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Understanding myth in consumer culture theory

Jack Tillotson and Diane Martin

Aalto University, Helsinki

This paper provides an understanding of the multidisciplinary synthesising of myth conceptualisation in consumer culture theory. Mythology is an umbrella term that has been used in a variety of forms and interpretations. This review draws from psychology, sociology, anthropology, cultural studies, literary criticism, history and political studies to examine the historical and discursive constructions of mythology. We distinguish multiple perspectives of mythology and demonstrate how exemplars of each are used in consumer research. Finally, we suggest new directions for mythology that pertain to consumer culture research.

Introduction

Consumption as a means to happiness and fulfilment remains the overarching marketplace myth that fuels national economies and deepens personal debt. Its widespread use exacerbates consumer discomfort and swells corporate profits. In the hands of the free market, the unanchored myth drives over-consumption, environmental destruction and unhealthy lifestyles. This powerful force is a significant agent of modern life that demands elucidation.

In 1924 Max Weber argued that modern bureaucratisation and intellectualisation had a significant hand in the disenchantment of the world. Weber explains that modern experience is divided between the ‘iron cage’ of rationalisation and mythological mysticism (Weber [1924] 1948; Ostergaard, Fitchett and Jantzen 2013). In the effort to escape Weber’s modern disenchantment, a normative preference for enchantment transpired (Curry 2012). No institution has been more willing and able to respond to this desire for enchantment than the modern marketplace. Attempts to invert modern disenchantment to one of monistic mythical enchantment is philosophically, environmentally and academically irresponsible (Curry 2012). Thus, the market remains firmly in charge of myth of consumption, its rewards and its consequences. Marketplace mythology has increasingly become an all-encompassing construct of assorted descriptions and theoretical advancements including the sacred, extraordinary, symbolic and transcendental.

Early in the cultural turn of consumer research Levy (1981: 52) drew a connection to myth: ‘if we take the idea that myths are ways of organizing perceptions of realities, of indirectly expressing paradoxical human concerns, they have consumer relevance because these realities and concerns affect people’s daily lives’. Consumer culture theory (CCT) scholars continue to examine consumption from an amalgam of theoretical perspectives and traditions including anthropology, history, literary criticism, political science, psychology and sociology (Arnould and Thompson 2005). These multiple perspectives and subsequent disciplinary lexicons results in some confusion in CCT scholarship such that definitions and conceptualisations disagree with one another. In essence, some theorists use the term mythology to describe new phenomena, while others use mythology to definitively advance theoretical and cultural discourses. Although consumer research is rife with mythology research (Thompson 2004; Brown, McDonagh and Shultz 2013) myth is also deeply rooted in other social sciences. Much like the archaeologist, this paper excavates and analyses the theoretical body of knowledge on mythology, drawing from psychology, anthropology, sociology, cultural studies, critical theory along with consumer research.

The scholars and literature singled out from social science and mythology literature (e.g. Blumer, Campbell, Durkheim, Eliade, Lévi-Strauss, Derrida, Barthes and Eagleton) are chosen
because they constitute theoretical foundations for many of the prominent contributions on marketplace mythology in consumer research literature (e.g. Levy 1981; Belk, Wallendorf and Sherry 1989; Velliquette, Murray and Creyer 1998; Holt 2004; Arsel and Thompson 2011; Brown, McDonagh and Shultz 2013). We provide a representation of theoretical foundations for marketplace mythology. The paper represents neither the complete oeuvre of mythology nor that of the scholars selected for this review. This paper focuses on myth theories in consumer culture research and is not to be taken for an account or phenomenological description of the ‘mythological form’.

Our purpose is threefold: (1) to investigate how the notions of mythology are discursively and historically constructed from various schools of thought; (2) to analyse how these constructions reflect assessments of mythology in consumer research; and (3) to identify previously unexplored avenues for consumer research. This paper is structured as such: we start by describing distinct perspectives of mythology. Each perspective is examined through its historically and discursively constructed standpoint of the meaning, function of myth, and philosophical position of myth. Each distinct perspective is then exemplified by consumer culture research. We then examine emerging uses of myth in CCT. Finally we formulate suggestions for use of myth in future research.

Symbolic perspective of myth

The symbolic perspective of myth explores how symbols are adorned with meaning and that affect social interaction (Mead 1964; Blumer 1969). Symbolic myth research involves both verbal and non-verbal forms of communication, with an emphasis on how people behave in day-to-day circumstances in the context of socio-historical structure and ideological of their environment. In this perspective mythology is represented as narrative. While Blumer, Campbell and Lévi-Strauss offer different views regarding the emergence of symbolism, a general consensus among scholars holding this perspective is that mythology is embodied through human interaction with the symbolic.

