

Vol 2 Issue 3 Sept 2014

ISSN No: 2321-5488

*International Multidisciplinary
Research Journal*

Research Directions

Editor-in-Chief
S.P. Rajguru

Welcome to Research Direction
ISSN No.2321-5488

Research Direction Journal is a multidisciplinary research journal, published monthly in English, Hindi & Marathi Language. All research papers submitted to the journal will be double-blind peer reviewed referred by members of the editorial board readers will include investigator in universities, research institutes government and industry with research interest in the general subjects.

CHIEF PATRON

Mr. Sanjeev Patil
Chairman :
Central Div. Rayat Shikshan Sanstha, Satara.

PATRON

Suhasini Shan
Chairman -
LMC & Director - Precision Industries, Solapur.

EDITOR IN CHIEF

S.P. Rajguru
Asst. Prof. (Dept. of English) Rayat Shikshan Sanstha's,
L. B. P. Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Solapur. (M.S.)

Sub Editors (Dept. Of Humanities & Social Science)

Dr. Prakash M. Badiger
Guest Faculty, Dept. Of History,
Gulbarga University, Gulbarga.

Nikhilkumar D. Joshi
Gujrat

Dr. Kiranjeet Kaur

Nikhil Joshi
Dept. of English G.H. Patel College of
Engineering and Technology, Gujrat.

Advisory Board

S. N. Gosavi

Shrikant Yelegaonkar

Punjabrao Rongre

D. R. More

T. N. Kolekar

Seema Naik

M. L. Jadhav

Annie John

Suhas Nimbalkar

Adusumalli Venkateswara Raw

Deepa P. Patil

R.D. Bawdhankar

Ajit Mondal

Guest Referee

Maryam Ebadi Asayesh
Islamic Azad University, Iran

Henry Hartono
Soegijapranata Catholic University, Indonesia

Judith F. Balares Salamat
Department of Humanities, IASPI, Philippines

Mukesh Williams
University of Tokyo, Japan

Address:- Ashok Yakkaldevi 258/34, Raviwar Peth, Solapur - 413 005 Maharashtra, India
Cell : 9595 359 435, Ph No: 02172372010 Email: ayisrj@yahoo.in Website: www.ror.isrj.org

THE SOCIOLOGY OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

Ashok Shivaji Yakkaldevi

Assistant Professor A.R. Burla Vartishta Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Solapur.

Abstract:

The social science of shopper conduct is currently appreciating a renaissance of investment. In a prior time of American humanism, especially in the years quickly previously, then after the fact World War II, purchaser conduct was basically overlooked. While buyers were specified in right on time group studies (Lynd and Lynd 1937; Warner and Lunt 1941), few articles on customer conduct showed up in expert diaries. Established scholars were surely not at deficiency; they cleared out a rich legacy of sociological hypothesis: Simmel ([1904] 1957) written work on design, Marx ([1867] 1990) on ware fetishism, Weber ([1922] 1959) on status bunches, Veblen ([1899] 1953) on arresting utilization. Handbooks distributed up through the 1980s kept on examining conventional sociological concerns identified with governmental issues, freak conduct, and race relations (Merton, Broom, and Cottrell 1959; Faris 1964; Smelser 1988). At the same time buyer conduct was not said whatsoever.

KEYWORDS:

Sociology , Consumer Behavior , social science .

INTRODUCTION:

It is impossible to say why customers were disregarded by sociologists for so long. Conceivably, shopper conduct was thought to be the region of other scholastic spaces mass trading, for instance, or retailing and promoting. Marxists and neo-Marxists saw social orders composed around generation, with utilization a diversion from the principal concerns of a free market system (Horkheimer and Adorno 1972). Others have estimated that creation has been the enduring champ in the sociological plan. Conceivably excessively sociologists believed that utilization was silly. Plants (1953) remarked that Veblen's sarcastic assault on the new white collar class really obscured his understanding of arresting utilization.

