Consumption encompasses almost every aspect of daily life. To study consumption, the fields of marketing and consumer research have shown renewed interest in theories of practice and suggested conceiving of consumption as practice moments. However, conceptual blind spots exist when it comes to specifying how consumption operates in relation to practices. The development of this conceptualization is the topic of this thesis presented in four papers unfolding consumption as practice moments.
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Drawing on empirical material collected in the contexts of online community practices, discursive re-enchantment practices, electric guitar playing, and gardening, this thesis treats practices as the sites for consumption and its entanglement with productive aspects. It peers behind the masks of the ‘consumer’, ‘producer’, and ‘prosumer’, and offers an alternative way of researching and theorizing consumption in relation to practices and in relation to productive aspects.
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Abstract

This thesis investigates consumption through a practice-theoretical perspective. Practices are routinized sets of human activity involving doings, meanings, and objects. Previous work has suggested conceiving of consumption as moments in practices. Yet, empirical and conceptual blind spots exist when it comes to understanding how consumption operates as practice moments. This thesis sets out to develop this conception of consumption by examining how consumption unfolds as practice moments.

The study of consumption in relation to practices, however, is complicated by long-standing debates in marketing and business literature that impart the notion of consumption being entangled with production in various ways. These debates infuse the idea that in order to understand consumption one must also pay attention to its links with productive aspects.

By treating practices as the empirical and theoretical sites for consumption and its entanglement with productive aspects, this thesis offers an alternative way of researching and theorizing consumption in relation to practice, and in relation to productive aspects. It presents four papers that draw on qualitative and quantitative empirical data collected in the contexts of online community practices, discursive re-enchantment practices, electric guitar playing, and gardening.

The collective findings and analysis of the four papers reveal how consumption unfolds as practice moments in terms of ingredient, momentum, transformation, and consequence. Unfolding consumption in this way offers conceptual specification of its operation in relation to practices. Moreover, it allows theorization of how consumptive moments are linked to productive aspects in two ways: first, by specifying how consumptive moments are inherently productive; and second, by giving insight into the dyadic relation between consumptive and productive practice moments.

Rather than collapsing consumption and production into one and the same or treating them as inherent in roles of consumers, producers, and prosumers, as advocated by previous works, this thesis suggests that consumption and production are useful analytical categories if framed as moments inherent in the practices that comprise our marketplaces and cultures. Several relevant implications emerge from this understanding regarding the concept of prosumption, the development of practice theory, understanding the operation of consumption in consumer culture, theorizing value creation, and the shaping of a practice-oriented marketing approach.
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I. Introduction

Consumption is genuinely embedded in our daily lives. Be it the consumption of water and electricity in our morning routines or the consumption taking place when we immerse ourselves in activities related to our interests and hobbies. It becomes almost unthinkable to celebrate Christmas without consumption, to celebrate a promotion without some form of consumption, or to take a vacation without consumption, go running without consumption, play guitar without consumption, work in the garden without consumption, or even relax without some form of consumption. Consumption lurks in almost everything we do in daily life; it is deeply nested within the practical activities we conduct.

To study consumption, the field of consumer research has paid renewed interest in theories of practice. Yet, conceptual blind spots persist when it comes to understanding how consumption operates in relation to practices. Specifically, prior work that translates the tenets of practice-theoretical perspectives to the study of consumption has introduced the idea that consumption is “a moment in almost any practice” (Warde 2005, 137, emphasis added). This notion suggests that consumption transpires within the context of practices and is something that practices bring about. However, the idea of consumption as practice moments lacks hitherto empirical and theoretical specification. The development of this conceptualization is the topic of this thesis.

Practices are generally understood as bundles of bodily routines and skills, explicit or implicit rules, understandings, and material arrangements, guided by teleoaffective structures (Reckwitz 2002; Schatzki 1996; Schatzki 2001a; 2001b; 2002; Warde 2005) and can be defined as “embodied, materially mediated arrays of human activity centrally organized around shared practical understanding” (Schatzki 2001a, 2). Practices involve practical understanding in terms of how to act; procedures in terms of what is considered right or wrong; and teleoaffective structures in terms of what is aspired and why (Schatzki 1996; 2001b; Reckwitz 2002).

Drawing on Warde (2005), this dissertation investigates how consumption unfolds as practices moments. To do this, I present four papers drawing on ethnographic and netnographic work, interviews, consumer diaries, document study, and a survey study conducted within the empirical contexts of online community practices, discursive re-enchantment practices, electric guitar playing and gardening. Thus, this thesis is a compilation of four papers and this introductory text. Although each individual paper presents its own purpose and findings, taken together, these four papers allow for empirical and theoretical
development of the conceptualization of consumption as practice moments. Specifically, I present four conceptualisations for understanding consumption as practice moments as ingredient, momentum, transformation, and/or consequence.

This thesis argues that understanding consumption as such moments is particularly suitable when responding to challenges resulting from debates on the ontological status of consumption as being productive—or entangled with some form of production. This is because the conceptualization of consumption as different practice moments I offer incorporates mutually constitutive relations of consumption and productive aspects; and allows theorizing their entanglement in novel ways.

This cover text is not merely an introduction to the topic of the shared research agenda of the four papers. It presents a synthesis of the papers as a post-hoc reflection, theorization, and discussion of the individual and collective findings of the papers with regard to unfolding consumption as moments of practices.¹

In the remainder of chapter 1, I begin by outlining the tenets of consumption and consumer culture. Next, I offer problematization of consumption in the light of theories of practice. This concerns the question of how we are to understand consumption in the light of practice theoretical approaches. Then, I present considerations that problematize a singular treatment of consumption, because several indications in literature suggest an entanglement of consumption with production. This concerns the issue of how we are to understand consumption in relation to production. Based on this, I present the research purpose and approach for this dissertation. The chapter concludes with providing a roadmap of the thesis and a brief summary of the four papers contained within.

### 1.1 Consumption and Consumer Culture

Consumption permeates social life to the extent that it becomes almost impossible to participate in everyday social life without consumption (Slater 1997). This can perhaps be illustrated with the following dramatization. As Baudrillard (1998/1970, 90) argues, even “the rejection of consumption (…) remains the very ultimate in consumption”. What he means is that even those activities that are supposedly about rejecting consumption (as evident for example in saving energy or minimalist lifestyles) are in fact all about consumption. In short: anti-consumption is still consumption. This is because Baudrillard (1998/1970) dramatizes such anti-consumption as differentiation that is achieved through the consumption of signs which are attached to a certain way of behaving. In other words, a certain way of consuming (or not

¹ Therefore, it is advisable to read the four papers first.
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... becomes a consumable sign that offers meaning, not on the basis of ‘what’ is consumed, but ‘how’ (Baudrillard 1988; Holt 1997).

Although this thesis is not about how consumption can or should be rejected, these points serve to make clear how consumption permeates everyday life, even in cases that appear to be supposedly anti-consumption. They dramatize the necessity of considering the nature of the consumption object: that which is consumed. Certainly, a consumption object may very well be a material object. But it can also be a sign—an immaterial object. Thus, it becomes difficult to conceive of any forms of social behaviours and activities that do not involve some form of consumption. As Slater (1997, 15) puts it: “in modernity all the world is consumable experience.”

To capture the permeation and importance of consumption in contemporary (predominantly Western and economically developed and developing) societies, researchers use the term consumer culture: “The notion of ‘consumer culture’ implies that, in the modern world, core social practices and cultural values, ideas, aspirations and identities are defined and oriented in relation to consumption rather than to other social dimensions such as work or citizenship, religious cosmology or military role. (…) Thus, in talking of modern society as a consumer culture, people are not referring simply to a particular pattern of needs and objects—a particular consumption culture—but a culture of consumption” (Slater 1997, 24; original emphasis).

This view portrays consumption in terms of its capacious social and cultural dimensions that offer meaning and structure as a central entity in society for the lives of its members (Slater 1997; Featherstone 2007; Arnould and Thompson 2005; Miller 1995). McCracken (1988, xi) notes that consumption, in this understanding, is a “thoroughly cultural phenomenon”.

The notion of consumer culture is the manifestation of a general shift in social science departing from production-focused accounts of social life to consumption-focused accounts of social life and the world. Specifically, the classical works of Karl Marx (1971), and Georg Simmel (2004/1904) took their departure from production-focused accounts. They broadly conceived of consumption as a function of production. Yet Simmel’s (2004/1904) philosophy of money portrayed consumption as a vehicle of self-constitution and refinement for members of a society, and Marx (1971) offered a reasoning of how production is related to consumption that is discussed below (section 2.1.1). But essentially, these authors developed their thoughts by focusing their attention on production. This was adequate; as it has been noted that at the time of these early works, the ideas of a ‘consumer’ and ‘consumption’, were virtually absent beyond being considered outcomes of production or demand (e.g., Ritzer 2010).

Moreover, according to Bauman (1998, 24), the society which provided the context for those classical theorists was different from later-modern and postmodern society: While the former engaged its members ‘primarily as producers’, the latter engages its members ‘primarily as consumers’.
With the consumer revolution mushrooming from the England of the 18th century as an “analogue to the Industrial Revolution” (McKendrick 1982), authors note that we have witnessed a “passage from producer to consumer society” (Bauman 1998, 24) or a transformation from a producer culture toward a consumer culture (Slater 1997). Historically, consumption played a decisive role in the transformations of the Western World (see McCracken 1988; Corrigan 2005)², and has become deeply intertwined with and central to everyday activities (Arnould and Thompson 2005). Whether we engage in consumption of toilet paper, gas, or radio (Gronow and Warde 2001) or river-rafting, skydiving, or baseball spectating (Arnould and Price 1993; Celsi, Rose, and Leigh 1993; Holt 1997), consumption researchers find consumption seemingly everywhere.

Consumption is not necessarily confined to the act of purchasing; it can be understood as a process that involves the appropriation, uses, enjoyment, appreciation, and/or experience of material and or immaterial objects such as goods, services, ideas, information, performances, and ambience for a variety of purposes including utilitarian, symbolic/expressive, hedonic/emotional, and contemplative ends (Halkier, Katz-Gerro and Martens 2011; Holbrook and Hirschman 1982; Holbrook 1999; Warde 2005). Thus, consumption is portrayed as a meaningful and value-laden activity of social beings (e.g., Firat and Dholakia 2006; Holbrook 1999; Ramirez 1999; Slater 1997) over which the consumer has some degree of discretion and which may or may not involve acts of purchasing (Warde 2005).

Rather than work, it is consumption that is used to “express cultural categories and principles, cultivate ideals, create and sustain life-styles, construct notions of the self” (McCracken, 1988, xi). While Warde (1992) notes that also consumption is work, the kind of work addressed by Slater (1997) refers to notions of work in the sense of classic social theorists such as Marx (1971), who reasoned around productive human labour.

Consumption is portrayed as having become a “dominant human practice” (Arnould and Thompson 2005, 873) and today’s cultures as having become consumer cultures (Slater 1997) that operate structured by people’s daily consumption practices (Holt 2002, 73).

But consumption is not only meaningful for consumers. Consumption of some sort is important and necessary for businesses. Firms compete in marketplaces and strive to (raise and) satisfy the needs and wants of consumers; which is typically reflected in notions such the customer-centred company and consumer-oriented marketing (e.g., Kotler et al. 2008). As Keller (2003) argues, consumer research therefore has a vital role in managerial decision making. Thus, studying consumption delivers important and decisive information to

² Specifically, this includes modernity. See for example Firat and Venkatesh (1995) appendix A for an overview on the tenets of modernity.
marketing managers and has become both an important practical and scholarly discipline of marketing and business.

In his speech at the 15th MindTrek social media conference in Tampere, Finland, in 2011, Joe Wilson, Microsoft’s Western Europe senior director of developer and platform group, stated: “Culture eats strategy for lunch!” He refers to the obligation of managers to understand the particularities of culture, its practices, and mode of operation in order to craft suitable market offerings. If we accept the idea that consumer culture is an adequate description of most contemporary Western and developed societies, this means marketers will have a hard time making the sale without understanding the operation of consumer culture. Thus, the resonation of a product or service with existing consumer cultures becomes not an option, but a strategic necessity for survival and success. As Holt (2002, 80) puts it, consumer culture is “the ideological infrastructure that undergirds what and how people consume and sets the ground rules for marketers’ branding activities.”

Consumption, then, seems to be of key interest not only for marketers, but it is also a window to understand the world we live in. Thus, research that contributes to our understanding of the operation of consumption is not only useful for marketing managers and other decision makers, but also serves to increase understanding of one of the dominant facets of our cultures (Arnould and Thompson 2005).

1.2 Problematizing Consumption

If accepting the idea that consumer culture operates through consumption practices (Arnould and Thompson 2005; Holt, 2002), then studying such consumption in relation to practices is a useful aim to elucidate the operation of consumer culture. In the following, I offer a problematization of literature on consumption. Specifically, two issues invite further questions, which provide the building grounds for this thesis:

The first question concerns the relation of consumption to practice—that is, the conceptualization of consumption in and through practice-theoretical approaches. If consumption is deeply nested within our daily life and is instantiated in almost everything we do, how can consumption be conceptualized as taking place within these sets of activities, more precisely, within practices?

The second question regards the relation of consumption to production—that is, the conceptualization of consumption and its entanglement with productive aspects. Increasingly, literature is concerned with consumption as a stand-alone construct. Can consumption exclusively explain the processes taking place when guitar players play guitar and make sounds and music, or when gardeners nurture plants; when members of an online community log on
to the forums and post pictures, ask questions, and receive answers; when consumers talk about brands on the internet?

1.2.1 Consumption in relation to practice

Various strands of practice theory suggest the ontological position that social reality is constituted in and by arrays of practices (Bourdieu 1977; Giddens 1984; Reckwitz 2002; Rouse 2007; Schatzki 1996; Schatzki 2001a, 2002). This view suggests that social phenomena, like consumption, cannot be adequately understood outside the practices with which they are interwoven (Bourdieu 1977).

As one of the early practice thinkers on consumption, Bourdieu (1977; 1990; 1984) offers a theoretical apparatus that aims to explain how consumption practices are both structured and structuring. He highlights the unconscious and routine aspects of patterns of behaviour, and how we draw on schemes developed in the past that structure our behaviour. To Bourdieu, consumption practices are structured by a baggage of internalized history and experience. He calls this ‘habitus’. He understands habitus as durable and unconscious internalization of certain conditions of existence (structure) that guides subjective action and thus consumption. According to Bourdieu, habitus is not dictating what exactly to consume and in which way, but it is a “principle of regulated improvisation” (Bourdieu 1990, 78). Accordingly, even what appear to be our most intimate and individual consumption tastes are subject to structuration by and through practices. Bourdieu asserts that habitus is “embodied history” (Bourdieu 1990, 56) and the “basis of perception and appreciation of all subsequent experiences” (Bourdieu 1990, 54). This disposition of preference and taste develops socially through upbringing and exposure to certain conditions of existence: To Bourdieu, structure is primarily positions in social class. Thus, habitus is a silent and unconscious structuring structure that “generates and organizes practices” (Bourdieu 1990, 53) as well as their perception and understanding; but habitus itself is conditioned by positions in social class.

Consumption practices, then, are not only produced and structured by habitus, but through their guidance of habitus, consumption practices are also structuring in turn. That is, consumption practices are classifying because they serve as symbolic expressions of class positions. But consumption practices are also classified because they develop within positions of class. Thus, Bourdieu offers theorization of how consumption practices structure and are structured by social class. He takes a primary interest in developing a dialectic operation of structure (objective) and agency (subjective) and he is interested in consumption only as a symptom and site for this dialectic. Despite the valuable insights offered for understanding the structured and structuring qualities of consumption practices, he leaves the operation of consumption in relation to practice relatively untreated. In other words, he takes an interest in theorizing
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how certain consumption practices develop (through habitus as internalized structure that in turn structures consumption); and how these consumption practices then serve as markers of distinction and vessels for the production and reproduction of social class boundaries (structure). But Bourdieu remains relatively silent on the composition of consumption vis-à-vis practice, because his primary interest revolves around the dialectic operation of structure (objective) and agency (subjective)—he is interested in consumption only as a site for this investigation.

Inspired by Bourdieu’s work, Holt (1995) specifically approaches this gap and offers a study of ‘how consumers consume’. In his research on baseball spectating he offers a range of practices that seemingly go on during consumption. He clusters these in the form of consumption metaphors (Holt 1995, 3-12) including consuming as ‘experience’, ‘integration’, ‘classification’, and as ‘play’. Thus, Holt frames consumption as a form of meta-practice that encapsulates a variety of sub-practices. His work is particularly valuable in showing the multidimensionality of consumption by revealing the different sets of activities that are part of the consumption of baseball. Thus, his study suggests that consumption is composed of a variety of (sub)practices: Where Bourdieu sees consumption practice, Holt unfolds a variety of practices going on in consumption.

More recent thinking on consumption and practice suggests that consumption is “a moment in almost any practice” (Warde 2005, 137). Drawing on practice theorists Schatzki (1996, 2001) and Reckwitz (2002), Warde (2005) asserts that consumption ‘occurs’ alongside practices. Warde (2005) situates consumption within practices and suggests that consumption takes place as moments within them. Thus, consumption is not a practice by itself, but rather transpires within practices. His argument develops along the following lines.

First, Warde (2005, 137) offers the conceptualization consumption as practice moments as follows: “Appropriation occurs within practices: cars are worn out and petrol is burned in the process of motoring. Items appropriated and the manner of their deployment are governed by the conventions of the practice; touring, commuting and off-road sports are forms of motoring following different scripts for performers and functions for vehicles”. Although

---

3 The notion of ‘occurring’ however is slightly problematic, since it depicts consumption in a somewhat detached manner. Consumption does not occur in a self-induced fashion. The question of ‘how does consumption happen’, in the sense of ‘how is it possible that consumption takes place?’ is however deeply ethnomethodological (Garfinkel 1967) and highlights the idea that consumption must be ‘achieved’ and ‘takes place’ through and with certain relevant entities, including members of a society and their ordinary methods and strategies and other resources used for consumption. As will be pointed out below, consumption transpires in the nexus of objects-doings-meanings. That is, it takes place in and through practices. Therefore I suggest the notions of consumption as ‘taking place’ and ‘operating’ within practices as an alternative to ‘occurring’.
this view of consumption as a moment carries connotations of consumption as depletion, using up, and destruction of resources, he portrays at the same time the function that moments of consumption have in relation to practice. Second, he asserts that consumption takes place and is not governed and steered by the practice, adding that consumption takes place not only within, but crucially, for the sake of practices.

Warde’s point of view resonates with research that demonstrate how consumption objects are utilized in and for the conduct of a specific practice (Magaudda 2011; Reckwitz 2002; Schatzki 2001; 2002; Shove and Pantzar 2005; Whittington et al., 2006; Watson and Shove 2008). This means not only that the practice requires and necessitates consumption, but also that individuals engage in moments of consumption required by the practice. Consumption in this view becomes an element of practice. This can be illustrated by Shove and Chappells’ (2001) study showing how water and electricity is typically consumed in the course of the routines of daily practices; and Watson and Shove (2008) demonstrating how screws, nails, and tools are consumed in the course of DIY practices. Tools, raw materials, water, and electricity are not consumed for their own sake, but their consumption is steered by routine activities of everyday life or specific practices. In other words, engaging in a certain practice necessitates the consumption of certain objects. Thus, the needs for these objects are less ‘consumer needs’ than practice needs (Warde 2005). In Watson and Shove’s (2008) reading of Warde (2005), consumption thus is an outcome of practice.

This previous research leaves room for theoretical development of the role of consumption in relation to practices. While Holt (1995) finds that practices take place within consumption, others find that consumption takes place within practices (Warde 2005; Watson and Shove 2008; Magaudda 2011).

The indication that consumption takes place not only within practices, but ultimately for the sake of practices (Warde 2005; Watson and Shove, 2008) is important because it implies that consumption is not only a function of practice, but also has a function in practice. This in turn implies that practices do not only steer consumption (Warde, 2005; Watson and Shove 2008; Shove and Pantzar 2005), but that consumption can also steer practices. This raises further questions as to how the role of consumption on the performance of practices can be conceptualized.

This thesis seeks to further advance the conceptualization of consumption as embedded in practices: How and in what ways can consumption be considered as practice moments—in terms of its role in the performance of practices? Although Warde’s (2005) introduction of the idea of consumption as practice moments is a fruitful point of departure, it lacks theoretical and empirical specification regarding those aspects.
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1.2.2 Consumption in relation to production

Interestingly, the consumption-focused accounts of the last decades have been met by a reverse movement with increased attention to production. As noted by Beer and Burrows (2010, 10), in contemporary consumer culture, “production appears to have become an important activity again”. This statement refers to the increasing realization that many things are produced by those who are supposedly consumers—outside the walls of factories, plants, offices, and workshops.

While Bourdieu (1984) has framed consumption practices as a form of cultural production, producing and reproducing social class boundaries—particularly the changes in popular culture resulting from the ongoing diffusion of participatory web applications, digital technologies, social networking platforms, and community media—has renewed interest in explicitly considering production. But do these activities represent another form of production? Millions of consumers fill their community profiles with content, write blogs, and create and publish videos on video-sharing platforms, just to name a few examples. The use of mass cultural products as resources that consumers use, manipulate, and undermine in their own production processes is a basic, but far from trivial, process in popular culture (Fiske 1989).

For it is here, in popular culture and media contexts, where it becomes very obvious that consumers not only consume but also produce (Burgess and Green 2009; Cova and Dalli 2009; Collins 2010). Taking this into account, researchers contend that “the term consumer seems hopelessly outdated and weighted with a baggage of passivity and isolation that is increasingly untenable” (Kozinets, Hemetsberger and Schau 2008, 351).

The changing media landscape and the concurrent rise of consumer participation in production processes highlight this concern: ‘Citizen journalists’ produce content for media organizations (Banks and Deuze 2009; Banks and Humphreys 2008; Bruns 2008; Deuze, Bruns, and Neuberger 2007; Jenkins 2006; Warde and Williams 2010); consumers are involved through Internet technologies in the production and innovation processes of products ranging from motorcycles to the pharmaceutical industry, over Boeing’s dreamliners and Nike shoes to musical instruments (Fuller, Jawecki, and Mühlbacher 2007; Jawecki and Fuller 2008; Jeppesen and Frederiksen 2006; Sawhney, Verona, and Prandelli 2005); and in open-source software development communities, consumers collaborate to produce, even without the involvement of commercial manufacturers (e.g., Hemetsberger 2003).

Exemplary taglines that dramatize this issue on a more general theoretical level include Gottdiener’s (2001, 6) note that there is “production in consumption”; Arnould and Thompson’s (2005, 873) account of consumers as “culture producers”; and Firat and Venkatesh’s (1995, 254) comment that “there is no natural distinction between consumption and production; they are one and the same, occurring simultaneously”.
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Such statements and the renewed interest in ‘prosumption’ as the merger of the terms producer and consumer (Toffler 1980; Kotler 1986; Tapscott and Williams 2006; Ritzer 2010; Ritzer and Jurgenson 2010; Ritzer, Dean, and Jurgenson 2012) indicate a somewhat conceptual crisis involving the way we understand the composition of consumption in relation to production. Increasingly, consumers are theorized as producers, and several positions in the literature challenge a clear split between production and consumption and producer and consumer (Arnould 2007; Firat and Dholakia 2006; Firat, Dholakia, and Venkatesh 1995; Firat and Venkatesh 1995; Humphreys and Grayson 2008; Kotler 1986; Normann and Ramirez 1993; Toffler 1980).

This attack on the conceptual rigid distinction between consumption and production has been influential in both interpretive streams within marketing (e.g., Arnould and Thompson 2005; Arnould 2007), as well as in more traditional marketing management literature (Lusch and Vargo 2006; Prahalad and Venkatesh 2004; Vargo and Lusch 2004).

Beer and Burrows (2010) argue that the entanglement of consumption and production provides an important research agenda for the area of consumer culture research. How can we understand consumption in terms of how it is related to or entangled with production? These considerations infuse the idea that when seeking to study consumption, some form of relation or entanglement to some form of production should be appreciated. No doubt, consumption continues to be a dominant facet in most Western and developed societies. But as explicated in more detail below (section 2.1), various literatures have been concerned with an entanglement of consumption and production: Almost all production consumes something and almost all consumption produces something.

Although some positions conclude that consumption and production are thus essentially one and the same (e.g., Firat and Venkatesh 1995), researchers maintain consumption and production as analytical categories—even those who argue for the notion of prosumption (e.g., Ritzer 2010) and for a complete collapse of consumption and production (e.g., Firat and Venkatesh 1995; Zwick and Denegri-Knott 2009). Because these indications of how the ontological status of consumption as being consumption is challenged in so far as consumption has been considered as being production, studying consumption means also incorporating and responding to this challenge.

If thinking about consumption and production as sets of activities, it is not very easy to spot their entanglement. Playing the guitar onstage is somewhat different from standing in the crowd, watching and listening to the guitar player; recording an album is somewhat different from downloading and listening to it; being a guest in a hotel is somewhat different from working as the hotel manager or cleaning the rooms; writing a post in an online community is somewhat different than browsing the community and reading posts written by others. These could be framed as different sets of activities, loaded with a baggage of different understandings, doings, and sayings (Schatzki 1996; 2001).
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that provide different experiences—e.g., making music versus listening to music. Although each of these activities may involve some aspects of consumption and production, conducive to the overall achievements of a concert, a record, a night in a hotel, or an online community, they are not necessarily one and the same. But within practices, such as guitar playing or online community participation, aspects of consumption are intertwined with the making of things. The guitar player consumes guitar gear and makes music. The online community member reads questions, answers or asks questions, and reads replies. How can such relationships between those relatively immediate forms of consumption and production be framed within practices?

While researchers have called attention to consumption/production linkages (Arnould 2007; Arnould and Thompson 2007), it is surprising to find such a paucity of research offering conceptual and systematic attempts to integrate consumption with production. How can we understand the entanglement of consumption with production on a practice level?

Warde (1992) argues that much of the confusion regarding the production/consumption debate stems from using different levels of analysis and the conflation of the systems of production of consumption with the roles played by individuals within them. This thesis relates to this discussion by taking practices as the level of analysis for studying consumption and its links to productive aspects.

The kind of production looked at in this thesis concerns the productive aspects of consumptive moments, as well as the productive aspects within practices. To capture the productive aspects of consumptive moments, I use the concept of performativity. To capture the productive aspects within practices, I introduce productive moments.

In this view, practices become the site for studying consumption and its entanglement with production. As Schatzki (2005, 468) puts it: “Practices are the site, but not the spatial site, of activities.” Based on this line of thought, Warde (2005) and Schatzki (2005) highlight the organization of practices as the focal point for analysis. This allows framing of both consumption and production as taking place within the site of practices. Thus, a practice-based approach suggests that a focus on practices allows a view of consumption and its entanglement with production as deeply embedded in the practices of everyday life.

1.3 Research Objective and Approach

Accepting the idea that consumption is central in consumer cultures, the topic of this thesis is the operation of consumption within consumer culture. Specifically, this dissertation seeks to investigate how consumption takes place in relation to practices, which have previously been described as the building blocks of consumer culture (Arnould and Thompson 2005; Holt 2002). Warde
(2005) suggests that consumption can be conceived of as practice moments, providing fertile grounds for the exploration of the various ways in which consumption operates as such moments, and thus for the conceptual development of both consumption and practice. Understanding how consumption operates in relation to practices is conducive to understanding how practices work.

Studying consumption as practice moments is important, particularly because this offers opportunities for analysing its entanglement with productive aspects in a relatively confined theoretical and empirical site—the site of practices. Therefore, the curiosity about consumption is entangled with a curiosity about productive aspects—following the thought that in order to appreciate consumption, it must be appreciated in relation to productive aspects. Thus, this thesis investigates how consumption unfolds as practice moments and specifically addresses links to the productive aspects entangled with these moments.

The purpose of this thesis is to unfold consumption as practice moments.

To this end, my approach to study consumption conceptually and empirically is through the lens of practices (Schatzki 1996; 2001; Reckwitz 2002; Warde, 2005; Halkier, Katz-Gerro, Martens, 2011). This is, to a great extent, inspired by Bourdieu’s (1977) argument that social phenomena cannot be adequately understood outside the practices in which they are interwoven. Thus, this thesis treats practices as the ‘sites’ (Schatzki 2005) in which consumption as a social phenomenon takes place. Specifically, I seek to study consumption and the dynamics resulting from its entanglement with productive aspects on a relatively confined site, namely that of practices.

A central claim of practice theory is that it is through action and interaction within practices that mind, rationality, and knowledge are constituted and social life is organized, reproduced, and transformed. “The practice approach can thus be demarcated as all analyses that (1) develop an account of practices, either the field of practice or a subdomain thereof, or (2) treat the field of practice as the place to study the nature and transformation of their subject matter” (Schatzki 2001a, 11). The former type of analysis resonates more with a descriptive type of research that creates valuable knowledge in and through the accounting of social phenomena and, in this case, the focal point of social practices—much like the anthropologists study different accounts of human cultures. The latter resonates more with an understanding of practices as a theoretical lens or perspective through which one can set out to research different matters of social and human life. It is the latter understanding of a practice approach that I adopt in this thesis, specifically because it opens up space for an investigation of consumption as a social phenomenon through the lens of the practices through and in which it is constituted.
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Therefore, the level of analysis is practices, and the focus of this thesis lies on consumption and how it operates within practices. This study of consumption is particularly informed by signals of an entanglement of consumption with production. When analysing the signals concerned with this entanglement (section 2.1), prior literature indicates that a study of consumption needs to be able to 1) recognize relationships of consumption and production; 2) incorporate mutually constitutive, but not necessarily equal, relations of consumption and production; and 3) on this basis, acknowledge the consequentiality of such consumption for the fabrication of social life. A practice-theoretical lens provides the appropriate theoretical and conceptual tools for such an endeavour, because it allows recognizing mutual constitutive relations of concepts and the consequentiality of its elements for social life (Feldman and Orlikowski 2011). In other words, studying consumption through a practice-theoretical lens allows for an explicit appreciation of productive aspects.

By treating practices as the site of consumption, a practice-theoretical lens is predisposed to clarify some of the confusion that results from different levels of analysis. Specifically, I regard Warde’s (2005) idea of practice moments as a fruitful way forward. It allows the embedding of consumption and its links to productive aspects within the frame of practices. Therefore, I approach consumption as practice moments as a point of departure for the development of consumption in relation to practices and in relation to productive aspects. Therefore, two research questions accompany the purpose of this dissertation:

(1) *In what ways can consumption be conceptualized as moments in and of practices?* This question embraces specifically the operation of consumption in relation to practices.