Symbolic interaction and personal myth

Perhaps one of the earliest representations of the symbolic perspective is found in Sigmund Freud’s use of mythic stories as metaphors in psychoanalysis. The Freudian Oedipus Complex (Freud [1900] 1974) and Jung’s Electra Complex ([1959] 1981) are metaphors explaining theories of personal unconsciousness. Jung specified archetypes as embodiment beliefs, ideas and images inherited unconsciously and collectively producing myth and religion. The entirety of mythology can be understood as an extension of the collective unconscious into society (Jung [1959] 1981).

Sociologist Herbert Blumer (1969) argues that human beings take action based on the meaning prescribed to symbols and that meaning is derived from social interaction. Individuals consider, modify and interpret these meanings. Social life is thus an on-going process, not a relationship of structures directing human life: ‘the human act is not a release of an already organized tendency; it is a construction built up by the actor’ (Blumer 1969: 94). The ability to act toward oneself is the central way individuals interact in the world. Humans have the ability to internally define themselves as objects, which creates the concept of self and the other (Blumer 1969). Individuals can be the objects and symbols of their own actions. This occurs when, for example, we set goals, formulate compromises or make plans with ourselves. The actor recognises objects and applies significance over and over again as a construction of meaning, which eventually leads to action. Without the ability to act, life is meaningless.

Personal myth and meaning

Individuals create personal myths through narrative storyline as a means to organise meaning in their lives (McAdams 1993). These narratives are used to organise and comprehend time,
events, and meanings (Ricoeur 1984). Thus, formation of self is developed through conscious reflection on past, present and future (Sartre 1956) and tends to hold meaning through narratives, which in turn reflect personal myths. Personal myths embody meaning and the human duality of agency and autonomy.

Culture provides the fodder for imagery, archetypes and characters evoked in the personal myths. What McAdams (1993: 61) calls ‘a vast but finite catalogue of images’ differs by culture and provides the raw material for narratives and personal myths. Historical, religious and state-influenced belief systems, culturally specific themes and ideology, form the context for personal myth creation. However, socio-historically influenced factors may be contradictory to one’s sense of self. When culturally sanctioned ideologies take the form of race, class, gender and age (Arnould and Thompson 2005) individuals must negotiate contradictions through personal narratives.

Personal myth and CCT

CCT scholars have long focused on personal identity in culture and consumption (e.g. Levy 1981; Belk 1988; Schouten 1991; Thompson 1996; Luedicke, Thompson and Giesler 2010; Arsel and Thompson 2011). While ‘identity and society are together responsible for the life story’ (McAdams 1993: 95), the personal myth is the interpretive strategy (Thompson 1997) for negotiations between ideology and society. The concepts of consumption and identity are increasingly featured in contemporary CCT literature. It is incumbent that scholars avoid confusing identity work with personal myth.

In their analysis of tattoo culture, Velliquette, Murray and Creyer (1998) examine consumption and personal myth, carefully maintaining the concept of personal myth. They focus on myth, symbolism and self, and adopted the perspective of simulacra and simulation (Baudrillard 1988). Personal myth and symbolism within the tattoo culture blurs the line between public and private spheres. Individuals build reflexive historic narratives attached to particular tattoos. For example, a marathon runner creates a narrative around a roadrunner tattoo as it symbolises personal running practice. However, a person tattooed with a brand emblem may have done so because they saw the tattoo on another and thought it was cool (Velliquette, Murray and Creyer 1998). The line between private and public burrs physically with the attachment of personal meaning to physical marking of the skin and symbolically through the personal stories attached to public brands. Velliquette, Murray and Creyer (1998) and Velliquette, Murray and Evers (2006) argue that individuals attach meaning to consumption as a result of negotiating the cultural tensions created through the perception of self contrasted with the influence of institutional structures (e.g. race, class, gender, age) and ideological pressures. Thus, meaning becomes embodied within objects from both sides of the relationship as a dialectic interaction between object and consumer.

The monomyth of Joseph Campbell

Joseph Campbell’s (1949) comparative critique of mythologies develops what he christened the monomyth, a universally applicable narrative of mythology. The familiar pattern of storytelling in contemporary Hollywood films follows the logic of the monomyth. In the first stage, separation, the hero suffers disjunction. In the initiation stage transcendence is found in the duality of death and rebirth. Finally the hero brings hard-earned transcendental knowledge back to humanity in the return stage. Campbell theorises the hero’s rites of passage as the experience of life in accordance with the phenomena of time. For Campbell time is essentially a duality: past and present; dead and alive; man and women; mind and body; being and non-being. Myth provides insights that transcend duality by providing harmony to live in accord with duality.