Amid the last few decades, numerous onlookers got to be progressively persuaded that social orders were changing in their introduction from creation to utilization (Mckendrick, Brewer, and Plumb 1982; Campbell 1987). Two different components, then again, assumed a more prompt part in hastening this present territory's development. The main is the "social turn" in human science: the acknowledgment of society's principal part in understanding society (Alexander 1990). Customer products are, when its all said and done, social curios. Of course, anthropologists presented a great part of the early research and a significant number of the fundamental works around there (Richardson and Kroeber 1940; Sahlins 1976; Mintz 1985; Mccracken 1988). Key here is the joint distribution of an anthropologist and economist: Douglas and Isherwood's (1979) World of Goods, a scorching evaluate of the utilitarian methodology to utilization. A second reason identifies with the resurgence of enthusiasm toward typical communication. This point of view was a regular purpose of dish for comprehension utilization and the typical qualities of

THE SOCIOLOGY OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

items. Look into by Blumer (1969) on style, Stone (1962) on clothing, and Goffman (1951, 1959) on prop administration and the typical properties of items reflected an early concern with the part of material merchandise in social life.

The social science of customer conduct is a similarly new territory of examination. The surge of late research is confirmation to another and energetic stream of insightful action much of it at the crossing point of society and the economy. The region addresses the whole scope of issues identified with buyer conduct: Why are there such a variety of products? Who utilizes them? How are they made and where are they purchased? As in a lot of people new ranges of scholastic investment, research diaries are not packed with various, contending standards. Attention rather is on investigating the part of shopper conduct in all parts of social life. To arrange this audit, I utilize the focal ideal model that has developed in the course of the most recent decade—the model of a buyer society. Customer social orders are characterized as social orders where character issues are determined through wares got from the commercial center. The sign of this ideal model is an attention on the interdependency between different parts of the business sector and in the middle of businesses and purchasers.

This survey is sorted out into three areas: the first considers how items are utilized as assets as a part of personality arrangement and consolidated into the social and social lives of people; the second and third segments investigate the market's part in creating and disseminating products. Examination surveys are affirmation to a scholarly range's transition; a few have as of late been distributed on utilization and intrigued perusers can counsel them for a somewhat diverse diagram of this field (Frenzen, Hirsch, and Zerillo 1994; Zukin and Maguire 2004; Arnould and Thompson 2005; Zelizer 2005).

II. MERCHANDISE IN THE SOCIAL AND CULTURAL WORLD

More than a century back, Veblen ([1899] 1953) delineated the essential thoughts for comprehension utilization: utilization is social (it is affected by others) and social (it is data passed on to others). Contemporary researchers have taken the social and social parts of utilization and set them against a background of an evolving society, which has adjusted the conventional bases of personality. Quick and profound situated social change, as per Giddens (1991), results in a "reflexive task" where people ceaselessly build accounts toward oneself, collections of memoirs of sorts, to grapple themselves in another world. This new world includes quick industrialization, postindustrialization, and urbanization as well as globalization. Globalization, as indicated by Frank and Meyer (2002:93), reduces the power of the country state and legitimates the "tastes, diversions, and needs" of people. Purchaser propensities are discriminating to these needs and basic to character. Things help place the self in social and social space. The business sector supplies the social assets the items fundamental to this procedure. In the meantime, shopper products are no panacea for the dangers and instabilities of the present day world. Interestingly with more seasoned and more steady social requests, an uneasy strain exists between the development of individualized characters and the market's supply of things. This strain that the fit in the middle of character and item is never correct or totally right—is a piece of the significance passed on by Giddens' (1991) "reflexive venture."

