed in which people in the working class identified their own good with the good of the middle classes, and thus, rather than revolt, they helped to maintain the status quo. Such analysis is helpful if we consider how the present dominant social paradigm (cf. Kilbourne, McDonagh, and Prothero 1997) implicitly suggests that our systemic waste collection processes are efficient at dealing with the residues of the system. Indeed, this is so axiomatic that it is common-sense and rarely, if ever, questioned. At an individual level, because trash is quickly removed to trash cans and collected from our places of residence (literally taken away from us) on a regular basis, this essentially relieves us from any further responsibility. This is what is referred to here as the social avoidance of waste.

In this article, the authors open up such avoidance to question. In doing so, they revisit one of Jacoby, Berning, and Dietvorst’s (1977) assertions, “As the amount of available storage space increases, the probability that an item will be kept will increase, and the probability that it will be thrown away will decrease” (p. 27) and juxtapose this against the now widely perceived reality of “Marketing and the Tragedy of the Commons,” where Shultz and Holbrook (1999) help us to realize that storage space is not unending (and the Commons is rapidly disappearing)! Therefore, as a clear social consequence of marketing, how we dispose of waste needs to be reconsidered at the systemic level and in terms of how this impacts policy and the household. Shultz and Holbrook (1999) also ask us to reconsider a positive role for technology in communicating Commons-friendly behavior. Waste needs to be recognized and confronted in policy discussion in the context of our ecological footprints, the limited use of resources, and the discussion around forms of waste disposal or energy (e.g., Wackernagel 2007; Pimentel 2007). All of these issues clearly locate waste as an important issue within the macromarketing domain. If we are able to locate discussion of waste not as one of Nason’s (1989) “unforeseen effects” considered only in hindsight but rather as an “internality” caused by imperfect information, it may be that technology could help, given its ability to enable access to pertinent information. This challenge provides us with the opportunity to refocus on “marketing systems performance” (Fisk 2006, 215). In this regard, how we deal with the waste question in our theory also contributes to much needed sustainable supply chain analysis (Fisk 2006).

The Slumbering, Festering Beast

We are a nation of slobs. Unimaginative, lazy, selfish, filthy in our habits and damn the consequences. If we had the choice, we wouldn’t keep ourselves as pets. Skunks would be easier to live with. (Girling 2002, 18)

The environmental lexicon bulges with references to “waste mountains,” “litter escalation,” “throwaway cultures,” and “landfill capacity exhaustion,” which are characteristic of Western consumer society. Waste is painted as a slumbering, festering beast, soon to wake and ravage the earth. Such analogies can be supported by readily available statistics. In North America, the Media Foundation’s Adbusters organization (http://www.adbusters.org/home/) regularly ridicules the “pig-like” waste generated there as well as on the other continents. In the European Union, each individual generates approximately 450 kg. (approximately 1,000 lbs.) of waste per year (Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs [DEFRA] 2007). Moreover, in the United Kingdom, citizens throw away nearly 30 million tons of garbage every year, and this figure continues to rise. Standard critiques focus on the shortage of landfill facilities, which currently house 62 percent of the United Kingdom’s waste (House of Commons Select Committee 2007). Meanwhile, apocalyptic press articles speak of a garbage crisis and question where tomorrow’s rubbish will be kept (Grogan 1997; Girling 2002).

Notwithstanding these statistics, our disposal habits go relatively unchecked. While there have been numerous studies of waste commissioned by waste management authorities, these rarely find their way into public or academic domains. The studies that emerge within marketing
are predominantly managerial and tend to use aggregated data, observing generic trends and waste generation patterns (e.g., Thøgersen 1993). While superficially useful, these studies are limited in facilitating an appreciation of the nuances underlying waste creation.

Waste has been addressed to some degree in other disciplines. For example, the pop-sociologist Vance Packard (1960) provided a wonderfully accessible exposition of the issue in his second book, The Waste Makers. With his finger firmly pointed at U.S. industry and marketers in particular, Packard uncovers many of the ways (e.g., planned product obsolescence) in which, in a saturated market, consumers are encouraged to consume ever-increasing quantities of goods at an ever-increasing pace. Jean Baudrillard (1970) questions the assertion that waste is dysfunctional, insisting instead that wasteful consumption allows us to feel alive. He argues that only with greater understanding of waste will its true function within society be uncovered. Thompson (1979) offers one of the few works to consider the dynamic nature of waste and the fluctuating value of the things we own. Martin O’Brien (1999) extends this work, raising issues on which a sociology of garbage might be constructed. However, O’Brien (1999) argues that even within sociology, waste has not received the attention it deserves. He suggests it is treated “as if it were literally immaterial, as if it existed in a world apart from the one we inhabit in our daily, routine lives” (p. 262). This has been more recently redressed with George Ritzer’s extension of Weber’s notions of rationalization into a discussion of the “globalization of nothing” (see Beilharz et al. 2004).

Within economics, Smith (1972) considers the cost to the consumer of recycling versus disposal, while Fullerton and Kinnaman (1996) measure the impact of related charges on the volume of waste produced. Schor (1998) offers an engaging analysis of the material overload caused by wasteful consumption. She challenges us to consider how much we really require and examines trends toward downsizing and voluntary simplicity. Recent responses to apparent consumption excesses and efforts to challenge consumption are now attracting the attention of consumer researchers (e.g., Kozinets and Handelman 2004; McDonald et al. 2006; Fråj and Martinez 2006). While considering distribution and public policy, Dholakia and Dholakia (1978) highlighted that socialist countries had concerns over the Western model of retailing due to its high cost and social waste.

However, it is arguably within anthropology where one is offered perhaps the greatest depth of research on waste. Rathje has researched extensively in the area and is probably best known for the development of the Garbage Project. With more than three decades of study in the field, he applies modern-day archaeological techniques to the examination of contemporary waste and recycling habits in what has become known as “garbology.” Rubbish: The Archaeology of Garbage is perhaps his most famous contribution (see also Rathje 1984; 1991; Rathje and Murphy 1992; Wilk and Rathje 1982). Rathje contends that garbage provides the key to understanding what consumers actually do rather than what they say they do. Wallendorf and Reilly (1983) have also used consumers’ household garbage to examine cultural differences in consumption habits.

To recap, using Jacoby’s (1978) work as a guide, research into disposition is important because consumer disposal decisions can have a significant impact on both individuals and the environment. Research in this area would also help to complete analysis of the cycle of consumption, providing a more complete picture of the consumer. Moreover, many marketing tactics encourage the “throwaway spirit,” and we, as marketing academics, have a moral obligation to improve our understanding of waste in particular. The research reported here represents an initial step in this process, as it seeks to elucidate the nature of our relationship with waste. The initial premise was that consumers are socialized into avoiding waste. Specifically, the authors were concerned that decades of Keep Britain Tidy campaigns (Environmental Campaigns [ENCAMS] 2001) and Keep America Beautiful crusades (Heywood 2002), years of early-morning or late-night garbage collection, and the everyday functioning of trash cans may have rendered waste invisible. That is, the tendency for individuals to experience waste in a fleeting, almost ethereal manner translates into a societal failure to truly experience and therefore acknowledge waste. This presents a particular empirical problem for macromarketers who wish to engage with how the issue of waste is rendered invisible and, following Fisk (2006), to consider what impact this might have on marketing systems. Bauman (2008) comments as follows:

In addition to being an economics of excess and waste, consumerism is for this reason also an economics of deception. As with the excess and waste, deception does not signal its malfunctioning. On the contrary—it is a symptom of its good health and of its being on the right track; a distinctive mark of the sole regime under which the society of consumers may be assured of survival. . . . The society of consumers derives its animus and momentum from the disaffection it itself expertly produces. It provides the prime case of a process which Thomas Mathiesen has recently described under the name of “silent silencing” (of potential system-born dissent and protest) through the stratagem of “absorption”—meaning that “the attitudes and actions which in origin are transcendent (that is, threatening the system with explosion or implosion-Z.B.) are integrated in the prevailing order in such a way that dominant interests
continue to be served. ‘This way, they are made unthreaten-
ing to the prevailing order.” I would add that they are
concerted into a major resource of the reproduction of
that order. (P. 153)

This provides an incentive for macromarketers to
investigate the causes and consequences of the hidden
mountain.

Methodology

Our direct experience with the waste we produce tends
to be limited. Thus, it is often difficult for us to explore
our thoughts and feelings about that waste. To consider
how to engage consumer informants on their experiences
of the issue at hand, the authors first had to confront and
detail their own personal experiences. Thus, one of the
researchers undertook subjective personal introspection
(SPI) as a way of engaging with the difficulties of articu-
lating personal thoughts about waste. SPI further allowed
the authors to consider what kinds of issues emerge when
they allow themselves to reflect on rubbish. SPI has been
employed successfully by researchers interrogating their
own mental processes (see Holbrook 1986, 1987, 1988;
Gould 1995; Shankar 2000) and is quite common as a
prelude to further data gathering (Brown and Reid 1997).
Indeed, the SPI employed here contributed substantially
to the subsequent study design.

The second phase of data collection involved inter-
views with five consumers.2 These informants were
interviewed in their homes in an effort to contextualize
the physical reality of waste in their everyday lives. For
example, information regarding the number and place-
ment of waste baskets throughout the homes (see Chappells
and Shove 1999) became important to inter-
view discussions. More fundamentally, it was interesting
to consider how the informants’ views on waste changed
throughout the interview as they began to actively expe-
rience their own rubbish. The informants were all young
and well educated. They provided an important role in
the study by corroborating suggestions that societal sys-
tems exist that substantially inhibit consumers’ abilities
to experience the impact of their consumption in terms of
waste (Douglas 1966). The consumer data are not used in
this study in any attempt to generalize to the United
Kingdom or other populations. Rather, they are mobi-
lized to highlight the nature of the problem and to offer
deeper and more compelling insights than have hitherto
been possible. Brief details of the consumer informants
are given below.

James, twenty-four, currently works as a product assis-
tant for a major multinational, sharing rented accommo-
dation with a friend. Sarah, twenty-four, presently lives
alone in her own house and works as a personnel officer.
Iain, twenty-five, is a vegetarian and also lives alone in an
apartment. He currently works as a software engineer.
Gemma, twenty-four, continues to live at her family
home and works as a producer for a U.K. radio station.
Finally, Jonathon, twenty-seven, has recently purchased a
new house, is a vegetarian, and works for the U.K.’s
Environment Agency.