Campbell theorises that myths and dreams come from the same place; they are realisations of the same kind that have to find expression in symbolic form (1949). Grounded in Jung’s ar-
chertypes ([1959] 1981) Campbell theorises that characters of monomyths are strikingly identical to those that show up in our dreams (1949). According to Campbell (1949) ritual is an enactment of a myth and by participating in a ritual you are engaging myth. Societies’ movement into modernity created a new view of myth:

The social unit is not a carrier of religious content, but an economic-political organization. Its ideals are not those of the hieratic pantomime, making visible on earth the forms of heaven, but of the secular state, in hard and unremitting competition for material supremacy and resources. (Campbell 1949: 358)

The present day ritual is imposed through materiality whereas in the past ritual would be performed through spirituality.

The monomyth and CCT

In the 1986 a group consumer researchers went on a hero’s journey, both metaphorically and physically, by spending a summer travelling across America in a motorhome. They called their project the Consumer Behavior Odyssey and their goal was to learn about self, the world, and other people (Belk 1987). They learned about American consumers from a cultural perspective (Levy 1981). The academic collaboration of the Odyssey is the birthplace of the CCT (Bradshaw and Brown 2008) in part due to the transcendental knowledge of the American consumer passed on through subsequent academic literature. The consumer Odyssey found that ‘the journey’ holds a sacred status that transforms knowledge generation into new mythological epistemologies and opens up new doors to understanding American consumers.

Arnould and Price (1993) also explore extraordinary experiences through the context of white water river rafting. Emergent themes of personal growth, communitas and harmony with nature translated to other consumer experiences. Drawing in part from van Gennep’s (1909) 1960) discussion of extraordinary experiences as rites of passage, the authors identified these themes that then translate to a variety of consumer experiences. Rites of passage occur through a pilgrimage that occurs in three essential features - Separation, transition, and reintegration, a pattern that mirrors Campbell’s monomyth of departure, initiation and return. Arnold and Price note that river rafting is an activity ripe with ritual. Ritual is the enactment of myth (Campbell 1949). Arnould and Price (1993) also show that the narrative of service embodies the initiation of the journey. Moreover, extraordinary experience is both an event and an enchanted temporal period. Liminality is the threshold of a ritual where ambiguity and disorientation occurs before the ritual has been completed (Van Gennep [1909] 1960; Turner 1995). The development of community contributes to the extraordinary experience and the building of mythological renewal of self (Arnould and Price 1993).

Dobscha and Foxman’s (2012) exploration of new brides-to-be experience extends understanding of monomyth. They theorise how a joyous activity is actually stressful and invokes transcendent experiences of a mythic journey. Brides who shop for wedding dresses at Filene’s Annual Basement Bridal Event in Boston are faced with the challenge of an over-crowded mob-like shopping frenzy. Brides are called to adventure by the need resolve their ideological and socio-historical expectations of a traditional wedding through the purchase of perfect wedding dress in a chaotic retail setting rife with conflict. They seek information and shopping strategies from friends and mentors who have successfully negotiated Filene’s chaotic basement. According to Campbell (1949) myth is the insight that transcends duality; the duality between the drive to find the dress and reality of Filene’s basement. Faced with challenged expectations consumers engage and overcome these conflicts and cross the mythic threshold that transform the consumption process into extraordinary event. When faced with stressful conflict consumers rely on the transcendence of myth to negotiate this duality that myth can
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transcend. Brides who find the quintessential perfect wedding dress at Filene’s have overcome conflict by enacting power, achievement, and mastery that is mythic agency (Dobscha and Foxman 2012). The dress becomes the elixir to share with the secular world.

**Structuralism and myth**

Anthropologists have long investigated the role of myth in pre-literary (i.e., primitive) societies. A central conflict among theorists is whether mythology of the pre-literary is dead and what sort of mythology might emerge in the face of scientific discovery and knowledge (e.g. Tylor 1871; Malinowski [1926] 1971; Frazer 1959; Lévi-Strauss 1966). Pre-literary societies produce images and narratives that resembled nature and the meaning of the mind (Lévi-Strauss 1979). Mythic narratives are interpreted and remembered by individuals and passed on to subsequent generations. Rather than written histories about progress and achievement, these narratives embodied resolution of contradiction (Lévi-Strauss 1979). Myth functions as a template to overcome contradictions and binary oppositions created through human interaction with the natural world (Lévi-Strauss 1966).

Literary societies (i.e. modern) are governed by agency to ‘achieve mastery over nature’ (Lévi-Strauss 1979: 17). Scientific minds of the modern world chose to pick the rationality of modernity over nature. For Lévi-Strauss, the holistic nature of myth resolves the anxiety of overcoming the dilemma over man’s desire to conquer nature, yet inability to ultimately do so. Man’s illusion of mastery over nature gives us the illusion that we can control a universe that we will never fully understand.