A. Social Distinctions: Product Use and Personal Identity

In premodern social orders, "appearance was to a great extent institutionalized as far as customary criteria" (Giddens 1991:99). Be that as it may order happens distinctively today, with characters more individualized and parts progressively different; various parts cross rearing clash and uncertainty in noting the inquiry "who am I" (Frank and Meyer 2002; Callero 2003). This string that character issues are more confounded than in the past—is found all through the essential research on status and item utilization. Youthful persons are concerned not just with being on the right half of the generational gap additionally with the approbation of their companions (Miles 1996; Freitas et al. 1997). Ladies at work are on edge about adjusting their womanliness with the expert requests at work (Rubinstein 1995; Kimle and Damhorst 1997). White collar class blacks are worried about race and agitated about separating themselves from the negative picture of a ruined minority (Lamont and Molnar 2001). In each one case, customer products or ways of life identified with utilization give ammo in the contemporary battle with personality. Items are contacts to differing social classifications, however especially to age, sex, and race. Youngsters end up purchasing the right physical shoes, despite the fact that they are generally not exactly helpful for them (Miles 1996). Ladies develop a style of business dress to scaffold the pressure between design, conservatism, and sexuality (Kimle and Damhorst 1997). Princely blacks strikingly devour, a script recommended by promoting hobbies (Lamont and Molnar 2001). In each one case, wares elucidate ambiguities in individual and social character, that is, in the way individuals see themselves and thusly the

way they trust they are seen by others.

Character is a venture. Point by point ethnographies demonstrate that issues connected with character increase nervousness (Thompson and Hirshman 1995; Freitas et al. 1997). Moreover, individual change basic in contemporary social orders includes part moves that heighten personality issues and adjust utilization. Exploration demonstrates that people use diverse things as they move starting with one part then onto the next moving to school (Silver 1996), for instance, or getting separated (Mcalexander 1991). New things help the move; they permit expectant socialization to investigate new parts. Cook and Kaiser (2004), for instance, indicate how beautifiers and related items are utilized by youngsters to investigate originations of womanhood. Arvidsson's (2001) examination examines the part of engine bikes in the journey for affirmation toward oneself among Italian youth. Products fulfill stable yearnings as well as accommodate the investigation of new parts and new personalities (Solomon 1983).

Direct as this exploration may be, it is a chosen hypothetical development over past perspectives. Rather than economists, the attention is on use as opposed to buy. Rather than neo-Marxists, the accentuation is on the estimation of things for people instead of entrepreneurs. Most vital, it likewise propels the way contemporary sociologists see how items are utilized. Consider, for instance, Goffman's (1959) symbolism: individuals are in front of an audience, handle life situationally and deal with whatever props are available to them to impact their presentation of self. In front of an audience, props are utilized; off stage, they may be relinquished. In much sociological research on consumerism, notwithstanding, the division between in front of an audience and off stage is vague. Here and there, wares can be effortlessly disposed of, as when youngsters try different things with makeup (Cook and Kaiser 2004). In different occasions, things are not simply props in an organized play, they are close to home ventures that are expansions of our self (Belk 1988). Much research contends that products assume a critical part in our life and may be permeated with a sacrosanct status. Mementoes and family pictures are esteemed well past their business sector worth. Autos are washed, cleaned, and unmistakably shown. Fragrances or adornments are thought to apply control over others. On the off chance that these belonging are a piece of any dramatization, they are the show of our lives—however surely not generally or fundamentally props to be disposed of without breaking a sweat (Wallendorf and Arnould 1988; Belk, wallendorf, and Sherry 1989; Kaiser, Freeman, and Chandler 1993; Otnes and lowrey 1993.)

B. Aggregate Life

Past their significance for individual personality, things incorporate people into aggregate life. In the convention of Durkheimian humanism, items reflect both separation and attachment, dividing "we" from "they."

This is archived in the broad writing on blessing giving that overhauls the exemplary take a shot at blessings and trade (Mauss 1954; Gouldner 1960; Titmuss 1971; Cheal 1988; Otnes and Beltramini 1996). Blessings are traded as indicated by recommended ceremonies. In Caplow's (1984) Middletown exploration, blessing giving at Christmas is as a matter of first importance an open event. Blessings are synchronized to suit the part connections in the middle of suppliers and collectors. Blessings distinguish the cozy ring of family and companions, however they can likewise be utilized to recognize others. This is conceivable on the grounds that the social separation inferred by endowments is more nuanced than the sharp double qualification in the middle of "we" and "they." In Middletown, closeness is measured by the metric of the business sector economy: the all the more unreasonable the blessing, the more cozy the relationship. In this view, the variable expense of blessings recognizes kinfolk from nonkin as well as everybody in the middle.