Because consumers do not easily experience waste, the
authors felt it important to gain access to individuals who
actually do experience waste in a real sense. Therefore,
they conducted further interviews with individuals
employed within the waste management industry.3 These
expert informants provided important access to everyday
experiences of waste. In undertaking this phase of the data
collection, a more phenomenological approach to inquiry
(Thompson, Locander, and Pollio 1989, 1990) was con-
sidered most appropriate. As such, the authors privileged
informants’ lived experiences and attempted to gain access
to their world. This could not be considered pure phenom-
enology, however, because of the parallel use of syncretic
introspection. As such, the insights gained from both per-
sonal and guided introspection allowed for exploration,
in an iterative way, into areas not initially driven by infor-
mants. Therefore, the approach taken is more akin to Mick
and Buhl’s (1992) phenomenological-type interviews.
Furthermore, the interviews also incorporated a degree of
participant observation, as researchers and informants
waded across landfill sites and through recycling centers
during the course of interviews. This facilitated the use
of grand tour questions (Fetterman 1989) and enabled the
authors to “learn where things are, what things are called,
and what is important—at least to the person giving the
tour” (Bailey 1996, 73). For these interviews, snowball
sampling was employed, where meeting one informant
presented opportunities to meet others. Again, all discus-
sions were audio-recorded and fully transcribed to ensure
all data were captured and to avoid interrupting the flow
through note taking.

Mick, forty-five, is the waste manager of Brigshaw
Borough Council, responsible for all local waste collection
duties. Tony, forty-nine, is a regional manager for a waste
disposal contractor, with thirty years’ experience in the
waste industry. Visiting a “rudimentary” public recycling
center, the authors met Bryan, forty-eight, self-employed
manager for the last twenty-five years. The authors also
visited Redfield Road Recycling Center, a more organized
and, hence, more typical example of recycling facilities
within the United Kingdom. This was run and owned by
John, fifty-two.

Both sets of interviews ran simultaneously and de-
veloped in an iterative process (Jones 1991). Analysis followed
a hermeneutical style, where researchers immersed
themselves in the data and embarked on an iterative and interactive back-and-forth process, relating part of the text to the whole (Thompson, Locander, and Pollio 1990). The number of informants in both sets of interviews is intentionally restricted to ensure depth concerning life-worlds (see Fournier 1998). These interviews typically lasted between one and one-half and two hours.

**Waste: An Inevitable Consequence**

A number of themes emerged from informant discussions. First and foremost, it becomes obvious that waste is regarded as an inevitable consequence of the society in which we live. This is important and demonstrates how the production of wealth (within consumer culture) is systematically seen to be accompanied by social risks and hazards (Beck 1992). Thus, as consumption has escalated, so too has the production of waste, signifying a relationship between the two (Thøgersen 1993), with the prevailing trend legitimized by capitalism’s insatiable appetite for profitable growth.

I think it’s like all forms of pollution really; it’s not going to get any better, so we’ve got to learn to live with it. . . . You have got to have certain waste; it is just a matter of minimizing that waste. (Jonathon, twenty-seven, Environment Agency officer)

The inevitable production of waste is highlighted particularly by those informants who work within the waste management industry. For example, both Mick and Bryan felt that the amount of waste produced by society was increasing and that this was to be expected given the way in which we choose to live:

Waste is on the up all the time. I’ve noticed; I’ve been here twenty-odd years, and I can tell the volume of waste that is coming in has gone up year after year after year. We live in a very wasteful society. (Bryan, forty-eight, Burnstump Recycling Center)

As long as we remain prosperous, people will still keep producing more and more waste. It’s the consumer age. (Mick, forty-five, Waste Manager, Brigshaw Borough Council)

The “consumer age” is predicated on the idea that we no longer consume to live but live to consume. The most salient feature of the long-term application of marketing technologies is the ideology of consumption that constitutes the dominant social paradigm (Kilbourne, McDonagh, and Prothero 1997). “Market discourses teach individuals not just about individual products but also about how to live and participate in the consumer society—thus ensuring its survival” (Kelly-Holmes 1998, 341). As a result, we learn quite early in our development as consumers that waste is an inevitable by-product of modern life.

Trying to persuade people to actually generate less refuse is not that simple because the amount [they] generate is driven by their lifestyle and by modern living; that is almost an inevitability of the development of society. . . . We are fighting a losing battle in trying to get people to change their attitudes towards waste. (Tony, forty-nine, regional manager, Nottinghamshire Waste Disposal)

[Waste] is the snail trail of human existence, the mess we leave behind us as we supposedly move forward. As our lives progress, we leave a trail of sludge and slime and poo that we’ve got no use for, but all the time, it’s showing us where we’ve come from and what we are about. (James, twenty-four, product assistant)

James’s intriguing metaphor highlights an ambivalence toward waste that resonates throughout much of the literature. First, referring to waste as the “mess” we leave behind, he then suggests that it shows us “where we have come from and what we are about,” connoting a more socially revealing aspect to our refuse. We may shed light on these issues by referring to the works of Norbert Elias and Mary Douglas. In The Civilizing Process, Elias (1939/1994) describes the means by which social standards and codes have developed over time. According to Scheff (2002), this civilizing process encompasses, among other things, Weber’s notion of rationalization, the increasing regulation and surveillance of the individual such that individual lives become more calculable and controllable. For Elias, there has been a movement through which the locus of control has shifted from the external domain to the internal one, making it even more powerful and restraining. Such a stance is also similar to the implications of Foucault’s (1979) disciplinary gaze, within which the perception of constant surveillance causes individuals to internalize normative conventions. Douglas’s (1966) examination of the intricacies of dirt is consistent with Elias’s work: “Dirt is essentially disorder. . . . We are not governed by anxiety to escape disease, but are positively re-ordering our environment, making it conform to an idea” (p. 2). Her assessment is evocative because it implies a set of ordered relations. Public manifestations of waste contraven these relations and disobey systemic rules. Waste must therefore be put in its proper place if the system is to be maintained, since it is “likely to confuse or contra-diect cherished classifications” (Douglas 1966, 36). In an effort to keep it in its proper place, we are socialized as children against public displays of waste (such as littering),
we are encouraged to maintain order (through governmental and commercial campaigns such as Keep Britain Tidy, Keep America Beautiful, and Don’t Trash California), and we are provided with mechanisms that isolate and remove waste quietly and efficiently (trash cans and garbage collectors), often late at night or in the early hours of the morning. Such organized waste disposal mechanisms are increasingly necessary given the disaggregation between consumption and disposition in modern society (Nicosia and Mayer 1976).

Socialization Against Public Manifestations of Waste

Young consumers are quickly socialized to believe that the public visibility of waste should be avoided. Gemma was involved in a school group called Litter Busters, while Jonathon received more direct parental intervention:

The only thing I did once that I felt really bad about was throw a banana skin on the ground outside work, because I didn’t want to carry it around in my pocket. So I just chucked that down the side of the pavement, and each day, I walked past and kept looking at it [feeling] . . . that’s really bad. (Gemma, twenty-four, radio producer)

My mum and dad used to train me, ingrain into me “pick that up” and give me a slap on the back of my head. It was ingrained from a young age that it is not the done thing. (Jonathon, twenty-seven, Environment Agency officer)

The need for order and the general abhorrence of public waste are also evidenced by other informants:

I get angry when I see people dropping litter. Sometimes, I feel that I would love to pick it up and just go and chuck it back at them. (Iain, twenty-five, software engineer)

It annoys me. I quite often get litter in my garden, which really irritates me because it doesn’t take a lot to put a [candy] wrapper in your pocket or to take something to a [trash can]. It makes the place look so horrible. (Sarah, twenty-four, personnel officer)

You’ve got a pretty place that is spoiled through people’s disregard, disrespect . . . for one’s environment. Considering you are in a developed country with high population density, we’ve got to work a little bit harder to keep things tidy, rather than just thinking, well, it gives someone a job, doesn’t it? (Jonathon, twenty-seven, Environment Agency officer)

In addition to parental instruction, such normalized reactions to publicly visible waste are reinforced through repetitive exposure to environmental campaigns, such as Keep Britain Tidy, which has been running since 1955. However, it has to be noted that slogans, such as Keep Britain Tidy, already presuppose a tidy Britain. Furthermore, these campaigns shift the onus of responsibility for managing waste firmly onto the shoulders of individuals and largely ignore industrial pollution (O’Barr 2006). Meanwhile, the U.K. government has divested itself of almost all responsibility, as it has transferred the accountability for such campaigns to a private organization, ENCAMS (Hobson 2004). Similarly, in Ireland, the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government was responsible for an advertising campaign titled Race Against Waste. As a result of the campaign, there was nearly a 50 percent increase in the number of people who believed that individuals have primary responsibility for the environment and an increase in recycling from 8 percent to 21 percent (Institute of Advertising Practitioners in Ireland 2004). The then Minister for the Environment also highlighted the campaign’s successes in a 2004 speech: “The message in the campaign has made everybody think, it’s making people talk, it’s making people take responsibility” (Institute of Advertising Practitioners in Ireland 2004). The overall purpose of this campaign then was to challenge the perception that waste was the responsibility of the government, local councils, or businesses and to promote personal responsibility.

There is currently much concern about landfill in the United Kingdom because of the 1999 European Union directive requiring a reduction in the amount of biodegradable waste going into landfill from the 18.1 million tons in 2003-2004 to 13.7 million tons in 2010, 9.2 million in 2013, and 6.3 million in 2020 (House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts 2007). While progress has been made toward this target, it is largely attributed to the enthusiasm and commitment of the public. Future strategies to achieve further reductions include the development of new infrastructure capable of processing up to 15 million tons of waste each year as well as further efforts to curb individual waste production through the introduction of a bin tax. Although the idea of a pay-as-you-throw charge operates in other countries (including Ireland), it is controversial in the United Kingdom. It is anticipated that the bin tax will hit poorer and larger families hardest and that there may be a concomitant increase in fly-tipping (people dumping their garbage in unofficial locations) as well as a possible increase in back garden bonfires. The development in infrastructure is also behind schedule, as there are widespread protests
about proposed locations (see BBC 2007). That is, while people may recognize the value of a potentially hazardous facility (such as landfill sites, incineration plants, etc.), they do not want these facilities situated in their locality. The “not in my backyard” (NIMBY) and “locally unwanted land use” (LULU) phenomena (Schively 2007) are important in resisting such infrastructural developments (Lober 1995).

In the United States, the Keep America Beautiful campaign was initially funded by large corporations in whose interest it was for citizens to manage the detritus of consumption rather than to curb consumption itself (Nees et al. 2003). More pointedly, the 1965 Highway Beautification Act was specifically designed to remove junkyards from the view of federal and state roads, thereby rendering them invisible (Nees et al. 2003).

These and similar campaigns espouse the idea that waste contained in a trash can ceases to be a problem. Thus, campaigns such as Keep America Beautiful are an exercise in cosmetology (Schnaiberg 1980) and fail to address the question, when we throw things away, where is away? (Thiele 2000). In other words, these campaigns have little to do with environmental concern but are related to the desire to keep waste in its place. Indeed, research by the organizers of Keep Britain Tidy found that both parental control and pride in an area, rather than environmental concern, were the key drivers perpetuating the social intolerance of littering (ENCAMS 2001).