(2) *How can the conceptualization of consumption as moments in and of practices elucidate links to productive aspects?* This concerns the entanglement of consumption with productive aspects on practice-theoretical grounds.

1.4 Overview of the Thesis

I investigate these issues through four papers that concern three types of practices (explained in section 2.2.3). All of the papers note a mutually constitutive relation between consumptive and productive aspects of the particular type of practice studied. These practices provide the context for studying how consumption takes place in practices and unfolds as moments in and of these practices. Figure 1 offers an overview.
Figure 1: Overview of the thesis

Paper 1 explores and illustrates two specific consumptive moments taking place in interpersonal practice performance (in the form of online community practices). It offers a synthesizing perspective on interpersonal practice performance as being fabricated of direct consumptive moments, vicarious consumptive moments and productive moments. This paper focuses on how vicarious and consumptive moments of community practices create different forms of value. Paper 1 is co-authored with Carline Wiertz and Eric J. Arnould.

Paper 2 explores and illustrates the way in which a retro brand is being authenticated through collective re-enchantment. More precisely, it specifies the discursive processes that construct specific brand meanings (authenticity) and a particular mode of manufacturing (craft production). Thus it shows how a brand is produced in and through discursive practice and pays attention to the consumptive resources in this process, for example, how and what resources are used in this discursive process. As a result, it offers theorization of how authenticity operates in relation to enchantment and contributes five re-enchanting craft discourses of vocation, dedication, tradition, mystification, and association, which are relevant in the discursive practice of re-authentication and can be used by marketers to transform ordinary production into craft production. This paper is co-authored with Jacob Östberg.

Paper 3 investigates how consumption constellations are formed and shaped in electric guitar playing as an object-focused practice. It explores and illustrates the ways in which these consumptive arrangements matter and operate in electric guitar playing by revealing the teleaffective properties of consumption
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constellation formation as being agentive, communicative, and associative. Based on these insights, it offers theorization of inductive and deductive routes in the formation of consumption constellations. This paper is single-authored.

Paper 4 examines the organization of consumptive and productive moments within the two object-focused practices of electric guitar playing and gardening. It reveals how a practice-level structure called ‘facilitation’ organizes consumptive moments in relation to productive moments. It foregrounds one particular understanding of productive moments by highlighting objects as carriers of productive moments and demonstrates how consumptive moments take place in orientation to assist objects in their productive capacities within practices. This paper is single-authored.

The remainder of this cover text is structured as follows. Chapter 2 introduces the theoretical backdrop and begins by discerning and elaborating on how the entanglement of consumption with production is depicted in five different logics, or schools of thought. It is on this basis that I motivate a practice-theoretical approach to the study of consumption, which is the content of the subsequent section. After introducing the tenets of a practice-theoretical approach, I delineate three types of practice that comprise the practices studied in this thesis. Then, I approach consumptive practice moments and present considerations that suggest a practice-level companion of productive practice moments. The chapter concludes with a brief summary.

Chapter 3 is the method chapter. I explain my motivation for selecting electric guitar playing and gardening as empirical contexts in which to study the identified research issues and present an overview of the research approach and empirical material. Then I elaborate the underlying ethical considerations of this research. The chapter concludes with matters pertaining to analysis and interpretation of empirical material.

Chapter 4 presents the findings and a discussion of the four papers comprising this dissertation with regard to their shared research purpose. Here, I unfold consumption as four practice moments, seeking to answer questions pertaining to the relation of consumption to practice. Then I offer a discussion of insights pertaining to the relation of consumption to productive aspects in this light. Subsequently, I discuss implications and contributions of this thesis with regard to prosumption, practice theory, the operation of consumption in consumer culture, the creation of value, an emerging practice-oriented marketing approach, and future research opportunities.

Chapter 5 offers final thoughts. The four papers are attached as an appendix.
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Before I begin to present the practice-theoretical perspective mobilized in this thesis, it makes sense to begin with a literature review that exposes the ontological status of consumption in the light of different theoretical perspectives. In this review, I explicitly focus on various indications in literature that pinpoint an entanglement of consumption with production. It is on this basis I motivate a practice-theoretical perspective to the study of consumption. Whereas specifically the transformations in the media sphere make consumers’ acts of production and the productive aspects of consumption quite obvious (e.g., Beer and Burrows 2010), I offer a review of prior literature that has indicated the productive aspects of consumption and that is concerned about a clear-cut split between consumption and production with regards to various theoretical perspectives.

On these grounds, I present the practice-theoretical perspective and argue that it is suitable for dealing with the entanglement of consumption and productive aspects that previous works suggest. I introduce the tenets of practice theoretical ontology and specify the types of practices under investigation in this thesis. Next, I approach consumptive and productive practice moments. Finally, I show how these considerations facilitate unfolding consumptive moments in relation to practice and productive aspects.

2.1 The Entanglement of Consumption with Production

This section identifies and presents five groups of thought that deal with consumption also in terms of production. I call these groups of thought logics, specifically, dialectic logic of Karl Marx, blending logic, co-creation logic, consumer-cultural logic, and collapse logic. These groups of thought are logics in the sense that they are particular forms of reasoning framed by particular theoretical perspectives.

This review serves the purpose of focusing on how these literatures incorporate some entanglement of consumption and production and thereby contribute to the discussion of the ontological status of consumption. It becomes also clear how production is dealt with in various aspects in relation to consumption.
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2.1.1  Dialectic logic of Karl Marx

In the introduction chapter to *The Grundrisse* Marx (1971) offers thoughts on a dialectical relationship between consumption and production. Marx (1971, 24) notes that there is a degree of unity of consumption and production and that each reproduces the other, while at the same “each is directly its own counterpart”.

The starting point for Marx is, by and large, production. He writes on the ‘general relation’, as he calls it, of production to distribution, exchange, and consumption, which to him form a ‘perfect’ connection. The focus here shall lie on his treatise of production and consumption. Although he notes that there is no ‘general production’, but rather specific production in certain sectors or industries, he contends that reasoning on production in general is a rational abstraction to make (Marx 1971, 19). In this thesis, however, I attend to the relatively immediate forms of production in relation to consumption and practice which I call productive aspects. Marx’s reasoning revolves around human labour. Here, he notes that in human labour, production as well as consumption is evident (it is important to note that Marx refers to material production and consumption). To him, production is simultaneously consumption, because raw materials and resources are consumed in the process of production, consumption “appears as a factor of production” (Marx 1971, 27). On the other hand, consumption is simultaneously production, because it “goes to produce the human being in one way or another” (Marx 1971, 24). He cites the example of us producing our own bodies by feeding ourselves as one type in which consumption is productive.

Accordingly, production and consumption “appear as different aspects of one act” (Marx 1971, 27, emphasis added), but he notes ‘intermediary movements’ between the two. First, he notes that without production, consumption would not exist, because production is what provides the consumption object. Second, he argues that without consumption, production would not exist, as it becomes senseless to produce if there is no consumption—consumption provides the rationale and impulse for new production. Thus, he notes that consumption and production appear as means of the other; they are mutually dependent because they induce each other, but stay extrinsic to each other. To capture this, he uses the terms of consumptive production (concerned with productive and unproductive labour) and productive consumption (concerned with productive and non-productive consumption). Further, he notes that “just as consumption gives the product its finishing touch as a product, production puts the finishing touch on consumption” (Marx 1971, 25). He makes these latter points on an economically abstracted level, speaking from a production-oriented frame. Here, Marx (1971, 24, emphasis added) offers one rather interesting point when he states that a product becomes only a “real product in consumption”. He cites the examples of a garment becoming “a real garment only by the act of being
worn” (Marx 1971, 25). To him, it is only through consumption that a product becomes a product—consumption is the concluding act that makes the producer a producer. Thus he speaks more to the ontology of a product and the producer than to the ontology of consumption.

As for the ontological status of consumption, Marx proposes some interesting points of departure by suggesting a dialectical relationship between consumption and production. Consumption and production mediate one another, “create the other and itself as the other” (Marx 1971, 26). They are one and the same, while staying outside of each other—consumption and production induce one another and are mutually dependent.

Although recognizing the difficulties that arise in his ‘perfect connection’, Marx’s dialectics do not oppose consumption and production as being analytical categories. Although written from a point of view with high degree of economical abstraction, his dialectics of consumption and production are not antithetical to empirical study. In contrast, his work suggests the idea that dialectical relations of consumption and production can be found not only on levels of theoretical abstraction, but also on the level of ‘actual’ processes. This is interesting and relevant in so far as it connects to a practice-theoretical approach with regard to the doings involved with practices.

Two key aspects can be learned from Marx’s treatise: First, he suggests that consumption is part of some process or activity; acts of consumption take place along some processes—which to him are predominantly equal to human labour. Second, consumption is dialectically related to some form of production. His work suggests that consumption is mediated through production; and production is mediated through consumption. However, the question that remains from his work is: How is production mediated in consumption, and vice versa? In other words, Marx does not offer theorization of the how component of the consumption production dialectic.

If anything, Marx suggests that consumption is a productive category (productive consumption), but his conceptualization of consumption defies many social and cultural insights we have today. Further, his work suggests that we pay attention to the ‘actual’ processes that host consumption and production if we are to learn about the nature of their relation. His focus on human labour, however, excludes other forms of what such processes might be, which will be given by practices investigated in this thesis.

2.1.2 Blending logic

In what can be called blending logic, literature suggests merging the terms ‘producer’ and ‘consumer’ to create ‘prosumer’ (Kotler 1986; Ritzer 2010; Ritzer, Dean, and Jurgenson 2012; Ritzer and Jurgenson 2010; Tapscott and
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Williams 2006; Toffler 1980). However, what appears at first glance to be a blending—or merging—logic derives from a fundamental underlying substitution premise.

Alvin Toffler (1980) coined the term prosumption. In his book, The Third Wave, he contemplated three waves of societal and cultural development that mark transformations from one type of society to another. He portrays technology bridging the gap between consumers and producers, a futuristic foresight that seems surprisingly accurate today. His idea of prosumption envisions that consumers turn into producers when they conduct bank transactions at a machine or on the Internet instead of the bank subsidiary, or pump their own fuel at gas stations instead of having it pumped for them by an employee. He writes: “Millions of people (...) are beginning to perform for themselves services hitherto performed for them by doctors (...) what these people are really doing is shifting some production from Sector B [the ‘visible economy’] to Sector A [the ‘invisible economy’]” (Toffler 1980, 267, emphasis added).

Here, Toffler refers essentially to substitution: Consumers produce the products and services they eventually consume, as opposed to buying them from a commercial producer. Simply put, a prosumer is a person who, for example, selects, buys, carries home, and assembles an IKEA bookshelf. These people are prosumers because they are not merely consuming but also producing by accomplishing important functions in the value chain (Normann and Ramirez 1993). But Toffler does not mention symbolic production—production cannot be understood only in terms of manufacturing a good or delivering a service. Rather, production takes also place in the making and shaping of meanings, ideas, symbols, knowledge and understanding, desires, and ideologies that is highlighted in marketing and branding activities. For example, the American Marketing Association (AMA) provides a marketing definition of production as “The creation of form utility, i.e., all activities used to change the appearance or composition of a good or service with the intent of making it more attractive to potential and actual users” (AMA 2013). However, such symbolic production is not addressed by Toffler.

Prosumption per Toffler refers to substitution in two ways. First, prosumption represents a form of outsourcing to the consumer. On certain steps of the value chain, the commercial producer is substituted by producing

---

4 In media studies, the notion of ‘produsage’ (Bruns 2008) is used in similar ways as prosumption. However, I hold with Jansson (2002, 6) who argues that there is no “self-evident reason to treat media consumption as a separate case”. Other versions of the term prosumer represent the blending of the words ‘professional’ and ‘consumer’, and to describe consumers using a product for both professional and private purposes. In this thesis, I understand prosumption as the merger of the terms ‘producer’ and ‘consumer’.
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consumers—consumers take over, or are made to take over, elements of the value chain traditionally performed by commercial producers. Cova and Dalli (2009) refer to these consumers as ‘working consumers’ and, unlike Toffler, they acknowledge the symbolic production of consumers. Other researchers have raised the issue of the exploitation of such consumers (Zwick, Bonsu, and Darmody 2009). Second, consumers produce their own products and services as opposed to acquiring them from a third party. Kotler (1986) echoes Toffler’s ideas and suggests that only very few people could be characterized as ‘arch prosumers’, or those that live a life dedicated to making ‘many things themselves’ (512). By contrast, the ‘avid hobbyists’ engage in prosumption as a meaningful form of leisure, sewing their own clothes, cooking their own food instead of going to a restaurant as meaningful activities. Toffler and Kotler argue that the ‘essence of being a consumer’ is to consume such goods and services, while the ‘essence of being a prosumer’ is to “prefer producing one’s own goods and services” (Kotler 1986, 510).

Campbell (2005) provides similar observations regarding the emergence of ‘craft consumers’—those who make products for their own consumption. Craft consumption entails the production of something “made and designed by the same person” (Campbell 2005, 31). Here, the craft consumer is simultaneously producer and consumer. Campbell envisions the craft consumer as a special type of consumer on the rise in contemporary consumer culture. However, craft consumption emphasizes that producing one’s own products is not necessarily antithetical to consumption: “the craft consumer is a person who typically takes any number of mass-produced products and employs these as the ‘raw materials’ for the creation of a new ‘product’, one that is typically intended for self-consumption” (Campbell 2005, 27-28). Thus, Campbell depicts a form of Marx-type consumption of raw materials in the production process. As a consequence, he notes that craft consumers are not so much interested in buying a finished product, but rather in products that they can employ in their own craft consumption processes. This means that craft consumers are still depicted as consumers, just as prosumers are also depicted as consumers—but both represent a type of producing consumers. Campbell differentiates this special breed of consumers from ordinary consumers based on what they do; that is, based on the specific craft procedures and activities, a distinction that gains relevance in the light of the practice-theoretical focus of this thesis.

The term prosumption has gained renewed popularity and is increasingly used in relation to the Internet in general and so-called social media in particular (e.g., Beer and Burrows 2010; Collins 2010; Comor 2011; Ritzer and Jurgenson 2010). Here, prosumption seems to be not a form of lifestyle choice that Kotler (1986) depicted; but the very essence of participation in online communities, forums, and social networks.

In this light, it may be easy to celebrate the arrival of such prosumption as ‘new’ or ‘on the rise’, but authors advise restraint. Ritzer (2010) notes that
people have always in one way or another produced their own products and services for their own consumption. To him, the concept of prosumption offers the possibility of correcting an ‘error in the history of social theory’, namely focusing either on production or consumption, when in fact social theorists should have always focused on both (Ritzer 2010; Ritzer, Dean, and Jurgenson 2012; Ritzer and Jurgenson 2010). Also Humphreys and Grayson (2008) develop a rather critical perspective toward celebrating such prosumption as new. By using Marx’s distinction of use value (in their terms that is: ‘consumption’) and exchange value (in their terms that is: ‘production’), they argue that production-by-consumers, which is concerned with the production of use value, is not ‘new’ or different from what people always have done. We play the guitar to make music, use the car to get from point A to point B, and create our own experiences when using goods and services. On the other hand, they note that if consumers begin to produce exchange value for firms, this does indeed indicate an important variation in the organization of economy. Thus, Humphreys and Grayson (2008) have contended that terms such as prosumption are rhetorical covers that mask a sustained split between the production of exchange value and the production of use value.

While Humphreys and Grayson’s (2008) argument builds on framing consumption as the production of use value and production as the creation of exchange value, Warde (1992) challenges this line of Marxian understanding of consumption and production according to whether they create exchange or use value. Warde argues that consumption creates both forms of value. He cites the example of the consumption of a house: Living in the house provides shelter.

5 Grönroos (2011) notes that although the expressions of ‘value creation’ and ‘create value’ are frequently used throughout in literatures, they are among the most underdefined and problematic, but highly relevant concepts in marketing and consumer research (see also Karababa and Kjeldgaard 2013; Arnould 2013; Venkatesh and Penaloza 2013; Sanchez-Fernandez and Iniesta-Bonillo 2007). In the classical economic understanding of value as proposed by the works of Marx, Smith, and Ricardo, goods have exchange value (monetizes in market transactions) and use value (when used or consumed). However, a discussion of use value can be traced back to Aristotle, who according to Gordon (1964, 117-118), views use value as subjectively experienced benefit. Holbrook (1999) adds that value is an experienced preference. The idea of value creation through consumption is central in consumer research and marketing literatures (Karababa and Kjeldgaard 2013) but runs counter to the historical and etymological roots and their economic coinage of the term. However, Ramirez (1999) identifies etymological roots of the term consumption that resonate with conceptions of consumption as value creator, rather than value destroyer. Because a historical overview of the value concept has been treated extensively in previous literature, I refer to Gordon (1964), Vargo and Lusch (2004), Ramirez (1999), Humphreys and Grayson (2008), Grönroos (2008; 2011), Ors (2010), and Karababa and Kjeldgaard (2013). Section 4.3.4 offers a further discussion of the consequences for theorizing the creation of value on the basis of my findings.
and comfort, which creates use value—and Marx would agree that this means the house is a ‘real’ house. Holding onto the house in rising markets also creates exchange value. According to Warde (1992), living in the house (i.e., consuming it) creates exchange value. However, one does not necessarily need to live in the house for it to create exchange value. Rather, Warde’s argument can be criticized with respect that it is more ownership than it is consumption which creates exchange value in times of rising markets. For example, a property may serve as a financial investment, which does not necessarily imply that it must be inhabited to create exchange value.

A limitation to discussing the nature of consumption and production by asking whether they create use value or exchange value is that it ignores discussions on the relation between these two value types as well as other forms of value. Grönroos (2008) argues that exchange value is determined by value in use: If a good has no use value, it will not have exchange value in the long run. However, this understanding undermines the value of appreciating an object for its own sake when it has little or no use value, such as an art object discussed by Holbrook (1994; 1999). Holbrook (1999) offers a typology of the many forms of value that are created in and through consumption, including value outcomes that are more self-oriented and those that are more other-oriented. According to him, self-oriented value outcomes of consumption are efficiency (convenience), play (fun), excellence (quality), and aesthetics (beauty). Value outcomes of consumption that are other-oriented are status (success, impression management), ethics (justice, virtue, morality), esteem (reputation, materialism, possessions), and spirituality (faith, ecstasy, sacredness). Although some of these value outcomes of consumption can clearly be sorted into the category of use value, for example, efficiency, it is problematic to define aesthetic value in terms of its use value or exchange value. Beauty lies in the eye of the beholder, and what is beautiful to some might be ugly and offensive to others. Because a beautiful thing may have a higher exchange value than an ugly thing, it could be concluded that consumption creates exchange value in the sense of Marx. Marketers frequently praise the beauty of their products. Guitar makers place emphasis on the design of their products in aesthetic dimensions, not only in technical dimensions. The question then becomes to consider what value is and means. I will discuss this question in more detail in section 4.3.4.

For the ontological status of consumption, this stream of literature contributes the following: First, it asks researchers to pay attention to consumption as well as production. Ritzer (2010) and Ritzer, Dean, and Jurgenson (2012) present prosumption as the middle point on a continuum between production and consumption. That is, production and consumption remain analytical categories, as the “term prosumption assumes both” (Ritzer 2010, 73, original emphasis). Assuming both represents a departure from Marx’s production-centred treatise. Where Marx focused on production and saw consumption as well, proclaimers of prosumption begin with both consumption and production. That is, they focus on some process or activity
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and acknowledge that they may be characterized more by production, or more
by consumption. This resonates broadly with Marx’s consumptive production
and productive consumption. Further following Ritzer (2010) and Ritzer, Dean,
and Jurgenson (2012), ‘pure’ prosumption, however, is the exact middle point
between consumption and production. Thus, both consumption and
production can be seen as constituting elements of prosumption.

But questions remain. Prosumption as originally envisioned by Toffler
essentially adopts a linear value-chain model and substitution logic. It is
conceived from a production focus, as Ritzer (2010) dramatizes with his
thought exercise of ‘conduction’ as the blending of the terms consumer with
producer rather than producer with consumer (≡prosumption). If we place
consumption and production on a continuum, with prosumption as its middle
point, how are we to conceptualize a relation of consumption with production
beyond the describing term prosumption? How can we be sure that the exact
middle point between consumption and production is studied, rather than
deviations to the left and right?

The term prosumption emerges as more descriptive rather than analytical.
At the core of this literature is the idea that the concepts of consumption and
production, and consumer and producer are less meaningful labels than the
notion of prosumption, as they have lost their discriminating power to
differentiate between things that eventually would be one and the same,
prosumption. Yet, proclaimers of this stream use the concepts of consumer,
producer, consumption, and production to define what prosumption is. This
indicates that production and consumption are meaningful categories after all,
because they are needed to explain what prosumption is. This raises questions
on the analytical value of the concept of prosumption. It does not suggest or
specify dynamics, relations, oppositions, enabling and/or constraining forces of
the two ‘ends’ of the continuum, its ingredients. Conceptual blind spots remain
on how prosumption can be conceived of in terms of—or mediated by—
consumption and production, as Marx suggested. How and in what ways is
consumption equal to production in prosumption?

Yet, and this is important with regard to the ontological status of
consumption, I argue that the largest contributions of this stream of literature
are as follows: First, it is an influential suggestion to deal with the productive
aspects of consumption, as it calls for attention to both consumption and
production. It questions profoundly the study of consumption in isolation from
production and a singular treatise of consumption. Not everything should be
considered prosumption, as Ritzer (2010) points out with his continuum, but
production should be considered in the study of consumption. Although some
conceptual blind spots remain on the constitution of prosumption as (≡)
consumption + production, it calls for anyone that engages in the study of
consumption to attend to production as well. Second, it incites to focus on
processes or activities in which consumption and production take place. In this
thesis, practices provide the context for studying these issues.
2.1.3 Co-creation logic

Another production-oriented approach that considers the entanglement of consumption with production is literature on co-creation. It is production-focused in the sense that it attends to the creation or production of value between firms and consumers (Grönroos 2006, 2008, 2011; Lusch and Vargo 2006; Normann and Ramirez 1993; Prahalad and Venkatesh 2004; Ramirez 1999; Vargo and Lusch 2004; Vargo 2008). The central question asked in this body of literature is ‘how is value created?’ and the basic answer can be said to be ‘value is co-created between firms and consumers’.

In their seminal article, Vargo and Lusch (2004) argue for a Service-Dominant Logic (SDL) of marketing as opposed to a goods-centred logic. They offer some reformulation and development of this in their subsequent publications, but the main tenets remain the same. In brief, this perspective theorizes consumers as important co-producers of value. According to Vargo and Lusch (2004; 2008), economies are essentially service economies rather than product economies. Service is the fundamental basis of exchange, and customers and firms interact in (co-)creating these services. For example, a USB stick is in this view not product; it is defined in terms of the service it offers. The service a USB stick offers is storing data. However, a firm can only offer the stick as part of that service of storing data; it is the customers who unwrap the stick, attach it to a computer, and put some data on it. Thus, customers turn into co-creators of that service, because they achieve an essential function in the value chain. They are, in that sense, always co-producers.

In contrast to the blending logic, proponents of the SDL regard consumers not as taking over steps of the value chain, but view consumers as a ‘natural’ part of value creation; they become resource integrators in that they integrate market offerings as resources in their own value-creation activities (Lusch and Vargo 2006; 2008; Vargo and Lusch 2004).

Service-Dominant Logic parallels what is essentially a Marxist production-oriented paradigm. First, the notion of value chain implies some form of linear relation between the firm (and production) and the customer (and consumption). This conveys the idea that production is the starting point of the process of value creation and is where realization of value begins (the offering of the USB stick). Although Vargo and Lusch (2004; 2008) note that firms can only make offerings, and not create value by themselves, the idea of firms initiating the process of offering is apparent. Second, much like Marx portrayed, SDL paints a picture of consumption as the concluding act (unwrapping, attaching to a computer, and putting data on it) in which production is achieved—consumption becomes a phase of (co-)production of value. The crucial difference however is this: To Marx, the value of a commodity springs primarily from the labour involved in acts of production, not primarily from acts of consumption—consumption concludes production.
only in a definitional sense and is the input for more production. The SDL, however, emphasizes consumption as a key facet of the creation of value and that value does not reside in a commodity, but derives from consumption of the co-created service. Thus, this stream of literature is relatively close to a twisted form of Marx’s suggestion—namely that consumption needs to take place so that (co-) production (of value) occurs.

Grönroos (2011) offers a critical analysis of this body of literature and its use of concepts. Although he agrees with the fundamental idea of the SDL, he raises some points of concern and questions: he wonders what is meant by value creation, and specifically, whether it refers to the value creating activities of consumers (value-in-use), or to some larger process in which consumers’ creation of value is merely an element. Thus, he addresses the limitation of the theoretical development and empirical study of the co-creation concept and process due to lack of clarity regarding value and the process of its creation. It has to be said, however, that value is one of the most problematic concepts in marketing and consumer research (Karababa and Kjeldgaard 2013; Sánchez-Fernández and Iniesta-Bonillo 2007).

Grönroos (2011) agrees with Vargo and Lusch (2004; 2008) that “consumers are by definition value creators”. But he separates value creation from value co-creation. He suggests defining “value creation strictly as the customer’s creation of value-in-use, and all other actions leading to value for the customer as value facilitation” (Grönroos, 2011, 296). Thus, value is always created by consumers. Consumers become co-producers in firms’ production processes only if they engage in direct interaction with firms concerning the production processes. The production processes he refers to typically take place within companies (to which he refers as design, development, production and delivery, and back-office and front-office phases). Only if consumers engage in direct interaction with companies concerning one or several of these production phases do they become co-producers. This is particularly evident in media contexts, where ‘citizen journalists’ participate in the production of news and where co-creation has become a pillar of consumers’ media usage, experience, and expectation (Banks and Deuze 2009; Banks and Humphreys 2008; Bruns 2008; Deuze, Bruns, and Neuberger 2007; Jenkins 2006). Here, media consumers engage in co-creative labour and participate in the production process of media organizations such as the BBC (Wardle and Williams 2010). However, examples of the use of Internet technologies for such co-creation are not unique to the media setting, but range across various industries (e.g., Fuller, Jawecki, and Mühlbacher 2007; Jawecki and Fuller 2008; Jeppesen and Frederiksen 2006; Sawhney, Verona, and Prandelli 2005). Thus, the practices revolving around the development of new products are increasingly fuelled by Internet technologies shaping innovation as collaborative processes between firms and consumers, but also between consumers and consumers (e.g., Hemetsberger 2003; O’Hern and Rindfleisch 2009; Von Hippel 2005).
However, this is somewhat different from Vargo and Lusch’s (2004; 2008) suggestion that consumers are always co-creators, but more in line with Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2004) who argue for a similar shift in how value is created between firms and companies. They suggest an alternative conceptualization of value—not in terms of service like Vargo and Lusch (2004), or innovation of products like the open-source software stream, but in terms of co-creation experiences. They contend that the locus of co-creation lies in the interaction between consumers and companies; but they note that this means co-creation is “neither the transfer or outsourcing of activities to customers, nor a customization of products and services” (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004, 10). This also represents a point of departure from the blending logic. Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2004, 13) argue that such value is not exclusively in-house in firms, but exclusively formed in consumption, but created at “multiple points of interaction” between firms and consumers. Thus, they conceive of the marketplace as a forum in which consumers and companies interact.

Returning back to Grönroos’ (2011) argument, Prahalad and Ramaswamy’s (2004) argument is built on similar grounds: that direct interaction between firms and consumers is needed for co-creation of value to take place. And so Grönroos (2011, 290) notes that “if there are no direct interactions, no value co-creation is possible”.

If, however, direct interaction of the kind described above between consumers and firms takes place, Grönroos (2011) suggests that firms and consumers operate within each other’s processes. For example, a consumer participates in the design of a product, or helps with the process of developing a product. Then, this consumer operates within the firm’s production process; however, the firm is also an influential resource within the consumer’s value-creation process. Thus, in value co-creation, Grönroos portrays the merger of the two processes in which consumers and producers are involved into one single process, because firms and consumers operate within each other’s processes. In his view, consumers and producers are distinct entities that operate inside one another’s processes to the extent that these processes merge into one process. His analysis suggests that the two separate processes he depicts are production (the firm’s operation) and consumption (the consumer’s operation). Thus, his refinement of the SDL suggests that in co-creation, production and consumption merge into one process, while at the same time maintaining the distinct categories of producer and consumer. This also implies that if no direct interaction between firms and consumers takes place, production and consumption continue to be separate processes. As for the ontology of consumption, this stream of literature holds several implications regarding the ontological status of consumption.

First, there are parallel developments of thoughts on the intersecting roles of consumers and producers in the co-creation of value. Vargo and Lusch (2004; 2008) propose that the basis of value is service, which is always co-
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created. Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2004) propose that experience is the basis of value. Grönroos (2011) views consumption as the basis of value creation.

Second, while Vargo and Lusch (2004; 2008) propose that consumers and producers are always co-creators and thus suggest a blend of the roles of consumers and producers as default, Grönroos (2011) implies that direct interaction is needed in order to speak of intersecting roles between consumers and producers. In contrast to the SDL as proposed by Vargo and Lusch, consumers in this view are not always co-producers, but are always value creators—and in some instances co-producers. This is an important difference. Grönroos’s (2011) idea of value facilitation referring to all other actions that influence consumers’ creation of value is interesting, but with all other actions, he refers exclusively to those actions by firms. Thus, he excludes other forms of value facilitation, and he does not specify the different forms facilitation may take. Paper 4 has a particular focus on an alternative conceptualization of such idea of facilitation and the merging processes of consumption and production in practices.

Third, although this body of literature seeks to answer the question of ‘how’ value is created, its answers revolve mostly around the ‘who’. For example, Grönroos (2008, 303) asks: “If customers are value co-creators, what is the role of the firm? Are firms the main creators of value, or what are they?” In other words, researchers in this stream so far have directed attention to the way value is created in the space between firms (as producers) and customers (as consumers) and what roles the firms and consumers have in this space. Nevertheless, interactions of some sort between consumers and producers have been identified as crucial for value co-creation to take place, but consumers and producers remain separate parties (Grönroos 2011). Grönroos (2011) offers some interesting points of departure by framing consumption and production as processes that merge in value-co creation. But he describes production as a process that firms perform, and consumption as a process that consumers perform. He focuses much on the interplay between firms and consumers, but leaves the territory of the process of consumption as being related to production relatively uncharted, other than stating that direct interaction needs to take place. Most importantly, however, this stream neglects answers related to the understanding of consumption as such a process.