There is additionally much research on the expansion of subcultures—affirmation to the part separation of contemporary society. Here once more, items clear up ambiguities, mark limits, and grapple persons into the differing qualities of social life. They give the social capital important to dish into the private ring that subcultures manage (Lamont and Lareau 1988). Researchers have composed widely about different subcultures: gays (Higgins 1998), wellbeing sustenance faddists (Thompson and Troester 2002), members in ranchers' business sectors (Mcgrath, Sherry, and Heisley 1993), and enthusiasts of Macintosh machines or Saab autos (Mu?niz and O'guinn 2000).

Schouten and Mcalexander's (1995) exploration on bikers delineates much of what this examination is about. These creators utilize the idea of a subculture of utilization: "a different subgroup of society that self-chooses on the premise of an imparted responsibility to a specific item class, brand, or utilization movement" (Schouten and Mcalexander 1995:43). They acquaint this idea with show how bikers utilize their Harley-Davidsons to express countercultural ways of life. What is fascinating about these bikers is not just the centrality of the bicycles in their lives additionally the way bicycles turn into the medium for social cooperation. The connections among bikers rely on upon the bicycle; it is as though

material articles dislodge people as accomplices in collaboration a methodology Knorr Cetina (1997) alludes to as "objectualization".

C. The Language of Commodities

Things, as in the past noted, are social ancient rarities basic in the presentation of self. Items convey social intending to others, meaning who you are and what you are about. In Sahlins' (1976) perspective, buyer products duplicate "the society into an arrangement of items" (p. 179). Anyhow there is no basic equality between the specific things utilized and the way they are seen by others. This is not shocking. Creators, sponsors, and buyers give items diverse implications. Few social researchers accept any typical codes are generally caught on. Goffman's (1971) idea of a tie-sign recommends a substitute approach to ponder this issue. Things, in his perspective, change in settled upon implications; there is more concurrence on a few products than others (see likewise Rubinstein 1995: 191–205). Tie-signs are effortlessly perused and their implications broadly caught on. Clear samples are regalia, exceedingly gendered attire, or great countercultural interpretations as in the apparel of punks or the hoods of the Ku Klux Klan. In different occasions, be that as it may, importance is basically more equivocal.

One evident element helping equivocalness in significance is that persons may utilize comparable items for diverse purposes—as Bourdieu (1984:177–200) proposes for disposition to suppers or as Halle (1992) recommends for the assessment of workmanship (see likewise Hebdige 1979). Distinctive implications are to a great extent a capacity of people involving diverse parts in different social gatherings. The uniqueness between the utilization of a specific merchandise and its elucidation by others has been generally perceived by buyer scholars. Davis (1992) proposes that items are polysemic, some piece of a shaky dialect of significance. Campbell (1996) suggests strongly recognizing items from use, contending that the two ought not be befuddled as equivalents. Holt (1998) contends for a more comprehensive methodology to utilization, breaking down star groupings of customer conduct as opposed to concentrating on any given item. Typical interactionists reason that questionable correspondence is inalienable in social connection; just interpersonal talk permits people to achieve common comprehension (Stone 1962).

The uniqueness in seeing likewise postures issues for performing artists. In Schouten and McAlexander's (1995) exploration, not everybody who rode a bicycle was considered by Hell's Angels sorts to be a piece of the no-nonsense; numerous were weekend bikers, often administrators yet unequivocally not lighthearted or countercultural. Unnecessary to include, weekend bikers were objects of contempt, scorned by in-your-face cyclists. Be that as it may derision is the expense of reliance on items that the business sector supplies. Access to the business sector is unregulated. Anybody with the assets and slant can purchase practically anything they need regardless of the fact that what they need is an identification of enrollment in a subculture where they are unwelcome. Things hence give a harsh manual for order people, however exact derivations are more problematic.