I think it just looks ugly. Whereas, a tidy place, you remember it. You know if you see a particular town when you go on holiday that is really well kept and well looked after, then you remember it. (Gemma, twenty-four, radio producer)

Thus, the desire for a waste-free environment simply represents the exercise of social control and the avoidance of shame. Such control, in turn, facilitates guilt-free consumption, for we are never faced with the unseemly product of our actions. By comparison, Singapore has harsh penalties for the (ab)use of chewing gum and Irish Business Against Litter (IBAL) names and shames in its annual Anti-Litter League. Therefore, it seems reasonable to suggest that consumers will engage in procedural tactics to enhance their sense of control such as removing evidence of waste from the streets themselves:

We were driving along, and we saw another car drop a carrier bag of rubbish by the roadside, and it was quite close to a relation’s house, and we felt really annoyed about it because they’d just left it there. So we went and picked it up and took it to a twenty-four-hour [disposal area]. (Gemma, twenty-four, radio producer)

You can’t drop a crisp packet when there is no litter to be seen. [In Florida], the streets [are] spotless, and you are the outcast if you drop litter. (James, twenty-four, product assistant)

The trash can

The trash can is a ubiquitous part of everyday life within Western consumer society. In every home, on every street, practically anywhere people congregate, a trash can is likely to be placed close by.

We have them in every room actually, apart from the entrance hall. We don’t have one in there ‘cause we just don’t use it enough. And the [one] that’s nearest to it isn’t that far away. Whereas, for a while we didn’t have [one] in the front room, and we had to keep going to the kitchen to put stuff in the [trash], and then we got a bit lazy, so we bought one for the front room really, and now its always full. (Gemma, twenty-four, radio producer)

The prevalence of trash cans within our homes, our workplaces, and our streets is not purely accidental. Rather, the trash can plays a fundamental role in the social construction of waste (Chappells and Shove 1999) and in the simulation of self-control. It is an intrinsic part of the system that serves to protect consumers from the evidence of their consumption by hiding waste.

. . . big black hole you throw things down, and they just disappear. (Sarah, twenty-four, personnel officer)

As soon as it gets in that [trash can] . . . that is not mine anymore. That is someone else’s, I suppose, the [garbage] collection people, and that’s it. (Iain, twenty-five, software engineer)

These descriptions share common themes; specifically finality and transcendence. That our garbage bags are only visible fleetingly as they pass from trash can to garbage truck means that they are hidden for the rest of the time. Thus, it appears that trash cans operate as a transcendent gateway between the visible and invisible aspects of consumption; the front- and backstage (Goffman 1971). Consequently, the trash can may be conceptualized as a “smoothing mechanism” that keeps the messy by-products of consumption hidden (backstage), making it easier for consumers to engage in guilt-free consumption in the front-stage theaters of consumption.

The trash can is, therefore, much more than just a passive receptacle for our waste. Rather, it actively constructs the nature of waste and dictates household waste practices (Chappells and Shove 1999). It both shapes and is shaped
by contemporary meanings of waste. For example, trash can design influences patterns of use by communicating a number of scripts, inscribed in its shape, size, and form. The introduction of the “wheelie bin,” now used in approximately 40 percent of U.K. homes, has dramatically changed “both the quality and quantity of waste, with a 50% increase in waste collected in affluent areas” (Chappells and Shove 1999, 269).

The bins are 240 liters [54.5 U.S. gallons], which is roughly one and one-half times the old [trash can] size. So you’ve given [people] the temptation there to generate more waste, because its there. They’ll fill it, where before they may have thought twice. Now this is a problem all councils’ experience; people fill the bins, can’t abide them being half full, just can’t live with it. (Mick, forty-five, waste manager, Brigshaw Borough Council)

The capacity of wheelie bins has led to calls for their replacement (Chappells and Shove 1999). They further conceal our rubbish, making it even easier for us to forget and ignore the amount of waste we produce. Thus, within Western consumer society, the trash can becomes iconic, absolving those who use them from the rubbish they have created.

The garbage collector

Garbage collectors and waste collection can also be regarded as smoothing mechanisms, ensuring the speedy dispatch of waste from the vicinity of our homes. These systemic mechanisms are very efficient and prevent us from dwelling too long on what we discard. The early-morning collection time is designed specifically to have minimum impact on daily life:

They are in my environment for such a short period of time, once a week, that I invariably miss them. If you are having a [sleep] in; you hear them coming; that is about it. (James, twenty-four, product assistant)

I hear them but don’t have any contact with them. (Gemma, twenty-four, radio producer)

The rare contact, and fleeting audible rumblings of the garbage truck, as it moves slowly through the street, is all that reminds us of the toil of garbage collectors. Indeed, informants’ limited contemplation of the role of garbage collectors belies the important job they do. Without their efforts, systems of production and consumption would collapse, and society would suffocate in junk and waste (O’Brien 1999). Our consumer informants appeared ambivalent to the role of garbage collectors within society:

They are doing an important job; they get a hard time. People suggest they wouldn’t want to be a [garbage collector], dealing with all that rubbish all day long, but it is an important service. Someone has got to do it. (James, twenty-four, product assistant)

I think it’s quite depressing actually. I think it’s a very vital role. It’s got a huge function, and we need to be told how valued it is. But actually, to physically do that each day of my life, it’s very menial, isn’t it? Though if they didn’t do what they did, what would you do with all the rubbish? So, it’s a huge responsibility. . . . But I think it must be quite depressing. (Gemma, twenty-four, radio producer)

They are doing a job just like anyone else. Probably should be respected more than other people because they are doing the stuff you don’t want to do. They are taking away the crap you can’t be bothered with. They fulfill quite an important role in society. I wouldn’t like to do it. (Sarah, twenty-four, personnel officer)

The contradictions within these responses are clear. Informants acknowledge the important role that garbage collectors play within society and, on reflection, suggest that this importance should afford them greater respect. However, they imply that such jobs are not for them, as they struggle to free themselves from the culturally constructed perception that such work is “depressing,” “menial,” and concerned with “the crap you can’t be bothered with.”

Consumer Experiences

Waste is not something that many of us confront in our daily lives. This is the inevitable outcome of the collective desire to maintain self-control and to keep waste in its proper place. Apart from the five minutes dedicated to taking the trash can out for collection each week, there is little else we need to think about. Moreover, while conducting interviews with our consumer informants, we noticed that many found it difficult to articulate their feelings toward waste, thus underlining its hidden nature.

I know where it goes, but I forget about it. To be honest, I don’t really think about it. I don’t think, oh my God, I’m destroying the planet because I’ve bought three yogurts I haven’t eaten. I suppose it’s the same as eating meat. You just don’t think about it. If I thought about the little lambs skipping down the little hillside, then taken off by Farmer Giles to be hit on the head and slaughtered, I wouldn’t eat meat. But you just forget about it and focus on the bit that involves you. (Sarah, twenty-four, personnel officer)

I don’t think about the volume of waste I produce. (James, twenty-four, product assistant)
The ability of informants to forget about their waste and to disregard the consequences is perhaps symptomatic of the way society operates. Alternatively, it may be the result of decades of successful socialization against waste. At best, this is mass senility, but at worst, it constitutes a manifestation of cultural doping and deserves greater scrutiny by the macromarketing academy. Moreover, there also seems to be a trend toward blaming others for environmental problems. Alexander (1993) found that 59 percent of Americans believed they were personally doing a good job for the environment but felt that the same was true for only 12 percent of their contemporaries.

I am quite a clean and tidy person, so I would probably make an effort to go and sort it out myself. The world in general would look quite crappy though, because there would be people who just aren’t bothered by things like that and would quite happily leave their rubbish on the street for someone else to clear up. (Sarah, twenty-four, personnel officer)

This type of attitude is problematic because it absolves the individual of personal responsibility, shifting blame onto a nebulous group of mythical “people who just aren’t bothered.” Interestingly, the informants acknowledged that if they were confronted with the amount of waste they had individually produced, they would inevitably be shocked, illustrating the power of this pervasive blindness:

If someone came back to me after a year and said, “This is all your garbage that you have thrown away,” all piled up, you would stop and think… well, maybe I could have taken all those letters, all that junk mail out and sent it off for recycling, or the bottles or the tins. So I suppose the shock tactics would work. (Iain, twenty-five, software engineer)

Probably the amount of waste that can be recycled would shock me, and that would probably embarrass me as well. (Sarah, twenty-four, personnel officer)

These reflections are likely to be merely temporary, as the bustle of daily life leaves little room for prolonged contemplation of one’s contribution to waste. Moreover, dwelling on such issues is likely to be uncomfortable and therefore avoided (Thompson 1979):

I think it would make me uncomfortable if I thought about it every time I was doing it because I would be thinking, God, I’m ruining the planet. (Sarah, twenty-four, personnel officer)

Waste management professionals further suggest that even when people attempt to recycle their waste, they limit their engagement with it and its associated trappings.

They think, because they’ve brought it to a recycling center, that’s where it all finishes. (Bryan, forty-eight, Burnstump Recycling Center)

Everybody pulls in and wants to chuck everything in one [receptacle], without rummaging through it and everything, taking the cardboard out and wood out. We [the employees] have to [do it]; otherwise, the yard’s not doing its proper job. (John, fifty-two, Redfield Road Recycling Center)

These comments concur with the research of Lyons, Uzzell, and Storey (2002), who found that only 56 percent of consumers who visited recycling centers used the different areas designated for different types of waste. This is perhaps why the rudimentary setup at Burnstump Recycling Center, which does not enforce segregation as rigorously as many others, takes approximately 25,000 tons a year, whereas the average is around 10,000 tons:

The paradox is that people like coming here because it’s so easy to use, because they can just drop it on the floor and drive off again. So it’s back to this; people like to pay lip service to environmental issues, but when it comes to the crunch, they want the convenience. (Tony, forty-nine, regional manager, Nottinghamshire Waste Disposal)

It emerges, therefore, that even when we consider ourselves to be environmentally conscious, we are uncomfortable when confronted with our waste. Much of the recycling behavior reported by consumers may be little more than an exercise in impression management (Goffman 1971; Rathje 1984, 1991; Rathje and Murphy 1992; Wallendorf and Reilly 1983). Indeed, Lyons, Uzzell, and Storey (2002) recorded that over two-thirds of their informants claimed they recycled whenever possible, a spurious figure, given that the current level of recycling in the United Kingdom is around 10 percent.