A synopsis of this research stream and its development is that consumers become (co-)producers if direct interaction between firms and consumers takes place during the firm’s production phases. However, this literature does not specify any other links of consumption to other forms of production. In focusing on how value is (co-)created between firms and consumers, this literature revolves around who is creating value, but gives indications of how this takes place only in terms of direct interactions between consumers and firms on a conceptual level. In focusing exclusively on interactions between firms and consumers, it does not explicitly consider consumption to be productive other than in the sense of value. However, this logic provides a good starting point.
for contemplating interactions between consumption and production, not as consumers and firms, but in terms of practice. Papers 1 and 4 focus on this issue.

2.1.4 Consumer culture theory logic

The entanglement of consumption with production is highly pertinent in research on consumer culture. By drawing together 20 years of research on consumer culture, Arnould and Thompson (2005, 868) offer the notion of Consumer Culture Theory (hereafter CCT)\(^6\) to refer “to a family of theoretical perspectives that address the dynamic relationships between consumer actions, the marketplace, and cultural meanings”.

In short, Marx was concerned with productive consumption in terms of human labour; literature on prosumption focuses on the substitution of consumption for production; and the co-creation logic focuses on how value comes about in the space between firms and consumers. However, CCT addresses explicitly the “productive aspects of consumption” (Arnould and Thompson 2005, 871). One of the basic tenets of CCT is that consumers are not ‘bearers’ of culture, but that they are ‘culture producers’ (Arnould and Thompson 2005, 873). Referring to Geertz (1973), they note that “perhaps, most important, CCT conceptualizes culture as the very fabric of experience, meaning, and action” (Arnould and Thompson 2005, 869).

Thus, CCT does not regard culture as a universal entity that operates top down, influencing and dictating the behaviour of its members. McCracken’s (1986) early work on the movement of meaning suggests that marketing vehicles of the advertisement and fashion industries are capable of associating consumer goods with cultural values and symbols, which in turn are transferred via consumption rituals to the individual consumer. In the light of the research cited by Arnould and Thompson (2005), McCracken’s (1986) account of movement of meaning is half wrong and half right. Surely marketers spend a great deal of effort infusing their products with symbolic meanings and qualities that resonate with cultural values. But as Holt (2002, 83) notes, even though “brands have become the preeminent site through which people experience and express the social world, (…) the worlds that move through brands are less orchestrated by managers than before.” As Geertz (1973) suggests, cultural values and symbols are human-made and do not pre-exist in static isolation. He writes: “Believing, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs (…)”

---

\(^6\) Later, Arnould and Thompson (2007) offer the refined label of consumer culture theoretics, to signify more strongly that consumer culture theory is not a grand single theory, but rather a family of theoretical perspectives. This is, however, something they already addressed in their 2005 article. Despite this refinement, the notion of consumer culture theory continues to be the label most frequently applied.
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(Geertz 1973, 4-5). This suggests that movement of meaning works the other way (bottom-up), too: Not only are “our ideas our values, our acts, even our emotions (...) cultural products” (Geertz 1973, 52), but our ideas, values, acts and emotions are what essentially forms culture. Consumption, then, can be portrayed as being a thread in the weaving of such ‘webs of significance’.

How consumers and their consumption produce culture becomes evident specifically in research on various forms of marketplace cultures—such as subcultures of consumption (e.g., Schouten and McAlexander 1995), consumer tribes (e.g., Cova 1996; Cova, Kozinets, and Shankar 2007a), or brand communities (e.g., Cova and Pace 2006; Luedicke and Giesler 2007; McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002; Kozinets 1997; 1999; Muñiz and O’Guinn 2001; Muñiz and Schau 2005). The notion of tribes in a consumption context derives mainly from the works of authors like Maffesoli (1996) and Cova (1997) and originates from the diagnosis that in their quest for the social link, people gravitate toward and build their own social aggregates that provide them with a sense of belonging, social cohesion, and identity. The word ‘tribe’ is a metaphor that aims to describe these fragmented social arrangements or communities. What becomes particularly interesting is the observation that consumers utilize the market and its palette of symbolic resources and use brands as a kind of social glue and common denominator to connect with others in these specialized consumer tribes. Here, research demonstrates how shared consumption practices or shared interest in a consumption object are grounds for the formation of social collectives and cultures; members develop their own rituals, codes, symbols, values, and languages, which offer identity and distinction: Thus, as Cova, Kozinets, and Shankar (2007b, 4) note, such consumer collectives “produce a range of identities, practices, rituals, meanings, and even material culture itself”. Thus, while consumers gravitate toward such social collectives based on consumption, in turn, these social collectives are social factories producing various facets of consumer culture.

The emphasis on the productive aspects of consumption and consumers as producers of various aspects of culture are not limited to such marketplace cultures, but transcends more generally from CCT-inspired work. For example, previous research has demonstrated—more or less explicitly—that consumers produce symbolic (brand) meanings (e.g., Arnould and Price 1993; Brown, Sherry,(214,650),(564,665) and Kozinets 2003; Holt 2002), lifestyles (e.g., Holt 1997), identity and self (e.g., Belk 1988; Elliott and Wattanasuwan 1998; Goulding, Shankar, and Elliot 2002; Schau and Gilly 2003), consumption experiences (e.g., Carù and Cova 2007, Holbrook and Hirschman 1982), social class (e.g., Bourdieu 1984; Holt 1998), their own realities and interpretations (e.g., Cova and Rémy 2007; Elliott 1997), social relationships (e.g., Schouten and McAlexander 1995), rituals (e.g. Wallendorf and Arnould 1991), resistance (e.g., Giesler 2008; Kozinets and Handelman 2004), and brand-related artefacts (e.g., Muñiz and Schau 2007).

Such production, however, is not at all independent of firms, marketers, advertisers, retailers, or any other important commercial or non-commercial
stakeholders. Just as Holt (2004, 359) notes that brands are ‘intertextual constructions’ to which a variety of market players contribute, the same formulation can be transferred to consumer culture. Consumer culture, with all its facets, could be viewed as an intertextual construction between market forces, consumption processes, and various facets of culture in terms of values and symbols (Arnould and Thompson 2005).

This is because CCT does not envision products, services, and brands as being produced in factories, offices, and marketing agencies, but rather it regards them as ‘market-made’ (Arnould and Thompson 2005, 869). That is, they are made and shaped in markets, not in factories. This implies that when viewing consumers and consumption as part of the making of such market-made commodities consumption is an important part, but it remains a part. To consumers, the marketplace offers a rich palette of resources they use for their own purposes, for example to construct their identities. The consumption of these resources, and specific ways of consuming them, offers meaningful ways of being and living (e.g., Campbell 2005; Holt 1997; 1998). Firat and Dholakia (1998, 144) dramatize this by elaborating on how consumption for members of New Age, punk, and grunge subcultures has become their production, as they “construct and signify new and alternative forms of being, in and through their consumption”. Consumption, thus, has been framed as a form of production (Mackay 1997), or ‘a productive process’ (Firat, Dholakia, and Venkatesh 1995, 52), because it is an ‘inherently transforming process’ (Curtin and Gaither 2005, 101).

But these examples of forms of production, lifestyle and identity, depend on symbolic and material resources that can be found in the marketplace and their consumption; as these resources are consumed in certain ways, the lifestyles and identities that result from these processes are market-mediated (Arnould and Thompson 2005; Slater 1997).

Thus, consumers are portrayed as being more than clever ‘readers’ of marketing messages and assimilators of the meaning that marketing managers seek to infuse into their brands. Consumers are active interpreters that shape, transform, re-work, and produce meanings; they work in co-productive ways with marketer-generated resources (Arnould and Thompson 2005). In consumption, consumers engage in a process of symbolic appropriation of objects produced in industrial production, personalizing the ‘things’ they possess and use; that is consumption can be seen as transforming alienable objects into inalienable commodities (e.g., Østergaard, Fitchett, and Jantzen 1999). Therefore, as Arnould (2007; 2008) points out, similarities exist between Vargo and Lusch’s (2004) SDL and CCT. Both regard consumers as co-creators. While SDL regards consumers and firms as co-creators of service, CCT portrays various aspects of culture as co-created in acts of production and consumption by a variety of market players.

On this basis, Arnould (2007) and Arnould and Thompson (2007) call for research that explicitly addresses dialectic consumption/production linkages.
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However, few studies have elucidated such linkages in systematic ways. These are described in the following.

First, the study by Hogg, Folkman Curasi, and Maclaran (2004) on the configuration of production and consumption in empty nest households is relevant. These authors find that the major change in households where children move out—hence the term empty nest—brings with it a different configuration of production and consumption to construct ‘family’ and ‘motherhood’. During periods where children are present in the household, production activities—such as making meals and washing clothes—are important vessels of meaning for creating family life. When children move out, the emphasis changes to consumption, such as purchasing and sending ‘care packages’, and consumption of technologies facilitating ‘keeping in touch’—as main methods for constructing ‘family’ and ‘motherhood’. Their study is interesting in the light of the production/consumption debate for the following reasons: First, it suggests that different constellations of production and consumption activities can exist in practicing ‘motherhood’ and ‘family’. Second, both consumption and production activities can serve as carriers of meaning to construct important social categories, such as ‘family’ and ‘mother’; and in that way the activities create specific forms of value. Third, the study demonstrates that although production and consumption co-exist, shifts in emphasis can occur. In this particular study, it is the major change in household members that seemingly triggers the shift from more production-like activities to more consumption-like activities, affecting their relevance for constructing important social categories. Thus, relations between consumption and production may not necessarily have to be equal. Fourth, and perhaps most importantly, this study points to the indication that consumption and production are embedded in something people do, in actionable contexts, for example their life circumstances and their understandings of motherhood and family.

Second, Roberts et al. (1988) study on craftsmen who gain intrinsic rewards from their work offers the notion of ‘production as consumption’. They refer to these craftsmen as the ‘fortunate few’ because “Work for its own sake and the experiential aspects (Holbrook and Hirschman 1982) of the production process (…)” are their life (Roberts et al. 1988, 430). In their proposed process model of production and consumption, they envision the craftsman as “selecting and combining various inputs destined to become finished products which will have value for both public and private consumption” (Roberts et al. 1988, 432). Their study is relatively close to Campbell’s (2005) depiction of the craft consumer. But Campbell’s account of the new type of consumer, as well as other studies in the related domain of Do-It-Yourself (DIY) phenomena (e.g., Watson and Shove 2008), emphasize the consumption of the finished products or the resulting experiences of those who are part of the production process, e.g., the craft consumer producing for his or her own consumption. For craftspeople, production activities become the object of consumption,
offering autotelic consumable experiences. Watson and Shove (2008) find that DIY activities are more about enjoyment and meaning than about saving money, and Moisio, Arnould, and Gentry (2013) reveal how such activities can be relevant for identity work and the construction of class-mediated masculinity, offering sites for ‘class-tourism’. In this sense, the productive activities become consumable experiences for those engaged in them, supporting Carù and Cova’s (2007, 7) note that “consumers are not passive agents reacting to stimuli but, instead, the actors and the producers of their own consuming experiences”. But as Moisio, Arnould, and Gentry (2013) point out, these experiences also serve also as sites for the construction and reproduction of social class. This element adds to the interrelatedness between consumption and production in a different way from that portrayed in the blending logic (prosumption). Roberts et al.’s (1988) study acknowledges this type of experience, but the authors explicitly state that finished products may have value not only for the makers’ own consumption, but for public consumption as well. That is, the finished product may also be consumed by other parties.

Third, prior research approaches the entanglement of consumption and production as a process of interagency. Kozinets, Sherry, Storm, Duhachek, Nuttavuthisit, and DeBerry-Spence (2004) find that in the ESPN Zone consumers produce producers’ products at the same time and as much as producers consume consumers’ consumption. Thus, they suggest that both consumers and producers, as entities, are embedded in processes of interagency. This connects back to the idea of firms and consumers operating in each other’s processes (Grönroos 2011).

Fourth, Holt (1995, 3-12) reveals some links of consumption to production in his consumption metaphors. Specifically his ‘consuming as integration’ metaphor—referring to those methods that consumers use to “break down the institutional distancing between consumer and consumption object”—highlights the entanglement with production. Here, he identifies three practices: assimilating (perceiving the “baseball world framework as a natural way of thinking and acting”), producing (helping to construct the consumption object), and personalizing (“altering the baseball world to assert the individuality of their bond with professional baseball”). Moreover, his ‘consuming as classification’ metaphor refers to the construction and reproduction of social class boundaries through actions and objects.

These studies emphasize the role consumption has in the fabrication of central facets of culture and thus points to the ‘production in consumption’ or ‘productive consumption’ (de Certau 1984). To de Certau (1984), everyday life is productive consumption, encompassing all its seemingly trivial facets. For example, his analysis of walking in the city portrays walking in both consumptive and productive terms (de Certau 1984, 97-98): “The act of walking is to the urban system what the speech act is to language or to the statements uttered. (...) It is a process of appropriation of the topographical
2. Theoretical perspectives

system on the part of the pedestrian (just as the speaker appropriates and takes on the language); it is a spatial acting-out of the place (just as the speech act is an acoustic acting-out of language); and it implies relations among differentiated positions (…)” Thus, walking transpires as productive consumption of the city, it constitutes a ‘here and there’ (de Certau 1984, 99). In walking, walkers take on and act out place.

Consumption is productive in the sense that it produces various forms of outcomes—such as social class, identity, and experience—but also in the sense that consumptive activities seemingly involve productive activities as specifically Holt’s (1995) producing practices entail. The CCT logic configures a specific ontology that treats consumption as the site for the creation of social and cultural reality. Consumer culture theory deals with the relation of consumption and production in various ways, because its central premise is that consumers and consumption are the producers of culture. Thus, the notion of consumer culture does not discount the role of production, but rather ascribes productive aspects, to varying degrees, not only to the spheres of consumption, but also to consumptive activities.

2.1.5 Collapse logic

The following logic of the entanglement of consumption and production resembles a collapse of consumption into production and vice versa. This specific logic derives specifically from postmodern critique driven by an agenda seeking to collapse dichotomies and binary oppositions.

In this vein, it has been argued that the division between consumption and production is a artificial and that consumption and production eventually collapse into one and the same. Firat and Venkatesh (1995, 254) note that “there is no natural distinction between consumption and production; they are one and the same, occurring simultaneously. Each act of production is also an act of consumption, and vice versa, that is, there is a cycle of production and consumption (…)

Whereas the blending logic suggests maintaining consumption and production as categories by focusing on their middle point, prosumption (e.g., Ritzer 2010)—that is consumption and production—postmodernist thinking collapses consumption and production altogether. However, one may ask, if production and consumption are indeed one and the same, even occurring simultaneously, as Firat and Venkatesh (1995) suggest, then how can there be a “cycle of production and consumption”?

There is a difference between recognizing one within the other, i.e., recognizing consumption in production and production in consumption, and imploding them (there is neither consumption nor production, but instead something else). All logics described previously above vary in the degree that they recognize relationships and conceptual similarities between consumption and production. For example, Ritzer (1996) conceives of shopping malls as one
of the ‘new means of consumption’, yielding to enchant customers and infuse shopping and purchasing. According to Ritzer (1996), shopping malls appear as a method to produce consumption. This thought easily extends to marketing at large, as marketing yields to stimulate consumption by offering the ‘right’ products that consumers will love, waking desires, and enchanting ordinary products and brands as being special. In this way, marketing appears as a method to produce consumption. Does this mean we deal conceptually with the ‘complete collapse of consumption into production’, as argued by Zwick and Denegri-Knott (2009)?

The collapse logic marks the limit of analysis of empirical phenomena through the lens of consumption and production as they implode as meaningful analytical concepts. It is, however, difficult to conceive of a replacement with similar or greater analytical power than consumption paired with production, however problem-laden these may be. Perhaps, in their place we could conceive of the organization of life, and practices as its building blocks?

While this thesis appreciates the theoretical arguments made by proponents of this stream, it is valuable and meaningful to explore further the entanglement of consumption and production. That means rather than working on the question of whether or not consumption and production are indeed the same as universal concepts, I argue for taking a practice-based approach and considering consumption with production.

### 2.2 A Practice-theoretical Approach to Consumption

This section introduces a practice-theoretical approach to consumption. I begin by motivating this approach to the study of consumption based on synthesizing the indications of an entanglement of consumption with productive aspects and how a practice-theoretical agenda can assist in elucidating such entanglement. Then, I offer an overview of the tenets of practice-theoretical ontology and discern three related, yet distinct, types of practices.

#### 2.2.1 Motivation

Given the above highlighted indications of an entanglement of consumption with productive aspects, what is needed then is an approach to studying consumption that can address this issue. A practice-theoretical approach to consumption presents fruitful opportunities to deal with this entanglement. It is important to note that the term practice theory has been used to refer to a conglomerate of practice-theoretical perspectives (Bourdieu 1977, 1990; Garfinkel 1967; Giddens 1984) and that have been developed and framed by Schatzki (1996; 2001a; 2002; 2005) and others in the compendium edited by
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Schatzki and Knorr-Cetina (2001), and from there shaped also by Reckwitz (2002), Warde (2005), Schau et al. (2009), and Magaudda (2011).

The following motivates a practice-theoretical approach on the basis of the review of the entanglement of consumption and production. From the above review, three implications for the study of consumption emerge.

First, studying consumption implies recognizing relationships to production. Consumption holds an analytical category, but shall not be treated singularly and in isolation of production. Most prominently, this is indicated in literatures of prosumption, which highlight the need for paying attention to the spectrum of consumption and production (e.g., Ritzer 2010). As Campbell’s (2005) craft consumption highlights, consumption still takes place but is embedded within productive activities. This resonates broadly with Marx’ (1971) work suggesting that dialectical relations of consumption and production can be found not only on levels of theoretical abstraction but also on the level of actual processes. While co-creation literature frames such processes in terms of actions of and interactions between firms and consumers, a practice-theoretical perspective introduces the idea of framing such processes as practices. Thus, it shifts emphasis away from the individual subject, or role, but rather suggests viewing production and consumption as being entangled with practices. This speaks to Warde’s (2005) practice moments of consumption as embedded within practices, but also recognizes relations to productive aspects of practices. In the context of consumption and production, this means appreciating the dyadic linkages between consumption and production as previous literature has suggested (e.g., Arnould 2007; Arnould and Thompson 2007; Ritzer, Dean, and Jurgenson 2012; Warde 1992)—but without the necessity of collapsing consumption and production into one category (Firat and Venkatesh 1995). The idea introduced by Schatzki (2005) of regarding practices as ‘sites’ translates here into practices becoming the site for studying consumption and its entanglement with productive aspects. As an implication, production and consumption must be defined in the light of the site in which they take place—the practices. In other words, consumption and production are not defined as universal categories, but must be understood in terms of the practice in which they take place. Marx recognized the many forms production can take, referring to different sectors of production. However, his reasoning on the entanglement of consumption with production was on a highly abstract level. Regarding practices as the site for consumption and production means paying attention to the relatively immediate forms of consumption and production taking place within this site.

Second, studying consumption involves incorporating mutually constitutive, but not necessarily equal, relations of consumption and production. Ritzer and colleagues (Ritzer 2010; Ritzer, Dean, and Jurgenson 2012) propose a continuum of consumption and production, which implies that deviations from prosumption to the left and right are possible. Hogg et al.’s (2004) study on the configuration of consumption and production indicates that such shifts of
emphasis of consumption and production can take place. Thus, while recognizing a relationship between consumption and production, this relationship does not necessarily have to be equal. For example, craft consumption involves different activities in which more consumption or production feature prominently.

And third, studying consumption involves acknowledging the role of consumption for the fabrication of social life. Literature within the stream of consumer culture demonstrates how various facets of social life and culture are fabricated through consumption. That is, consumption is portrayed as a productive category in the sense that it is in and through consumption that a variety of aspects of contemporary (predominantly Western) cultures are created and shaped—as reviewed in section 2.1.4. Thus, as dramatized by Arnould and Thompson (2005), consumption can be seen as productive, and consumers are, through their consumption, producers of culture. A practice-theoretical perspective is conducive to this perspective, because it presents a kind of cultural theory through which such culture and its elements can be studied (e.g., Reckwitz 2002; Swidler 2001). Practice theory can be understood as a specific form of cultural theory, because practices resemble collective cultural templates that structure and direct routinized activities and interconnected complexes of behavioural acts that feed into local performances of such templates (Reckwitz 2002; Swidler 2001; Warde 2005). This way, practices resonate with blueprints and an infrastructure for how to do things, and how to understand the things that others do. Practices then serve as the research objects of culture (Swidler 2001). A practice-theoretical perspective hosts the role of consumption for the fabrication of social life and culture through the concepts of performativity and teleoaffectivity (as detailed in section 4.1.1).

2.2.2 Tenets of practice-theoretical ontology

In the following, I present core ontological considerations of a practice-theoretical approach.

Unit of analysis

A practice-theoretical approach emphasizes how the conduct and enactment of everyday activities is guided by routine practices and implicit know-how and rules, rather than by intentional actions (Reckwitz 2002; Schatzki 1996; 2001a; 2002; Turner 2007). The essence of a practice-theoretical lens is to focus on the practices as unit of analysis (Giddens 1984; Reckwitz 2002; Schatzki 1996). While this may seem obvious, it is not trivial. In treating practices as the unit of analysis, a practice-theoretical approach de-emphasizes, but does not degrade, the individual subject. A practice-theoretical approach is not about
understanding the practitioner who performs a certain practice; it is rather about understanding the organization of the practice.

Practices are nonindividualist phenomena. It is people, to be sure, that perform the actions that compose a practice. But the organization of a practice is not a collection of properties of individual people. It is a feature of the practice, expressed in the open-ended set of actions that composes the practice. The relation of the practice’s organization to its participants is that this organization is differentially incorporated into their minds. Understandings, rules, ends, and tasks are incorporated into participants’ minds via their ‘mental states’; understandings, for instance, become individual know-how, rules become objects of belief, and ends become objects of desire.

(Schatzki 2005, 480)

In this way, it becomes less important to consider the practitioner as such, but rather focus on the ‘what’ and ‘how’. The individual subject retains certain discretion over her actions and activities, but at the same draws guidance and direction from the template of the practice in which he/she engages. Thus, a practice-theoretical perspective treats individuals as ‘carriers’ of practice: “The single individual—as a bodily and mental agent—then acts as the ‘carrier’ (Träger) of a practice (...) Thus, she or he is not only a carrier of patterns of bodily behaviour, but also of certain routinized ways of understanding, knowing how and desiring. These conventionalized ‘mental’ activities of understanding, knowing how and desiring are necessary elements and qualities of a practice in which the single individual participates, not qualities of the individual” (Reckwitz 2002, 249–250).

Individuals become carriers of practices in the sense that they perform practice, but also beyond. One may be a carrier of gardening, even when one is not in the garden performing gardening. Rather than ascribing knowledge, mental activities, understanding, language, bodily movements, and routines to a particular individual, these elements belong to the practice; they are collectively shared properties rather than properties of the individual. As Warde (2005) notes, it is the practice that guides not only behaviour, but also desires and emotions. Yet, the individual subject acts as the performer of a practice and uses conventions and standards inscribed in the practice to guide the performance of the practice. Thus, practices appear quite powerful, equipping individuals with culturally shared blueprints of routinized behaviour and ways of thinking as well as understandings.

Practices are organized entities that are performed by its carriers. A practice exists on the theoretical level, while the performance of a practice exists on the empirical level, which means that practices must be performed to exist (Warde 2005). Carriers of practice are neither dupes nor heroes (e.g., Slater 1997); they are considered merely a part of the organization of practice—as practitioners embedded in a nexus of practice elements. By developing the idea of consumption as practice moments, this thesis treats consumption as such an organising and organised practice element.

49
**Interest in ‘how’**

Specifically the practice-theoretical interest in the ‘how’ of things can be traced back to the ethnomethodological research program (Garfinkel 1967; Holstein and Gubrium 1994). Ethnomethodology is concerned with the analysis of the procedures people use for achieving different matters of everyday ordinary life (Garfinkel 1967). In this view, ‘reality’ is seen as a social accomplishment and the focus is on the processes by which meanings are socially created, negotiated, maintained, and altered within a specific context of action. The emphasis lies on the practices and actions and how which methods are used for creating, sustaining, and managing a sense of daily life, along with the ways social structures are locally created, sustained, and experienced (Holstein and Gubrium 1994)—rather than considering who performs the practices. Ethnomethodology is of interest, specifically because it shares a common interest with the practice-theoretical approach: Both are perspectives that foreground how elements of social life are organized. For practice theorists, a central question revolves around the organization of a given practice and its organization vis-à-vis other practices (interconnectedness), rather than in the individual subject as such. This thesis is concerned with the question of how consumption operates in relation to practices and productive aspects.

**The conceptual crisis of the consumer**

Translating these thoughts to the study of consumption means shifting the focus away from the consumer—as an individual or social role—and toward consumption. The distinction between the consumer and consumption is not trivial, as Warde (2005, 146) notes: in the practice theoretical perspective and its focus on the organization of practice and the embedded moments of consumption, the consumer ‘evaporates’.

What this means is that a practice-theoretical approach to consumption de-emphasizes the consumer as a figure, individual, or social role, but rather takes interest in consumption as it is embedded in practices. This does not mean that the term consumer is to be deleted from academic vocabulary; it still makes

---

7 It has to be noted, however, that the field of ethnomethodology is quite diverse (Atkinson 1988; Lynch and Peyrot 1992; Maynard and Clayman 1991). Some branches of ethnomethodology, particularly conversation analysis, have been criticized for neglecting the phenomenological and hermeneutic roots of ethnomethodology to become overly restricted, narrowly empiricist, or structuralist in flavour (Atkinson 1988). Here, I am referring to the hermeneutic-interpretative strand of ethnomethodology that emphasizes how the practices members use for creating, sustaining, and managing a sense of their daily lives illustrate how social structures are locally produced, sustained, and experienced (Holstein and Gubrium 1994; Coulon 1995). Because such ethnomethodological analysis is interested in the local construction of meaning and local rules for behaviour, it relies on emic meanings and accounts of behaviour, that is, on ‘membership knowledge’.
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sense to label those who engage in some form of consumption as consumers. But—and this is the point that Warde (2005) emphasizes—the consumer as a level of analysis to understand consumption fades into the background in a practice-theoretical approach. Consumption is an element in many practices—not an element within individuals. Consumption takes place in the course of performing practices. It is the practice that consumes; and individuals become carriers of this consumption, because they are carriers of practices. This means that eventually, consumption belongs more to the practice than to the individual performing the practice. This is because practice theory treats the social agent, here ‘the consumer’, never purely as the sole subject of the practices the agent conducts (see Schatzki 2001a; 2002; Schatzki 2005). Consumption emerges as it is accomplished in and through practices. Thus, consumption can be seen as a method for achieving the performance of practice, as indicated in the idea that consumption takes place for the sake of practices (Warde 2005).

The organization of practice

This approach, in turn, implies that to understand consumption one must understand the organization of practices in which it takes place. Practices are “forms of bodily activities, forms of mental activities, ‘things’ and their use, a background knowledge in the form of understanding, know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge” (Warde 2005, 133). Practices are the contexts in which routinized actions are carried, things are used and desired, things and actions are understood and may involve a multitude of different actions and patterned activities that interconnect in practices (Schatzki 2001a; Reckwitz 2002).

Schau et al. (2009) analyse practices in terms of their anatomy and physiology. A practice’s anatomy entails understandings in terms of knowledge and tacit cultural templates, procedures in terms of explicit performance rules, and engagements in terms of emotional projects and purposes. The physiology of a practice then describes the ways in which these anatomical parts relate and function together. Practice theorists generally describe bodily routines and skills, rules, understandings, material arrangements, and teleoffective structures as the core elements interconnected in practices (Reckwitz 2002; Schatzki 1996; 2001b; Warde 2005).

Schatzki introduced the notion of teleoffective structure to account for the fact that the bodily activities comprising practices are not merely linked by certain social rules and understandings, but are also linked and guided by specific ends and emotions. In short, the term teleoffective structure aims to describe the ends and aspirations of practical activities. Schatzki (2001b, 52-53) defines a teleoffective structure as “a range of acceptable or correct ends, acceptable or correct tasks to carry out for these ends, acceptable or correct beliefs (etc.) given which specific tasks are carried out for the sake of these ends, and even acceptable or correct emotions out of which to do so”.
Therefore, practice theory accounts for human behaviour as neither exclusively directed by subconscious scripts—as Bourdieu’s habitus suggests—nor as exclusively steered by the free will and intentions of goal-directed individual subjects (Schatzki 1996). Practice theory suggests both. Practical activities are guided by shared templates of doings and understandings, but also by certain acceptable aspirations of their carriers, who strive to achieve certain acceptable ends in and by performing practices.

Essentially, practices involve a tripartite structure. They are constituted in the nexus of objects—doings—meanings (Arsel and Bean 2013; Magaudda, 2011; Schatzki 1996; Shove and Pantzar 2005).

Practices involve objects. Objects are necessary elements in many practices. Carrying out a particular practice oftentimes involves using particular objects in particular ways. Therefore, objects are things to be handled within practices and can be regarded as resources for performing practices. Objects can be physical (e.g., tennis racket) or abstract (e.g., sounds). Consumption is essentially intertwined with objects. Consumption necessitates some material or immaterial consumption object: that which is consumed (an idea, experience, desire, story, product, brand, service, or any other object). Because previous research has demonstrated that the use and appreciation of objects is entangled with practices (Arsel and Bean 2013; Epp and Price 2010; Hui 2012; Magaudda 2011; Shove and Pantzar 2005; Truninger 2011; Warde 2005; Woermann 2012), a practice-theoretical perspective is a promising route for the study of consumption.

Practices involve doings. Practices encompass routinized bodily activities (such as bodily movements, handling things in certain ways), as well as routinized mental and emotional activities (such as talking, reading, and writing). Practices are thus sets of routinized bodily performances that involve mental patterns including know-how, competences, particular ways of interpretation, certain aims, and emotions.

Practices also involve meanings. Meanings arise within the context of a practice. For example, objects gain meaning in the light of the practice (e.g., Epp and Price 2010; Truninger 2011). But practices also produce meaning for their carriers. It is through participation in practices that individuals develop a sense of the world and the self (Reckwitz 2002; Warde 2005; Woermann 2012).