Lévi-Strauss recognised a commonality of mythical structures present in different types of societies, both primitive and modern. Mythic structures are generalisable forms common in all types of societies and universal categories of the human mind (Doja 2006). Here myth is seen as a phenomenon where cultures and populations of people are replicating a structure to create a chain event. Thus myths are superstructures that result from collective structures.

Myths insert themselves through human minds. As Lévi-Strauss argues, ‘I therefore claim to show not how men think in myths, but how myths operate in men’s minds without their being aware of the fact’ (1969: 12). This theory is built around Ferdinand de Saussure’s work on language. For de Saussure, ‘there are no pre-existing ideas, and nothing is distinct before the appearance of language’ ([1915] 1966: 112). For de Saussure language is a way of understanding the world. Words were considered signifiers to signs where meaning is held; furthermore, because translations are an approximation, meaning is dependent on difference and not independent concepts outside language (de Saussure [1915] 1966). From the structuralism perspective, myth is form of speech that exists before ideas.

Social structures at the heart of myth are repeated in a variety of cultures. For example, gift-giving is found throughout different cultures (Mauss [1925] 1967). Mauss theorised that gifts are not truly freely given but evoke the obligation of reciprocation. This power relationship creates a binary of giver and receiver and through the reciprocity the synthesis of the gift.

However, in his efforts to outline a unified anthropological perspective on gift giving, Sherry (1983) identified two different perspectives. The first – a structuralist perspective – deals with the reduction of the phenomenon into oppositions and subsequently understanding how the unifying principle of gift giving reflects mythology. This perspective supports Lévi-Strauss’s understanding of binaries typically abstracting out to the most basic of notions of nature and culture. At its centre, the first perspective underscores the theory that gift giving evolved through an affinity to avoid incest taboo and through the exchange of women and groups created society and caste systems. Yet, the second perspective follows the interpretive branch of anthropology which paints binary opposition as too simple and demands the detail of ‘thick description’ (Geertz 1973), to truly understand the phenomenon in its entirety. Levy (1981) explains that myth is a ubiquitous mental exercise of bridging perceived binary oppositions and creating triadic arrays of meaning.
Levy (1982) also begins to incorporate symbolism, which leads to an understanding of myth around identity as well as interpretation and socio-cultural patterning. Levy argues that our ability to have an objective self allows us to project how we would want others to see us. Consumption becomes a way of symbolising this desired projection. Objects and actions are used for this symbolisation. Levy builds on sociocultural patterning by showing how symbols interact with each other. For example, owning a big home and a small car says something different than a big home and a big car. As Levy argues, ‘It may be salutary to recognize that we are just more others observing selves ... we are studying fantasies about personalities, their ages, their sex, and their social status, and in so doing having fantasies of our own’ (1982: 543).

In his critique of structuralism, Derrida (1967) claims that we are not bound by the deterministic human need to understand origin as a transcendental anchor to build signification. Rather, signifiers move around randomly and freely allowing for infinite production of meaning and possibility. Derrida is juxtaposing Lévi-Strauss’s concept of the exemplar model that was speech and remembrance for pre-literary cultures, which created a transcendental grounding for signifiers and meaning. According to Derrida, we are free to interpret meaning anyway we like without upsetting traditions including the interpretation of a world full of absurdity and meaninglessness.

**Semiotic perspective**

Lévi-Strauss, Roland Barthes, and Charles Sanders Pierce developed theories from Ferdinand de Saussure’s ([1915] 1966) concept of sign and signifier. De Saussure describes the understanding of the relationship between the signifier and the signified as semiology, the science of signs. Signs are a conceptual object or image that consist of a signifier, the name of the sign, and signified, the connotation created in the mind by the signifier.

Barthes ([1957] 1972) argues ideological tendencies of cultures manifest as myth. He demonstrates how ideological, politically-driven myth can distort history. Myth ‘depoliticizes speech’ (Barthes [1957] 1972: 142) so that the language of the cultural elite becomes the unquestioned normality of the day. The language of the bourgeoisie becomes the myth of universal truths, obscuring the power relations and blocking the perspective of power between class, race, gender and other marginalised people. Myth functions to perpetuate existing social conditions through ideology.

However Peirce (1931: 58) rejects the dualistic ontology behind semiology, replacing it with a three-part system. Pierce argues that triadic relations between the signifier, signified and interpretant (e.g. the mind) creates a relationship between the mind and experience. This relationship between the mind and an experience that changes behaviour and in turn creates new signs. In short, the sign constructs the relationship between the mind and experience. When the signification occurs between the mind and the experience, the interpreters practice changes. Practices create the meaning behind an individual’s interaction with a sign. Signs mediate reality and the process of signification and meaning that creates through triadic symbolism. Systems of signification create discourses (Best and Kellner 1991).