I get concerned that we don’t look at the bigger picture; we focus on our little bit, but we don’t look at the bigger picture in terms of the environmental impacts and what we are doing and whether we are really doing the right thing. (Tony, forty-nine, Regional Manager—Nottinghamshire Waste Disposal)

Often it seems that we feel the “effects are too distant to motivate change [and that] . . . small lifestyle changes by an individual would have ‘zero effect’ on what was a global problem” (Lyons, Uzzell, and Storey 2002, 9-10). However, as Smith (1972) rightly points out, while an individual’s waste contributes only marginally to general discomfort, in aggregate, it may produce “severe disruption to the environment” (p. 601).
Discussion

Waste is regarded as an inevitable consequence of consumption. While all of our informants considered this an undesirable situation, importantly, they also displayed a tacit acceptance that this must be. This partial hypocrisy remains relatively unchallenged because prevailing social conventions absolve us of our profligacy, and consumption continues to grow unchecked. Thus, the initial challenge is to ascertain how waste is understood and accepted in particular way(s) and to uncover the axioms that underpin this dominant view. In this article, the authors detail how the production of waste is regarded as an inevitable consequence of consumption and, thus, how the “problem” of waste is framed as a “waste management” issue. By exploring the mechanisms that cumulatively result in the systemic social avoidance of waste, the authors offer insights that will inevitably be more helpful in informing policies that engender social change rather than continuing to vilify waste per se.

The bottled water market provides a useful characterization of the problem at hand. Over the last decade, bottled water has become ubiquitous in the West, with more than 2,900 brands of bottled water produced in over 115 countries (Mineralwaters.org 2008). In 2004, global consumption of bottled water reached 154 billion liters (41 billion U.S. gallons), up nearly 60 percent on 1999 (Blumenfeld and Leaf 2007). The phenomenal growth of bottled water has been buttressed by concerns over the quality of tap water, the perceived purity of spring water, and by the status attached to drinking a bottled product (Connell 2006). As May (1996) outlines, “Consumption [of bottled water] . . . typifies the emergence of a new, urbane consumer niche, where people use consumer goods to signify who they are and, in so doing, are constituted as a new ‘cultural class’” (p. 60). Even in areas where tap water is safe to drink, demand for bottled water is increasing. As such, the production and consumption of bottled water create unnecessary garbage and consume vast quantities of energy (Arnold and Larsen 2006). In the United States, Mayor Anderson of Salt Lake City accused the product of embodying wasteful and reckless consumerism.

The environmental problems associated with bottled water are numerous. It tends to be packaged in single-serving plastic bottles. The most commonly used plastic for water bottles is polyethylene terephthalate (PET), which is derived from crude oil. “Just manufacturing the 29 billion plastic bottles used for water in the United States each year requires the equivalent of more than 17 million barrels of crude oil” (Larsen 2007, 2). According to Mary Owen (2007), 86 percent of used water bottles in the United States end up as garbage. If they are simply dumped into landfill, they can take up to one thousand years to biodegrade. If they are incinerated, they produce toxic by-products such as chlorine gas and ash containing heavy metals (Arnold and Larsen 2006). Thus, recycling is the only real option. However, only about 23 percent of bottled water containers are recycled in the United States because water bottles have not traditionally been included in local redemption plans (Owen 2007). Moreover, of the limited plastic water bottles presented for recycling in the United States in 2004, almost 40 percent were exported, sometimes to countries as far away as China (Arnold and Larsen 2006), further adding to the environmental footprint. Even when recycled, it is hard to turn scrap PET into new bottles. More virgin material is always necessary (Mooallem 2007, 8).

Two thousand seven was a bad year for the bottled water industry. Despite predictions of continued increases in worldwide consumption, there have been strong criticisms of the industry. In June, the U.S. Conference of Mayors representing 1,100 American cities discussed the irony of purchasing bottled water for employees and for functions, while simultaneously touting municipal water supplies. Indeed, with $43 billion a year going to provide clean drinking water in cities across America, the United States’ municipal water systems are arguably among the finest in the world. During 2007, a number of U.S. cities banned the purchase of bottled water. These included San Francisco, San Jose, Boston, New York, and Salt Lake City. A number of prominent European city councils have also followed suit, including Rome, Florence and Paris. In the United Kingdom, DEFRA has also ceased to offer bottled water at official functions (Larsen 2007). In November, the city council of Chicago placed a landmark tax of five cents on every bottle of water sold in the city to discourage consumption.

The industry has attempted to respond to these various criticisms by running a series of advertisements in The New York Times and San Francisco Chronicle containing the message from the International Bottled Water Association that water is good whether it comes from a faucet or a bottle (McGinn 2007). Some water companies have even redesigned their bottles to use 15 grams of plastic rather than the normal 19 grams, a reduction of 20 percent. Nonetheless, Corporate Accountability International continues to urge us to “Think Outside the Bottle.”

Current attempts to update the 1980s bottle bill include an increase in the deposit involved (currently only a nickel in most states) and the inclusion of water bottles alongside soft drink bottles and beer bottles (Cox 2007). Thus, an economic incentive is being initiated that encourages recycling rather than littering. However, if we consider the innovative “Plas-Tax” introduced by the Irish government...
in 2002, we begin to understand the true possibilities afforded by economic incentives.

The Plas-Tax was designed to rein in rampant consumption of 1.2 billion plastic shopping bags in Ireland each year. Motivation was provided by the country’s escalating litter problem, the scale of resource use, and by respect for the environment. Moreover, recycling was not considered a viable option, as Ireland lacks the necessary infrastructure. Because consumer apathy was seen as high, the levy was set intentionally high at €0.15 to affect the appropriate change in consumer behavior. An education campaign was run prior to the introduction of the tax to encourage compliance and to give Irish consumers a reason to engage.

The Plas-Tax has been hailed as an outstanding success. In the twelve months after its introduction, Ireland witnessed a 90 percent drop in consumption. Moreover, close to €10 million was raised from the tax in the first year and placed in a green fund to benefit the environment (www.reusablebags.com). Consumers purchase “bags for life,” which they reuse for each shopping trip. Retailers have also gained, as they are saving close to €50 million a year by not having to provide single-use plastic bags.

The interesting contribution of the Plas-Tax centers on its ability to curb consumption itself rather than to manage the residue of consumption. Unlike other programs that attempt to decouple the link between economic growth and waste growth, the Plas-Tax acknowledges the link and recognizes that the environmental impact of consumption can only be arrested by tackling consumption itself. While progress toward waste reduction can certainly be made by reducing unnecessary waste through increased producer responsibility and consumer activism, it is questionable whether the inherent profligacy of a consumer society can be reduced to a truly sustainable level without a comparable reduction in consumption. Indeed, waste management itself is an expanding industry, where the primary motivation is economic growth. An increasingly prosperous and sophisticated waste management industry may only serve to further limit the engagement of consumers by convincing them they are doing all that is required. Thus, the authors join other commentators in questioning whether the problems of a capitalist and consumer society can be reduced using the same logic that created them (Ritson and Dobscha 1999; Kilbourne, McDonagh, and Prothero 1997; Peñaloza and Price 1993). Strategies such as DEFRA’s “Reduce, Re-use, Recycle” are essential but only partial solutions to the growing waste mountain, since they tackle the symptoms not the cause. Operating within a capitalist system, the consideration of environmental problems in economic terms may be the quickest way to precipitate the required action. However, it remains to be seen whether the managed reduction in consumption is even possible within a system that has an “insatiable appetite for profitable growth” (Willmott 1999, 217).

**Conclusion**

The emergence of centralized disposal systems reflects an effort on our behalf to control our environment. The desire for control emerges as a result of the rationalization brought about by civilizing processes (Elias 1939/1994). Public manifestations of waste evidence a lack of control and contravene the standards established as a result of these civilizing processes. Managing waste, therefore, involves a number of processes designed specifically to keep it out of sight and in its place. This provides support for Beck’s (1992) assertion that the management of the inevitable social risks caused by wealth creation becomes as functional as wealth creation. We need to consider how this impacts on marketing systems (Fisk 2006; Layton and Grossbart 2006). Implicit in this is the need to understand how waste is currently understood because this determines policy.

The authors have examined several ways in which waste is prevented from becoming visible and kept in its proper place. We are encouraged to maintain the established order through our socialization against public manifestations of waste. This is perpetuated through parental guidance and promotional campaigns such as Keep America Beautiful. Such activity attempts to foster unquestioned norms by ensuring waste is in the proper place (the trash can) rather than foster proactive environmental concern. Garbage collectors and the waste disposal system also mask the visibility of waste. Consequently, these mechanisms help to reinforce social norms by ensuring our waste remains predominantly hidden, preventing extended contemplation. Out of sight and out of mind (De Graff, Wann, and Naylor 2001) is the order of the day.

As academics and members of society, we question our current attitudes toward waste. Concerted action is likely to be difficult, however, given that “one of the political characteristics of waste is precisely this silencing process: the removal or dispersion of shared meanings and experiences of waste” (O’Brien, 1999, 263). Additionally, the systemic logic that seeks to minimize public displays of waste is something of which we are only vaguely aware (Kilbourne, McDonagh, and Prothero 1997). Ironically, citizens also trust the present system to solve the adverse consequences of that system.

The influence of these systemic mechanisms only becomes truly apparent when they fail or do not work as they are supposed to work. During the “winter of
discontent” (1978-1979), the General Strike caused torrents of rubbish to fill U.K. streets, sparking a massive public backlash against the system and heralding the birth of an entirely different ideology—Thatcherism. Clearly notions of hyperconsumption are socially constructed (Dolan 2002), but the data support the assertion that we become decidedly uncomfortable when faced with our waste and, thus, begin to question our consumption levels. As such, consumer society is happiest when consumption is isolated from its waste consequences. Conversely, consumer society is challenged when confronted with the detritus of consumption or when waste solutions introduce social contention, as may occur around the location of waste incinerators, for example.

Throughout this article, the authors have examined the role of several social conventions, norms, and mechanisms that facilitate our desire to keep waste out of sight. They have also speculated that this has made waste tolerable, which is why they introduced notions of questioning the common sense of systems in the introduction, since they create the precarious situation in which we now find ourselves in relation to the Commons. As the waste mountain grows steadily each year, the authors’ aim here is to mobilize further research into this largely neglected area. To engage constructively in this debate through macromarketing ideals (Shultz 2007), we need to better theorize consumption and to acknowledge waste and its role in consumer society. We must, therefore, place the finite Commons at the center of the analysis in the knowledge that once the Commons are no more, our own existence as a human race becomes precarious (Shultz and Holbrook 1999). The authors’ contribution attempts to provide some small pieces in the waste puzzle. However, as we make macromarketing like the agora (Mittelstaedt, Kilbourne, and Mittelstaedt 2006), there are numerous other areas that require examination before the entire picture takes shape. Following Mittelstaedt, Kilbourne, and Mittelstaedt (2006) the effects of commercial and industrial waste also require investigation. Additionally, longitudinal ethnographic inquiry into waste would be beneficial. The authors make no claim to definitive knowledge, merely offering one interpretation of our relationship with waste. Accordingly, the authors invite others to reexamine their findings and consider the role other implicit systemic mechanisms play in consumer perceptions of waste.