All of these elements are co-constitutive of practices and guided by teleoaffective structures. Treating practices as the sites of consumption implies accounting for the different forms of consumption defined in the light of the practice in which it takes place. What this means is that consumption may well be something we do, but it takes various different forms and shapes depending on the context in which these doings take place.
2.2.3 Types of practices

Although all practices share in common the presence of the elements described above, different types of practices differ with regard to the emphasis of certain elements. Schatzki (2001a, 2002) describes two different forms of practices: integrated and dispersed practices. In my understanding, these are meta-cATEGORIES OF PRACTICES ENCOMPASSING VARIOUS TYPES OF INTEGRATED AND DISPERSED PRACTICES. In this thesis, I deal specifically with three variations—or types—of practices: object-focused practices, interpersonal practices, and discursive practices (figure 2). As will be shown in more detail in chapter 3, these practice variations provide the opportunity to study how consumption unfolds as practice moments, particularly in light of the entanglement of consumption and production.

Figure 2: Types of practices investigated in this thesis

It is important to note that this list is not exhaustive and that I do not treat these variations of practices as singular practices. Just as different practices are related and feed into each other on the empirical level (Reckwitz 2002), so do these etic constructions of practice. Admittedly, the labels for these practice types do not do justice to the complexity of theories of materiality (Miller 1987), which at its rudiments suggests that neither object or subject is defined as being object or subject, but they are rather defined through their relationships—an ongoing dialectic with subjects making objects making subjects (Miller 1987). The argument that objects create subjects just as well as subjects create objects emphasizes the mutual constitution of individuals and things. Therefore, it might be interesting to investigate the mutual constitution of these practices, but that is outside the focus of this thesis.

Instead, I use these types of practices in the following way. As mentioned above, practices involve doings, objects, and meanings; and individuals are ‘carriers’ of practices. Thus, practice theory does not imply a dichotomy between individual and object, but instead it portrays individuals and objects as
co-constitutive in the nexus of objects, doings, and meanings. Thus, all practices are object-focused practices, as a specific materiality is at the heart of all practices. But as pointed out below, there are some practices in which the handling of some object is at the centre of performing the practice. Interpersonal practices, those practices that take place between two carriers of the same practice, are also object-focused practices—but the objects in this case are of human nature. Their nature as subjects is constituted in the way they are handled as objects. The kinds of doings performed between human objects are, in most cases, somewhat different from those performed with and to objects. Last, discursive practices are also object-focused practices, as they deal with objects such as institutions, brands, or identity.

However, despite this overlapping, the practice types depicted here are somewhat different in their organization: They are characterized by different emphases on their different organizational elements, and their modes of operation and performance. To account for these differences, which will be detailed in the following, the distinction among the three types of practice offers a point of departure.

**Object-focused practices**

Magaudda (2011), Watson and Shove (2008), as well as Reckwitz (2002) and Warde (2005) highlight how material objects are interwoven with the conduct of practices. In most practices, some material object is involved. However, prior literature also indicates that some practices are more about handling objects, while other practices are more about handling subjects. In other words, almost all practices require some object, but a difference arises in how the practice operates with regard to whether that object is a human object or a non-human object or subject (Schatzki 2005; 1996). This distinction is implicitly apparent in Schau et al.’s (2009) analysis of brand community practices. They classify brand-use practices (including grooming, customizing, and commoditizing practices), vis-à-vis, for example, social networking practices (including welcoming, empathizing, and governing practices). Brand use practices are more object-focused, whereas social networking practices are more subject-focused. To dramatize, the act of welcoming an object is different than welcoming a person. Although Østergaard (2011; 2013) indicates that people do perform welcoming as well as grooming rituals to recently acquired brands in sacralisation processes, the welcoming practice as depicted by Schau et al. (2009) operates differently for persons.

Therefore, I propose defining an object-focused practice as a practice that involves a non-human object at the core of the performance. Such practices include, for example, hand-knitting (Hui 2012), brand-use practices (Schau et al. 2009), eating practices (e.g., Cheng et al. 2007), DIY practices (e.g., Watson and Shove 2008), but also motorcycling (e.g., Schouten and McAlexander 1995). In all such practices, an object takes centre stage as the doings are performed on and with non-human objects. Papers 3 and 4 look at electric guitar playing and
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gardening as examples of such object-focused practices. However, this is not to say that object-focused practices lack interpersonal or social dimensions—as the next section outlines.

**Interpersonal practices**

I propose defining interpersonal practices as those practices that are performed between human individuals as carriers of that practice. Such practices include Schau et al.'s (2009) community practices of social networking, Arsel and Bean’s (2013) apartment therapists, or Holt’s (1995) socializing practices. The performance of interpersonal practices is directed toward human subjects, and in fact, takes place between at least two individuals. For example, helping a member in an online community by offering advice on a specific problem resembles a specific empathizing practice (Schau et al. 2009) that is directed to the empathizee. Interpersonal practices may also involve non-human objects, but the doings are teleaffectively directed to individuals rather than to non-human objects.

The practice of gift-giving, for example, is a complex interpersonal practice that has cultural-specific rules, doings, understandings, and teleaffective structures that not only guide the often ritualistic ways in which gifts are handed over, but also what is deemed appropriate and acceptable as a gift on which occasion. Gift-giving often involves a non-human object, such as a nicely wrapped present, but the practice essentially happens interpersonally—except for the phenomenon of self-gifts where gift-giver and recipient are united in one person (Mick and Demoss, 1990).

The gift as object is part of the performance of gift-giving and serves as a site for negotiating and signifying status, the importance of the relationship between gift-giver and recipient, and so forth. But essentially, gift-giving is about the interaction between gift-giver and gift-recipient. As such, it is tempting to conceive of gift-giving as more ‘social’ than, for example, lawn mowing, but this is misleading because object-focused practices are also social. In fact, for practice theorists, all practices are social (e.g., Schatzki 1996; 2002; Reckwitz 2002). But there are different dimensions to social when it comes to the centrality of the social in terms of interpersonal activities. As Schouten and McAlexander (1995) point out, riding a Harley Davidson has important subcultural and communicative (and hence interpersonal) dimensions that offer shelters for the creation and negotiation of identity; so that motorcycling as an object-focused practice is interwoven with interpersonal community practices.

In other words, in object focused-practices, interaction with some sort of object is at the centre of the practice, while in interpersonal practices the interaction between individuals is the focal point of the practice. This does not stand in conflict with the considerations above (section 2.2.2) outlining that material arrangements are integral parts of practices. As Schatzki (2005) notes, human beings are simply one entity and a specific form of material arrangement:
“By material arrangements, meanwhile, I simply mean set-ups of material objects. Whenever someone acts and therewith carries on a practice, she does so in a setting that is composed of material entities. The material arrangements amid which humans carry on embrace four types of entity: human beings, artefacts, other organisms, and things.”

(Schatzki 2005, 472)

Thus, interpersonal practices are those practices in which human beings are foregrounded as providing the material arrangement as one type of entity. Naturally, blends of various constellations between more object-focused and more interpersonal practices can occur. For example, Holt (1995, 3) structures the actions involved in consumption (practices) with regard to ‘object actions’, and ‘interpersonal actions’. In doing this, he refers to the ways in which people engage directly with consumption objects—which resonates here with the object-focused practices discussed above—and to the ways such objects, or object-focused practices, provide the platform for interacting with other people, referred to here as interpersonal practices. He demonstrates this with baseball spectators engaging in the appreciation, evaluation, and accounting of the baseball game as a consumption object, but also in interpersonal actions of communing and socializing. Similarly, electric guitar playing can be seen in terms of its object-focused dimensions as well as its interpersonal dimension, which become evident in band rehearsal rooms, teaching lessons, and live gigs.

According to this understanding, interpersonal practices can be seen as interaction practices; they are practices of interacting. Like actions, interactions are also integral parts of many practices. Although some sort of interaction is likely to take place in object-focused and discursive practices as well, I refer to interpersonal practices as those practices that are essentially practice templates underlying interaction, such as a specific way of welcoming, conversing, arguing, and so forth.

Interpersonal practices, as argued below in paper 1, are particularly pertinent in (online) social collectives, such as communities and tribes, because they provide the backdrop for members’ interactions. Such social collectives form around a shared interest (see section 2.1.4) that is often a practice, for example, motorcycling, football, cooking, travelling, fitness, guitar playing, and gardening. These social collectives can develop their own specific rules, understandings, and ways of seeing things. They can form their own cultural scripts that may posit the rules of the game of how to consume what in the right way.

It is essentially the performance of interpersonal practices that continuously creates a social collective into existence and that forms such a structured set of social relationships among its members (Muñiz and O’Guinn 2001) along with its own rules and cultural scripts. All practices are social, but interpersonal practices are about the social in a different way than object-focused practices. Often, more object-focused practices are surrounded by more interpersonal
practices. For example, Woermann’s (2012) free-skiing and McAlexander and Schouten’s (1995) biking practices are object-focused practices that are encircled by interpersonal practices that organize the subculture which has formed around the object-focused practice. Thus, a community or tribe that forms around a shared nucleus consists of layers of practices that fulfil certain functions within the community or tribe. Like in an onion, the object-focused practice may be at the core of the subculture, community, or tribe that forms around it, and interpersonal practices transpire on the next layer as specific templates of interacting on the shared nucleus, as demonstrated in Holt’s (1995) baseball spectating study.

**Discursive practices**

As noted by Reckwitz (2002), discursive practices are one specific type of practice.

> “In discursive practices the participants ascribe, in a routinized way, certain meanings to certain objects (which thus become ‘signs’) to understand other objects, and above all, in order to do something.”

Reckwitz (2002, 255)

Foucault’s (1971; 1972) use of the notion discourse refers, on the one hand, to material and linguistic features that originate from history. But on the other hand, he refers to discourse as a particular way of speaking. Accordingly, discourses are what establish certain fields of culturally and historically situated meanings, orders of truth, or put simply: discourses construct the social world in meaning or what is accepted as ‘reality’ in a society. A discursive practice then, refers to the process through which such meanings are produced, understood, maintained, challenged, and negotiated.

Discourses can be understood as systems of rule-bound and meaning-giving statements (Fairclough 1995) which construct objects and subjects, produce and reproduce power relations, maintain institutions, and have ideological effects (Parker 1990; 1992; Phillips and Jorgensen 2002). Thus they can be seen “as rhetorical strategies in order to establish their accounts of the world as solid and objective and competing accounts as false and subjective” (Phillips and Jorgensen 2002, 170).

Thus, discursive practices involve linguistic, verbal, and rhetorical patterns and habits (doings); objects and subjects; and meanings in the form of, for example, power and sexuality (Foucault 1971; 1972). Discourses represent ways of handling an object that constructs the handled object. For example, Ahl (2002) shows how the female entrepreneur is discursively constructed in research texts. Here, the specific patterns of writing about female entrepreneurs represent the doings; the female entrepreneur represents the subject of discourse; and the specific identity and positioning of female entrepreneurs versus male entrepreneurs created through this represents the meaning. Thus,
discursive practice constructs, shapes, and reinforces identities and subjectivities through linguistic doings on specific objects and subjects. As Foucault (1972, 49) notes, discourses are thus “practices which systematically form the object of which they speak”.

Where Berger and Luckmann (1966) focus on conversation as the most momentous vessel of accomplishing and maintaining reality, Foucault (1972) regards not only statements brought about through verbal language, but also other forms of statements resulting from a variety of discursive practices, including material and object-focused practices. Specifically Hirschman and Holbrook (1992) suggest treating consumption as such a discursive text. Although in this light, almost any practice may have discursive elements, because it is in and through practices that the social world is accomplished. In particular, I find it helpful to regard verbal and rhetorical discursive practices as one specific type of practice. This is because rhetorical strategies and meaning-giving statements are about handling an object—which may be a brand, product, or person—in a certain (that is rhetorical) way, and in this process culturally specific rules are applied. Although it is possible to ‘read’ the performances of practices as ‘text’, which implies that all practice performances can be discursive, in this thesis I focus on the use of language as discursive practice.

Discursive practices have some sort of outcome—they have (symbolic) consequences for the object involved—which can be a subject-category like the female entrepreneur like Ahl (2002) depicts or an object such as an institution or brand. Discourses portray the object or subject as being involved in specific ways of producing and reproducing particular identities or relationships of power (Foucault 1972). Here, the conception of the author of discursive text is similar to the concept of the carrier of practice described above. Individual authors draw on already existing patterns and rhetorical strategies; they feed from the system of discourses, but they also tweak and alter them, feeding back to the system of discourse. Thus, carriers of discursive practice do not choose entirely freely, but are guided by pre-existing patterns (Foucault 1972). Because discourses involve a set of specific rules, they resonate with the notion of practice. But as Reckwitz (2002) pointed out, in a practice-theoretical approach, discursive practices as linguistic and rhetorical practices are not overruling the material practices (as suggested by Berger and Luckmann 1966); they remain one type of practice.

2.3  Approaching Practice Moments

Various streams of research suggest an entanglement of consumption with productive aspects, but few studies explicitly address such entanglement conceptually and empirically on the level of practice. Studying how consumption unfolds in relation to practices requires considering the
entanglement of consumption with productive aspects. Researchers have been keen to jump on the concept of production, but the approach taken in this thesis is to study the entanglement of consumption with production by focusing on the operation of consumption in relation to practices.

Developing an understanding of consumption in relation to practices presents opportunities to parallel conceptual development of the relation of consumption and productive aspects within practices. In other words, this dissertation holds with Ritzer (2010) that one should pay attention to both consumption as well as production—that consumption is profoundly intertwined with production (e.g., Arnould and Thompson 2005), but that this does not necessarily mean conceiving of that entanglement as existing purely in the interactional space between firms and consumers (e.g., Vargo and Lusch 2004; Grönroos 2011) or that consumption implodes into production.

Following Warde’s (1992) notion that difficulties arise from blending various levels of analysis, an approach that treats the entanglement of consumption with production on ‘equal grounds’ can therefore be helpful in light of this debate.

A practice-theoretical approach offers such an approach by hosting consumptive and productive practice moments, which are the topics of this section. From the review of the entanglement of consumption and production presented above, production emerges in the practice-theoretical context as ‘productive aspects’. On the one hand, there are productive aspects of consumption. On the other hand, there are productive aspects within practices. As discussed in the following, the idea that consumption is productive, as advocated for example in the CCT logic, implies that a conceptualization of consumptive moments should be informed by incorporating the productive aspects of consumption—by recognizing the specific ways in which consumptive practice moments are productive. Moreover, the conceptualization of consumptive moments should incorporate mutually constitutive relations to those aspects of practices that can be categorised as productive. To this end, the introduction of productive practice moments is useful. So how does a practice-theoretical approach help conceptualize the entanglement of consumption with productive aspects?

### 2.3.1 Consumptive moments

Beginning to answer this question means unfolding consumption as various moments of practices. Although Warde (2005) introduces the idea of consumption as a practice moment, he leaves room for conceptual development of this notion. Specific questions remain concerning the operation of consumption in the performance of practices.
The operation of consumption in relation to practices

As mentioned above, the indication that consumption takes place not only within practices, but ultimately for the sake of practices (Warde 2005; Watson and Shove, 2008) implies that consumption is not only a function of practice, but also has a function in practice. This suggests further that practices do not only guide consumption as stated by Warde (2005) and others (Shove and Pantzar 2005; Watson and Shove 2008), but that consumption may also take a guiding role in the performance of practices. Consumption objects often serve as resources necessary for the performance of practices and can be both enabling and constraining. This means that on the one hand, consumption can be seen as a form of outcome of practice; but at the same time it can be seen as an important actor within the performance of practice. One way to conceptualize this would be to declare consumption as playing an ambidextrous role vis-à-vis practices. However, based on the implication of previous research (Holt 1995; Watson and Shove 2008), it makes sense to unfold such consumption in terms of its two dimensions: function in and function of practice. This implies also that the notion of consumption as practice moments exceeds the notion of consumptive moments as a temporal reference, such as given by the conception of a moment as a specific point in time.8

Consumption and performativity

The indication that consumption is not only an outcome of practice but also plays a vital role in the performance of practice speaks to a performatory quality of consumption. As for practice performances, consumptive moments are prone to exert influence on the ‘doings’ (as Schatzki 2010 refers to practice performances). This can be illustrated with the range of studies demonstrating how consumption that takes place within practices is a necessary ingredient of doings—for example free-skiing (Woermann 2012), DIY (Watson and Shove 2008; Moiso, Arnould, and Gentry 2013), or Nordic Walking (Shove and Pantzar 2005)—and can enable and constrain the performances of practices. This suggests that moments of consumption have performative effects on practice performances.

In other words, this understanding of consumption conceptualizes consumption as performative. Here, it is important to note that performativity is different from performance. Practices are entities that are performed by their carriers—these enactments of practices are performances (Schatzki 1996; Reckwitz 2002; Warde 2005). “The action is what is done, whereas the performance is the doing of it”, Schatzki (2010, 170) writes. Performativity on the other hand, refers to the capacity to make a difference, to act onto something, and thus to exert influence. Writing in the areas of linguistics and feminism, Judith Butler (1990; 1993; 1997) uses the term performativity to

8 However, interesting implications for further research emerge that are discussed in section 4.3.6.
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account for the construction of gender identity categories through discursive practices. To her, performativity is a process through which a subject emerges by speaking of it (Butler 1993, 2). Thus, by describing a subject, one simultaneously creates it—the description is performative. This idea has roots in Foucault’s (1972) description of discourses as practices that form the object they concern. Performativity, then it seems, is a quality of discursive practices as they have effects on the object that they handle. However, Schatzki (1996, 13) notes that “both social order and individuality (…) result from practices”.

Thus, it is not only discursive practice performances that have performative qualities, but almost all practices, because they have consequences for their carriers and social order. Schatzki (2002; 2005) acknowledges material arrangements (i.e., objects) as active and performative in relation to social phenomena. It is through participation in practices that its carriers develop a sense of the world (Reckwitz 2002; Warde 2005) and practices are entities that produce and reproduce organized, collective outcomes (Feldman and Orlikowski 2011). This is evident also in Bourdieu’s account of practices. To Bourdieu, the performance of certain consumption practices symbolically constructs the performing individual as a member of a certain group in social structure, and constructs and reproduces social class boundaries.

The concept of performativity is promising in the light of the entanglement of consumption and production—because performativity allows capturing not only the agentive qualities or effects of practice, but also the agentive qualities of the moments that take place within it. In this light, the role of consumption vis-à-vis practice can be captured with the concept of performativity. Here, it makes sense to borrow additionally from Actor Network theorist Latour (2005) to complement Butler’s exclusive focus on language. Latour (2005) uses the concept of performativity to foreground change and transformation, and differentiates between mediators and intermediaries in this process. To him, mediators transform, change, and alter practices, while intermediaries are primarily vessels of meaning, but are not capable of transformation. Translating these thoughts to the issue at hand implies regarding practice moments as non-human actants capable of acting within, for, and of practices; practice moments become things that have the power to make other things act and react in certain ways. In this sense moments of consumption can be regarded as having productive qualities as they transform, alter, and influence practice performances. This modified understanding of performativity thus regards moments of consumption as being capable of making a difference, exerting influence, and acting onto other practice entities.

2.3.2 Productive moments

This thesis considers production not in terms of a grand economical narrative as depicted by Marx (1971), for example, nor as a field in the sense of Bourdieu; and neither does it primarily aim to develop the notion of marketing
as production (Dixon 1990). Rather, it is concerned with a small fraction of cultural production, which can be described as the making, transformation, and circulation of cultural products (Lash and Urry 2002). Here, this thesis specifically aims to bring attention to production as a ‘micro’ account within practices. A few amendments and subtractions from this depiction of cultural production, thus, are necessary.

A practice-based account of production

Traditionally, cultural products can be understood in terms of those products that the (commercial) cultural industry is concerned with, such as literature, films, art, music, and any combination thereof. The players in the cultural production process can typically be understood to be in three camps: producers of cultural products, intermediaries diffusing those cultural products, and finally consumers experiencing cultural products (Lash and Urry 2002; McCracken 1988; Kozinets 2001; Venkatesh and Meamber 2006; Wright 2005). Fiske (1989), however, distinguishes between those cultural products created by the cultural industry as a capitalist society—which he calls mass culture—and those cultural products that transpire from consumers employing mass cultural products as resources in their own meaning-creation processes, which he calls popular culture. Here, particularly, these meaning-creation processes on the consumer side come to the fore in fandom, which has been ascribed productive qualities, with fans reworking and twisting meanings (Fiske 1992). This is especially observable in and facilitated by Internet media (Taalas and Hirsjärvi 2013; Kozinets 1999). In their analysis of an Internet forum on science fiction and fantasy literature, Taalas and Hirsjärvi (2013) show how the afterlife of cultural products living in fandom subcultures can be understood as a mode of ‘second production’—a form of production that is not merely production in terms of a system of reworked and twisted reproduction of commercially produced cultural products (popular culture), but a form of post-production as a productive network of exchange. However, this analysis still assumes a divide of cultural production into primary versus secondary production, or the separate spheres of the commercial producers and the producing audiences, fans, readers—or consumers.

This thesis deviates from this understanding. Where Fiske (1989; 1992) treats mass culture and popular culture as sites of ideology, power and resistance, this thesis takes a practice-based account of production: neither as the grand narrative of popular culture, nor in terms of fandom. Rather, in this dissertation project on consumption and practice, I am interested in production in so far as to understand how and in what ways production can be understood on the level of practices as well—as argued above, this interest in production emerges from the interest in consumption. Because it is only in its relation to production that consumption can be understood, this interest is conducive to understanding consumption.
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For this, it is useful to ask: What constitutes a cultural product, be it mass cultural or popular cultural? What makes it a *cultural* product? A product that is particularly culturally valuable? Or, is it a product that ‘carries’ culture in it? This thesis adopts the view that cultural products can be understood as the creations of and through culture. Following Geertz (1973) all acts, ideas, values, and emotions are cultural products. To Bourdieu, consumption practices are a form of cultural production because they produce and reproduce the boundaries of social class structures. Are cultural products only produced by cultural producers, disseminated by intermediaries, and finally consumed by consumers? From the consumer cultural logic depicted above one can discern that consumers are producers of culture (Arnould and Thompson 2005). However, this thesis strives to move away from relying on roles of producer, intermediary, and consumer to explain ‘social reality’, as all these participants of culture could be seen as carriers of practices. A practice-theoretical view thus cuts through the clutter of this tripartite structure of the cultural production process, or the divide between primary and secondary production.

Pairing these considerations with the conception of practices as the building blocks of culture (e.g., Reckwitz 2002; Holt, 2002; Swidler 2001) means considering those things that practices produce as cultural products. Thus cultural production should be considered not purely in terms of the cultural industry and cultural products like books, films, art objects, or music. Instead, the question of concern here is, how can production be considered on a practice level?

**Embedding production within practices**

If consumptive activities are embedded as moments in practices, then it is plausible also to contemplate that also productive activities can be embedded in practices. In other words, there are productive aspects inherent in practices. Consider hand-knitting (Hui 2012) or DIY (Watson and Shove 2008). These practices are essentially about shaping and making something. They result in a knitted object, a kitchen, bathroom, a roof, and so forth. Production does not only entail the creation of something; it also includes a ‘change in form’, as Vargo and Lusch (2004) note.

Thus, just like some forms of consumption take place along practices, some sorts of production also take place along the lines of practice performance—if the end result, or product, is some change in form or artefact. To Miller (1987, 112) an artefact is the product of human labour. If hand-knitting and DIY (and craft consumption, for that matter) are practices that result in artefacts and shape in forms, then it is reasonable to conceive of production as taking place in and through performances of the practices of hand-knitting and DIY. Or, more precisely, that these practices involve some sort of productive human labour embedded within them, practical procedures and doings. Although paper 4 explicitly departs from this notion of production as productive labour, the point is: Although Warde (2005) introduced the notion of moments of
consumption, a corresponding notion for moments of production is currently underdeveloped. This is surprising in so far as literature has called for considering consumption not as singular but as entangled with production.

Although hand-knitting and DIY could be seen as more producerly practices, as they are about making and shaping things, productive aspects also are evident within other practices such as free-skiing. As Woermann (2012) points out, in the free-skiing subculture he studied the making and sharing of films is deeply interwoven within the free-skiing practice. Here, the making of video is not simply about making the video; producing video is a part of the practice. Such production, however, cannot be compared with the production that Alvin Toffler envisions in his depiction of the rise of the prosumer, because as mentioned above, he refers to substitution. But this does not quite capture the production going on in, for example, the free-skiing practice (Woermann 2012). Here, free-skiers do not produce these videos to avoid purchasing commercial skiing videos. In other words, they do not substitute. Rather, the making of videos appears as a meaningful portion of the practice’s teleaffective structure and as such becomes part of the performance of free-skiing. Production takes place alongside the performance of free-skiing and is needed for the practice as such, as Woermann (2012) points out.

Furthermore, Chaplin (2001) demonstrates how holiday homeowners work on their houses as a form of vocational leisure, consuming their ‘productive activities’ as an appreciated variation of ordinary life. Thus, these activities appear as vessels of meaning and forms of leisure. As Deci (1975) notes, carrying out an activity can provide intrinsic satisfaction in itself—that is, it can offer autotelic rewards. Consequently, DIYers derive satisfaction from both, doings and end results (Chaplin 2001). In this sense, the productive activities, or work, become consumable experiences. Similarly, Meamber (2000) frames artists as simultaneous producers and consumers of their art, touching upon the notion of ‘production as consumption’ as put forward by Roberts et al. (1988).

This previous research pinpoints the interrelatedness between consumptive and productive moments: In this specific case of an object-focused practice, the productive moments become autotelic consumption experiences, offering a more fine-grained resolution to the notion of consumers as the producers of their consumption experiences (Carù and Cova 2007b). The idea of complementing consumptive moments with productive moments on the level of practices poses questions regarding the composition of practices with respect to their entangled consumptive and productive moments.

Here, Schatzki’s (2005) illustration of educational practices, which can be seen as a form of interpersonal practice, gains relevance. Schatzki (2005, 472) notes that such interpersonal practices contain chains of actions and reactions:

“A teacher poses a question, students raise their hands, the teacher calls on one or more of them, answers are ventured, the teacher or other students respond — this chain occurs entirely within education practices. It also transpires as part of these
practices: the actions involved help compose the practice. Similarly, the ends and projects the teacher and students pursue in performing these actions—teaching, learning, impressing the teacher, demonstrating even-handedness etc.—are contained in the teleoaffective structure of educational practices: to pursue them is ipso facto to be carrying on the practice.”

(Schatzki 2005, 472, original emphasis in bold)

This example serves as an illustration to begin reasoning on the consumptive as well as productive moments as parts of such a practice. Students assemble in lecture halls; they listen to the teacher; the teacher offers reasoning on a specific topic; students ask questions; the teacher responds; the teacher creates assignments and exams; students engage in reading; students make and create projects, and write essays; the teacher offers advice on how to improve and gives feedback. Thus, educational (interpersonal) practices can be composed out of an array of consumptive and productive moments. This implies appreciating such moments as elements of practices embedded in teleoaffective structure. Pursuing the ends and projects of a practice is, as Schatzki puts it above, “to be carrying on the practice”. However, Schatzki (2005) de-emphasizes the consumptive moments of the chain of actions he illustrates, which are addressed in depth in paper 1.

Productive moments can also become consumable experiences for others, as Küng, Picard, and Towse (2008) point out in the context of content industries. By making content available symphony orchestras or theatre groups become content producers, in addition to, creating live shows. This understanding of producing as making available, which is also evident in Roberts et al. (1988), then, extends to the area of the Internet, and specifically online communities and social networks, where millions of people share content and document their activities; they make things available and therefore become content producers.

Considering the arguments above, I regard those actors not as content ‘producers’, but rather the activity of making things available as a specific productive moment that relates to the context of the specific practices that are performed—by various carriers of practices. This specific notion of production refers to production also in terms of making available or bringing forth for notice. This is particularly evident in the area of online community, where through practices such as documenting—uploading stories, images, and other representations of brand usage, for example—content is being produced in the online community (Schau et al. 2009). In fact, an online community would cease to exist if one were to take away such productive moments. Although they did not explicitly refer to them as productive moments, Schau et al. (2009) found that it is through such (productive moments of) community practices that brand communities create value.

In their study on the abandoned Apple Newton community, Muñiz and Schau (2005; 2007) investigate how the members of the community act
independently of marketers and advertisers. Left alone by the manufacturer Apple, the Newton device and its community find no support by Apple. Interestingly, they find that members of this community not only engage in mutual support to uphold the brand and its use, but also create artefacts (documents, images, and videos) that “resemble advertisements and are intended to serve many of the same functions as advertising” (Muñiz and Schau 2007, 189). These advertising-like artefacts are a form of what can be called consumer-generated media but they must spring forth out of productive moments. While the cultural artefacts described in their study are one special type of artefact, Kozinets (2007) shows how so-called ‘Inno-tribes’ are capable of producing entire movies adding to the conception of tribes as productive of various facets of culture (Cova, Kozinets, and Shankar 2007b).

A tribe, however, can only produce such things as rituals, identities, and meanings if its members engage in community (or tribal) practices, and further if they become carriers of productive moments of these practices (e.g., social networking practices, community engagement practices, brand use practices, see Schau et al. 2009). To date, however, empirical and conceptual blind spots exist when considering how such productive moments relate to consumptive moments.

2.4 Toward Unfolding Consumptive Moments in Relation to Practice and Productive Aspects

If consumption can be conceived of practice moments, as Warde (2005) suggests, how can we conceptualize such moments? The purpose of this thesis is to unfold consumption as practice moments. The review on the entanglement of consumption and production suggests that an approach to the study of consumption needs to be able to 1) recognize relationships of production and consumption; 2) incorporate mutual constitutive, but not necessarily equal, relations of consumption and production; and 3) acknowledge the role of such consumption for the fabrication of social life. I use this basis to motivate a practice-theoretical approach to the study of consumption.

The sections above highlight that production emerges as ‘productive aspects’ in two ways: first, consumption holds productive aspects—consumption is productive. Second, there are indications of productive aspects within practices, such as the doings involved in DIY or hand-knitting which can be categorized as being productive. This indicates that a conceptualization of consumptive moments should be informed by incorporating the productive aspects of consumption. That is, detailing the specific ways in which consumption...
2. Theoretical perspectives

is productive. Further, the conceptualization of consumptive moments should incorporate mutually constitutive relations to those aspects of practices that can be categorised as productive. To inform the conceptualization of a dyadic relation between the two, the introduction of productive practice moments is useful.

One of the opportunities offered by a practice-theoretical approach to the study of consumption lies particularly in appreciating the entanglement of consumption and production. Through a focus on the cultural practices involved in consumption and its productive aspects (Featherstone 2007), this thesis advances a dialectical approach to consumption and production by treating them as inherent in the practices comprising our marketplaces and cultures, rather than being inherent in the singular roles of consumer, (cultural) producer, prosumer, or intermediary.