D. Social Class and Cultural Distinctions

Pierre Bourdieu (1984), in his persuasive book on *Distinction*, proposes that items in contemporary society give the social cashflow to maintain class rank. He accepts that fused into the microlevel environment of people the habitus—are social airs relating what is disgusting, what is unique, and what gives respect and regard. These mental sets are, in Bourdieu's perspective, class based. In the nineteenth-century class was a real determinant of ways of life, as both Simmel ([1904] 1957) and Veblen ([1899] 1953) watched. Researchers however have scrutinized the association in the middle of class and purchaser conduct in contemporary social orders. They doubt whether status has supplanted class and whether ways of life are tied down in monetary pecking orders.

The part of class in utilization keeps on being talked about (Lamont and Fournier 1992; Lamont et al. 1996; Kingston 2000; Grusky and Weeden 2001). In one sense, class is unquestionably powerful in utilization: salary can't be disregarded and training, especially as it identifies with writing proficiency, similarly may be applicable (Wallendorf 2001). There is a further question, then again: Do classes look like status gatherings with comparable ways of life and customer propensities? Holt (1998) contends that they do; utilizing a wide meaning of utilization, he finds that high societies more probable worth style than capacity and bona fide items than mass-created products. Others recommend, on the other hand, that class today no more recognizes ways of life. Halle's (1992) exploration on craftsmanship in center and common laborers homes shows few noteworthy contrasts. Turner and Edmund (2002) demonstrate that Australian elites were not appallingly inspired by highbrow society. Lamont's (1992) examination recommends that Bourdieu's perceptions on class qualification might more precisely portray France than the United States. By what method ought to one translate clashing discoveries on class? Two conclusions, I accept, are

THE SOCIOLOGY OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

justified. Initially, class and utilization oblige more refined investigation to unravel imperative subtleties in utilization (Crompton 1996; Holt 1998; Grusky and Weeden 2001). Second, it is likely that class stays persuasive, in spite of the fact that its essentialness presumably has decreased in later times.

An extra hypothetical issue is whether Veblen's perceptions on obvious utilization stay substantial today. This is a regular theme in social analysis. In her book *Do Americans Shop Too Much?*, Juliet Schor (2000) reargues Veblen's investigate by noting that "the ways of life of the upper white collar class and the rich have turned into a more notable perspective for individuals all through the pay dispersion. . . . Extravagance, instead of insignificant solace, is a far reaching yearning" (p. 8). Extravagance items are for sure accessible and may be more broadly conveyed than they were previously (Twitchell 1999). In the meantime, other proof recommends that obvious utilization may not precisely portray American purchasing propensities. Case in point, forms in attire are divided today along lines irrelevant to privileged impact (Crane 2000). Gartman (1991) contends that item plans much of the time veil instead of emphasize class contrasts; his examination of autos gives much backing to this position. Moreover, powerhouse retailers like Wal-Mart and Kmart and McDonalds barely energize arresting utilization. Heffetz's (2004) examination of the Bureau of Labor's Consumer Expenditure Survey shows that individuals do use all the more on things that are profoundly unmistakable to others—adornments, autos, or dress, for instance. In the meantime, the additional cash used on extravagance buys is not considerable; it represents 12 percent of all using and is restricted to the top 50% of the pay conveyance.

Extravagance is generally ballyhooed in the broad communications (O'guinn and Shrum 1997). In any case interest with the ways of life of the exceptionally rich does not mean shoppers wish extravagance items. An exchange method for taking a gander at arresting utilization, nonetheless, may be more conceivable: to see it as unmistakable specifically circumstances—as when minorities are attempting to break obstructions of segregation. Mccracken (1988:96–102), for instance, sees business dress for ladies as copying the power of men at work. Similarly, Lamont and Molnar (2001) contend that middleclass blacks may devour obviously to separation themselves from more denied classes. Class may even now clarify who utilizes what, and obvious utilization may surface specifically occurrences. Regardless, Veblen's thoughts are presumably not the most ideal approach to clarify present day utilization.