Challenging the implicit logic of the system within which we live is extremely difficult, but it is crucial if we are to be more than mere slaves to that system. This above all else makes waste a vital area for research. Essentially, as Alexander (1993) points out, “To live is to pollute. We all consume. We all generate waste” (p. 175). Thus, to theorize waste as simply a waste management issue or indeed a marketing or consumer research issue is problematic in itself. Rather, it is a societal problem and one that is culturally embedded. This requires a more robust theoretical frame than has been offered to date. As Jones and Spicer (2006) have posited with reference to the entrepreneur and excess, if it is possible to change the distribution of excess, then this would involve not simply returning ourselves to a circle of production, but opening up a different political economy of the distribution of excess. (P. 202)

The authors would therefore argue that under the dominant social paradigm, waste, its social cultural significance, and the potential for reconceptualizing our relationship to it are undertheorized. In considering meaningful social change, it might be useful to consider new ways of visualizing waste (Schroeder 2005). The broadcaster Channel 4 (2006) in a documentary titled Britain’s Waste claimed, “The U.K. produces more than 434 million tones of waste every year. This would fill the Albert Hall in less than 2 hours. And babies’ nappies [diapers] make up about 2% of the average household rubbish. This is equivalent to the weight of nearly 70,000 double-decker buses every year. If lined up front to end, the buses would stretch from London, England, to Edinburgh, Scotland.”

In 2003, Seattle city employees used the equivalent of a mountain of paper 10,000 feet high, higher than the state’s highest peak, Mount Rainier (Taevs 2005). It is both necessary and appropriate for the marketing academy to engage with these issues and for practicing marketers to actively develop and promote waste policies. Only then can marketers confidently claim that marketing has a social conscience and that it can demonstrate this as a form of constructive engagement. As Shultz, Rahtz, and Spreece (2004) argue, it is in the very nature of macromarketing to engage broad challenges. In the case of waste, the authors contend it is hidden from the macromarketing agora, but perhaps as Fisk (2006) and Peterson (2006) both allude to, our future is in our past. To deal with the hidden mountain, the authors submit that transdisciplinary studies—associated so much with Charles C. Slater—are needed to help us to unveil the whole picture and, as a result, out the systemic economics of deception.

Notes


2. These interviews were conducted in person by Edd de Coverly between January and May 2002 in Leeds and Nottingham, United Kingdom.

3. Ibid.
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Abstract
In addressing skin this paper seeks to illuminate current research within consumer culture theory. Framing our discussion within a consideration of tattoo culture, we explore the double-sidedness of skin, its ambiguity and ambivalence. In this way, we examine the relationship between identity and consumption and throw into question many of the received ideas concerning embodied identity within consumer research. Utilizing three skin metaphors (skin as container, projection surface, and cover to be modified), we generate a series of insights into intercorporeality, embodiment, and body projects.
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Skinning up
In their re-imagining of consumer research, Arnould and Thompson (2005) contend that consumer culture theory (CCT) holds identity as a prime concern. However, the production of a singular disciplinary skin such as CCT serves to camouflage the multiplicity of approaches taken to understanding identity within consumer research. Of concern here are the tensions between considerations of consumers as postmodern fragmented selves and consumers as seekers of a coherent sense of self. Postmodern selves represent temporary attachments to multiple and sometimes contradictory subjectivities constructed by particular discourses (Patterson and Elliott, 2002). In the liberatory sense ‘the individual is freed from seeking or conforming to one sense or experience of being’ (Firat and Venkatesh, 1995: 253). In contrast, the alternative view posits
that consumers are trapped by long-standing cultural narratives and/or pursue a coherent sense of self in spite of contemporary conditions (Thompson and Hirschman, 1995).

CCT contends that the marketplace offers up a plenitude of commodities and symbolic resources to be incorporated by consumers in the construction of identities and related narratives. Moreover, the study of marketplace cultures suggests that communal identity is increasingly forged through an engagement in common consumption interests. Underscoring such conceptualizations are three fundamental contentions: first, that identities are not static or given but worked through by consumers. Indeed, ‘an ideology of limitless improvement and change, defying history, mortality and materiality of the body’ (Joy and Venkatesh, 1994: 351) obliges consumers to work upon their bodies through consumption; second, that identities are the responsibility of the individuals concerned. Unique selfhood has long been connected to mass-produced goods by marketing (Grainge, 2000). Moreover, this focus on unique selfhood is replicated in the majority of consumer research (Firat and Dholakia, 2006); third, that the communication of identities to and their interpretation by others remains relatively trouble free. As a consequence of the focus on the individual, the communication of identity to others remains largely implicit and unproblematic within CCT.

The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to interrogate the conceptualization of identity generally and embodied identity in particular within CCT. Drawing upon the literature on the body and skin from sociology, cultural studies, feminism and consumer research, this paper offers a theoretical exploration of these issues that renders current conceptualizations problematic. In so doing, the paper presents an analysis of three skin metaphors (skin as container, as projection surface, and as cover to be modified) that opens up broader considerations of consumption and identity in respect of identity’s intercorporeal nature, its legibility, and its embodiment. We further address these issues from the perspective of heavily tattooed women and include a number of quotations from a previous interpretive study (see Patterson and Elliott, 2003) as illustrative of the concepts under discussion. This previous study was focused on the anxieties experienced by heavily tattooed women with respect to traditional beauty ideals.

**Bodies, skins, tattoos**

The literature on embodiment within CCT incorporates explorations of the embodied nature of impulsive behaviour (e.g. Rook, 1987), body projects (e.g. Askegaard et al., 2002), and representations of the body in advertising (e.g. Schroeder and Zwick, 2004). However, skin, the body’s largest and most visible organ, remains strangely peripheral to this work (see Schroeder, 2002; Schroeder and Borgerson, 2003a for exceptions). Yet as consumers, we are routinely preoccupied with skin. We clothe it, we expose it to the sun, we depilate it, we moisturize it, we beautify it with cosmetics, we cleanse it, we tattoo it, we pierce it and we scar it. But skin is important not just because it is the focus of much consumer activity. Skin reflects the dynamic relationship between inside and outside, self and society, between personal identity projects and marketplace cultures. It represents the meeting place of structure and agency; a primary site for the inscription of ideology and a text upon which individuals write their own stories. This liminality of skin, its in-betweeness and ambiguity, contrive to make it a powerful medium for the further exploration of embodied identity and consumption.

Our discussion here is framed by a consideration of heavily tattooed women. While tattooing has undoubtedly become big business, it remains a relatively marginalized practice ‘perceived as a social marking that, if not inscribed on the bodies of deviants, then constitutes a deviant practice on the bodies of individuals’ (Fisher, 2002: 97). It is precisely this association with deviance, its shady
background, its subalternity, that lends tattooing its credibility as a form of resistance. In this way, heavily tattooed women are engaged in what Holbrook et al. (1998: 21) refer to as ‘refiguration’ or intentional deviance from prevailing norms of personal appearance designed to make a social, ethical or spiritual point. Tattoos do refigure the body, shifting identity into liminal zones between subject (of the tattoo, of identity) and object (of the gaze, of social stigma).

Over the past 30 years tattooing has increasingly captured the imagination of consumer researchers. Sanders (1985) describes the tattoo as an ‘expressive symbol’, the acquisition of which is motivated by decoration, protection, ritual and identification (see Fisher, 2002). Veliquette et al. (1998) lend recognition to the fact that the ‘tattoo renaissance’ has diversified the traditional client base for tattoos, expanding the market for skin art, and exposing tattooing practice to a more mainstream clientele. Furthermore, they indicate that, as part of the extended self, the tattoo may symbolize that self to others, in a self-conscious and often highly visible act of inscribing the body.

For Bengtsson et al. (2005) tattoos are thought to capture the essence of the self and, as a consequence, tattooists and tattooees are driven to favour custom designs that demonstrate authenticity. Nonetheless, Bengtsson et al. (2005) contrive to position contemporary tattooing as a commodified practice devoid of transgressive value and, thanks to current technologies for tattoo removal, purely fashionable. However, while much tattoo consumption might justifiably be considered fashionable, Bengtsson et al. (2005) resolutely fail to consider the circumstances of tattoo ‘collectors’ or heavily tattooed women whose positioning within the fashion domain remains problematic.

In a groundbreaking study on tattooing, Sanders (1989) posits that tattooed women are something of an aberration, generally limiting themselves to small, delicate, ‘feminine’ designs located on parts of their bodies that remain essentially private. This surprising ‘invisibility’ of heavily tattooed women continues throughout the literature on tattoo within CCT. Watson (1998) argues that women largely confine themselves to vow and personal tattoos that signify their love for another. However, Goulding and Follett (2002) challenge such conceptualizations and argue that heavily tattooed women use tattooing as a means of differentiating themselves from the masses, engaging with alternative community forms, and challenging gender stereotypes. In illustrating the interconnectedness of skin, identity and consumption, it serves our purposes here to build on the work of Goulding and Follett (2002) by giving greater consideration to heavily tattooed women whose visible designs conflict with the fashion thesis and may or may not be viewed as traditionally feminine.

Thus we begin the process of accounting for skin in consumer culture by sketching its liminal, ambivalent and double-sided nature. In this way we provide the backdrop for an exploration of three skin metaphors: 1) skin as container, 2) skin as projection surface, and 3) skin as cover to be modified. We argue that these metaphors engage with the relationship between embodied identity and consumption, facilitate insights into related theoretical concerns within CCT, and provide useful guidelines for incorporating skin into future research in the field.

**Traversing skin**

While we imagine skin as a definitive boundary between ourselves and the world outside, it is more a crossing point between various conditions. Skin is both inside and outside, facilitating movement between internal and external worlds. Biologically, it is porous and impermeable, protecting us from the damaging effects of our environment while allowing for biochemical negotiations between us and that very environment (Jablonski, 2006). Though it may be read, skin also reads
through touch. Such reading is simultaneously active and passive, collecting information while providing it, receiving while expressing (Grosz, 1994). It is continuously dying and being reborn, shedding dead cells and replacing them from underneath (Jablonski, 2006). It serves as a site for commodified expression, as well as an ultimately unmanageable aspect of the aging body. Skin, then, is ‘materially and metaphorically contested terrain: a site wherein agency, freedom of choice and individual empowerment conflate with the pressures of cultural power and tensions of social/personalized control’ (Farber, 2006: 249).