Performativity is central to the approach I use to conceptualize this entanglement. More precisely, unfolding moments of consumption with regard to their performativity is conducive to understanding how consumption operates in relation to practices, and elucidating the entanglement of consumption with productive aspects. Thus, the practice-theoretical perspective allows unpacking moments of consumption and at the same time appreciating a dyadic relationship to productive aspects. This development of consumption is important because it allows understanding not only of the way consumption operates in and through practices in contemporary consumer cultures, but it also offers guidance for the theorization of consumption and production as core market processes that are instantiated in practices. Thus, understanding how basic market concepts of consumption and production operate in relation to each other in this lens offers the potential to develop practices as a suitable and granular tool for the analysis of market and consumption phenomena.

Unfolding consumptive moments happens in two ways. The first way is through the concept of performativity. Performativity here refers to the capacities of consumptive moments, as elements of practices, to be able to make a difference; to act as non-human objects within practices; and thus exert influence on other practice entities. Hence, I use this term to describe the productive abilities of consumptive moments in practice performances. The second way is by complementing consumptive moments with productive moments, a notion that is hidden implicitly in previous literatures, but notably under-appreciated. Although the focus of this thesis remains on consumptive moments, the introduction of productive moments is useful in light of the need for dyadic, non-singular treatment of consumption and production (e.g., Arnould and Thompson 2007).

In this perspective, practices become the site for consumption as well as production. Here, production does not refer to the grand economic narrative, but adheres more to the relatively immediate processes of making and creating, on similar grounds as using and appreciating is for consumption. Through a focus on performativity, consumption can be investigated and further unfolded
as a productive category. Relations between consumptive and productive practice moments can be analysed by complementing the notion of productive moments. Thus, in this thesis, I approach consumption and production not as spheres (by large), but through nuanced dynamics on the level of practices.
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To unfold consumption as practice moments, this thesis uses several empirical contexts and types of empirical material. In the following I present, discuss, and reflect on the methodological decisions. Because the respective methodology for each single study is elaborated in the individual papers, the focus of this chapter lies on the underlying methodological considerations of this dissertation taken as a whole, and on issues that did not find places within the restrictions of the four papers. I begin with the selection of research contexts. Then, I provide an overview of my research approach and empirical material. Subsequently, I present ethical considerations and matters relating to the analysis and interpretation of the empirical material.

3.1 Selecting Research Contexts

The focus on consumption and its entanglement with productive aspects necessitates the selection of empirical context(s) that help facilitate theoretical insights (Arnould, Price, and Moisio 2006). In other words, contexts are needed in which these aspects are highly pertinent. As argued above, a practice-inspired approach regards practices as the sites in which actions are carried out and in which consumption and production take place. I introduced interpersonal practice, object-focused practice, and discursive practice as theoretical contexts within which to study consumption and its entanglement with productive aspects. In the following, I present the selection of online community practices, electric guitar playing, gardening, and authenticating re-enchantment as empirical versions of these theoretical contexts to help facilitate insights on the operation of consumption in relation to practice and in relation to productive aspects.

This thesis presents one paper on each interpersonal (paper 1) and discursive practice (paper 2), and two papers on object-focused practices (papers 3 and 4). However, this decision does not imply that object-focused practices are more interesting or relevant with regard to investigating moments of consumption and their relation to productive aspects. Rather, the motivation for conducting two studies on object-focused practice stems from the opportunity to study not only within specific practices, but also finding commonalities between different practices. Here, paper 4 utilizes the empirical contexts and materials of papers 1 and 3 to explore structural commonalities of two practices with regard to how consumptive moments are organized in relation to productive aspects.
3.1.1 Online community practices as interpersonal practices

I studied consumption within interpersonal practices in the form of community practices in an online gardening community with two co-authors. Community practices have been studied before by Schau et al. (2009) in the form of brand community practices; i.e., community practices taking place in brand communities. The motivation to study interpersonal practices in such online community practices is sparked by two points. First, prior research indicates that the entanglement of consumption and production is particularly pertinent in the online sphere (e.g., Beer and Burrows 2010; Ritzer, Dean, and Jurgenson 2012). Second, however, prior research on community practices (Schau et al. 2009) focuses implicitly but exclusively on the productive moments of such practices, leaving room for complementing a focus on the other side of the same coin—namely consumptive moments—and to begin theorizing the nature of the relationship between consumptive and productive moments.

To do this, I chose a specific UK-based online community that revolves around the practice of gardening. Gardening as an object-focused practice fades into the background of the study compared to the interpersonal practices surrounding it. For the study of interpersonal practices in an online community, gardening is somewhat arbitrary; gardening is not the only possible case for conducting a study on online community practices—a similar study could have been conducted in a community revolving around cars, for example. However, gardening proved to be a helpful practice context for the study of interpersonal community practices surrounding it, because gardening is a rather complicated practice. Therefore, rich interpersonal interactions emerge; community members log on to the community to receive advice on how to grow specific plants, deal with particular problems, and learn various techniques. Moreover, gardening involves creativity—in the design and layout of gardens, for example—and members turn to the community to find inspiration and new ideas. Lastly, many gardeners share a passion for gardening as a meaningful, even therapeutic, aspect of their lives. These aspects are conducive to finding rich instantiations of a variety of interpersonal practices in the online community.

I chose a specific gardening community because of its commercially motivated nature. The two owners founded the community as a start-up, manage it, and earn a living from it. This community is an example what can be called a community media business model\(^9\). Naturally, the owners have an interest in the thriving of their community: more clicks and more members

\(^9\) With this notion I refer to the wider trend of community media becoming a viable business model. Community media, such as the gardening community studied in this thesis, are technical shells filled with content by their members. Community owners strive to make profit from selling advertising space, ultimately selling the community members as an attractive and involved audience to advertisers seeking relevant target groups.
generate more money from the advertisers, and the owners aim to keep existing members happy, attached, and engaged. Because this community media business model is built around the idea of providing a technological infrastructure that then is filled with content entirely from its members, this can be seen as a case of the ‘working consumer’ (Cova and Dalli 2009).

The question of how to ensure that the community experience is so valuable that people choose to become members (membership is free), produce content regularly, and decide to maintain their membership is crucial for operating a sustainable business in the form of community media. But, as argued later on, community experience is not made up entirely out of productive moments. Naturally, for consumers to join, stay, and participate, some form of value must be at play, also in terms of consumptive moments. We received great support from the two community owners, who had a genuine interest in a study within their community to better understand the processes in the community (‘what is going on how’) as well as the interplay and mix between different aspects of community participation.
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3.1.2  Artistic and horticultural practices as object-focused practices

I studied consumption within object-focused practices in two forms, artistic and horticultural practice. Artists have been framed as producers and consumers of their art (Meamber 2000; Roberts et al. 1988). Specifically, Roberts et al.’s (1988) description of the processes in which Brian the jazz DJ and Dave the pottery craftsman engage indicates an entanglement of consumption with production in artistic practice. Cole’s (2011) study suggests that in musical artistic practices connected to the project studio, the blending of production and consumption is highly pertinent. I studied object-focused artistic practice in the form of electric guitar playing. In object-focused practices, the materiality of objects is specifically foregrounded.

I chose to focus on electric guitar playing, because the organization of this practice prescribes the formation of a set of objects that is consumed in order to produce: the consumption constellation. This term derives from prior marketing literature (e.g., Englis and Solomon 1996), but emerges essentially a material arrangement of objects used in and for the practice of guitar playing. Thus, it resonates with Warde’s (2005) moment of consumption, as it is takes place within the practice of guitar playing. Studying the formation of this arrangement of objects provides insights into the operation of consumption in relation to practice and the linkages to production within electric guitar playing. Like other musical and artistic practices, electric guitar playing also involves interpersonal practices. In paper 3, however, I foreground electric guitar playing as a form of object-focused practice.
The other object-focused practice I studied is gardening, a horticultural practice. Gardening is a rich context in which productive activities (growing flowers, plants, and trees) are paired with consumption of various resources (seeds, earth, plants, water, books, the online community). In this way, gardening resembles much of the DIY project practices that Watson and Shove (2008) write about as well as Campbell’s (2005) craft consumption—studies in which issues of consumption and production had been foregrounded.

3.1.3 Authenticating re-enchantment as discursive practice

When deciding to study within discursive practices, I chose to select and focus on processes that are germane to marketing and branding. Thus, I studied brand-related discursive practices. Discursive practices are inherently productive. To Foucault, power is what constitutes subjectivity, as it creates discursive domains and fields in which subjects emerge and come into being. Accordingly, the subject is produced by discourses (Butler 1999, 219), but discourses also produce relationships, organizations, and institutions. A discourse, however, does not merely exist—it must be performed through discursive practices. In critical marketing studies, the accepted view is that marketing discourses construct “a particular view of society and markets, organizations, consumers and consumption objects” (Brownlie, Saren, Wensley, and Whittington 1999, 8).

Studying within discursive practices means finding and selecting a rich discursive field. As prior research has argued, the field of musical instruments and specifically the guitar provides such a context (Dawe and Dawe 2001). But to study consumption within discursive practices also means selecting an empirical context in which these elements are foregrounded so they can be studied. While some sort of production is inherent in discursive practices (subjects, relationships, institutions), I selected a context in which the discursive production object (that which is constructed through discourse) is the consumption object (that which is, or is to be consumed). Ideally, the association is one of dispute, or at least not straightforward, so that discursive negotiation processes—which may otherwise remain relatively hidden—come to the fore.

One domain in which such association between these two objects is relatively complicated is the domain of retro brands (relaunched historical brands), because retro brands are inherently paradoxical as they are characterized by the “simultaneous presence of old and new, tradition and technology, primitivism and progress, same and different” (Brown et al. 2003, 21). In terms of objects, this indicates that different versions of the same consumption object co-exist: the old and original products as well as their associated images and meanings, and the relaunched technologically updated versions. It is in this retro brand context, discursive processes are triggered that
deal with constructing both the original ‘old’ product as well as the ‘new’
product, appearing in the same suit as the original product.

The formerly Swedish brand Hagström provides a rich example. Hagström
relaunched their brand after a 20-year hiatus through licensing to a third party,
and relocated manufacturing from Sweden to China. The commonly accepted
business practice of licensing and outsourcing manufacturing to cheaper parties
and locations triggers rich discursive struggles in the marketplace over the
consumption object, the company’s guitars.

3.2 Research Approach and Empirical
Material

A practice-theoretical approach is essentially an ontology that comes with a
number of epistemological implications. Practice theory declares practices as
the research object: practices are the objects on which to conduct research.
More precisely, then, this translates into scrutiny of the organization of a
practice (section 2.2.2). Like most theories, or theoretical perspectives, a
practice-theoretical approach offers a certain simplification of social
phenomena, while at the same time complicating it. By foregrounding certain
elements, it deemphasizes other elements. The ontological nature of the subject
as a carrier of practice in a practice theoretical perspective implies focusing on
what is going on (in terms of doings—meanings—objects) rather than on the
characteristics of the subject, or carrier, per se. The carriers cannot be excluded
from the analysis, but they are not overly deterministic. A practice-theoretical
way of knowing implies a focus on practices. However, practices are abstract
entities. Epistemologically, then, attention has to be paid to their performances.
Consumption (and production, too, for that matter) is an etic label sculpted
over emic doings performed by carriers on the site of practices. Practices are
the shells that organize the sets of activities within them and constitute the
experiences for those engaged with the performance of practices.

In this thesis, I do not take an interest in the practice per se, but focus on its
organization specifically in terms of consumption as ‘moments’ taking place
within them. In other words, I focus on practices as a vessel in and through
which to understand consumption and its entanglement with productive
aspects. Given the aims of this thesis, the epistemological challenge is to derive
and construct a research approach that allows for gaining relevant empirical
material (Silverman 2001). In the following, I present my overarching
considerations of approaching the organization of practices, while the
individual methodologies are outlined in the individual papers. Table 1 offers
an overview of empirical material by papers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Empirical material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>Form</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 1</td>
<td>Diary study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netnography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 2</td>
<td>Netnographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Paper | Ethnographic | Interviews, participant observation | - 20 interviews (34 hrs. relevant material) NOTE: 13 interviews are shared with the Hagström project) during a 3.5 month period in Winter 2010/2011. Excerpts translated by me  
- Approx. 150 hours of observing at guitar retailers, concerts, rehearsal rooms, studios, home studios, and guitarists' homes  
- Informal chat with 37 persons in stores and concerts; played one gig in two bands during data collection  
- Field notes | No co-author |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Paper | Ethnographic | Interviews, participant observation  
NOTE: material shared with paper 3 | - 20 interviews (34 hrs. relevant material) during a 3.5 month period in Winter 2010/2011. Excerpts translated by me  
- Approx. 150 hours of observing at guitar retailers, concerts, rehearsal rooms, studios, home studios, and guitarists' homes  
- Informal chat with 37 persons in stores and concerts; played one gig in two bands during data collection  
- Field notes | No co-author |
| Diary study | Paper-based diaries of community members  
NOTE: material shared with paper 1 | - 16 handwritten A5 diaries | Design and execution together with Caroline Wiertz |
| Netnography | | - 8 months of general non-participant observation (shared with paper 1)  
- 5 months of specific attention to gardening practice |
3.2.1 Qualitative approach and material

Practices are the site of study. Researching within practices means studying their elements and examining their organization within practices. Thus, an approach is needed to ‘get inside’ the practices. How can knowledge on the organization of practices be created? Because practices are both bodily performances and mental activities—and they can be understood as a set of activities that entails both understandings and procedures—researching within practices implies ‘getting access’ to these elements. This suggests getting as close to practices as possible; to learn where and how they are performed.

Practices can be considered building blocks of culture (Arnould and Thompson 2005; Swidler 2001). To Holt (2002), consumer culture is structured by (consumption) practices. Thus, practices are deeply cultural and culture is deeply practical. To research cultural matters, to explicate social patterns of action and practices, an ethnographic approach is suitable (Arnould and Wallendorf 1994; Atkinson and Hammersley 1994; Goulding 2005; Kozinets 2002a; Van Maanen 1988). Ethnographic research investigates and interprets the cultures and subcultures of groups such as peoples, societies, or communities and explicates and represents facets of these cultures such as actions, values, meaning systems and codes, norms, ideals, or materiality.

Ethnographers do this by studying in the field—that is within the groups that constitute the interest. The practice-theoretical programme suggests, however, that it is in practices that norms, ideals, and actions are imprinted. The agenda of this thesis is not to research the culture of a specific group of human subjects, but to research issues of consumption embedded within the practices that are performed by carriers. Dingwall (1997, 53-55) argues that in social sciences there are essentially two ways of studying, through ‘hanging out’, i.e., data finding, and ‘asking questions’, i.e, data construction. An ethnographic way of knowing is constituted by studying in the field, that is within groups, and by both data finding (participant observation) and asking questions (interviewing). Thus, similar to an ethnographic approach, attempts to derive an emic account of a group from within that group, this thesis aims to derive insights from within practices—with the object of study being practices and their organization. Because the nature of my research interest resonates with the ethnographic programme to explicate the social patterns of action and practices (Goulding 2005), the ethnographic way of knowing as a combination of participant observation and interviewing within contexts is a promising route to get inside practices.

Here, attention has to be paid to the specific practice. Although the elements of doings, objects, and meanings are present in all practices, they take various forms depending on the practice. In other words, guitar playing operates differently than discursive re-enchantment with regard to the doings, objects, and meanings involved. Moreover, researching these elements implies
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being where the practice takes place, because they transpire in different locations.

Although practical understanding and teleo affective structures are
prescribed by the practice, they are inscribed and embodied in their carriers and
their activities. Thus, a practice-theoretical endeavour has to draw on multiple
sources to collect empirical material that represents the organization of a
practice. In the simplest terms, this means studying what practitioners do, what
they say, and what they say they do (Reckwitz 2002; Warde 2005). A qualitative
approach is particularly suitable for this endeavour (Halkier and Jensen 2011;

Thus, the studies in this dissertation adopt a combination of a variety of
qualitative approaches including participant observation (Atkinson and
Hammersley 1994), interviews in practice contexts (Arnowld and Wallendorf
1994; Bengtsson and Östberg 2006; Thompson 1997; Thompson, Locander,
and Pollio 1989), netnography (Kozinets 1997; 1998; 2002b; 2010), diary study
(Bolger, Davis, and Rafaeli 2003), and the study of documents—as outlined in
the individual papers. Thus, I researched practices through observation of their
local performances and through their carriers' linguistic constructions,
representations, and explanations. This means observation is a good means to
move toward the activities and procedures, bodily movements, and the
handling of objects; meanwhile, listening in and asking questions reveals
particular insights into practical understandings and teleo affective structures. In
the case of discursive practices, the practice is linguistic practice. These
considerations resonate with an ethnographic way of knowing as an
epistemological stance that relevant knowledge can only be created from within
contexts.

When talking about practices, their carriers construct and reproduce
practices and their performances. This speaks to Berger and Luckmann (1966),
who stress the importance of language as a vessel of the social construction of
reality. But in a practice-theoretical approach, these linguistic constructions and
reproductions of practices are paired with attention to bodily doings.
Specifically, interpretive consumer research has developed the tendency to
overemphasize language and consumption narratives as the major tool to
assess and understand consumer behaviour, resulting in calls for a more
balanced approach to ethnographic consumer research. For example, Peñaloza
and Cayla (2006, 287) note that “we must go beyond the fetish of the narrative
as the ultimate measure of consumer behaviour”. The research approach taken
in this study is generally embedded in this line of argumentation. But the
benefits of narrative experiences and textual representations are also
recognised. The practice-theoretical flavour seems to balance the need for
attention to the material and the symbolic as well as activities and
understandings of them. I found interesting guidance in Ruth and Otnes'
(2006) etiquette of qualitative research for practical matters.
The overarching motivation for selecting a particular approach, or combination of approaches, is grounded in the necessity of capturing and constructing relevant empirical material on the organization of the practice under investigation and in being where the practice is. Thus, the selection of contexts follows the idea of utilizing contexts as a means of facilitating relevant insights (Arnould, Price and Moisio 2006). These considerations are briefly outlined in the following.

**Online community practices**

For studying consumption and its entanglement with productive aspects within online community practices, I employed a netnographic non-participant approach to gain insights into the mode of operation of the gardening community through practices. Netnography is essentially ethnography on the Internet (Kozinets 2002b; 2010). Because the nature of my research interest resonates with the agenda of ethnography, this approach served as a starting point for investigating consumptive and productive moments in online community practices. Here, the technological infrastructure of the community was particularly helpful because of its transparency: Everything is publicly archived in the categories of ‘forums’, ‘individual member profiles’, ‘questions’, and ‘latest ideas’. Because everything is archived on an individual member profile, it is possible to trace what person X wrote in forum B on a specific day, and how person Y responded to person X’s question. This means that the interactions between members (action inter action) can be observed. In the context of interpersonal practices, initiating an episode of conduct or participating in it through writing (or talking) represents the productive moments, as explained in paper 1. Thus productive moments are readily observable in everything that is visible on the community sites, and in its contents.

In order to capture the lived experience of the carriers of community practices, a diary approach is useful. Having carriers of practices describe what they do how and why, and also how they feel, allowed to gain insights into the mental properties of practices (understanding, teleoaffective structures) and the effects they have on carriers (performativity). The diary approach is particularly useful, because it facilitated capturing specifically the consumptive moments of interpersonal practices. In interpersonal practices, consumptive moments are experiences of interaction (see paper 1). In their diaries, study participants reflected on their teleoaffective (and value-laden) experiences of interaction by constructing introspective narrative accounts of their participation and engagement in the online community practices of the gardening community (an overview of respondents is provided in table 2 in the appendix).
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Keeping the Diary

During the next 4 weeks, please make an entry into this diary after every time you visited [ ] or every time you came to think about the community, its members, or its content.

What and how to record

Please feel free to use as much space and as many pages as you need to express your experiences and reflections in any way. Please focus on the following:

**The date and time.** This is really important to us; we’ve printed “today’s date” on each page as a reminder but please feel free to use multiple pages for one entry. If you visited [ ] please note how long you stayed for.

**What you did.** For example, what you read and looked at or what you added to the site.

**How you feel about your visit.** What did you particularly like or dislike? For example, how did you feel when you read someone’s blog and the responses to the blog, how did you feel if someone responded to your question or made a comment about your photos, and so on...

**How you feel about being a member of [ ].** In general. For example, do you feel that you are getting to know other members, or learning new things?

**If and how being part of [ ] influences what you do in your garden.** Even if it’s just what you do on your balcony or with your pot plants.

**Anything else you want to tell us.** Feel free to take whatever space you need, illustrate your point with drawings, put in photographs, or do anything else you like.

*Figure 3: Instructions to diary members*
Figure 4: Diary excerpt

Electric guitar playing and gardening

To study consumption and its entanglement with productive aspects within electric guitar playing, I opted for an ethnographic-inspired approach. As Thompson (1997, 451) notes, ethnographic analysis is suitable for marketing research that aims to “analyze the social scripting of consumption through rituals and other types of collectively shared practices”. My ethnographic approach is detailed in paper 3. It involved participant observation in band rehearsal rooms, studio recording sessions, sound-checks, live gigs, and retail settings—hanging out and asking questions—as well as 20 in-depth interviews with guitar players (an overview of respondents is provided in table 3 in the appendix).

To study these issues within the gardening community, I utilized the material collected for paper 1. That is, I mainly relied on rich diary material and netnographic observation of the gardening community, as detailed in paper 4. I supplemented the netnographic material collected for paper 1 with netnographic material that explicitly focused on gardening. The analysis focused
on gardening rather than the interpersonal practices surrounding it in form of community practices.

**Figure 5: Photographs from fieldwork on guitar playing**

**Authenticating re-enchantment practices**

For studying consumption and its entanglement with productive aspects in discursive practices, I used a combination of netnographic inquiries in forums relating to guitar gear, in-depth interviews with guitarists and a manager, participant observation, and document study for the following reasons. In discursive practices, the productive moments are inherent in the rhetorical and discursive ‘constructing’ the nature of an object or subject (which is in the studied case the nature of the Hagström/Hagstrom retro brand). Thus, an approach is needed that provides access to such meaning-giving systems of statements, or discourses. Here again, the Internet provides an advantage: Discussions in forums and blogs are occurring without researcher stimulus and are self-transcribing—in the sense that discursive statements and discussions are available as written text. Thus, a netnographic approach is suitable for capturing and immersion into these discussions. Unlike the online community practices studied in paper 1, which are bound to the online sphere, the
discursive practices under investigation here are not naturally limited to online forums and blogs.

Thus, I conducted complementary in-depth interviews with guitarists to allow for triangulation with the material collected online. To understand the realm of the discursive practices, and help facilitate researcher sensitivity to the discursive issues, disputes, and negotiations at hand, it was necessary to immerse into the marketplace in which these discourses are embedded. However, the quotes from 'consumers' presented in paper 2 are ethnographic material, to pinpoint the collective nature of this discursive re-enchantment.

Through participant observation at a Swedish guitar fair—a guitar fest with hundreds of brands exhibiting their products—my co-author and I familiarized ourselves with the marketplace and learned about the guitar marketplace culture—what is deemed 'normal' and ordinary, but also extraordinary. Here, we paid specific attention to brands’ presentation of their country-of-origin and references to specific manufacturing techniques. This allowed us to contextualize the specific discursive processes we studied in relation to the guitar marketplace (culture). Because these discursive processes revolve around the brand Hagström/Hagström, we collected relevant documents that informed us on the historical trajectories of the brand in order to contextualize these processes.

All in all, the empirical approach was set to study the process of discursive authenticating re-enchantment practices and to allow for triangulation between different materials. The focus on processes and ‘how’ means including relevant carriers of the discursive practices, no matter ‘who’ they are (in this case: retailers, brand owners, 'consumers'/guitarists, and reviewers).

3.2.2 Quantitative approach

While qualitative approaches lend themselves to the study of and within practices, there is a shortage of quantitative approaches. Although Arnould and Thompson (2005) assert that the study of consumer culture and its aspects can and have been researched also quantitatively, only a minority of research within CCT adopts quantitative approaches. Because paper 1 deals explicitly with the experiences of engaging in practices, it complements the qualitative approach with a quantitative element that can capture the differential impact of two forms of experienced consumptive moments on experienced value. The quantitative approach opted for in paper 1 takes the form of a survey study. In terms of ontology, the quantitative and qualitative approaches are compatible, because they both study ‘subjective experiences’. By studying not what ‘is’, but by studying what respondents experienced from their own perspective, the

---

10 I use the term 'normal' to refer to the cultural norms and traditions. What appears ordinary and normal in a culture is not innocent or trivial, but deeply rooted in its values, as norms are reflecting deeper cultural values.
quantitative approach shares the ontological assumptions of the diary study, but presents a different epistemological route toward acquiring knowledge on these subjective experiences.

Figure 6: Screenshot from the online community survey

Although a qualitative approach is more suitable for studying the nature of consumption and its relation to production within practices, a quantitative approach presents different opportunities. First, it allows an overlooking view on the phenomenon under investigation because of its capability to present aggregated results. Second, it allows studying the phenomenon over a larger number of respondents. In the specific case of study I, a diary study with n=205 handwritten diaries would not have been possible. A large sample size is not valuable by itself, as generalizable results do not indicate automatically that
the approach suits the purpose of study. Third, a quantitative approach allows insights specifically into the differential effects of different forms of consumptive moments of community practices.

The quantitative approach opted for in paper 1 is an explorative quantitative approach. This means it contributes to theory building rather than theory testing. At the heart of most quantitative approaches is the formation of hypotheses, which are incrementally deducted from theory, and their successive testing for significance. In an explorative quantitative approach, however, there is no up-front hypothecation, or deduction. Of course, questions have to be formulated, which is a form of deduction, but that holds true also for many forms of interviewing, such as structured and semi-structured interviewing. In technical terms, the explorative quantitative approach uses a different estimator for modelling results than more mainstream SEM techniques.

3.2.3 Ethical considerations

This thesis uses empirical material collected through diaries, survey, interviews, participant observation, document study, and netnography. In the following I present ethical considerations pertaining to the collection, analysis, and representation of the resulting empirical material. Chief ethical concerns can be considered in terms of potential harm, privacy and anonymity, and informed consent (e.g., Bryman and Bell, 2005; Kozinets 2002b).

To begin, the nature of the research topic of this thesis does not constitute what can be considered a sensitive research topic. It concerns community participation in an online gardening community, electric guitar playing, gardening, and conversations about a guitar brand. The practice-theoretical perspective de-emphasizes an interest in personal and sensitive information; that is, although the engagement with practices can be considered as being personal, the information and material collected in this thesis are not considered sensitive personal material—the interest in doings-meanings-objects, rather than an interest in human subjects, is theoretically anchored within a practice-theoretical approach. Human subjects can be regarded as participants in this research, but they remain ultimately merely carriers of practices. Rather, it is the practices and their performative effects that constitute the research subjects in practice theoretical work. As carriers of practice, human subjects are interesting only in so far as they perform and carry practices.

Diary

Diary respondents were recruited on a voluntary opt-in basis and informed about the research purpose and the procedure, with the possibility of opting out in any stage of the research process, and the purpose of the study, as it would result in the use of the provided material for conference presentations,
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research articles, and dissertation writing. Thus for diaries, I obtained informed consent. I was overwhelmed by the richness and details in which diary respondents elaborated on their experiences in the online community and the things they do in their gardens. Participants in the diary study were sent a £25 gardening voucher, along with the paper-based diary, which they could keep even if they chose to opt out at any point. After four weeks, respondents sent the diaries back (postage paid), diaries were photocopied, and subsequently sent back to their authors, if requested. This procedure was established based on comments respondents made in the initialization phase, saying they desired to keep their diaries as a token of personal memory. All respondent names have been made anonymous and a pseudonym has been given to each respondent. The community’s name is not mentioned in the paper; is merely called ‘[the community]’.

Survey

As for the survey study, respondents were also recruited on a voluntary opt-in basis via the community’s home page, similar to the procedure concerning diaries. In the survey, participants could chose not to answer questions revealing personal or potentially sensitive information, such as age, while other questions regarding purely the experience of participation required answers in order to proceed with the next set of questions. The results were used on an aggregated statistical level and no personal-level information was used in the quantitative analysis. Participants could voluntarily choose to participate in a drawing to win one of the gardening vouchers and for that, they had to provide an email address to allow for communication in case they won.

Interviews

For the interviews conducted with twenty guitar players and one manager, I obtained informed consent. Interview respondents were informed about the nature of the research subject, purpose, and procedure and the use of the material for academic purposes, including conference presentations, research articles, and dissertation writing; they were given the option to opt out during any stage of the research process. I offered all interviewees anonymity and a pseudonym, but the majority (16 out of 20) of guitar players declined this offer, saying it was not necessary. Three guitar players did not have an opinion on this topic, and only one asked for anonymity in the beginning of the interview. But when I asked the respondent to pick a pseudonym, this person declined anonymity. This indicates that the nature of the research topic is not a sensitive one, and is unlikely to harm respondents if identities are revealed. Since no one requested or insisted on being cited with their real name, I chose to provide pseudonyms for all respondents. As for the manager, no name pseudonym was used—this respondent is only referred to as ‘manager’, which emphasizes the interest not in the human subject, but as a carrier of practice. Later, when
writing the article, I contacted the manager and sent the particular excerpt of the transcribed interview that I would like to use in the article and asked for permission to quote this specific part. Although the manager had agreed earlier to allow his interview to be published, I felt that the nature of the excerpt justified a double check with the manager, who granted permission to use that specific excerpt.

**Participant observation**

In participant observation in band rehearsals, studios, sound checks, and concerts, I introduced myself as a researcher crafting a dissertation on the topic of guitar playing, gear, and sound to the people that were present. I usually met up with a guitar player, or established contact beforehand via mail or phone explaining the research nature and procedure, so that these contacts informed their band members and other people present about my role as a researcher, or introduced me to the others present. During concerts, in the observation of a guitar fair, and during the observation in musical instrument stores, it was more difficult to reveal my role as a researcher. However, whenever I chatted with respondents and told them I was writing a dissertation on guitar playing, the topic served well to get into a conversations and evoke interest. I had the feeling that most respondents were quite intrigued by the idea of explaining their perspectives, understandings, and procedures of guitar playing; explicating their thoughts and reasoning about the ‘perfect’ sound; and elaborating on their own guitar gear. In short, most respondents seemed happy to talk to me, also for an extended time period. Several guitar stores did not allow taking photographs or recording, but were happy allow me to talk to their customers, as long as it did not interfere with potential purchases.