Cultural codes are needed to interpret signs (Mick 1986). Advertisers and marketers use signs and symbols to create meaning surrounding their brands. Consumers interpret these signs and symbols in different ways. In early representations in consumer research, Barbara Stern (1989) utilises semiotic analysis to understand how advertising text is culturally and historically determined in relation to the imagery of women as mothers and homemakers.

**Semiotics and CCT**

Consumer culture research utilises the semiotic perspective as a way of understanding individual and collective experiences within society. Thompson and Haytko (1997) explore consumer conversations to gain an understanding of how consumers feel, experience and perceive
fashion. Peñaloza (2000) uncovers the American symbolism inherent in the western livestock shows. Brown, McDonagh and Shultz (2013) demonstrate how literary narratives of an iconic brand can be used to elucidate the ambiguous. The semiotic perspective of mythology provides a wealth of opportunities for understanding consumption and culture.

Thompson and Haytko (1997) employ perspective theory and its relation to mythology and semiotics to understand the naturalisation of ideological assumptions and how consumers problematise those assumptions in creating individual identity, shared identity and symbolic significance through consumer narratives. Perspective analysis functions to problematise interpretations of the socialisation process, or what seems natural:

Naturalization refers to what is probably the most discussed function of ideology. Through this ideological function individuals become immersed in a shared understanding whereby the culturally contingent aspects of social life (such as common cultural associations, social practices, or power relationships) are seen as being the natural order of things. (Thompson and Haytko 1997: 20)

Through problematisation researchers highlight ideological subtexts that formulate binary opposition and in turn, through their naturalisation, constructed consumption meaning.

Historical constructs of the old west, the frontier and the cowboy help to frame the significance of stock shows. Peñaloza (2000) found four major imaginaries within stock shows centre around cultural contradictions. First, stock shows mythically relieve anxiety created between symbolic freedom and independence of rancher life that is in opposition with commercial ranching. Second, stock shows mediate the contradiction between love and respect for nature and need for food and control over nature. Third, imagery of the market as a community is opposed by competitive realities of ranching life. Fourth, stock shows depicts family values, which mythologises family unification in opposition to male domination and female subordination.

Brown, McDonagh, and Shultz (2013) utilise ambiguity as their theoretical framework to understand mythology around the Titanic as an iconic brand. The authors conceptualise storytelling as a commonality and signification of myth (Segal 2004) as a way to transcend the discursive contradictions inherent in not only the Titanic myth but also the construct of myth itself.

Proponents of the symbolic perspective of mythology are mainly concerned with the transformation symbolism to meaning and how that meaning becomes transposed to larger narratives of the collective society. Narrative performance is like ideology in that it allows people to act without logic, facts or values through illusion or myth (McAdams 1993; Holt 2003, 2004, 2006). Accordingly, mythology is a storyline crafted by the process of individuals’ incorporation of symbolic resources provided through the marketplace, which then must be negotiated between the cultural contradictions and sphere of the dominant and public viewpoints (Holt 2004).

**A functionalist approach to mythology: Social cohesion perspective**

Functionalism portends each part of society is dependent on other parts of society, creating social cohesion. All aspects of society are interdependent, relying on each other to function (Merton 1938). The functionalist perspective relies on the certainty that whatever is happening in society is what is supposed to happen (Ritzer 2007). Myth in the functionalist approach is a collective representation that empowers and supports social solidarity (Durkheim 1912). Myth substitutes for traditions, rituals and beliefs of both pre-literary and modern societies alike (Malinowski [1926] 1971).

Functionalist Emile Durkheim postulates that knowledge is socially constructed and the world exists through collected representations (1912). These symbols embody collective beliefs and values of a social group. Collective unconscious projected through myth creates bonds and cultural interdependencies holding society together (Calhoun, Gerteis and Moody 2007). The power of social cohesion lays in its coercive ability to influence an individual’s psyche and in-
The social cohesion perspective celebrates mythology as a fundamental enterprise for solidifying communities by reflecting societies’ values and moral obligations.

Mythology emerges through the contradiction imposed by the duality of personal desire and community obligation (Durkheim [1914] 2005). When alone, individuals will act upon their own desires. Myth valorises community such that individual actions are dominated by obligation to conform to the moral order. If the mythology of social cohesion breaks down, anomic takes over and chaos results (Durkheim [1897] 1951).