Tattooing provides a productive arena for the investigation of skin because it too is laden with ambiguities. Taylor (1997: 123) notes that the constant movement of tattooing between the dualisms we use to organize experience and structure knowledge ‘marks and remarks a boundary that cannot be fixed’. Tattoos are ‘permanent’, yet life is not. Tattoos are personal, yet mark one as a member of the tattooed class. Some tattoos seem mainstream, others transgressive. Tattooing is both a private and public act. In telling our tattoo stories we customarily circulate between personalized meanings and the reactions of others (Rosenblatt, 1997). Moreover, tattooed bodies occupy a space between subject and object; they are personal identity projects which produce the body as an object subject to an external gaze (Oksanen and Turtiainen, 2005).

The ambiguity surrounding tattoos arouses a degree of moral panic (Oksanen and Turtiainen, 2005) that sees them positioned as self-mutilation (Jeffreys, 2000) and laden with health risks (see Stirn et al., 2006). In the face of such discourses, heavily tattooed women are routinely called upon to justify their actions (by constructing narratives of personalized meaning around their tattoos) and/or to moderate them (by covering them up): ‘women’s involvement in the body project illustrates the ways in which forms of body modification are simultaneously replete with cultural messages about conformity and resistance’ (Atkinson, 2002: 224).

The cultural history of tattooed women also pulses with narratives of spectacle, conformity and resistance. For example, Betty Broadbent, a Barnum and Bailey sideshow act, participated in the first televised beauty contest at the 1939 World’s Fair. Braunberger (2000) underlines that, at that moment, and whether or not she intended it, Betty enacted a critique of beauty culture. Sporting tattoos of Charles Lindbergh, Pancho Villa, and the Madonna and Child, Broadbent was otherwise conventionally beautiful. ‘Eliding the gap between beauty pageant and freak show, she was, in that moment of contest participation, two Barnum acts in one’ (Braunberger, 2000: 13). Of course, tattooed women are no longer the preserve of circus sideshows. Mifflin (1997) suggests that upwards of 60% of those getting tattoos and 15% of tattooists are women. Such infiltration of tattoo culture by women could be argued to provide them with a means to re-appropriate their bodies, normally the target of objectification (Waterhouse, 1993).

I grew up in a crazy, abusive, violent home . . . My survival depended upon my ability to shut away my true reactions, beliefs and feelings in order to be acceptable in this situation . . . And after a while, I lost who I was and became an ongoing performance of whatever character I thought would come out alright in any given situation . . . Then I became a career drug addict . . . So there was no money for something like a tattoo. Plus . . . I hated myself so deeply I would not have allowed myself to have something I might enjoy. In addition, my body was really no longer my own. Any act to claim my body would have been too disturbing to me . . . I got into recovery in my mid-30’s and was 8 years clean and sober when the tattoo issue came up again . . . An ongoing theme in my early recovery involved overwhelming, painful feelings related to my self-destruction and the harm I had done to my body because I didn’t care. I decided I needed to make a commitment to never abdicate myself again and
then decided I needed to do something, like a ritual, to bring about some physical evidence of this commitment... So, it wasn’t until I was in my 40s that I had any hint about who I was or any need to claim my body or assert my individuality... Until that time I was too sick to do anything that had spiritual meaning for me, let alone transgress the fascist systems that informed my previous life... a sick family, misogyny, lookism, patriarchy, blah blah blah. (Carla [Housewife])

However, the body work engaged in by heavily tattooed women may see them inhabit a space both beyond and contained by the confines of normal beauty culture, simultaneously transgressive and deferential. These women are often caught in the contradiction identified by Jagger (2000), whereby at the moment of self-production they are self-monitoring and docile.

I think... Well... I think I’m quite well turned out anyway... I don’t dress scruffy or anything like that... So, I get away with it... Even though I’m proud of it, sometimes I do feel a bit uncomfortable... I mean... If I had to go somewhere where I thought it might cause problems... I’d cover up. It’s not like I have a point to prove or anything. Right now I look quite feminine... So I can balance it.

(Terri [Tattooist])

In the West there is a long held association between women and skin that evokes notions of surface, superficiality and artificiality (Tyler, 2001). Indeed, the relationship between femininity, skin and consumption increasingly hinges on three major concerns. First, the containing function of the skin is central to constructions of the feminine as notions of the ideal slender body abound: ‘a body that is protected against eruption from within, whose internal processes are under control’ (Bordo, 1993: 189). Second, femininity has come to be coded on the skin such that its communication has come to be a matter of surface projection (Benthien, 2002). Third, because soft, smooth, and taut skin is viewed as the epitome of the feminine, women are persuaded to work upon their skins to retain this marker of gender difference (Ahmed and Stacey, 2001).

It is to these three relationships between femininity, skin and consumption that we now turn. In so doing we deploy the three metaphors of skin as container, skin as projection surface, and skin as cover to be modified. The metaphors are used here as framing devices enabling us to view these relationships from a particular vantage point. But metaphor is never neutral. It always highlights some elements of a phenomenon while hiding others. Nonetheless, the metaphors considered here are useful in that they also overlap with the motivations for tattooing outlined by Sanders (1989). As such they are not simply theoretical devices but also effectively work to organize the lived experience and practice of individuals.

**Skin as container**

Conceptualizations of identity within CCT tend to coagulate around notions of the sovereign self. This is not to deny work that has been conducted under the rubric of the extended self or the postmodern fragmented self. Rather, in spite of this work we continue to view selfhood as somehow bounded and discrete. Much consumer research ‘is done with a focus on individual consumers, and a clear conceptual distinction between the individual and the social – a contentious distinction at best – is assumed’ (Firat and Dholakia, 2006: 141). This focus is not unusual given that western discourse is replete with ideas of the sovereign self, a *Homo Clausus* (Elias, 1939 [2000]), whose orifices have been privatized (Pitts, 1998), and who maintains a relatively independent existence (Benthien, 2002). Our retreat to individualized skin containers is likely to be a direct result of the nature of the social structure in the modern West. Falk (1994: 12) contends: ‘The
less rigid the cultural Order and the weaker the community bonds, the more intertwined are the boundaries of the self with those of the individual body.'

Seen in this light, tattooing, which involves the penetration of the skin, may be seen as ‘a denaturalizing act of subversion’ (Pitts, 1998: 70), an attack on the sovereignty of selfhood. Indeed, not only does the tattoo bear witness to the body-self’s vulnerability, it turns it into a spectacle (Connor, 2004). In this way, the interpenetration of self and other is inscribed beneath the skin for all to see (Oksanen and Turtiainen, 2005). It comes as little surprise, therefore, that parallels have readily been drawn between the process of tattooing and sexual intercourse. For example, Parry (1933 [2006]: 2) neatly underlines the erotic basis of tattooing: ‘The very process of tattooing is essentially sexual. There are the long, sharp needles. There is the liquid poured into the pricked skin. There are the two participants of the act, one active, the other passive. There is the curious marriage of pleasure and pain’. At the same time, the sight of tattoos may lead to interpretations of sexual subjection (Gell, 1993) or sexual promiscuity (Braunberger, 2000).

Tattooing also testifies to the interconnection between self and other in the negotiation of identity. That is, the acquisition of a tattoo is never an individual affair: ‘cultural producers, cultural intermediaries, and consumers of culture interact and collaborate in the production of symbolic meaning’ (Venkatesh and Meamber, 2006: 13). From this perspective, the tattooee is anything but a passive consumer.

Collectors often have a high degree of input into the tattoo design itself. Furthermore, they must endure the pain inherent in the tattooing process. They attend to self-care practices to ensure adequate healing. And, of course, they eventually become a living, breathing gallery for the tattoo, interacting on a daily basis with those with and without skin art. Tattooists also contribute a great deal to this body project. The contemporary tattooist must be a talented artist, capable of transforming the complex surface of the body, but also needs to be skilled in rhetoric and interpretation, putting customers at ease and making sense of their ideas (Hardy, 1995). In addition, the media play their role. Tattoo magazines are populated by experts carrying a great deal of authority; they showcase much of the best work, and apportion credit to skilled tattooists for their work (DeMello, 2000). The readership of these magazines thus becomes entangled in knowledge systems that reproduce subcultural notions of what constitutes good and bad tattoo practice, from the avoidance of ‘scratchers’ to the admiration of particular styles and the work of revered artists.

In reality, then, skin provides us with a constant reminder of the fragility of our conceptualizations of the hermetically sealed self. It is a vulnerable boundary with orifices that leak and ooze, absorb and assimilate. Accepting the factitious security of the bounded self leads us to a consideration of intercorporeality. For Weiss (1999: 5): ‘the experience of being embodied is never a private affair, but is always already mediated by our continual interactions with other human and non-human bodies’. As such, connections to others, our affiliation with particular marketplace cultures, may not be a reflection of shared value sets. Rather, belongingness may be embodied as an atmosphere that structures our very perceptions and experiences (Diprose, 2005). Moreover, notions of the sovereign self seem almost nostalgic in an age characterized by surgical implants,
gene therapy and the like that erase the distinctions between inside and outside (Mascia-Lees and Sharpe, 1992). Indeed, the everyday sustenance, maintenance and transformation of bodies, and the production of selves are only made possible by the judicious use of commodities and the interjection of others.

Bodies are also permeated by culture in a manner consistent with how those bodies are classified and categorized into socially significant groups (Grosz, 1994). Advertising is central in the constitution of bodily norms, promoting images of idealized corporeality, instructing consumers in the creation of image, forming idealized notions of identity, bodies and difference, and encouraging them to take responsibility for the way they look. It is this final point that leads us to a consideration of how skin may be utilized as a projection surface.

Skin as projection surface

Contemporary conditions of a society prone to visualization favour conceptualizations of skin as communicative and connective rather than as isolating and alienating. Connor (2004: 50) contends: ‘Precisely because of the omnipresence and unlocalized quality of the skin, it is also uniquely exposed to the operations of the other senses, and particularly those of the eye’. As the document of our lives, a ‘visual curriculum vitae’ (Pålsson, 2007), skin evidences our passage through life through its wrinkles and creases. In this way skin represents an important component of embodied capital in the West, given our fetishization of youth and beauty. As we have suggested already, femininity is irrevocably tied to smooth and youthful looking skin. Also, because skin is taken to be a reflection of the moral character within (Ahmed and Stacey, 2001), failure to meet idealized visions of feminine skin is indicative of the inadequacy of the self and its consumption (Bordo, 1993). Thus, women are coerced into becoming constantly engaged with surface projection.