**Documents**

The study of documents involved collecting publicly available information in publication outlets including newspaper articles from a Swedish newspaper database offered by the university library; press releases available through the Hagstrom websites; and images, advertisements and retailer websites available on the Internet. No sensitive information was collected or used in terms of financial, accounting, and marketing/sales data. As for the magazine review articles excerpted in paper 2, I contacted the editors-in-chief of the respective magazines to ask permission for quoting excerpts from the articles in question. I formulated an email explaining that I was writing a dissertation article for publication, the research topic, and the specific excerpt as well as the way it would be cited in the article and in the reference list. The editors-in-chief granted permission to use these excerpts.
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**Netnography**

Ethical considerations in netnographic work are considered to be rather complex (Kozinets 2002b; 2010; Markham and Buchanan 2012). Even though recommendations are constantly in the making, for example by the Ethics Working Committee of the Association of Internet Researchers (AoIR), there is no universal set of official rules for Internet research ethics (Markham and Buchanan 2012). Rather, a case-based approach considering the particularities of the nature of the research and the collection and use of internet-based material is recommended (Markham and Buchanan 2012). Kozinets (2002b; 2010) identifies four key considerations regarding the ethics of netnography: 1) the question of whether online communities should be considered public or private places; 2) informed consent; 3) avoiding potential harm to participants; and 4) the representation of empirical material.

However, these four considerations are related. According to Eysenbach and Till (2001), the question of whether informed consent is needed or not is determined by the nature of the Internet community as public or private. They state that collecting communication that is considered private necessitates obtaining informed consent, whereas the collection of communication that is considered public does not (Eysenbach and Till 2001). So how can it be determined whether communication can be considered private or public?

Eysenbach and Till (2001) suggest considering three characteristics of the researched online community: 1) The communications within an online community can be considered as private if there is some form of log-in, registration, or subscription needed in order to gain access to the communications. If the community is such a closed group, members are likely to consider their community as a private space. 2) The quantity of actual or projected members, users, or lurkers in a community indicates how private a community can be considered. The more members, users, or lurkers there are or can be assumed to be present, the more public the community can be considered. In other words, someone who comments on a video that has already had 15 million views and 3,000 comments must assume that their comment is likely to be seen by others. 3) Local community codes and norms, which are often described in site documents, can give clues about whether or not the community is intended as a private or public space.

According to Eysenbach and Till (2001), informed consent is not necessary if the research incorporates non-intrusive and merely passive analysis (observation and download) of postings and communication, given that the material is made anonymous in the research process.

This thesis mobilizes netnography for several purposes in papers 1, 2, and 4, but uses a non-participant unobtrusive and purely observational approach: in paper 1 for becoming familiar with the online community, its cultural codes and values—to get an idea of how the community works and what is generally going on; to look at what gardening community members write and publish (productive moments); in paper 2, reading statements and conversations in
forums revolving around guitars, brands, and Hagström/Hagstrom in particular; and in paper 4 analysing representations of gardening practice. No community used in this collection of empirical material required a log-in, registration, or any other form of subscription in order to view this material and no community stated in their terms of service that the communities’ contents are not to be seen by the world. Further, following Kozinets’ (2002b) advice, only those communities with a large number of members were considered, as these are likely to be more interesting due to a corresponding higher number of conversations and topics—there is more going on. Therefore, members of these communities are likely to assume that they do not operate in private spheres. The names of the communities are not mentioned and pseudonyms for members were used as early as possible in the analysis and in subsequent representation of empirical material in an effort to prevent community members from potential harm.

Whereas the material collected in papers 1 and 4 take an interest in the content of communication, the material collected for paper 2 takes an interest more in the form of communication, i.e., discourses as rhetorical patterns and strategies. According to Ess and the AoIR ethics working committee report (2002, 8), “in either case (i.e., whether it is the form or content that is most important for the researcher), if the content is relatively trivial, doesn’t address sensitive topics, etc., then clearly the risk to the subject is low.” Because the contents of the material used in this thesis—gardening, communication about gardening, guitar playing and communication about guitar brands—can be considered to be relatively trivial and not sensitive (e.g., Langer and Beckman 2005), this should reduce potential harm to community members of this research. I have been in contact with some community members, for example to follow up on questions and answers, and I was met with great support. Similarly, the owners of the studied gardening community provided me with generous support and permissions.

3.3 Analysis and Interpretation of Empirical Material

According to Spiggle (1994), the terms analysis and interpretation are often used interchangeably, but are essentially two distinct processes in the procedure of qualitative research. To her, analysis is concerned with breaking down and dividing the whole of the material by dissecting, reducing, sorting, and reconstructing the data. Interpretation, on the other hand, describes the activity of making sense of the data in terms of what it means. Analysis and interpretation then work together to “generate conclusions, insights, meanings, patterns, themes, connections, conceptual frameworks, and theories (...)” (Spiggle 1994, 492). Similarly, authors of ethnographies report how analysis and
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Interpretation begin in the field, but they represent an on-going post-hoc process (e.g., Kozinets 2002).

I used NVIVO9 software for some technical assistance in the process of data analysis, because of its ability to store large sets of empirical material and to allow for subsequent sorting and coding, or as Weitzman (2000) states, linking: that is the process of forming categories or clusters.

Alvesson and Sköldberg (2000) argue that data is something that is already an interpretation of reality and thus a form of primary interpretation. Following this line of thought, then, empirical material is a form of secondary interpretation and its subsequent interpretation by the researcher is a tertiary interpretation.

Thus, this tertiary interpretation began with the organization of the material. My overall approach toward this (tertiary) interpretation was inspired by qualitative content analysis (Goulding 2005) and Glaser and Strauss’ (1967) depiction of the analysis as being coding: extracting from the material, grouping codes into concepts, and then forming categories to allow theorization through interpretation. The goal was to find emerging themes or patterns, but this was different for every single paper, because of their different purposes and materials. Because all papers are based on a variety of different empirical material, I triangulated between the materials. It has been argued that triangulation is conducive to deeper understanding of one issue or different aspects of an issue (Dingwall 1997), because triangulation offers the opportunity to situate complementary or contrasting aspects with one another.

The triangulation process facilitates reflection, which “occurs when one mode of thought is confronted by another “(Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000, 247). Particularly with vast empirical material, this reflection process then was aided by inter-researcher comparisons with co-authors and colleagues, but also by a great extent by presenting initial findings at conferences and workshops.

I also contacted key participants of my studies and provided them with initial interpretations of the material (Arnould and Wallendorf 1994), which led to interesting discussions and adjustments.

Before I engaged in the collection of empirical material, having a broad idea of the topic, I wrote down and explicated assumptions of what I expected to find or what the findings may be like. This helped me avoid selective use of material based on what I expected to find, but rather to play the game of analysis with open cards—explicating the assumptions served as a kind of warning beacon. Suspicions in research are helpful; if they were not, how would we ever begin researching a phenomenon? But explicating my suspicions helped me to delve into the empirical material during the analysis, but at the same time create a critical distance allowing for ‘intra-researcher’ checks. Interestingly, my initial suspicions revolved around the complete collapse and implosion of consumption and production as analytical categories, which is somewhat different from this current conceptualization of them being helpful analytical categories.
As for analysis and interpretation of quantitative material, the quantitative analysis builds on principle component analysis and partial least square modelling and is detailed in paper 1.
4. Findings and Discussion

The purpose of this thesis is to unfold consumption as practice moments, which implies elucidating links to productive aspects. In what follows, I present an analysis of my findings and offer a discussion of the individual papers taken together. As a whole, the individual findings of the four papers allow unfolding consumption as practice moments and specifying links to productive aspects. Figure 7 offers an overview.

While previous literature has developed an understanding of the entanglement of consumption with production that can be discerned as Marxian dialectic logic, blending logic, co-creation logic, consumer culture theoretical logic, and collapse logic, the following analysis of the four appended papers can be seen as advancing a practice-logic of this entanglement. To recapitulate, the four papers comprising this thesis can be summarized as follows.

Figure 7: Overview of findings

Paper 1 foregrounds two specific consumptive moments taking place in interpersonal community practice performances of an online gardening community. It offers a synthesizing perspective on interpersonal practice performance as fabricated of direct consumptive moments, vicarious consumptive moments, and productive moments. It demonstrates how
vicarious and consumptive moments of community practices create different forms of value and it specifies links of consumptive moments to productive moments in the studied online community.

Paper 2 explores and illustrates the way in which a retro brand is being authenticated through collective re-enchantment. It specifies the discursive processes that construct specific brand meanings (authenticity) and a particular mode of manufacturing (craft production). Thus it shows how a brand is produced in and through discursive practice and pays attention to the consumptive resources in this process, for example, how and what resources are used. Thus, it offers theorization of how authenticity operates vis-à-vis enchantment and contributes five enchanting craft discourses of vocation, dedication, tradition, mystification, and association that are relevant in the discursive practice of re-authentication and which transform ‘ordinary’ production into ‘craft’ production.

Paper 3 investigates how consumption constellations are formed and shaped in electric guitar playing. It explores and illustrates the ways in which these consumptive arrangements matter and operate in this practice by revealing the teleoffective properties of consumption constellation formation. It offers theorization of an inductive and deductive route in the formation of consumption constellations.

Paper 4 explores how consumptive and productive moments are organized by a practice-level structure of ‘facilitation’ within electric guitar playing and gardening. It shows how facilitation organizes consumptive moments in relation to productive moments and highlights one specific notion of productive moments that foregrounds the role of objects as carriers of productive moments. The findings show how consumptive moments take place in orientation to assisting objects in being carriers of productive moments in practices.

Considering all four papers together allows theorizing consumption in relation to practices and elucidating entangled productive aspects. In what follows, I offer a development of different conceptualizations of consumption as practice moments. On this basis, I present considerations on unfolding the entanglement of consumptive moments with productive aspects. This concerns specifically considerations for the theorization of productive consumption through performative consumptive moments as well as through the relation of consumptive moments with productive moments. Then, I offer a discussion of implications and contributions as well as emerging future research opportunities.
4. Findings and Discussion

4.1 Unfolding Consumption as Practice Moments

In what ways can consumption be conceptualized as moments in and of practices? I offer development of Warde’s (2005) conceptualization of consumption as practice moments by unfolding consumption alongside teleoaffective and procedural performativity of and within practices. While Warde (2005) has introduced the notion of consumption as practice moments, further unfolding such consumptive moments with regard to teleoaffective and procedural performativity allows specifying the way in which consumption relates to both practices and productive aspects. In this section, I explain how and why consumption unfolds as moments with regard to performativity. Then, I elaborate and illustrate the conceptualization of consumptive moments.

4.1.1 Consumption and performativity: Deriving conceptualizations of consumption as practice moments

To elucidate how consumption unfolds as a moment in and of practices, this thesis attends to the entanglement of consumption and production through performativity. The mobilization of performativity is useful, because it allows capturing and detailing the ways in which consumptive moments are loaded with productive aspects. Specifically, four conceptualizations of consumption as a moment emerge alongside performativity as a function in and of practice and the origin of performativity in terms of procedures and teleoaffective structures, as illustrated in figure 8. In this way, moments of consumption can be understood as ingredient, momentum, transformation, and consequence.
The first dimension considers the performativity of consumption in relation to practices in terms of a function in practice but also as a function of practice. As a function in practice, consumptive moments are a protagonist in the performance of a practice. That is, consumption is functional in serving the performance of practice. As a function of practice, consumptive moments can be described as an outcome of the performances of practices.

The second dimension emerges by anchoring the performativity in teleoaffective or procedural proportions. Teleoaffective performativity refers to those performative qualities of practice moments that are related to the teleoaffective structure of a practice. In this light, the performativity of consumptive practice moments is an acceptable, meaningful, and desirable means to an end that is inscribed in the teleoaffective structure of a practice. In other words, the performativity of practice moments is intertwined with the teleoaffective structure of the practice. For example, as shown in paper 1, online gardening community members engage in vicarious and direct consumptive moments with the understanding that these might ultimately result in inspiration and new ideas, more skills and understanding of the gardening practice, and ultimately becoming a better gardener. This is reflected in the use value of community membership. Community members also turn to the community for social recognition, which they experience through consumptive moments of interpersonal community practices. As shown in paper 1, the indication that community members actively aim to construct desirable direct moments of consumption supports the argument that these consumptive moments are entangled with the teleoaffective structure of community practices. As shown in paper 3, the performative quality of the consumption of certain objects is prescribed in the teleoaffective structure of...
electric guitar playing. Guitar players employ certain consumption constellations as means to the end of achieving a 'good' (desirable, acceptable) practice performance. It is 'acceptable' to be influenced by the types of objects used and to employ them as actors in the overall performance. Thus, the performativity of such consumptive moments—appreciating and using objects for the (enabling) influence they exert—is engrained in the teleaffective structure. This is particularly evident in the position I characterize as 'sound comes from the gear' and the enabling agentive qualities of the consumption constellation as specified in paper 3. In paper 4, the moments of consumption relating to facilitation come with the teleaffective understanding of helping improve practice objects in their capacities as carriers of productive moments.

On the other hand, performativity is also engrained in procedures; consumptive practice moments are nested within practice performances as procedural elements of the overall organization of practices as doings—objects—meanings (Magaudda 2011). In other words, their performatives originate from being procedural parts of the organization of practices. This is particularly evident in the discursive processes analysed in paper 3. As Foucault (1972) and Butler (1993) point out, discursive practices have symbolic consequences for the objects involved as they portray the objects or subjects involved in specific ways. In this sense, they are by definition performatives. In other words, it is the organizing template of the discursive practice that shapes and forms the consumption within it, but also determines the 'effects' on other objects involved.

This slightly modified understanding of performativity put forward here thus regards practices as not only being performative, but also the enjoined moments of consumption within practices. Moments of consumption are capable of making a difference, exerting influence, and acting onto other entities. Such entities include carriers of practice (e.g., community members in paper 1), meanings (e.g., authenticity of the Hagstrom brand in paper 2), doings (e.g., guitar playing in paper 3), and objects (sound and garden in paper 4).

Schatzki (1996) asserts that practices have effects on their carriers; their performances act on the actions, thoughts, and sense of self of their carriers and create teleaffective experiences. Consumptive moments taking place within practices appear as mediators enjoined with this performativity not only for practice carriers, but also for doings, meanings, and objects.

Combining these two dimensions maps four conceptualizations of consumption as practice moments as ingredient, momentum, transformation, and consequence. These conceptualizations derive from taking on different perspectives or viewpoints on consumptive moments. Each conceptualization foregrounds certain qualities of consumptive moments useful for describing the operation of consumption in relation to practices and productive aspects. Thus, it is important to note that these consumptive moments are not mutually exclusive, but represent a change of perspective. Certain aspects of consumption as ingredient, momentum, transformation, and consequence may
be specifically foregrounded in certain practices, variations of performances, or different practical understandings of the same practice. Specifically, papers 3 and 4 highlight that within electric guitar playing, different practical understandings exist with regard to the creation of sound. On the one hand, the strand ‘sound comes from the fingers’ places less importance on gear as acceptable means to the creation of sound than attention it pays to bodily skills. On the other hand, the camp of ‘sound comes from the gear’ particularly appreciates the material arrangements within guitar playing as acceptable and desirable means to that end. Thus, in the purist practical understanding, the consumptive moments enjoined with electric guitar playing are more procedural ingredients, while in the gear-head practical understanding, the consumptive moments enjoined with electric guitar playing resonate more with momentum.

In the following, I elaborate on this conceptualization of consumption as moments in practices based on the findings of all four papers. I explicitly engage here also with productive aspects from which these consumptive moments cannot be isolated—or better, they have to be understood in relation to productive aspects. Like Daniel Miller’s (1987) idea that objects and subjects are defined through their relation, similarly, consumptive moments cannot be separated from the productive aspects entangled with them. But, as I will show below, these different conceptualizations present an opportunity to engage with such linkages in various ways.

4.1.2 Consumption as ingredient

I begin with the conceptualization of consumption as an ingredient in practices. This ties to prior research demonstrating the consumption of objects as taking place within practices (Arsel and Bean 2013; Epp and Price 2010; Shove and Pantzar 2005; Truninger 2011; Watson and Shove 2008). Consumptive moments can be understood ingredients, or parts, in the performances of practices. They take place in the performances of practice. In this understanding, a consumptive practice moment is a part of the procedure of practices and as such has a function within practice performances. Connecting back to Schatzki’s (2005) statement that a practice is composed of its actions within them, similarly, consumptive moments can be seen as ingredients of the composition of a practice.

Paper 1 frames the performance of community practices as the synthesis of productive and consumptive moments. This means that both consumptive and productive moments in interpersonal practices help compose the performance of practice. Such consumptive and productive moments are depicted in paper 1 as episodes of conduct, and as such are procedural ingredients of practice. For example, when a community member writes a message, it is a productive moment of community practice, one that is necessary to enrol the performance of, for example, empathizing. But this initiation of an episode of conduct requires another procedural element, that of consumptive moments—for
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example when a member browses the archives, or reads a personalized note; these are vicarious and direct consumptive moments essential to community practices. Participation in such online community practices would not be possible without writing or reading. Thus, writing, which is more of a producerly action, and reading, which is more of a consumerly action, take place in the performances of community practices—as Schatzki (2005) illustrates with his example of educational practices. Thus, engagement with an online community is structured by participation in community practices (Schau et al. 2009), but participation in community practices is composed of consumptive and productive moments. Paper 1 foregrounds how specifically the consumptive moments enjoined in community practice performances are crucial, value-creating ingredients of practices, even if it is a simple ‘thank you’ note that matters to carriers of community practices.

In the discursive practice studied in paper 2, consumption can also be understood as a procedural ingredient. The paper reveals how the rhetorical strategies of re-enchanting craft discourses use other brands (such as Volvo and Saab, but also competitors such as Epiphone), countries (such as Sweden, with a focus on the specific handicraft cultures of the Swedish region in which the traditional Hagström brand was located), artists (such as celebrity guitarists and bands but also celebrity models such as Christina Lindberg), professions (such as the luthier in general and Jimmy D’Aquisto in particular), and elements of popular culture (such as the classic rock anthem ‘Immigrant Song’ by Led Zeppelin) as consumptive moments in the discursive practice. That is, this form of consumption is an ingredient that takes place in the performance of the discursive practice.

Discursive practices are not only inherently productive in the sense of producing or transforming the ‘reality’ of some object or subject (see transformation). But within the performances of discursive practices, text is produced. This text may be speech, but also as the case in paper 2, blog posts, community forum entries, promotional text, retailer descriptions, reviews, or statements in and responses to videos. Without such productive moments, there would not be discursive practice. These productive moments are entangled with the consumptive moments depicted above that are conducive to the performance of discursive practice. This means that consumptive as well as productive moments are inherent parts of the discursive practice that helps compose it. In the context of the production and consumption of medieval events, Taalas (2006, 298) refers to the production process not only being about “the production of the organizational end product, good or service; it is also referring to employing cultural practices in making a cultural event”. In this light, practices are employed for the making of events. In paper 2, this is illustrated in a similar but different way. Here, in discursive practices, ‘craftsmen’ and ‘luthier’ practices are employed as purely symbolic resources in the discursive production or making of the Hagstrom brand.
In paper 3, the consumption of gear is an ingredient of guitar playing. Even those guitarists who subscribe to the purist camp consume a minimum amount of gear in order to perform the practice, but they also consume the idea of not consuming too much gear. This form of anti-consumption or the rejection of consumption connects back to Baudrillard’s (1998/1970) statement quoted in the beginning of this thesis, that such rejection of consumption is very much about consumption at heart. Specifically here, consumptive moments can be understood as a necessary ingredient of practice performances for both the ‘purist’ and ‘gear-head’ camp. Thus, these aspects are in line with prior conceptualizations of consumption as embedded in practices—as taking place within practice performances (e.g., Shove and Pantzar 2005; Warde 2005).

Consumptive moments are ingredients of practice performance. As such, their performativity is more procedural and a function in practice. Therefore, consumptive moments are functional within practice, as ingredients in the procedures that practice performances entail.

### 4.1.3 Consumption as momentum

The above conceptualization of consumption as an ingredient in practices resonates with previous conceptions of consumption in relation to practices. In addition, my findings suggest that consumption can be understood also as a moment in terms of providing momentum. As Warde (2005) points out, consumptive moments take place for the sake of practice performances. However, with this notion Warde (2005) refers more to the procedural necessity of using some consumption object in the course of practice performance. The following considerations, however, foreground the way in which this consumption matters for the sake of practice performances, exceeding the notion of consumption as merely a procedural ingredient.

Consumptive moments fulfil important functions in the practice performance and exert influence in so far as they propel, give impetus to the performance of practice; they provide momentum. Their performativity derives from the teleaffective structures of practices, which direct and guide consumptive moments in order to provide momentum to the performance of practices.

In this light, consumptive practice moments may be understood as non-human actants capable of acting within and for practices; things that have the power to make other things act and react in certain ways for the sake of practice performance. As Miller points out in Borgerson (2009), privileging the agency of objects over the agency of individuals, which resonates with locating agency in isolation on the object level, is less meaningful than speaking of the processes and relationships between individuals and objects. Here, consumptive moments take place as a relation between objects and individuals as carriers of practice, and are embedded within the context of practices; these consumptive moments provide something to the practice performance.
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The momentum that consumption can give to the performance of practice is particularly illustrated in paper 3. Here, guitarists form specific consumption constellations with the shared understanding that the consumption of specific material arrangements matters when it comes to the creation of sound, creativity, playing, and the construction and communication of desirable artistic images and ideas. Thus, the consumption of objects is performative in the practice of electric guitar playing, because it has the power to both enable and constrain playing, creativity, and communication. Consumption is not only an ingredient of the practice, but a decisive protagonist in the practice that is capable of shaping, and moulding guitar playing. In this way, consumptive moments as momentum resonate broadly, but differently, with Latour's (2005) mediators. Latour mainly writes about the social processes that shape and form practices in terms of practice templates. I borrow his idea of mediation, not to refer to social processes and actants that shape and produce social order, but with regard to the performances of practices. Thus, this foregrounds the more empirical and local aspects of practices—that is, their performances. Here, the formation of consumption constellations is an acceptable—yet negotiable and not undisputed—means to the end of playing electric guitar. The findings in paper 3 allow for understanding consumption constellations as mediators between consumptive moments and productive aspects of guitar playing, because of their power to give momentum to the producerly aspects of guitar playing (crafting sounds, recording, playing concerts, songwriting, and so forth). This understanding is nested within the teleaffective structure of electric guitar playing and the formation of consumption constellation in the pursuit of this practice. The consumption here holds not only functional qualities (Boyd and Levy 1963; Levy 1978) enabling and constraining the crafting of certain sounds, but it also holds symbolic qualities in this practice in terms of communicative ends.

Paper 4 foregrounds how consumptive moments are directed toward assisting objects as carriers of productive moments through a structure of facilitation. Thus, these consumptive moments have the function in practice to aid productive moments. For example, guitar players turn to the marketplace and consume the experience and judgement of luthiers, who assist not only in improving playability of instruments, but also in shaping ingredients of the total material arrangements in which the instruments are embedded. This was demonstrated specifically when one respondent exchanged his amplifier for an amplifier recommended by a luthier. The practical understanding of consumptive moments revolving around skill, judgement, and commitment is hosted by the teleaffective structures of both electric guitar playing and gardening, as described in paper 4. These consumptive moments include the appreciation of objects for the purposes of providing momentum to the performance of practice. In the teleaffective structures of guitar playing and gardening, consumption is anchored not merely as an ingredient—rather, consumption emerges specifically as an appropriate means to provide
momentum to the performance of practice in terms of delivering desired results, resonating with Sennett’s (2008) understanding of craftsmanship as the desire to do well for its own sake. Here, paper 4 notes how consumptive moments have re-vitalizing and fuelling effects for deepening the teleoaffective engagement to assist objects in their role as carriers of productive moments—striving for improved overall practice performance and outcome. In this way, consumptive moments provide momentum.

4.1.4 Consumption as transformation

Curtin and Gaither (2005) note that consumption is a process characterized by transformation. Typically, it is in production processes, where raw materials are transformed into what can be called the product as the end result. Consumption, however, also transforms. For example, Belk’s (2003) study elucidates how the consumption of supposedly ordinary objects such as shoes has the power to transform the identities of their consumers. Metaphorically speaking, this means in consumptive as well as productive moments mass and energy are preserved but transformed.

My findings support the assertion of understanding consumption as practice moment in terms of such transformation. That is, its performativity or ability to exert influence is nested in the teleoaffective structure similar to the conceptualization of momentum. But unlike the momentum, transformation can be seen as a function of practice.

Paper 1 demonstrates how it is through consumptive moments of community practices that a consumption object is transformed into an experience. This is consistent with prior literature on the experiential aspects of consumption, which informs us that through their consumption, objects transform into experiences (e.g., Holbrook and Hirschman 1982; Carù and Cova 2007). In paper 1, the consumption object is represented by a productive moment, such as a blog post or welcoming note. Productive moments represent value offerings that are transformed through consumptive moments into value-laden experiences. Thus, the values created in and through engagement with community practices are transformations of consumptive moments into experience. This experience is a result, or function, of practice and part of the teleoaffective understanding of participation in the community. Consider, for example, the use value that transpires from community participation and the related effects on learning and gardening competence that respondents mention (“You learn so much from other people’s comments”; “I learned from [conversations in the community] about growing cucumbers—so now I know to remove the male flowers or I will get bitter cucumbers”). It is through experiencing consumptive moments that the use value, social recognition value, community vitality, and community attachment are formed and shaped. And those values have transformational characteristics. As shown in paper 1, engagement in direct consumptive moments of
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badging/milestoning and social empathizing fosters positive emotions of pride, affection, positive self-esteem, and delight. Community members actively seek such desirable direct consumptive moments with an understanding that they provide such gratification.

That is, community members as carriers of community practices are aware of the value-creating effects of such consumptive moments. This is explicitly foregrounded in instances where members reflect on the benefits of productive moments for other members. The statement made by one member “I tend to add something, as it must be tough not to receive anything at all” indicates how members are aware that productive moments potentially create value on the consumer side of the performance. Because these direct consumptive moments ultimately have the ability to transform members’ level of attachment to the community, paper 1 illustrates the transformative qualities of consumptive moments.

Paper 2 demonstrates how enchanting craft discourses operate with regard to the use of signs and symbols as consumptive moments in the discursive practice and how these elements are appreciated as objects and used for the transformation of the Hagstrom brand. Essentially, this paper presents a case of the co-production of brand meaning to which a variety of market players contribute—in the intertextual making of the Hagstrom brand, more precisely its authenticity brand meanings. This production of brand meaning is about transformation in two ways: First, it is about the transformation of (old) Hagstrom into (new) Hagstrom. And second, it shows the transformation of Hagstrom from a disenchanted and rationalized mass producer to an enchanted craft producer. But crucially, the paper shows how this transformation takes place via consumption. These kinds of consumption, which take place within discursive practices, have been underemphasized in prior literature. The signs and symbols employed in the discursive making of Hagstrom are not only ingredients of discourse, but are used to produce re-enchantment, and this re-enchantment contributes to transforming brand meaning through re-authentication. Thus, this paper makes the case of authenticity as a social production that is achieved through practices, and pays attention to the transforming nature of consumptive moments of this practice. A discourse is performative, because it contributes to the constitution of the ‘reality’ of an object or subject that it describes. It is through discourses that meanings are re-worked and objects and subjects are created and transformed, but the use of consumptive material in this process is conducive to this transformation. However, the performativity of these consumptive moments is a function of the discursive practice. Paper 2 demonstrates this transformation of inauthentic to authentic, of mass production to craft production, that is carried out by many carriers of the discursive practice—including retailers, brand owners, consumers, and other important stakeholders. The point here is that it is the discursive practice that transforms the brand meaning of Hagstrom brand, but that consumptive moments brings transformative cards to the table.
In paper 4, consumptive moments as transformation are also evident, but in a slightly different understanding. It demonstrates the transformation that is intertwined with consumptive moments—for example, the transformative qualities of consumptive moments are evident in the case of experiencing the commitment of fellow gardeners which can have transformative effects on practical understanding and teleoaffectional engagements. Here, one gardening community member states how reading another member’s blog post and experiencing the commitment and devotion another member puts into gardening has changed his “whole gardening ethos”. This indicates how particular consumptive moments have the ability to transform not only intra-practice teleoaffectional engagements (“so inspiring to read this level of commitment”) but also as a function of practice, “changed the way I think about living here”.

4.1.5 Consumption as consequence

Consumptive moments can also be understood as taking place because of practices. This conceptualization is implicitly evident in Watson and Shove’s (2008) reading of Warde’s (2005) idea of consumption as practice moments and taking place for the sake of practices. In this reading, consumption is a consequence of practice. Here, consumptive practice moments are characterized by procedural performativity that is a function of practice. Thus, consumptive moments can be conceived of as a result of practice. For example, the consumption of guitar strings and notes can be seen as the consequence of engaging in guitar playing; the vicarious consumption entangled with membership in an online gardening community can be viewed as a function of gardening; or the consumption of water and fertilizer serve as a function of gardening.

In this perspective, it is the procedures prescribed in the practice templates of a practice that are consequential for consumption—the practice governs consumption. The consumption of guitar gear, water, fertilizer, images and symbols, and skill, judgement, and commitment can be seen as functions of electric guitar playing, gardening, participation in an online community, and discursive practice, respectively. This resonates with the idea that, for example, to perform Nordic Walking, Nordic walking gear is necessary—an idea that is shaped by both consumers (more in the sense of carriers of practice) and producers (more in the sense of firms and marketers) as shown by Shove and Pantzar (2005).

Compared to the conceptualization of momentum and transformation, the consumptive moment-as-consequence constitutes a rather detached perspective, because it treats consumption as the outcome of practice, and the performative effects that consumptive moments have as a function of practice. This perspective resonates with literature on the Service Dominant Logic (SDL) in marketing (e.g., Vargo and Lusch 2004). The SDL proposes that
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consumers act as resource integrators of the resources provided by firms. In this view consumers create value because they integrate market offerings as resources in their own value-creation activities. However, the conceptualization of resource integration requires something into which the resources can be integrated. This would be the practice. This means that as a consequence of participation in practices, the carriers of practice act as resource integrators—that is as consumers. And through this, carriers of practice act as producers in the sense portrayed in SDL literatures.