Mircea Eliade ([1954] 1959) argues that myth was most clearly elaborated within pre-literate societies and is evoked in contemporary times through an archaic ontology. Myth for these societies is the foundation for life and culture. It depicts the origin of life and is expressed as the sacred, absolute truth of historical beginnings. Individuals imitate exemplary acts of origin myths. In pre-literate societies myth is the true history of what came to pass at the beginning of time, the transcendental origin, a pattern for comportment and an exemplary model for all human actions. ‘Myth, then, is always an account of a ‘creation’; it relates how something was produced, began to be. Myth tells only of that which really happened, which manifested itself completely’ (Eliade [1963] 1998: 5–6). Religion exemplifies this shared set of central social values that bind the individuals to each other (Durkheim 1912).

**Social cohesion and CCT**


Kozinets’s (2002) ethnography of the temporary consumption community Burning Man examines a synthesis of community and markets through the exchange of goods and creative acts of art and performance. Community narratives embodying mythological creativity (Eliade [1954] 1959) as art and performance ‘construct a temporary cohesiveness’ (Kozinets 2002: 31). Liminality is inherent in the community. Festival participants create and amass goods in the desert that are creatively redistributed and reconstituted rendering them sacred only to be acknowledged profane as the festival comes to an end and participants return to the ordinary world (Sherry and Kozinets 2007).

Belk and Tumtum (2005) investigated communal solidarity of consumers whose cult-like loyalty to the Apple brand renders products in a mythical light. The authors found evidence of hierophany, the breakthrough of the sacred from the profane world (Eliade [1963] 1998). For enthusiasts, the Apple brand is a sacred creation manifested in contemporary time through the archaic ontology (Eliade [1954] 1959) of Macintosh products. Owning Macintosh creates transcendent experience and a strong social cohesion among the brand community.

The functionalist perspective of social cohesion offers a theoretical lens in which mythology engaged to make sense of the world. Consumption is therefore a means of consumer conformity to culture. The cohesion perspective affords a positive feeling through the appropriation of creative agency and resistance to challenge the unreflexive consumption at the heart of the marketplace myth.

**Critically reflexive mythology perspective: Critical theory**

Myth in critical theory stems from Barthes’ ([1957] 1972) concept of myth as naturalising socially constructed and historical discourse. Dominant societal actors oppress subordinates by normalising markers of segregation and subordination. The primary concern of critical theorists is to take the side of the oppressed whose language and ‘that of his emancipation’ (Barthes
[1957] 1972: 150) is politicised. Emancipation occurs through de-mythologising dominant ideology. Advocates of this perspective are concerned with social change, particularly the new forms of consumption that allow for escape of oppressive ideological forces.

*Understanding myth through ideology*

Marx ([1932] 1970) conceptualised ideology as the mode of ideas expressed from the dominant class and had no relation to the subordinate except through ‘false consciousness’. For example, capitalist ideology conceals and naturalises managerial power and implicit subordination of workers. Eagleton (1991) broadens Marx’s concept, noting that ideology lives in dominant as well as subordinate forms: ‘Ideologies are often thought, more specifically, to be unifying, action oriented, rationalizing, legitimating, universalizing and naturalizing. Whether these features apply to oppositional ideologies as well as to dominant ones is a question we shall have to consider’ (Eagleton 1991: 301). Subsequent theorists answered this question finding that either side of a power duality can become valorised.

Hegel conceptualises mythology as ideology aesthetically expressed for easy adoption by society. Ideology becomes an imaginary map that furnishes motivations for action within society and secures social solidarity. During political breakdowns, ideologies become apparent and independent of mythology individuals lose the feel for social regularity (Geertz 1973). Once ideology of subordinates overcomes domination ideology, it becomes mythical (Eagleton 1991).

*Critical theory and CCT*

Critical theorists focus on the tensions or inconsistencies between subject and object and become the source of change:

> reality is enacted or socially produced, but in time these social structures become stubborn, resist social change, and thus become constraining. Unless reflection occurs, the meanings people attribute to social structures change more slowly than the structures themselves. Thus, reality—the meanings given to social structure and the objective structures—is inherently contradictory. (Murray and Ozanne 1991: 133)

The contradiction lies in the idea that societies both create reality and are shaped by it. There is an inconsistency between subject and object. Critical theorists seek to emancipate individuals from social control created by this ontology.

Kozinets and Handelman (2004) move beyond Durkheim’s (1912) theory of social solidarity and show how consumers are an oppressed class in postindustrial society. Durkheimian myth seeks to understand how the solidarity is continued while critical theorists break down ideology through critical reflection. Kozinets and Handelman (2004) uncover the problems of new social movements (NSM) that stray from ideological influences and focus on consumers as adversaries.

Thompson (2004) addresses the underlying mythic architecture of nature, technology and science that encompasses the natural health market and addresses whether consumers hold any agency over the power structures enforces through cultural and national ideologies. He breaks the natural health myth into two merging ideologies based on the dominant consumer segment of natural medicine known as ‘cultural creatives’.