The idea that skin can be read unproblematically is a standard motif within the world of advertising. The manner in which skin is used in advertising to elicit our attention indicates that it comes with pre-coded significance (Stauff, 2002, cited in Scholz and Surma, 2008). From the airbrushed alabaster skins of Moschino models, to the tattooed backs of Bacardi drinkers, advertisers continue to plumb the depths of skin’s denotative qualities. In the process of meaning management they chase the twin goals of recognizability and distinctiveness:

to be recognized as meaningful, an advertisement has to draw upon existing cultural resources and structures of cognition. Furthermore, following the market logic, an advertisement must differentiate itself. In the space between recognition and uniqueness the tattoo appears as a meaningful symbol which over time has gained broad acceptance as a way of expressing mainstream identity, and has become a resource for mass cultural expression. At the same time, the tattoo has held onto its associations with deviance and transgression that set it apart from other modes of identity expression. (Bjerrisgaard, Kjeldgaard and Bengtsson, forthcoming)

However, if skin is our curriculum vitae it is by no means reliable. As the work of Frantz Fanon (1967) on the epidermal schema highlights, the meanings associated with skin are cultural and learned (see also Schroeder and Borgerson, 2003a). For Prosser (2001: 52), ‘the fact that we continue to invest the legibility of identity in the skin in spite of knowing its unreliability suggests skin to be a fantasmatic surface, a canvas for what we wish were true – or for what we cannot acknowledge to be true’.

Alfred Gell (1993) divides the tattooing process into three stages: wounding, healing, and the subsequent acquisition of a design. Cultural context determines which of these three stages
receives most attention in readings of tattoo practice. In the West, according to Gell (1993), we give almost exclusive attention to the tattoo artefact and, thus, its visualization becomes paramount. Again, such visualization comes pre-packaged with a set of cultural meanings. For example, Braunberger (2000: 1–2) argues that tattoos magnify many of the cultural truisms we associate with women: ‘When a woman’s body is a sex object, a tattooed woman’s body is a lascivious sex object; when a woman’s body is nature, a tattooed woman’s body is primitive; when a woman’s body is spectacle, a tattooed woman’s body is a show’. As a consequence, the heavily tattooed female body may be considered grotesque; at once abhorrent and fascinating, attracting the gaze and challenging it, demanding the attention of others and of the cultural body as a whole. It is liminal, existing on the border but not respecting it (Johnston, 1996), questioning the distinctions between beauty and repulsiveness, subject and object, nature and culture, masculine and feminine.

People are fascinated by it . . . and, at the same time they’re disgusted. Mind you, those who are determined to tell you how much they hate it are also the first ones up to try and get a closer look . . . People tend to think that they can just come up and touch you . . . I was on a train to London and these three guys just pulled my shirt and sleeves up . . . I find that rude . . . and . . . I know it’s just an interest but I’m not there just to be gawped at . . . Whether they think that because I’ve got tattoos that gives them license I don’t know. (Jenna [Musician])

It has also been suggested that the spectacle of heavily tattooed female bodies presents a critique of patriarchal power. Indeed, these women don’t just offer the critique, they live it, inhabit it (Rosenblatt, 1997). They challenge naturalized ideals of feminine beauty; they are creative and transgressive. By making ‘themselves prodigious and visible [they] disrupt long-standing definitions of the ideal woman as restrained and diminutive’ (Covino, 2000: 3).

This girl came in with her boyfriend and she wanted a dragon tattooed on her arm . . . He said: ‘Don’t have it on your arm, have it on your back where nobody can see it’. She said: ‘I want to be able to see it’, and he said: ‘Girls with tattoos on their arms look disgusting’, and I was sat next to him, and I said: ‘Shall I pretend I’ve not heard that’. People come up to me and say: ‘Oh, you’re very brave. Does it not bother you . . . you know . . . for the future . . . that you’ve had all this work done’. I suppose, if nothing else, I’ll make a colourful corpse . . . prettier. (Lucy [Tattooist])

Thus, we reach the conclusion that if tattooed bodies do possess meaning, such meaning is tied to the expression of our relationship as selves to the social whole (Rosenblatt, 1997). Nonetheless, membership of the category ‘deviant’ quite often only serves to reinforce the category ‘normal’ rather than offering it any substantive challenge (Van Lenning, 2002).

Girls often say to me: ‘I like tattoos, but I wouldn’t have what you’ve got . . . but it looks nice on you’. And my dad said to me: ‘You’ve made yourself an acquired taste now’. (Becky [Fetish Model])

While, as Irwin (2001) advocates, tattoos allow women to engage with notions of hardness and strength, it may be that the prodigious acquisition of tattoos by women merely serves to expedite their desexualization (Bartky, 1997). Furthermore, Pitts (2003) argues that the hidden nature of many tattoos dulls their potency as a form of protest. For Pitts (1998: 81) too, while women’s tattoo narratives are replete with references to reclaiming the body from patriarchal culture, bodies are never materially reclaimed: ‘The resistance offered is symbolic and communicative, and thus the efficacy of the claim of reclaiming is of course immeasurable.’
These arguments problematize the notion that identity might be easily read from the surface of the skin. Just as the interpretation of the body’s representation in the media is fraught with difficulties, the interpretation of lived bodies, and the legibility of identity, is never an easy matter. Though the surfaces of bodies may indeed come with pre-coded significance, the chameleonic nature of ideologies of the body and the bricolage engaged in by consumers conspire to complicate the business of interpretation.

**Skin as cover to be modified**

Within contemporary consumer culture the body and skin have been engulfed by the paradigm of plasticity (Joy and Venkatesh, 1994) allowing the ‘creation of bodies as sign systems, texts, narratives, rendered meaningful and integrated into forms capable of being read’ (Grosz, 1994: 141). Acknowledging the body and skin in this way necessitates individuals being aware of and engaged in self-care practices. The literature suggests that, given appropriate levels of body work, bodies and skins may be re-created to reflect a desired appearance. As a result of their commodification skins are ascribed exchange value, that is, they are seen to possess capital that may be subsequently converted to economic, cultural and social capital. Moreover, this value increases the closer those bodies approximate a social field’s normalized ideals (Featherstone, 1991). Thus, we are persuaded to devote our energies to improving our skins, thereby maximizing our exchange value.

However, such a conceptualization of skin and body work is problematic for three reasons. First, it largely ignores the question of access to resources (Skeggs, 2004) and, in this manner, reproduces class distinctions (Smith Maguire and Stanway, 2008). ‘It is significant that assumptions proliferate about how individuals have equal access to the cultural resources for self-making, as if the self can be entirely divorced from the conditions that make it possible’ (Skeggs, 2004: 75). Not everyone is born with perfect genes; not everyone enjoys an environment, diet, and hygiene that nurtures healthy skin; not everyone can afford to maintain a glowing complexion. Despite the supposed egalitarianism of the free market, not everyone has access to the same resources (money, taste and, of course, refigurable bodies) and not all resources possess the same value: ‘not all material counts, at least to the same extent, in the making up of the self’ (Fournier, 2002: 60).

Second, body work is laden with apprehension. While marketing and advertising offer some guidelines as to which bodies are valuable bodies, these are plastic in themselves, changing with the passage of time. Moreover, because, as we have seen, marketplace ideologies of the body and skin vary according to gender, class and ethnicity, individuals are always in danger of getting it wrong (Smith Maguire and Stanway, 2008), or being mis-recognized (Skeggs, 2001). These individuals then suffer the further injustice of having their efforts read back onto them ‘as an individualized moral fault, a pathology, a problem of bad-choice, bad culture, a failure to be enterprising or to be reflexive’ (Skeggs, 2004: 91).

Third, our understanding of body projects, as it is currently framed, reproduces the mind/body dualism that envisages the body as merely an instrument of the mind. ‘To see the body as the introjection or internalization of an external image is to give a highly mind-dependent account of the body’ (Bray and Colebrook, 1998: 55).

In this light, Budgeon (2003) urges us to view the body not as an object but as an event. Representations of bodies become embodied by real people. This embodiment of ideologies of femininity and masculinity fuels the drive of hegemonic masculinity and the oppression of women. If, through conventional readings of advertising representations, men pursue hypermasculine
ideals and become ‘stronger’, and women pursue feminine ideals and effectively become ‘weaker’,
then we eventually reach the position where, in terms of embodiment, women are ‘the weaker sex’
(Connell, 1987). As a consequence, our focus needs to shift from asking what bodies mean, to
asking what bodies can do (Bray and Colebrook, 1998).

In contrast, tattooing has often been read as a disavowal of the paradigm of plasticity. The
penetration of the body by needles, the pain, the blood and the healing process all draw the
individual into the immediacy of the real (Fournier, 2002).

To be honest I’m not entirely sure why I’ve always been drawn to them . . . But I suppose it’s been my
interest in the arts. Being able to create a picture that was glued onto your skin amazed me . . . I think
maybe the question back then was how was it done that began my growing interest . . . Once I had done
more research they began to appeal in a different kind of way. For me it was being able to mark a
significant event or a period of time into your body so it would always be a part of you . . . chees[y, I
know . . . and represent who you are and what made you what you are. (Michelle [Artist])

Additionally, and notwithstanding modern methods of tattoo removal, tattoos are viewed as per-
manent marks in the skin thus defying change, effecting a degree of continuity (Connor, 2004) and
anchoring the self (Sweetman, 1999): ‘by irreversibly marking the body, the subject ... protests
against the ideology that makes everything changeable’ (Salecl, 2001: 32). For Benson (2000),
tattoos are used to question and ameliorate the uncertainty of the future and the confusion
engendered by the postmodern fragmentation of identity.

However, Neville (2005) posits that the practice of tattooing may, in fact, only serve to reinforce
postmodern fragmentation given that tattoos are generally open to multiple interpretations and
their legibility is never guaranteed. Indeed, the substance and meanings of tattoos may even change
across time and context for those who bear them. Designs merge into each other, new designs are
added, some are covered up, some altered, and the narratives that surround them evolve
(Springgay, 2003).

I do know that some people have got meanings behind theirs. But I just choose mine for the design. I
choose designs I like. I mean . . . I tend to invent the stories behind them after they’re done. I think
about it, and dream something up. (Jackie [Apprentice Piercer])

As such, we witness in tattoo practices the tensions expressed in CCT between the search for a
coherent self and the liberatory potential of the fragmented self. While the fragmentation of life
experience, society and metanarratives may be a frightening prospect for some, the pursuit of
coherence and stability may be nothing more than an elusive dream. In this way tattoo functions ‘as
a symbolic representation of that which can never be attained, and as such it is a reminder of the
elusive character of desire’ (Beeler, 2005: 7).

Skin as symbolic representation remains a powerful marketing tool. A key strategy of
contemporary marketing is to create a compelling identity for products and services by
affiliating with some aspect of personal or group identity. The human body forms a basic
building block of this strategy – functioning as a radiating landmark for innumerable product,
social, and emotional attributes ascribed to a vast array of products, services, websites, annual
reports, promotional brochures and wider discourses. Sophisticated, high-tech products often
incorporate the ancient, basic human form – the body – within their marketing strategy,
attempting to make familiar complex, ethereal, and often ephemeral product promises. In con-
temporary brand campaigns, human skin, identity and strategy combine to produce striking,
sexually tinged images designed to promote a basic vision of the good life (Schroeder and Borgerson, 2003b).