4.2 Unfolding the Entanglement of Consumptive Moments with Productive Aspects

How can the conceptualization of consumption as moments in and of practices elucidate links to productive aspects? The above section has focused on consumption as practice moments and indicated that there are notable links of these moments to productive aspects. It offers an empirical and conceptual refinement of how consumption can be understood as operating as a moment in and of practice. This section discusses further this entanglement of consumptive moments with productive aspects in the following ways. First, I discuss a theorization of productive consumption through performative moments of consumption—that is, the ways in which consumption can be sculpted as a productive category: Consumption is productive consumption because consumption has productive aspects. Then I offer theorization of productive consumption through the entanglement of consumptive moments to productive moments. That is, consumption is linked to other aspects of practices that are productive. Finally, I present considerations that arise from different levels of analysis with regard to these discussions.

4.2.1 Theorizing productive consumption through performative consumptive moments

How is consumption entangled with productive aspects? CCT attends to the “productive aspects of consumption” and suggests that consumption produces culture (Arnould and Thompson 2005, 871). Theories of practice suggest, however, that practices produce culture. Thus, practices would be one way in which the operation of culture can be analysed and described. Now the question is how this entanglement of practice and consumption can be unfolded so as to illuminate the operation of consumption in consumer culture. This entanglement emerges as consumptive production, because it is in and through consumption that something is produced (various facets of culture).
Rather than putting consumptive production per Marx (1971) in the spotlight, the following considerations show how consumption is an important protagonist in practices and how it is in this sense it can be understood as being productive consumption.

The above section detailed the ways in which consumption can be specified as moments in and of practice. Specifically the conceptualizations of consumptive moments as momentum and transformation pinpoint productive consumption, as it is these moments of consumption that lurk into production. It is important to note that this refers to consumption and production on a practice level. What is production in one practice is not necessarily production in another practice. For example, guitar playing hosts production in the sense of making, creating, and making sounds and music and it is involved in creating imagery, symbols, and communicative ends. Online community practices, on the other hand, host production, for example, when members write messages, publish images of gardens, and answer questions. These can be considered productive moments and are treated in the section below (4.2.2).

This section, however, explicitly considers the productive aspects of consumptive moments—consumption within practices as a productive category. This means considering the things that are shaped, formed, and made in and through consumption.

To begin, consumptive moments of transformation and momentum are productive in the sense that they are making and unmaking ‘things’: They make and unmake practice performances (momentum; as function in practice) or objects (transformation; as function of practice).

**Momentum**

Consider the momentum-giving qualities of the gear deployed in electric guitar playing (paper 3). For example, respondents explain that “your playing absolutely sucks when you have a shit sound” and that “Good sounds make you want do something. That’s what it’s about. That’s why we play around with this… all this stuff”, with ‘stuff’ being the guitar rig or, in theoretical terms, the consumption constellation. The agentive qualities of the formation of the material arrangements depicted in paper 3 pinpoint the importance of consumptive moments in the practice of electric guitar playing and their abilities to ‘make or break’ a performance. However, consumptive moments are not to be seen in isolation—consumption of a guitar rig alone is not productive in practice-theoretical terms. But as a moment within practices, the use and appreciation of the rig gains relevance in terms of its abilities to provide momentum to the practice. The consumptive moment is performative in the practice of guitar playing and it is in this way that it participates in making the performance. This includes not only the ‘sound’ element, as the excerpted statements above allure to, but also the production of meaning. The teleoffective communicative end of the formation of consumption constellation suggests that a range of particular objects does not only influence
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‘doings’ in terms of bodily movements of fingers, or composing songs, but also on the level of meanings. Guitar players purposefully appropriate and appreciate consumption constellations, creating a meaning dimension to guitar playing performance. In paper 4, consumptive moments are depicted as related to making practice performances through making objects perform better in their roles as carriers of productive moments.

When consumption contributes to the performance of practices by giving momentum, then consumption helps to produce the practice performance, and with it the production object—that which is produced. This becomes particularly evident with the depiction of consumption constellations in electric guitar playing in paper 3. When consumption transforms the nature of an object involved in the performance of practice, it can be seen as shaping, developing, and producing this object. Particularly in paper 4 and paper 1, this transformative quality of consumption highlights the entanglement of production on a practice level.

This renders consumptive moments a productive category in the sense of accumulation. Paper 1 shows how it is the engagement with direct and vicarious consumptive moments that affects the sense of selves of community members (social recognition), the perception of the gardening community (vitality), and the relationship value to the community (attachment). Thus, consumptive moments are capable of producing various forms of outcomes through transformation. This cumulative understanding of consumption as productive means: By consuming ‘enough’ direct and vicarious consumptive moments, community members develop a sense of use value and social recognition, which leads to community attachment. Thus, the community—in the form of community vitality—and its members—in the form of community attachment and member identities, in terms of social recognition—are produced cumulatively through direct and vicarious moments.

Transformation

Turning to transformation, consider the symbolic production of Hagstrom, which takes place through the deployment of consumptive moments in this process (paper 2). As such, these consumptive moments can be considered as productive in the sense of making the Hagstrom brand, more specifically brand meanings relating to authenticity and the manufacturer as a craft producer (see transformation). But they can also crucially be seen as productive in the sense of unmaking the disenchantment and its effects that result from the brand’s rationalization process. Again, the consumptive moments are not productive in and of themselves, but they are deployed as discursive means in the production of meaning. Here, they are performative, but not in the sense of giving momentum to the performance of discourse. The teleoaffective roots of using symbols, images, and ideas in the discursive re-enchantment practices depicted in paper 2 are not on similar grounds as the deployment of consumption constellations in electric guitar playing. They do not serve primarily to enhance
the performance of discursive practice—but they serve essentially the transformation of the Hagstrom brand that takes place through the discursive practice. As a performative function of this discursive practice, the ‘reality’ of the Hagstrom brand is transformed through the deployment of consumptive resources in this process. The physical guitars are still produced in a factory by Hagstrom; but the semiotic production looked at in paper 2 is the productive consumption of authenticity and brand meaning. In the case of the Hagstrom brand, a variety of market participants—as carriers of discursive re-enchantment practice—desire the authentic brand, and collectively deploy the consumption of symbolic resources in this process to unmake the disenchantment and the disauthenticating effects. In other words, they desire Hagstrom to be an authentic brand and engage in the discursive negotiation processes of re-enchantment that eventually serve to re-authenticate the Hagstrom brand. Thus, popular culture and mass culture (Fiske 1989) are somewhat connected as carriers of the same discursive practice involving shared engagement in deploying transformational consumptive moments.

Consumptive moments are productive in a transformative manner also in the interpersonal community practice processes analysed in paper 1. Here, they are transformatively productive of various value types; they are transformative in terms of identity (social recognition value), competence (use value), community vitality, and community membership without accumulating on community level. Consumptive moments are, however, accumulatively productive of these issues on an individual level. The specific questions asked in the quantitative proportion of the study (study II) revolved around asking how much respondents subjectively experienced an incident to take place in the community. For example, typically the more a member experienced task empathizing, the more he or she discerned use value. Thus, on an individual level, consumptive moments are accumulatively transformational and are capable of shaping the form of matters of identity, competence, and ultimately, community attachment. On the community level, however, such consumptive moments do not accumulate and crystalize as productive moments do. Nevertheless, it is because consumptive moments are capable of producing identity, competence, and community membership, consumptive moments are creating and forming productive moments in turn.

Consumption is not productive in isolation, but within practices consumptive moments of momentum and transformation gain productive qualities. Within practices, consumption lurks particularly into production in the form of the consumptive moments here depicted as momentum and transformation. Where an outsider of practice may see an amplifier as a ‘trivial thing’, a carrier of electric guitar playing appreciates the consumption of this ‘thing’ in terms of its momentum-giving productive aspects in the practice of electric guitar playing. This is particularly shown in papers 3 and 4, which pinpoint the productive aspects of consumptive moments as key ingredients of practice performance.
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4.2.2  Theorizing productive consumption through consumptive moments in relation to productive moments

The above suggests that consumptive moments of transformation and momentum can be understood as inherently productive—but not in isolation. This thought shall be deepened here by considering how consumptive moments relate to productive moments. That is, while the preceding section looked at productive consumption in form of the productive aspects of consumptive moments, this section turns toward productive consumption as the entanglement of consumptive moments with productive aspects of practices: productive moments.

From the appended papers, practices transpire as a host not only of productive consumption, but also as a host of a dyadic relation between consumptive moments and productive moments. This does not dispute prior reasoning on the productive qualities of practices as argued by Bourdieu, Foucault, and Schatzki, who regard practices as building blocks of the social and its subjects and objects. But it specifies the ways practices can be considered to achieve this form of production. Specifically, papers 1 and 4 delve into the relation of consumptive moments with productive moments as they are organized through a system of generalized reciprocity (paper 1) and a practice-level structure of facilitation (paper 4) and show how consumptive moments are oriented toward productive moments, and vice versa, within practices. This specifies a dyadic relation between consumption and production as practice moments.

This thought embraces the different practice types that are under investigation in this thesis (interpersonal, object-focused, and discursive): They are organized by different constellations of productive and consumptive moments, between using and appreciating objects and creating objects. Here it is particularly the conceptualizations of consumption as momentum and transformation that add to previous indications of the productive qualities of consumption put forward in various streams of research including Marx, Prosumption, Co-creation, CCT, and postmodern Collapse logics.

Practice performances are comprised of consumptive and productive moments. In practices, consumption and production speak together as one voice, but each for itself as well.

As shown in paper 1, direct consumptive moments can fuel further productive moments. That is, after having been engaged with a particular direct consumptive moment, carriers of this consumptive moment are incited to engage in productive moments of the same practice, or other practices. For example, a member being welcomed welcomes other members, a member that receives congratulating and encouraging messages on her blog posts is inclined to continue writing and posting more blogs. Paper 1 explicitly approaches the makings of consumptive moments in exploring how and in what ways consumptive moments of practice are conducive to the making of value and the
making of new productive moments. But these consumptive moments and the performativity they can enact is dependent on productive moments. Here, productive moments are portrayed as the initiation of a practice performance. This is particularly evident in interpersonal practices, as they involve chains of actions and reactions (Schatzki 2005). In this context, the initiation of a practice performance involves some form of production object; that which is being made, created, or made accessible. In the context of online community practices, these are, for example, a question, a blog post, or an uploaded image of a garden, or a combination of these. Productive moments are productive in the sense of accumulation (see Lash and Urry 2002). That is, each archived productive moment is accessible for vicarious consumption by other members and lurkers, and everything visible in the community presents future opportunities for members to create value through experiential aspects of vicarious consumptive moments in the ways depicted in paper 1.

Specifically, paper 1 gives indication of a cyclical relationship between consumption and production as practice moments, supporting Firtat and Venkatesh’s (1995) argument, but without the necessity of collapsing consumption and production into one. It shows how productive moments occur for consumptive moments of community practice performances; that is, how members produce content in the community in order to experience desirable direct consumptive moments. Reconsider the example of members reporting on feelings when denied direct consumptive moments: when Cassia uploaded a picture and felt there was ‘disappointing’ response; and when Emma reflected on the interesting nature of her uploaded photos due to a paltry response from other members as part of a plan to improve the ‘attractiveness’ of her productive moments so they would render more responses. These instances show how productive moments of documenting are tied to (an expectation of) direct consumptive moments. That is, engagement in productive moments comes with the teleaffective understanding of triggering direct consumptive moments. If it were for the sake of producing content alone, members would not have disappointing responses if their productive moments did not render consumptive moments for them. Here, however, it emerges that at least for relatively recent members, direct consumptive moments are deeply nested with the teleaffective structure of community participation. This, however, may be different for more experienced members, where it could be speculated that productive moments and ‘being able to help’ gains importance.

Drawing from paper 3, consumption constellations can be portrayed as mediators between consumptive and productive moments of electric guitar playing. Essentially, the consumption constellation as a material arrangement is embedded in an interplay between consumption and production. On the one hand, guitar playing is about creating music; the bodily movements of fingers, hands, and arms, strumming the strings and playing chords are about the creation of sound and music, i.e., the set of activity is productive. On the other
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hand, the practice of electric guitar playing, specifically, is laid out so that a variety of objects is consumed in this process, including the rig but also ideas and images of anti-consumption. Guitarists need consumption constellations or gear to play electric guitar. Because a practice theoretical approach shifts emphasis away from the individual, both consumption and production can be conceived of as being built into the practice of electric guitar playing; they are moments that belong to the practice. Thus, my findings on the formation of consumption constellations through exploration of their teleoaffective properties invite productive consumption from a consumption constellation informed view. Although playing electric guitar, as a whole, may appear on the surface to be an act of prosumption, the formation of the material arrangements in and through the practice follows different routes when it comes to foregrounding more producerly and more consumerly practice moments. That is, the consumption constellation as a material arrangement with agentive qualities mediates a dyadic interplay between consumptive and productive moments in the guitar-playing performance. Thus, the findings presented in paper 3 allow a more fine-grained understanding of the consumption constellation as it is situated between consumption and production: it is neither about consumption generally, nor it is generally about production.

In paper 4, facilitation emerges as the interplay between consumptive and productive moments by carriers of practice. Here, this practice-level structure of facilitation organizes consumptive moments in relation to productive moments. Both consumption and production transpire as moments in practices that are linked and organized through one specific guiding principle that transcends procedures, practical understanding and teleoaffective structures of practices—facilitation. Whereas paper 1 makes similar points, the asynchronous nature of the chain of actions depicted in paper 1 carves out the relation of consumptive and productive moments as episodes of conduct. Paper 4, on the other hand, focuses more on the synchronicity of consumptive and productive moments, not in terms of temporal synchronicity, but in terms of teleoaffective synchronicity. That is, the link between consumptive and productive moments not in terms of a chain of events, but in terms of synchronizing the purposes of consumptive and productive moments as speaking together in practice performances.

The conceptualizations of practice moments presented above allow unpacking productive consumption as a dyadic relationship of specific consumptive moments with specific productive moments. What this suggests is that consumptive and productive moments are paired within practice performances, but that the weight and role they take is not necessarily equal. While in one practice performance, consumptive moments may be foregrounded, in another practice performance, productive moments may be more accentuated. This is because as moments of practice, both consumption and production are interwoven with the practice’s teleoaffective structure. This
means also that variations in the teleoaffective structure of a given practice may result in a different emphasis on consumptive or productive moments.

4.3 Implications and Contributions

In this section, I offer a further discussion of the implications and contributions of this thesis with regard to prosumption, the ontology of practices, the theorization of value creation, practice-oriented marketing, and future research opportunities.

4.3.1 Peering behind the mask of the prosumer

Utilizing a practice-based approach, this thesis offers a de-individualist perspective on the entanglement of consumption and production. The refinement of various moments of practices can be seen as a direct response to Warde's (1992) call for clarity in level of analysis in the investigation of consumption in relation to production. I have suggested above that the entanglement of consumption with production on a practice level can be unfolded in two related ways.

The first way is through explicating the productive aspects of consumptive moments. The concept of performativity is particularly helpful to analyse the ways in which consumptive moments make and unmake, shape and influence objects, doings, and meanings. In this view, consumptive moments are a productive category by being performative.

The second way is through explicating the co-constitutive relation of consumptive moments with productive moments. This view puts forward an inter-momentary operation of practice performances. That is, practice performances are comprised of the intersection of consumptive and productive moments.

In the following, I offer a discussion of how this relates to, but also departs from the conception of prosumption. My aim here is to clarify the difficulties but also the contributions of various levels of analysis. Thus, this section peers behind the masks of the producer, consumer, and most notably the prosumer by matter of levels of analysis. Here, I use mainly the insights developed in paper 1, because different levels of analysis are particularly foregrounded in the context of online community, its members, and practices.

On a practice level, community members clearly distinguish between those experiences related to being engaged in direct and/or vicarious consumptive moments and/or productive moments. However, paper 1 suggests also that the online community creates itself, its participants, and its objects through the link of productive and consumptive moments of practice performances. An online community takes place through the performances of online community
practices (Schau et al. 2009). Individuals perform these practices as carriers, but essentially it is the performance of practices that creates the community. Breaking down the performance of community practices into producerly and consumerly elements implies that individuals can be engaged as carriers not only of practices, but they appear as carriers of consumptive and/or productive moments within these performances.

Outside the practice as the unit of analysis, however, an individual engaged as a carrier of a direct consumptive moment (such as reading personalized advice) may be seen indeed as a ‘producer’ of online community. This is because the individual is contributing to the performance of the community practice as a consumer. Thus, this person could be seen as ‘producing’ online community through his or her consumption, which resembles broadly the notion of productive consumption. But it is important to note that this understanding stems from applying two different levels of analysis: on the practice level we see consumption, and on the community level we see production. Understanding every individual who logs on to the community as a ‘producer’ even though he or she may be simply lurking or observing (one may call them consumptive producers), does not, however, capture the difference from those ‘producers’ who write posts, give advice, help members, offer emotional support, and engage in governing. Should one call these individuals ‘productive producers’? How can this difference be captured? The suggestion advanced in paper 1 is that within the practice, this form of consumption (reading the personalized advice) is not production, but a specific consumptive moment within the performance of practice.

Thus, in the case of interpersonal practices, a practice performance is co-created between productive and consumptive moments and it is the practice performance that is conducive to the production of online community. Thus, all members who participate in the online community as carriers of distinct moments of community practices partake in the production of community. In other words, for interpersonal practices, a practice performance can be seen as a system of production and consumption, a meeting point between offerings (such as a welcoming note) and the experiential consumption of this note (understanding it as such and not as an ironic joke). Interpersonal practices are about interaction and exchange with other members.

Even though any member, whether creating content (producer) or merely lurking (consumer), may be conceived of as a ‘producer’ as discussed above, applying the notion of prosumer to describe community members here is not straightforward. As outlined above, prosumers are producers of that which they consume. Consider the following example: Individual A responds to individual B’s question and explains how and when to plant tomatoes. In this case, individual A’s advice is ‘produced’ for ‘consumption’ by individual B. Although there might be an autotelic dimension of enjoying writing advice for its own sake, interpersonal practices operate across moments of production and consumption, which are mostly carried by different individuals (A and B).
Within the unit of analysis of practices, individual A is not producing content (the detailed description of advice on planting tomatoes) most likely for his or her own consumption, but for direct consumption by individual B and with the awareness of possible vicarious consumption by lurkers C and D. Here, on a practice level, individual A is not the producer of that which he or she consumes. But there is still a link between production and consumption when focusing on individual A as the unit of analysis. As shown in paper I, the participation in the online community is guided by regimes of reciprocity. Individual members may not produce content which they consume, but they produce content for consumption by others with the understanding of generalized reciprocation. That is, they ‘work’ not for the community owners (Cova and Dalli 2009), nor for the mere pleasure of other members, but they engage in productive moments of community practices with the understanding that their favours will be returned. This may appear as work outside the site of practices, as a function of practice so to say. In other words, participation in interpersonal practices is guided by an understanding of ‘give and take’. Thus, on the level of a specific community practice, such as task empathizing, individual A may be a producer of that (advice) which he or she consumes—however not simultaneously, but mediated by generalized reciprocity. For example, individual A may later become a consumer of another piece of advice given by a different member. Interestingly, as illustrated in paper I, a different version of this logic is also apparent: Individuals become the producers of that which they have consumed previously. For example, paper I finds that individuals become carriers of productive moments of those practices they have been previously engaged with as carriers of consumptive moments. On a practice level, individuals become carriers of consumptive and productive moments of the same practice, but not necessarily of the very same practice performance—and not necessarily simultaneously.

With regard to a community-level analysis, however, community members may well be described as prosumers; as producing that (community) which they consume. Individuals participate in online community through engaging in community practices, involving both productive and consumptive moments. If both producing content and consuming content are conducive to the production of online community, then all individuals who engage in online community practices in one form or another simultaneously produce and consume the concept of online community; they emerge as community prosumers. But as maintained earlier, prosumption at its core implies paying attention to both consumption and production; that is, it essentially means using production and consumption as analytical categories. The analytical leverage gained by classifying community members as prosumers, without dwelling on the operation of production and consumption within such prosumption, is rather limited, however.

Thus, by de-emphasizing the individual as being consumer, producer, or prosumer, this dissertation offers an alternative resolution to the concept of
prosumption. While the thesis offers consumption with production as an analytical category, the findings in this thesis foreground that if anywhere, prosumption occurs on practice level (e.g., Woermann 2012). This means that the individual should not be regarded as the prosumer, but the practice would be where prosumption takes place. This is because both consumptive and productive moments are conducive to the performance of practices. This, in turn, foregrounds still a certain liminality of practices in the space between consumption and production.

The specific context of online community practices brings to the fore a central critique to the idea that production and consumption happen simultaneously in social media (Ritzer, Dean, and Jurgenson 2012; Chia 2012). Because the interaction in this (and most other) online community is asynchronous, production and consumption do not necessarily occur simultaneously, as argued for example by Firat and Venkatesh (1995), but are distinctive empirical incidents. Consumption and production are social processes that are centrally mediated by practice moments.

Thus, this dissertation contributes to existing research on the relation between consumption and production by presenting this alternative perspective. It complements Warde’s (2005) previous argument that consumption is a moment of most practices with the idea that production is also inherent in most practices as dramatized in Holt’s (1995) ‘producing practices’; Woermann’s (2012) study on the production of mediatized representations of free-skiing; Arsel and Bean’s (2013) research on how doings performed with objects produce a taste regime; Schau et al.’s (2009) grooming and customizing practices; and Watson and Shove’s (2008) study on DIY practices. Although these studies document the ways in which practices are inherently productive, they remain relatively silent on how the producerly qualities of practices relate to their consumerly qualities.

Therefore this thesis connects to previous literature on the relation between consumption and production (e.g., Warde 1992; Arnould 2007; Humphreys and Grayson 2008; Toffler 1980) by offering a conceptualization of inter-momentary operation of the production/consumption dialectic. Rather than conceiving of interaction in the space between firms and consumers (e.g., Grönroos 2011; Vargo and Lusch 2004), this thesis considers the interaction between consumptive moments and productive moments. Both consumption and production emerge as co-constitutive moments of practices. And both firms and consumers can perform practices. By considering this relationship, the thesis connects to previous literature discussing the relationship between consumption and production (e.g., Firat and Venkatesh 1995), stating that there can be no production without consumption. However, this thesis departs from the idea that consumption and production have to be one and the same, but demonstrates how both production and consumption are moments of practice performances. Treating the organization of practice as a constellation between consumptive and productive moments, as I suggest in this thesis, implies
appreciating the relationship between these moments, while at the same time preserving them as analytical categories.

This thesis therefore offers a granular account of how practices operate through consumption and its productive aspects. It has utilized practices as shells for the study of consumption and its productive aspects within them. As demonstrated above, the matter of levels is important in shaping the understanding of consumption and its entanglement with productive aspects.

4.3.2 Advancing practice theoretical ontology

This dissertation has not only utilized practice theory as a perspective through which to understand consumption and its entanglement with production, but I also offer development of practice theory in the following ways.

First, through meta-analysis of all four papers comprising this dissertation, I suggest a refinement of the conceptualization of consumption as practice moments by specifying consumption as ingredient, momentum, transformation, and consequence. Thus, the thesis complements and expands previous work that has dealt more generally with consumption as a moment (Warde 2005). My findings do not explicitly develop a temporal dimension of consumption as a moment; as in the idea that a moment is a point in time (see section 4.3.6). Rather, the notion of moment as unpacked in this thesis revolves around performativity.

Second, unfolding the operation of consumption inside practices reveals its productive aspects, which I bring forward in terms of performativity. However, specifically in papers 1 and 4 I found it necessary to expand upon the concept of productive moments to elucidate the operation of consumptive moments. Although previous practice-theoretical work has implicitly attended to productive moments (Holt 1995; Woermann 2012; Schau et al. 2009; Watson and Shove 2008), it left the relationship between consumption and production on practice level relatively untouched. Woermann (2012) is a valuable exception here.

Third, this thesis holds implications as to the theorization of practice performance by offering a synthesizing perspective on practice performance. It theorizes and illustrates how a practice performance transpires at the intersection of its entailed consumptive and productive moments. For example, paper 1 theorizes and illustrates how the performance of interpersonal practices is comprised of both consumptive and productive moments and that a practice performance can be seen as a synthesis of consumptive and productive elements. The performance of a given community practice—for example, task-empathizing—requires a producerly activity, such as writing a note or message in a forum giving advice, but it also requires a consumptive moment in order to be complete: the reception, experience, and understanding of this advice as being advice. Paper 3 joins this line of thought and indicates how consumptive moments and productive moments are mediated by the material arrangements
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in electric guitar playing. The teleaffective structures of guitar playing are inscribed in the formation of consumption constellations and the performance of electric guitar playing does not only involve skilful bodily movements of fingers and arms (and it may be added, appropriate discursive 'guitar-player movements') as well as mental musical patterns (notes, chords, song structures) but also the use and appreciation (alternatively, non-appreciation) of the agentive teleaffective properties of the consumption constellation, enabling and restraining electric guitar playing. As Miller (Miller 1987; Borgerson 2009) points out, objects are not agents because they enable or constrain. The attempt to tagline the teleaffective performativity of the consumption constellation in terms of agentive qualities strives to do justice to this thought. Rather, as paper 4 demonstrates, the guitar player (and gardener for that matter) exists at the intersection of consumptive and productive moments, both of which are crucial elements in the performance of practice.

Fourth, this thesis offers implications for the conceptualization of 'carriers' in practice theory in three ways. First, it demonstrates not only that individuals can be understood as being 'carriers of practice' (Reckwitz 2002), but it also specifies the ways in which individuals can be understood as being carriers of productive and consumptive moments. That is, it provides an analytical perspective to specify the ways individuals are engaged as carriers in practice performances. For example, paper 1 shows how members of an online community can participate in community practices purely as carriers of vicarious consumptive moments, browsing the community forums. Second, this thesis suggests that and specifies how objects—and not only individuals—can be conceived of as carriers of such moments (paper 4). Third, this thesis offers development of the conceptualization of practices as 'carriers of value' (Schau et al. 2009). The introduction of consumptive and productive moments to this notion of practices as carriers of value allows refining the understanding of the way in which practices are carriers of value (see section 4.3.4).

Fifth, this dissertation adds to the theorization of the performativity of and in practices by specifying two dimensions, procedural and teleaffective performativity, which relates to discussions of practices as 'carriers of value' (Schau et al. 2009) but in terms of performativity; and to discussions on practices as entities through which we develop an understanding of the world (Warde 2005). Not only are practices performative, but so are the moments enjoined within them.

Sixth, this thesis includes a first effort to measure practices and the value-laden experiences of engaging in them. Thus, it offers a point of departure from the epistemological tradition of practice theorists and allows us to learn about practices and their consequences on the practice level by offering a measurement instrument for the study of interpersonal online community practices in terms of subjective engagement with their practice moments. This is useful not only for future research, but also for managers in the area of
online community, because the measurement of practice moments allows for deriving value-laden practice topographies across different communities.

Seventh, this thesis indicates that and how practice-level structures organize and shape consumption in relation to production as moments in practices. Specifically, paper 4 presents an analysis of how a practice-level structure arranges consumptive and productive moments so as to facilitate practice performance and its desired outcomes.

4.3.3 The operation of consumption in consumer culture

The notion of consumer culture describes how consumption encompasses almost every aspect of daily life and indicates how many contemporary societies can be thought of as “culture(s) of consumption” (Slater 1997, 24). According to Holt (2002) and Arnould and Thompson (2005), such consumer cultures operate structured by consumption as a dominant practice. This implies the view that consumption can be conceived of as a practice, a point that is also advocated in Bourdieu’s writings (1990; 1984). With the introduction of the idea that consumption itself is not a practice in its own right, but rather that moments of consumption are enjoined within practices, Warde (2005) presents a conception of consumption that portrays consumption as something practices bring about. In this understanding, social life is not primarily organized by consumption, but by practices (Reckwitz 2002; Schatzki 1996; 2001a; 2002) of which consumption is a part.

This thesis develops this notion by researching how consumption unfolds as practice moments. By doing so, this thesis contributes to understanding how consumption encompasses the routinized activities of our daily life, or more precisely the practices. An understanding of the ways in which consumption permeates the activities we pursue—our hobbies, the interactions we have with others, and the ways we talk about brands—illuminates the operation of consumption in consumer culture. This is because in the practice theoretical perspective, consumer culture is constituted by practices. Such understanding situates consumption within practices as the entities through which consumer culture operates.

The findings presented in this thesis offer one attempt to contribute to the understanding of the operation of consumption in consumer culture by focusing on the relatively confined sites of practices. The topics of the individual papers join discussions of central concerns in consumer culture theory literatures. The discoveries presented in paper 1 add to literature on consumer collectives by specifying how consumer collectives operate through practices (paper 1). Paper 2 joins discussions in the literature that revolve around the role of enchantment in consumer culture by demonstrating the ways in which collective re-enchantment can be understood as discursive processes. Paper 3 offers a perspective on consumption constellations that integrates the role of doings, objects, and meanings to show also how the formation of such
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constellations corresponds with more widely held beliefs and discursive positions in consumer culture. Paper 4 contributes to recent consumer cultural research interested explicitly in production with an attempt to conceptualize emic understandings of production.

With regard to illuminating the operation of consumption in consumer culture, these findings show how moments of consumption are mediated by practice-level structures (paper 4), how they matter for and within the performances of practices (paper 3), how they contribute to shaping brand meanings (paper 2), and how they create value (paper 1).

The conceptualization of consumption as practice moments based on performativity as well as the introduction of companioning productive moments, offers a response to calls for systematic attempts of specifying the entanglement of consumption and production in consumer culture (Arnould 2007; Arnould and Thompson 2007; Beer and Burrows 2010). Overall, this thesis offers insights that attend to understand the operation of consumption in consumer culture, by aiming to illuminate consumption in relation to practices and in relation to production. The conceptual development of consumption as practice moments proposed in this thesis situates consumption deeper within the practices that comprise consumer culture.

4.3.4 Theorizing value creation beyond the scope firm-consumer

Because consumption and production are intertwined with value, and because paper 1 deals explicitly with the creation of value in and through consumptive moments in practices, this section discusses implications for value creation that arise from framing the creation of value in terms of practice theory. In the following, I outline implications for the understanding of how value is created in consumer culture that derive specifically from situation consumption deeper within practices through conceptualizing consumption as practice moments.

Marketing and consumer literatures have widely departed from the classical economic understanding of value as residing merely in goods that the producer produces and the consumer consumes. It is now widely accepted that both production and consumption are creating many forms of interrelated value and that value does not reside in the goods offered by a firm, but in acts of production and consumption (Arnould and Thompson 2005; Arnould 2007; 2008; Cova and Dalli 2009; Holbrook 1994; 1999; Holt 1995; Korkman 2006; Kozinets et al. 2004; Lusch and Vargo 2006; Normann and Ramirez 1993; Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004; Ramirez 1999; Vargo and Lusch 2004).