First, the Romantic ideology derived from technologies’ ill effects on humanity and nature wherein:

> nature is mythologized as an Edenic paradise where all living organisms exist in a state of harmony. Conversely, science and technology represent the forbidden knowledge that has cast humanity out of paradise, severed our organic connection with nature, and led to spiritual and physical distress. (Thompson 2004: 164)
Second, the Gnostic myth emerged from a desire of consumers to bridge technology and spirituality and ‘the immune system is metaphorically rendered as a mysterious immaterial force, constituted by intricate mind-body connections and ephemeral energetic forces, which can be brought to practical ends through quasi-magical practices of holistic healing’ (Thompson 2004: 166).

Advertisers exploit these tensions as conflicting ideologies converge with reality. They capitalise on myths of purity, nature and eastern medicine. As individuals seek to fulfil identity projects and iconic selves, they look to consume goods aligned with metaphors and mythical promises created by advertisers. Consumers gaining agency over their situation resist mass media’s brand messages. This resistance creates unmasks power between consumers and enterprise wherein more levels of structure and agency become exposed.

Thompson and Arsel (2004) develop the construct of a hegemonic brandscape to understand how brands inadvertently create a point of difference and oppositional meanings. Hegemony is an overarching concept that includes ideological, cultural, political and economic features of civil society (Gramsci 1971; Eagleton 1991).

In the context of coffee giant Starbucks, Thompson and Arsel (2004) found anti-hegemonic consumption patterns. Coffee shops that don’t personify the Starbucks hegemony produce an attractive social and creative buzz. This symbolic boundary is defined aesthetically rather than politically. Anti-hegemonic consumers hold strong preferences for decor that symbolises the counter-culture.

Kristensen, Boye and Askegaard (2011) probe emancipation of Danish dairy consumers from the ideological forces and beliefs around health and wellness imposed through history and the government. Building on Thompson (2004) and Barthes ([1957] 1972), the authors focus on morality and the understanding of how communities develop conceptualisations of right and wrong. Moral systems are inherently ideological and in order to emancipate consumers from these forces critical reflection must occur. Storytelling solidifies new forms of ideologies allowing community to form and beliefs and values to spread. The authors note that the consumers don’t escape the market per se but instead reshape collective identity through counter-mythology.

Arsel and Thompson (2011) explain how hipster consumers use large investments of time and social capital (Bourdieu 1984) in their attempt to de-mythologise a consumption ideology in order to protect themselves from mainstream consumers or ‘followers’. Hipsters have sizeable cultural capital (Bourdieu 1984) invested in their identity field. When followers begin to encroach on the identity value insiders will de-mythologise using three distinct methods: aesthetic discrimination, symbolic demarcation, and proclaiming consumer sovereignty. Consumers de-mythologise their consumption practices allowing new avenues of consumption to occur in an emancipated state.

Consumerism can be enslaving and manipulative mythology crafted by the ruling class, can be overcome through resistance and demythologising. Critical theorists view the market as an arena of domination and power struggle and are mainly concerned with the transformation of consumers to less oppressive states of consumption. As such, emancipation occurs in the form of new consumption arenas that hold a favourable power dynamic for consumers. Critical theory it is not necessarily addressing escape from capitalism, but an unveiling of oppressive ideologies that allow for new emancipated avenues of consumption to occur (Murray and O’zanne 1991; Murray, O’zanne and Shapiro 1994).

**A future for myth and CCT**

Early examinations of myth in consumer studies (e.g. Levy 1981; Belk, Wallendorf and Sherry 1989) reflect their cultural and theoretical times and focused primarily on personal and socially cohesive forms of mythology: symbolism and functionalism. Symbolic mythology concerns the transformation symbolism to meaning in collective social narratives. Functionalist mythology provides stabilisation of existing social systems and discourages change as a break from reified
function. More recent research again reflects cultural and social times and scholars investigate mythology with consumer resistance, emancipation and identity projects.

CCT researchers contribute to critically reflexive theoretical perspectives of consumer resistance (i.e. Murray and Ozzane 1991; Murray, Ozzane and Shapiro 1994) hegemonic landscapes (Thompson and Arsel 2004), natural health and wellbeing alternatives (Thompson 2004), counter mythology (Kristensen, Boye and Askegaard 2011), and demythologising consumption strategies (Arsel and Thompson 2011). The post-structuralist critique of myth is metamorphic and will transmogrify (Brown, McDonagh and Shultz 2013) society, culture and technology; it is can be an agent of change (Kristensen, Boye and Askegaard 2011; Dobscha and Foxman 2012). Kozinets and Handelman (2004) expanded our understanding of the pitfalls new social movements when they stray from ideological influences and focus on consumers as adversaries. Murray and Ozzane (1991; 1994) explain it is not necessarily the escape of capitalism that critical theory addresses within consumer culture but the unveiling of oppressive ideologies that allow for new emancipated avenues of consumption to occur.