In this way, tattoos reiterate within cultural and strategic arenas as emblems of consumer identity, agency, and, often, deviancy, informed by cultural histories of skin, sexuality, and resistance. The three skin metaphors discussed here provide a rich thematic repertoire of images and stories that appropriate skin as a commodified, persuasive device, in both personal lives and the wider consumer culture.

**Conclusions**

Skin vividly embodies key tensions in consumer culture – particularly between liberation, celebration and agency on one hand and repression, disciplinarity and conformity on the other. Skin provides a novel, productive frame for research on consumer identity, yet few studies have made it a central focus. Our intention here was to focus on the body’s boundary as a means of highlighting its imagined character and shedding light on understandings of embodied identity within CCT. First, we challenged the lingering conception of consuming bodies as relatively self-contained and solely responsible for their own identity construction. A critical analysis of skin validates its conceptualization as a fragile and permeable border between self and world. Rather than texts we write ourselves, identities are intertextual inasmuch as they are penetrated by the work, looks and discourses of others. Consumption inevitably musters a legion of actors whose combined efforts are required in the construction of identity. Thus, it is time to call into question the inherent distinction within CCT between the individual and the social, and the attendant focus on the individual.

Second, we raised the contention that the interpretation of our identity work by others, though brimming with pre-codified meanings, is never a straightforward process. Though it resides on the surface, skin is taken to be a signifier of depth; appearance becomes shorthand for the moral character deep within. Following Garber (1992, cited in Holbrook et al., 1998: 47), however, we recognize that skin may function as both a signifier and that which signifies the undecidability of signification. Embodied identity statements, when visible, retain a polysemic quality that leaves them always open to multiple interpretations. More fundamentally, marketplace ideologies and class distinctions lead to the mis-recognition of some involved in identity projects. Mis-recognition is ‘to be denied the status of full partner in social interaction and prevented from participating as a peer in social life – not as a consequence of a distributive inequality . . . but rather as a consequence of institutionalized patterns of interpretation and evaluation that constitute one as comparatively unworthy of respect or esteem’ (Fraser, 1995: 280, cited in Skeggs, 2001).

Third, we offered a critique of the dominant understanding of body projects within CCT. Here we gave consideration to the relative access to resources such as money, time and taste. Moreover, we acknowledged that the obdurate physicality of bodies (Frank, 1991) regularly sees them stubbornly fail to concede to the intentions and desires of their inhabitants. Our skin crossing has suggested that our identity projects are also laden with anxieties associated with getting it wrong. Finally, we critically engaged with the replication of the mind/body dualism that characterizes the majority of research on body projects within CCT.

Ultimately, we suggest an abandonment of our fetish for meaning, and champion instead an examination of what consuming bodies do. In essence, then, we have used our analysis of tattooed skin to affirm that work on the border truly effaces that border. This paper, therefore, acts as a rallying cry, for further boundary work that engages with our understanding of identity and consumption, grounded by cultural history, embodiment and lived experience.
References


Maurice Patterson lectures on Consumption & Consumer Culture at the University of Limerick. His research is positioned at the intersection between consumption, embodiment and identity. He is primarily concerned with how naturalized ideas about gender become written on and under the skin, and with how consumption is both implicated in this process and may be used to offer a critique of it. His publications have appeared in Consumption, Markets and Culture, the European Journal of Marketing, the Journal of Marketing Management, Marketing Theory and other scholarly outlets. He is on the editorial board of the Journal of Consumer Behaviour. Address: Department of Management & Marketing, Kemmy Business School, University of Limerick, Limerick, Republic of Ireland.

APPENDIX 2: STATEMENTS BY COLLABORATING AUTHORS
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I understand that Maurice Patterson is submitting three papers co-authored with me as part of his submission for a PhD by Published Works at the University of Warwick. In respect of this, I detail his contribution to the three papers below:


This paper was originally intended as simply a critique of the Marketing Mix in opposition to the emerging idea of Relationship Marketing. Maurice’s interest in new ideas around consumer behaviour and brands were brought to bear on the paper and it changed significantly. Originally and rather naively entitled Road to Damascus, Maurice rendered the paper more compelling through his introduction and use of the metaphor of the road movie. Moreover, following initial reviewers’ comments, we were required to expand the contribution of the paper beyond a simple critique to offer something in its stead. In this regard, the focus on participatory consumer experiences was very much an outcome of Maurice’s interests as was the focus on a more socially informed marketing. The alphabetical order of authorship represents our equal contributions to the paper. Four years later when the article was reprinted in The Marketing Review, Maurice took sole responsibility for writing the retrospective commentary.


This paper extended critiques of Relationship Marketing in consumer markets which was my area of interest, to consider emerging thinking that consumers intuitively develop relationships with brands. The paper built upon his understanding of branding (the subject of Maurice’s Masters thesis) and notions of brand personality as articulated in Patterson (1998), as well as his developing expertise in consumer research. Maurice took the lead on this paper both in terms of critiquing brand-consumer relationships and in terms of crafting the paper. This is reflected in his position as lead author.


I supervised Edd de Coverly’s Masters thesis on consumers’ experience of waste (University of Nottingham). Edd’s approach was strongly influenced by the Consumer Behaviour module that Maurice had taught - both in terms of his focus on disposition (rather than use) and in terms of his use of phenomenological interviews. After submission of the thesis, Maurice and I worked on developing a paper from the thesis and we submitted this to the *Journal of Macromarketing*. In order to help us...
address some specific issues raised in the first round of reviews, I subsequently invited Pierre McDonagh to engage with the paper as a fourth co-author in order to expedite our response. While the alphabetical listing of authors suggests equal contribution, in reframing the work from thesis to paper, Maurice contributed more than 25%.

Kind Regards

[Signature]
October 30, 2013


This paper was Maurice’s idea, and it was based on research interviews he carried out, transcribed, and analyzed. Maurice invited me to co-author based on my interest in consumer identity and skin. We had both participated in a special session at the 2003 European Association of Consumer Research conference in Dublin, and had kept in touch about research interests. Maurice did the bulk of the work on the paper, creating a first draft, compiling the reference list, getting it ready for submission to the journal, and corresponding with the editor. I assisted with editing and crafting the paper, helping to frame it, and responding to the reviews, but clearly in the role of a second author.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Schroeder  
William A. Kern Professor  
Department of Communication  
Rochester Institute of Technology

The above paper began life as a conference paper for the Academy of Marketing Conference in Cardiff in 2001 where it won a Best Paper in Track prize. As a result the paper was then published in JMM. We jointly discussed the initial idea for a paper on the historical development of Interpretive Consumer Research and I wrote a first draft and sent it to Maurice for his input. Maurice added what became the second half of the paper dealing with related issues of methodological pluralism, the relationship between the researcher and the research, and the representation of research texts. Maurice also contributed the sections on Homer’s Odyssey that helped to frame the entire paper. While I am first author, Maurice’s contribution was greater than mine to the finished paper.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Professor Avi Shankar, School of Management, University of Bath, Bath, BA2 7AY

This paper was primarily the outcome of Maurice’s initial work on a PhD that I was to supervise at Exeter University. Building on earlier work he had presented at the Academy of Marketing Annual Conference (2000) the framing of the paper and first full draft was Maurice’s work. I came on board at Maurice’s invitation to help prepare it for submission to *Consumption, Markets & Culture*. I contributed a section of the paper on Embodiment, Discourse and Resistance and helped shape the final draft.

Sincerely

Prof. Richard Elliott

Professor of Marketing and Consumer Research
Monday, 1st February 2014


With regard to this article I can confirm the initial phase of the work was undertaken as a Masters dissertation at the University of Nottingham. Lisa O’Malley and Maurice then worked the paper up into a publishable format and submitted it to the journal. Having received the first set of reviews they then asked me to collaborate on the work given my area of expertise in sustainability as well as my experience of the theoretical contributions to the journal.

My contribution to this paper was to work with my co-authors on the sustainability aspects of the argument to help gain publication. While authorship is alphabetical the main theoretical arguments where developed by Maurice Patterson.

Please feel free to contact me if you require any further information on this matter,

Kind regards,

Dr. Pierre McDonagh, +353 1700 5996
Pierre.mcdonagh@dcu.ie
Associate Editor, Journal of Macromarketing
Senior Lecturer in Marketing, DCU Business School
APPENDIX 3: CONTRIBUTION OF COLLABORATING AUTHORS

I wrote the first draft of this paper based on ethnographic work. I then invited Professor Jonathan Schroeder to collaborate based on our joint interest in skin and consumer communication. Jonathan helped to frame the paper, contributed relevant sections, and also aided with the response to reviewers. My contribution to this paper was in the region of 70%.


In its original form this was a Master thesis written by Edd de Coverly and supervised by Lisa O’Malley at the University of Nottingham. Lisa invited me to collaborate in order to turn the work into a piece that might be suitable for publication. This involved a complete repositioning of the research with a great deal more literature and further interpretation of the data. Following initial reviews for the Journal of Macromarketing Pierre McDonagh came on board to help connect the work more closely to sustainability and to help deal with the review process at the journal where he had a great deal of experience. The listing of authors is alphabetical and my personal contribution is substantial.


This paper emerged out of work I had completed for my Masters thesis and which had been published in Marketing Intelligence & Planning (1998) and in the Journal of Brand Management (1999). Lisa provided the backdrop for this paper in respect of
her expertise in Relationship Marketing and specifically Social Exchange Theory. My major contributions came in terms of my use of branding and consumer theory to offer a critical appraisal of the concept of brand-consumer relationships. My contribution was in the region of 60%.


This paper began as an offshoot of my interest in embodiment in consumer research. I began by putting together a theoretical treatment of the representation of male bodies in advertising, critiquing extant work which was one-dimensional in orientation. I invited Professor Richard Elliott to collaborate based on his expertise in the field of advertising. Richard helped to prepare the paper for submission and contributed a section that helped to tie arguments together. My contribution to this paper was in the region of 90%.


This paper was the result of discussions between us about the trajectory of interpretive consumer research. It was decided to submit a paper to the Academy of Marketing Conference and Avi put together the first draft which focused on the historical development of the field. I then connected those ideas to arguments about representation in research which were to form the second half of the paper. I also devised the rhetorical device of the Odyssey as a means of moving the paper forward and of connecting it to antecedent work in the field. My contribution to this paper was roughly 50%.

Initially a conference paper for the Academy of Marketing this paper represents an equal collaboration between myself and Lisa O’Malley. I devised the narrative device of the road movie, and developed the ideas around the new kind of marketing which was to be creative, flexible, experiential, open, interactive, participative, connective, and cognisant of its social role and social consequences. These were the outcomes of work I had been doing elsewhere in consumer research and beyond. My contribution to this paper was 50%.
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