11 Venkatesh and Penaloza (2013) suggest that the many types of value depicted in marketing literatures can be summarized as exchange value, use value, sign value, sociocultural value, and environmental value.
How value is created

The focus of the following discussion lies on the modalities of how value is created. Here, Karababa and Kjeldgaard (2013) provide an interesting synthesis of value in marketing. In viewing these discussions from a sociocultural perspective, they draw on Graeber’s (2001) anthropological account of value and note that “the notion of value creation is moving from a linear value chain perspective toward a view of value co-creation through the interactions of a multiplicity of actors” (Karababa and Kjeldgaard 2013, 5). The findings offered in this thesis contribute to this line of thought, but also provide some points of departure.

To begin with the notion of actor, paper 2 offers an empirical illustration of the interactions of a multiplicity of actors; the process through which the authenticity (brand) value of a commodity (Hagstrom guitars) takes place through discursive practices in which a range of networked actors participate as carriers of discursive re-enchantment practices. Thus, in the discursive practice analysed in this paper, firms, guitarists, retailers, and other important stakeholders of the Hagstrom brand appear as actors in the sense of being carriers of practice.

Turning to interactions, this thesis suggests looking not only at interactions between actors in the sense of market participants or in the sense of carriers of practice—but also to appreciate the interactions between practice moments. As papers 1 and 4 show, consumptive and productive moments interact with each other as protagonists of practice performances. It is through this interaction that value springs forth. Further, the accounts of production offered in paper 4 suggest conceiving also of practice objects as carriers of productive moments. Because these productive moments are interconnected with consumptive moments through the practice-level structure of facilitation, this touches specifically on the interactions between these moments. Consumptive moments that facilitate objects as carriers of productive moments are entangled with teleoaffective purposes of transforming practice objects so they provide better momentum to the performance of practice. Thus, consumptive moments provide some of value within practices.

In order to move forward the conceptualization of such value, it is useful to turn to Graeber’s (2001) work on value. He synthesizes conceptualizations of value in social theory. He finds that value comprises three seemingly different forms (Graeber 2001, 1): social values (“conceptions of what is ultimately good, proper, or desirable in human life”); economic value (“the degree to which objects are desired, particularly, as measured by how much others are willing to give up to get them”), and what can be called semiotic value (which he derives from work on structural linguistics). Graeber (2001) proposes that these can be traced back to one and the same principle: To him, all three conceptualizations of value in social theory comprehend value as consisting of meaningful difference (in the social, economic, and semiotic sense). Further, they conceive
of value implicitly, but ultimately, as a result of action. Thus, Graeber (2001) suggests that action is the source of value:

“Value emerges in action; [...] Commodities have to be produced (and yes, they also have to be moved around, exchanged, consumed . . .), social relations have to be created and maintained; all of this requires an investment of human time and energy, intelligence, concern. If one sees value as a matter of the relative distribution of that, then one has a common denominator. One invests one’s energies in those things one considers most important, or most meaningful.”

(Graeber 2001, 45; original emphasis in bold)

Conceiving of value as action is important in the present context, because practice-theoretical approaches accentuate the importance of coordinated human action in the production and reproduction of collective outcomes (Feldman and Orlikowski 2011; Schatzki 1996). Actions and activities help compose practices. Thus, value can be considered as one of the collective outcomes achieved through practices. In this sense, value “does not reside in an individual, independent of his actions, nor in a good, independent of the interaction to which it is subjected” (Ramirez 1999, 51). Rather, value emerges as an outcome of action and interaction and therefore resides in the actions and interactions enabled and facilitated by various resources (Simmel 2004/1904; Ramirez 1999; Graeber 2001). Thus, this thesis suggests that actors participating in the creation of value are not merely found on market system level, but also exist within practices. This supports previous arguments that practices are the entities in and through which value is created (Arnould 2013; Holttinen 2010; Korkman 2006; Ots 2010; Schau et al. 2009). This thesis contributes to this conception by offering further indication of how value(s) derive from and within practices.

**Value as meaningful difference**

Returning back to the idea that consumptive moments provide some form of value within practices, Graeber’s (2001) work allows conceiving of such value as meaningful difference. Thus, value can be seen as conditional of action and interaction, which creates meaningful differences. Warde (2005, 142, original emphasis in bold) provides support for consumptive moments creating such meaningful differences:

“The practice is the conduit and raison d’etre for the gratifications which arise from its component moments of consumption. Consumption rarely occurs purely for its own sake, but contributes to the delivery of a range of varied rewards.”

The various gratifications and rewards arising from the consumptive moments within practices are tied to the performance of the practice in which
consumptive moments occur. In papers 3 and 4, the meaningful difference induced by consumptive moments has not been framed explicitly as value. However, it is possible to trace the meaningful differences these consumptive moments encourage on the performance of practices. Specifically, the teleoafffective properties that guide the formation of consumption constellations in paper 3 prescribe not only agentive means and ends of the ‘right’ arrangement of guitar gear, but also communicative purposes and aspirations. The formation of consumption constellation can make a difference in the performance of electric guitar playing, as these constellations are formed, altered, and modified to give momentum to guitar playing. Paper 2 shows how brand meanings (which can be seen as significant difference in terms of ‘authentic’ and ‘craft producer’) emerge from discursive practice. In paper 4, the meaningful difference that emerges from within practices can be seen as springing from consumptive moments facilitating productive moments. Here, these consumptive moments help advance the overall practice performance of electric guitar playing and gardening by assisting objects as carriers of productive moments. In paper 1, the meaningful differences that spring from direct and vicarious consumptive moments are depicted as use value, social recognition value, and through these, community attachment and community vitality.

The site of value creation

Further following Graeber’s (2001, 14) line of argumentation, then, “objects are defined by the meaningful distinctions one can make between them. To understand the meaning (value) of an object, then, one must understand its place in a larger system.” In the practice-theoretical perspective, the practice is the larger system in and through which value is to be understood. Connecting back to the papers, this implies the following:

In paper 1, the value created by the consumption of comments and imagery offered by participation in community practices (which resemble consumption objects in this context) can only be understood as value-creating within this context—that is, within the realm of online gardening community practices. These objects are consumed in the course of community interaction and their consumption creates various types of value for community members. That means to understand the value of consumptive moments, one must understand them within their system, which is, in this case, community practices. Value emerges from within practices as the frames in which actions and activities are organized.

If value springs from actions (Graeber 2001), and actions and activities are organizing elements of practices (Schatzki 1996), then practices become carriers of value (Schau et al. 2009), because they are the resources that organize and support action and interaction. This implies conceiving of value as transpiring in the nexus of doings, meanings, and objects. This perspective frees the discussion on value creation from the scope of firm-consumer, because both
firms and consumers can be carriers of practice and action. Firms (or rather their employees and workers) as well as consumers perform practices; and within them, activities and actions conducive to the creation of value.

This view advocates a contextual view on value and its creation. Rather than treating value as a universal concept, it must be treated within the realm of specific practices as sites in which it is created. In other words, different practices create different types of value and prescribe different teleoaffective understandings of what value is. For example, community practices, wellness practices, cooking practices, marketing practices, and manufacturing practices all hold different understandings of what value is or should be like. Thus, value must be understood within its practice-specific context.

Graeber’s (2001) thoughts apply to consumptive and productive moments in terms of actions and interactions that are capable of creating meaningful differences, refining identities, and contributing to the substantial achievements of the practice in which they are embedded. On this basis, it can be argued that both consumptive moments and productive moments are value-laden, but have to be understood within the practices in which they occur and to whose performance they contribute. This view suggests that value is neither ‘created’ by the consumer nor the producer, but formed in constellations of productive and consumptive moments encompassing practice performances.

**Inter-momentary dynamics**

Appreciating the sites of practices as the resources in and through which actions and interactions take place, then, has value residing in the interaction of elements of practices: Value exists in neither in the object, understanding, doing, nor meaning alone but rather in the interaction between these elements. Value springs from the interactions within the constellations of consumptive and productive practice moments. In particular, the practice structure of facilitation depicted in paper 4 emerges as one force that aligns consumptive moments in relation to productive moments. Here, although objects can be understood as carriers of productive moments, they do not create value in and for the practice performance by themselves. Moreover, the productive moments of interpersonal community practices (paper 1) represent mere value offerings and it is first in interaction with consumptive moments, direct or vicarious, that value is created. Paper 3 can be read with regard to foregrounding how value emerges from significant difference and action as a function within electric guitar-playing practice. Paper 4 lurks into value in the sense that it portrays the meaningful difference of consumptive moments in facilitating practice performances.

It is in these nuances that this thesis has implications for the development of theorizing practices as the site of value creation. Although practices can be regarded as carriers of value, if we look at what is going on within practice performances, inter-momentary dynamics between consumption and
productive aspects shape and form the basis for practices to create and carry value.

Thus, this thesis connects to literature on value co-creation in that it specifies how practices are the sites of value co-creation and how value co-creation operates through linkages between consumptive and productive moments of practices, rather than linkages and interactions between firms and consumers. What this suggests is a contextual approach on value creation by linking Graeber’s (2001) conceptualization of value as meaningful difference and emerging through action; Schatzki’s (2005) emphasis on the site of practices (in which actions, and thus value emerges); and the unfolding of Warde’s (2005) moments of consumption as well as the addition of productive moments as practice-level companion.

4.3.5 Toward practice-oriented marketing?

The specification of consumption as practice moments contributes to the development of what can be called a practice-oriented marketing approach. A practice-oriented marketing approach follows a thought that is similar to the relevance of consumer research for informing marketing decisions. It is typical for consumer research to start the research process at the consumer side, from which, ultimately, marketing and business decisions can be derived through better understanding consumption-related phenomena.

Building on the ideas that consumer demographics are less important when targeting than a focus on a shared practice or interest (Cova 1997; Cova and Cova 2002), that meaning resides not in a specific consumption pattern or set of objects but in the difference between how things are consumed (Holt 1997; 1998), and that the sum total of the objects consumed by an individual can be less explained by the characteristics of the individual than by the practices in which he or she engages (Warde 2005), I suggest that looking at the operation of practices offers relevant insights for understanding and doing marketing and branding work. In other words, consumers become less important than what they do. As argued by Cova and Cova (2002), Korkman (2006), and Schau et al. (2009), managers can create value by supporting the practices in which their consumers engage. In this vein it is logical to engage in understanding these practices in order to facilitate insights on how they can be supported.

Understanding practices

This thesis suggests that practices can be understood in terms of consumptive moments and entangled productive aspects. Understanding practices in this way, offers opportunities for developing market offerings that resonate with practices.

Essentially a practice-oriented marketing approach suggests to marketing managers that appreciating practices in which their customers engage as a
relevant unit of analysis can deliver vital information informing managerial decisions. This means to understand that wants and needs are not inherent in consumers, but rather that they are shaped by the practices these consumers are carriers of (Warde 2005). Such marketing approach de-emphasizes consumer needs and wants, but emphasizes practice needs and wants.

To understand customers in terms of the practices they conduct means understanding ‘what they are up to’, what they accomplish, what they aim to achieve, and what they struggle with. It also means asking what is consumed or needs to be consumed in this process—and how? And what is produced, is desired to be produced, or needs to be produced in this process—and how?

A practice-oriented marketing approach gains relevance, because it helps to appreciate a focus, not only on the consumption, but also the production going on in contemporary consumer culture—for practices link consumptive with productive aspects. A focus on the consumptive and productive moments of practices offers vital information for marketers to support not only practices in general in order to create value—as argued previously by Korkman (2006) and Schau et al. (2009)—but also to specifically target and support the consumptive and productive moments within these practices.

The conceptual development of practice moments put forward in this thesis offers a template for marketers to analyse the moments of the practices they are targeting, which can act as a ground for shaping the entire marketing mix.

**Practice-oriented community ‘management’**

One area in which this is particularly evident is the area of community ‘management’. Although I believe the idea of managing communities is problematic in itself, the practice of marketing management is infused with community marketing fetish (see also Fournier and Lee 2009). Brands install Facebook pages, and want consumers to ‘like’ them, and fill the pages with content and comments. They create online communities and hope consumers will join, interact, and stay—eventually hoping for increased positive branding outcomes. Media are, more than ever, important platforms in which marketing happens; not only by marketers but also by other relevant interest groups who also become carriers of marketing practices.

Entrepreneurs form entire business models around communities. These relatively new community media business models follow the credo of offering a technical platform for consumers to interact, and for owners to earn a profit from selling members’ attention to the advertisements placed on the site. In this vein, community managers strive for growth of the community (more members means more attractiveness for advertisers) but also engaged members who regularly visit the site and post content (more clicks means more potential views of the ads and firms hope more content will result in a more interesting community, keeping members and attracting new members). However, Moran, Gossieaux, and McClure (2009) found that 80% of such commercially sponsored communities cease to exist after three years. This begs the
managerial question of how to get consumers to join, engage with, and stay in the community. Managing communities is a delicate manner (Fournier and Lee 2009), and that is why it is so important to understand how community participation operates. I propose that the relevant answers to these questions are grounded in taking the perspective of practices.

The community media business model prescribes a certain constellation of production and consumption in the participation in that community. Community members provide the content. That is, they produce content on and for the community, and ultimately for their owners. But members also want to indulge in consuming the contents available in the community. They want to read what others wrote and posted and be part of the interaction in the community. Community owners and managers, thus, need to understand the relation between the consumptive and productive moments of community participation as prescribed in their business model. For the area of media management, there is something that can be learned from this. As shown in paper 1, community members use the specific community under investigation in this thesis as a substitute for magazines and books; a magazine that you can ask directly and that would respond. A magazine that allows certain experiences that can only be achieved through community practices.

For example, online community managers can learn from analysing the community practices, how important the experience of what kind of consumptive moments is to community members. Paper 1 offers a detailed portrayal of how community attachment and vitality are created through direct and vicarious consumptive moments of these practices. Thus, consumptive participation is important for shaping the relation members have to their community. Naturally, community managers put emphasis on inciting members to produce more content for the community, because then it might be perceived as more vital and attractive. Paper 1 shows however, that the experience of certain consumptive moments can trigger certain productive moments. Thus community managers might place emphasis on supporting such consumptive moments. An understanding of which practices and their moments are important for community members offers insights for managers striving to foster community attachment and vitality. For example, insights from an analysis of which consumptive moments of what practices are important in a particular community could imply using moderators who answer members’ questions, reward positive governance, mark milestones, or merely comment on blogs/photos, if no one else does, in order to avoid feelings of disappointment resulting in detachment from the community. Other interventions are possible depending upon which productive and consumptive moments of performance loom large in the community in question. Moreover, mere observation, or vicarious consumptive moments, shall not be seen as residual participation. Paper 1 shows how such pure observation creates valuable experiences for members. Thus, community managers might encourage vicarious consumptive moments for example through introducing a
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community infrastructure that suggests ‘readings’ for members, or where members can tag and import their ‘readings’ to a personal library.

**Resonating with practices**

A practice-oriented marketing approach suggests striving for marketing that resonates with practices. Paper 3 highlights how the analysis of the teleoffective properties of the consumption constellation has revealed two different processes in which consumers form their consumption constellations: inductively and deductively. Each route has different implications for marketing promotion and communication decisions, either foregrounding meaning or doings. Promotional marketing activities of musical instrument brands can specifically foreground and detail the enabling qualities of their promoted product or brand—not in isolation, but with respect to the momentum-giving qualities of the entire constellation and how their product or brand fits into this. Because the practice-based investigation has also revealed how the consumption constellation is constraining in practice performance, this example offers another point of departure for tweaking promotional marketing activities in a way that resonates with the variations of practical understandings that are evident in the object-focused practices studied in this thesis. The two different logics underlying the appreciation of consumption constellations—‘sound from the fingers’ versus ‘sound from the gear’—offer important insights when crafting marketing and advertising messages that resonate with these positions.

The insights developed in paper 4 offer further implications. Practices hold organizational structures that guide the consumption going on within practices in relation to the production that takes place in practices. Therefore, specifically the notion of ‘facilitation’ presents opportunities for marketers to understand how consumption is governed and practice-induced, and on this basis, engage in marketing activities that resonate with this practice-level structure. Marketing efforts might be directed towards deeply nesting the consumption of a brand or product within this structure.

**Implications for marketing education**

Most classical marketing textbooks, particularly in the area of consumer marketing, present the firm as producer and the customer as consumer. Although the marketing philosophies that emerged over the last decades have moved closer toward sensitive marketing to consumers in their consumer-oriented approaches, the notion of production happening outside factories is notably de-emphasized. Although the phenomena of tribal marketing, consumer-generated content and advertisement, and the theoretical perspectives of co-creation and Service-Dominant-Logic are present in many textbooks, they tend to be found on the last pages. Most marketing education continues to present marketing as being produced by marketing managers.
However, as illustrated in paper 2, marketing is achieved in and through practices that can house many carriers. The re-authentication of the re-launched Hagstrom brand, for example, involves many carriers, but is ultimately shaped and formed by discursive practices. An empirical implication for students of brand management that derives from this paper is to target not only consumers, but also the discursive practices that make and shape a brand. By understanding the discursive practices carried by a variety of market participants, opportunities arise as to joining the conversation in a way that resonates with a specific discursive practice, rather than attempting to impose elements to that practice that would seem artificial and alien. Further, students of marketing need to understand how the practical and strategic decisions, such as brand licensing or re-locating production, have symbolic consequences for their brands. An investigation of the discourses in the marketplace surrounding such decisions a priori might offer opportunities for informing about the symbolic consequences such decisions might have.

This dissertation adds to the line of education but suggests that one important facet in marketing research can be found in the practices which are performed in marketplaces. If consumption and production take place in practices, future marketers need to understand this entanglement in order to craft relevant market offerings with regard to the whole marketing mix, a notion that becomes increasingly problematic in the light of a practice-theoretical approach.

4.3.6 Future research opportunities

Although the individual papers outline future research opportunities in their specific realms, a number of issues need to be addressed in the future, with hindsight to the discussion above.

This thesis invites further examination of the different shades that interpersonal, object-focused, and discursive practices can take with regard to the study of consumption with production. That is to say, while this thesis focused, for example, on electric guitar playing as an artistic practice and eventually as an object-focused practice, there are opportunities to investigate other forms of related object-focused practices, such as drumming, but also less related forms of object-focused practices such as car driving, cooking, or fishing. Further, other forms of artistic practices, such as painting, invite examination with regard to their consumptive and productive moments. Moreover, opportunities exist for future research to investigate other forms of artistic practices that are not at all or less object-focused, such as theatre play or singing. These considerations hold true for the other types of practices investigated in this thesis, because a multitude of discursive practices and interpersonal practices exist.

The discoveries invite studies that explicitly address the autotelic dimension of practices when it comes to consumption with production. For example, the
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Findings from this thesis may be contrasted with studies on other types of practices that specifically foreground an autotelic dimension such as hiking, climbing, or diary writing. Specifically such studies could contribute to furthering the relation between consumption and production, and therefore contribute to the development of the consumption/production debate.

This dissertation offers four different conceptualizations of practice moments that need further specification in terms of practice sites, but also with regard to their operation across practices. Because practices are related and feed into each other (e.g., Reckwitz 2002) future research that explicitly addresses how a consumptive moment of one practice relates to another consumptive moment or productive moment of another practice can produce interesting insights needed to advance knowledge on the operation of moments across practices.

This thesis has drawn mainly upon the practice-theoretical perspective as advanced by Schatzki. Its findings of how consumption and production occur in and through practices invite future studies that utilize different stances of practice theory. For example, an Actor-Network inspired study on the assemblages of consumptive and productive moments—or a study specifying the ways in which consumption and production operate in terms of an actor-network with a particular focus on mediators and intermediaries—may produce further insights that can further develop the debate of the entanglement of practices—consumption—production.

The indication of the role of practice-level structures in shaping consumptive and productive moments in practices offers grounds for future research. For example, further research might explore other practice-level structures shaping the organization of practice elements, including consumptive and productive moments, or other elements foregrounded in different practices. Research that specifies further the dynamic interplay between practice-level structures and practice elements might produce valuable insights on the operation of practices. Moreover, research is needed that expands on the market-mediated nature of practice-level structures—how they are shaped, maintained, and change in market-mediated processes.

Future research that addresses further the temporal dimensions of practice moments might contribute further to mapping the operation of the interplay of practices, consumption, and production. Although paper 1 indicates how the constellation of consumptive and productive moments has temporal aspects, temporal dimensions of practice moments are not further mobilized as a way of theorizing the relation of consumption, production, and practices in this thesis. However, the findings of the individual papers implicitly involve temporal aspects of consumptive (and productive) practice moments. Paper 1 addresses consumptive and productive moments as episodes of conduct in an asynchronous communication setting. However, papers 2, 3, and 4 address more the teleoaffective synchronicity of consumptive and productive moments. Understanding such practice moments in terms of a temporal dimension offers
opportunities for elucidating further the operation of the entanglement of consumption and production in relation to practices.

Specifically the above discussion (section 4.2) unfolding the entanglement of consumptive moments with productive aspects provides grounds for future research to investigate the makings and unmakings of consumption. Specifically, the notion of consumption as a productive category through unmaking deserves further attention. For example, future studies that focus on how and in what ways consumptive moments are unmaking ‘things’ might provide additional insights not only into the productive qualities of consumptive moments, but also into their potentially value-destroying qualities. Particularly the latter notion has been de-emphasized in this thesis. If consumptive moments can be understood as productive, how can we understand them in terms of being unproductive or even as being value destroying? Studies that elucidate the value-destroying qualities of consumptive moments might render insights that are conducive to understanding consumptive moments as productive by adding the valence of value into this debate.

Studies are needed that further investigate the productive dimensions in consumer culture with specific attention to technology. For example, the diffusion of inexpensive home-recording software, video-editing and cutting software integrated in smartphones, apps relating to productive and consumptive moments in practices, or phenomena such as 3-D printing technologies that allow carriers of practice to design and literally print out material objects at home.

More research is needed on production. Future research that further expands the study of production vis-à-vis practices, its emic instantiations and practice-theoretical consequences might provide interesting and relevant insights into the operation of production in and through practices in consumer culture, and inform a subsequent practice-based conceptualization of production. Specifically paper 4 offers insights that may guide future studies on the operation of production in practices. A provocative reflection is given by the idea to study further how and in what ways production may also be understood in similar terms of the conceptualized moments above. The conceptualization developed here stems from a primary interest in ‘consumption with production’. This needs to be contrasted with future research that addresses this issue with a perspective of ‘production with consumption’ which may create interesting results as to paving the way for understanding practices entirely in terms of moments.

Particularly the performativity of consumption invites further research. In this thesis I have elucidated the performativity of consumptive moments within practices. Future research might investigate other forms of the performativity of consumption within and outside the theoretical and empirical context of practices. The findings of this thesis foreground how performativity in practices is primarily entangled with a practice’s teleaffective structure or primarily with
a practice’s procedural template. Future research that investigates other roots of performativity might contribute to further specifying the performative nature of practices and their enjoined elements.

Finally, future research that addresses further the discursive and market-mediated dimensions of consumptive and productive moments might offer insights into the operation of consumer culture with regard to how consumption and production as moments in practices are established, maintained, and altered in collective negotiation processes in which a variety of market participants as carriers of practice participate.
5. Concluding Remarks

This thesis studied consumption in relation to practice and productive aspects by unfolding consumption as moments in and of practices. Grounded in the problematization of consumption and practice as well as the problematization of consumption and production, two central questions emerged:

(1) In what ways can consumption be conceptualized as moments in and of practices?
(2) How can this conceptualization elucidate links to productive aspects?

In order to respond to these questions, this thesis draws on four papers encompassing object-focused practices, interpersonal practices, and discursive practices as the sites for studying consumption and its entanglement with productive aspects.

To answer the first question, this thesis offers a conceptualization of consumption as four moments in practices: consumption as ingredient, consumption as momentum, consumption as transformation, and consumption as consequence. This conceptualization presents a development of Warde’s (2005) notion of consumption as practice moments by unfolding consumption alongside teleoaffective and procedural performativity of and within practices. Unfolding such moments of consumption specifies how consumption operates in relation to practices.

The answer to the second question is twofold: First, consumption unfolds as a productive category through its capacity of ‘making’ and ‘unmaking’, which is particularly evident in the conceptualization of consumption as momentum and transformation. Here, consumption is productive consumption because consumption holds productive aspects. Second, consumption transpires as co-constitutive moment related to productive moments of practices. Here, consumptive moments are related to other aspects of practices that are productive, i.e., productive moments. Thus, this thesis offers theorization of productive consumption by specifying how consumptive moments are inherently productive and by elucidating a dyadic relation between consumptive and productive practice moments.

By focusing on consumption and its relation to production, this thesis deals with core concepts of marketing and business literature. Although such previous literature has developed an understanding of the association of consumption with production that can be discerned as Marxian dialectic logic, blending logic, co-creation logic, consumer culture theoretical logic, and collapse logic, this thesis complements these debates by advancing a practice logic of the entanglement of consumption and production. Specifically, it contributes by treating practices as the sites for consumption and its
entanglement with production. By doing so, this thesis reveals how consumption operates as moments in and of practices and suggests that consumption and production are useful analytical categories if framed as moments within practices, rather than collapsing consumption and production into one and the same, as other authors have suggested.

The analytical treatment of consumption and production as moments in practices not only further elucidates the entanglement of consumption with productive aspects; but it also contributes to theorizing the operation of practices.

Because practice theory suggests that practices are the building blocks of society and culture, it is important not only to comprehend the way in which practices are productive of various aspects of culture—but crucially also to illuminate the operation of practices, that is how they work. Thus I suggest that if we are to understand the operation of consumer culture through practices (Holt 2002; Arnould and Thompson 2005), then we need to understand how practices operate. By studying consumption and productive aspects within practices, this thesis contributes to elucidating how practices work. In marketing-theoretical terms, it mines a co-creation approach of practices and shows how practice performances are achieved through the intersection of consumption and production as moments within practices. I shows how consumption and production speak together in practices, but that each has its own voice as well—like they do in markets.

The practice-theoretical perspective advanced in this thesis offers a de-individualist approach to these processes; it does treat practices as the unit of analysis instead of consumers, producers, or prosumers. In peering behind the masks of these labels informative dynamics emerge that complicate previous understandings of markets as scenes for protagonists in terms of consumers, producers, or prosumers. Rather, as put forward in this thesis, the protagonists here are practices, carried out by various carriers of practice—and within practices, another layer of protagonists emerges: consumptive moments and productive moments.

My primary goal has been to illuminate consumption as it operates in relation to practices—by conceptually unfolding consumption as moments in and of practices with the comprehension that understanding practices is conducive to understanding consumer cultural processes that these practices are part of. However, this route has led me through terrain paved with production, because only in relation to productive aspects can the nature of consumption phenomena be described, analysed, and understood.
References


References


References


References


References


Markham, A. and Buchanan, E. (2012). 2012: Ethical decision-making and internet research 2.0: Recommendations from the aoir ethics working committee. Available at: www.aoir.org/reports/ethics2.pdf


References


Wardle, C. and Williams, A. (2010). Beyond user-generated content: A production study examining the ways in which UGC is used at the BBC. *Media, Culture & Society*, 32 (5), 781-799.


——(2013), Branding and sacralization: Women and their underwear consumption. Manuscript presented at the Brand Camp 2, January 27-29, University of Innsbruck, Obergurgl, Austria.

Appendix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Community experience (months)</th>
<th>Gardening experience (years)</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
<td>Enjoys gardening. Joined the community because it seemed to be run by ‘ordinary gardeners’ and membership is free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
<td>Adores gardening. Found the community through a gardening-related search on the Internet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassia</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>No further background provided in the diary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarissa</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>Enjoys gardening as a ‘huge part’ of her daily life and spends ‘many long hours in the garden’. Came across the community through searching gardening ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>States that he is not a good gardener and does not spend a lot of time at gardening, but appreciates his creation of ‘quite a romantic and meaning-charged space’. He explains how his garden is about freedom and enjoys how is garden ‘merges with the fields and hills’ and how ‘going out into it gives me a sense of almost infinite space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>Housewife, 42, spends most of her time on gardening, which is her greatest passion (‘I mean nothing/I am nobody without gardening’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>States that he loves all sorts of plants, enjoys anything that has grown from seed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>No further background provided in the diary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>No further background provided in the diary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matilda</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
<td>States that gardening is her biggest hobby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>Never had a garden before but is looking for plants that remind her of her childhood. Wants to create a beautiful place to sit and feel life grow around.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
<td>Came to gardening to get away from processed foods and additives and to grow own fruit and vegetables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
<td>Came to gardening after her child almost ate a poisonous plant. Would spend all day gardening if it were possible and loves the outdoors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simone</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>&gt; 30</td>
<td>Has been a gardener for most of her life – ‘and still learning’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>Found a ‘real sanctuary’ in her garden, ‘a place to unwind and relax’. Takes evening and home study courses in gardening design and gardening history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>No further background provided in the diary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym</td>
<td>Instrument; keyboard</td>
<td>Experience (years)</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>Plays for a double-platinum winning artist; various side projects (soul; funk; grunge; 80s pop); bass teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
<td>Various project bands (soul; funk; rock)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
<td>Solo artist/‘virtuoso’ guitarist; platinum song writer, music producer and guitar teacher; has been playing with several celebrity artists (various genres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>&gt; 30</td>
<td>Live and studio projects as a musician and/or producer; writes, produces and re-mixes music in styles that range from rock, pop, electronica, jazz, and classical to Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>‘Atonal jazz’ projects; studies guitar at a university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>Heavy metal band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>Several bands, (soul, fusion-jazz); has a history of rock bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>&gt; 30</td>
<td>Solo artist/guitarist (pop, rock, fusion / jazz) and plays gala jobs (top 40); guitar teacher at a university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>Various bands (soul and funk); teaches bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
<td>Two bands (‘indie trash rock’; ‘soul punk’); has a history of ‘experimental jazz’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Guitar; keyboard</td>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
<td>80’s pop-rock project; audio engineer and music producer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaus</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>&gt; 30</td>
<td>Two bands (classic-rock; soul/pop).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>No current band; looking for a metal band; plays every day at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linus</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>Rock band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
<td>Pop-rock band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Guitar; bass</td>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
<td>Plays guitar / bass in two blues bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>Various project bands (jazz; fusion); studies guitar at a university; guitar teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>&gt; 30</td>
<td>Latin-jazz band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>Various projects (experimental jazz and pop); studies guitar at a university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>Jazz projects; composer and arranger; author of music educational books; Professor of upright bass, jazz theory, and aural training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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