Society has proven its ability to manipulate nature through intellectual and technological advancements resulting in modern disenchanted. Modern advancements of post-industrial society provide a sense of overpowering and unstoppable progression into a future unknown (Brown, Kozinets and Sherry 2003). The human/nature duality and resulting insatiable thirst to control the natural environment evokes imbalance and the potential anomic of society through environmental disaster (Hawken, Lovins and Lovins 2010; Scott, Martin and Schouten 2014). Scott, Martin and Schouten (2014: 7) expand on the concept of new materialism explaining how it, ‘bridges the gap between dualities of matter and meaning, culture and nature, and science and humanities’, emphasising a materialism that evokes mythical enchantment to all that is non-human. The possibility of industrial focus on symbiotic relationships with nature through cradle-to-cradle strategies (McDonough and Braungart 2002), allow for a more meaningful change and emancipatory consumer strategies. Scott, Martin and Schouten (2014) argue that change requires an ontology and methods that are capable of demythologising materiality so as to unmask techno-social reality. The authors examine how myth is used in mass marketing and the importance of exposing the ontological fallacies when a society needs to move toward more sustainable consumption. They highlight a need to expand into new philosophical understandings of ontology and myth in consumer culture theory.

Community based meaning of goods (McCracken 1986) are transformed when individuals are able to attach meaning to objects in their own self-expressive way (Thompson and Arsel 2004; Velliquette, Murray and Evers 2006). This transformation paralleled the rise of neo-liberalism over global economic-political organisations (Campbell 1949). Campbell describes individuals’ unrecognised and subjugated by the economic system: ‘One does not know toward what one moves. One does not know by what one is propelled’ (1949: 359). Salient mythical storylines offer safety and happiness allowing consumers to overcome the chaotic paradox of post-industrial society (Brown, Kozinets and Sherry 2003).

Consumer culture research has shifted from a focus on the solidarity of social organisations (e.g. Belk, Wallendorf and Sherry 1989; Schouten and McAlexander 1995; Kozinets 2002; Muniz and Schau 2005; Sherry and Kozinets 2007; Giesler 2008) to epistemological theories that effect social change and action with regards to particular situations (e.g. Holt and Thompson 2004; Thompson 2004; Thompson and Arsel 2004; Thompson and Tian 2008; Arsel and Thompson 2011; Kristensen, Boye and Askegaard 2011; Dobscha and Foxman 2012). Mythology research has shifted the focus of myth from organisational cohesion to understanding agency and emancipatory consumption practices in oppressive situations.

This paper uncovered the nature of myth theory within consumer research, advancing understanding of mythology and its conceptualisation and empirical investigation of consumer culture theory. Two major conclusions emerge from this analysis, which help to further define distinctive characteristics of mythology theory within CCT literature and identify avenues for future research.
First, instead of simply accepting the ambiguous nature of mythology, analysing myth through these perspectives reveals how various typologies of myth theory interact to advance theoretical and cultural perspectives. The symbolic perspective of mythology takes a micro- to mid-level analysis of mythologies representation in society. The functionalist and conflict perspectives each demonstrate how a macro-level analysis can be combined with the symbolic perspective given informed and purposeful theory borrowing (Murray, Evers and Janda 1995). Arnould and Thompson (2005) stress that CCT studies addresses parts of four main CCT pillars: consumer identity projects, marketplace cultures, socio-historic patterning of consumption and mass mediated marketplace ideology and consumers’ interpretive strategies. CCT research theoretically foregrounds a respective advancement or contribution. Myth theory must then also utilise similar levels of theory-borrowing in order to embody the holistic nature of CCT. We offer various myth typologies to support theorists in evaluation of myth theories and appropriate integration of theoretical advancements in the field of CCT.

Our second conclusion considers with the closing the gap between marketing theorising and managerial practice. Contemporary theoretical advancements in consumer research reflect holistic theoretical preferences and culturally acquired tendencies of consumer culture that influence scholars toward particular forms of analysis and explanation. Reflection of these taken-for-granted ideas and predispositions may make theoretical contributions more accessible to marketing practitioners. The breakdown of mythology offered in this paper is designed to allow theorists an understanding how mythology is being used in consumer research, were the foundations for those contributions came from, and in turn allow stronger and more accessible theoretical contributions. Our arguments are based on the idea that in order to advance mythology and consumer research, we have to more seriously consider the implications of foundational literature and the formation of contemporary theories.
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