This exploration on class, subcultures, wares, and characters demonstrates how items are utilized and joined into the lives of people. The buyer society ideal model likewise proposes that shoppers rely on upon business sectors for determining ambiguities in personality. In Appadurai's (1986) expression, products have social lives; they have histories, beginnings, and endpoints. Markets are the stadiums where these histories play out: in the specialized points of interest of generation, in the ways items secure typical characters, and in the dispersion framework that moves items from production lines to retail locations and into the hands and homes of shoppers. The following real areas consider two sections of purchaser markets: the businesses that make items and the business sectors that convey them.

III. PURCHASER MARKETS 1: PRODUCING GOODS, CONSTRUCTING SYMBOLS

A. Item Diversity: The Case of Fashion

In *The Second Industrial Divide*, Piore and Sabel (1984:189) remark on the "evident move for assorted qualities" amid the 1970s. Differing qualities alludes to item differences, that is, the multiplication of items contrasting in styles, colors, and shapes. Differentiated products have comparable uses however vary in typical importance; they speak to shoppers with diverse tastes. As per purchaser scholars, item differing qualities has become exponentially throughout the last 40 to 50 years. Development in item differences brings up a charming and essential question about buyer markets: Why markets have such a variety of items? The answers given in the writing draw fundamentally from exploration on designs in ladies' clothing. In spite of the fact that bound to a solitary zone of utilization, the writing on style in ladies' attire offers understanding into how scholars contemplate generation markets and about the interest for item differing qualities. In this subsection, I first survey the chronicled records that scholars use as a background for their thoughts and afterward basically analyze the clarifications for differing qualities they give.

The verifiable records of style portray a business sector on the move. In the mid-nineteenth century up to the years taking after World War II, ladies' styles were overwhelmed by an arrangement of haute couture. Key makers and planners, for example, the House of Chanel or Dior were a piece of a brought together and progressive structure in ladies' designs. Styles were generally homogeneous and changed little from year to year. The outlines were at first gone for a high society customers, however were broadly sold to others. In the United States, makers replicated first class styles and sold them at diverse costs to ladies changing in salary; this practice, in Barber and Lobel's (1953) perspective, permitted privileged styles to

trickle down to center and average workers ladies in much the way Veblen anticipated.

By the 1970s, the haute couture framework reduced in vitality. Davis (1992:138–45) portrayed new, developing forms as democratized, polymorphous, and pluralistic. In the haute couture model, style diffused starting from the top be that as it may, as per Crane (2000), styles started to diffuse from the base up—with planners progressively receptive to assorted subcultures, including minorities, the adolescent, and the working people. As critical as the fracture of style was the velocity at which molds changed. In the haute couture framework, styles changed rarely. In the more pluralistic framework, styles changed all the more quickly, as much as five to six times each year or more (Gereffi 1994).

This history is informative. Style items broadened in two routes: in the first place, by getting to be more heterogeneous and divided indulging a more extensive scope of tastes and diversions; second, by quickening the pace of progress moving styles done and finished with vogue a few or more times each year. Why this blast in item differences, in the interest for new items and images? A large number of the clarifications offered draw on the extremely same thoughts utilized as a part of talks of personality the increment in heterogeneity and many-sided quality in contemporary social orders. As indicated by Crane (2000), new requests develop working together with the "discontinuity of contemporary social orders" and "the more noteworthy many-sided quality of connections between social gatherings" (p. 166). Davis (1992) binds style change to inner conflict about the self that a "more intricate and heterogeneous society" stresses (p. 24). Different analysts ascribe late form change to postmodernity and the breakdown of uniform social codes (Kaiser, Nagasawa, and Hutton 1991).

Mainstream as these clarifications may be, they are not by any means fulfilling on all records. In any case, more institutionalized, less assorted designs are not so much incongruent with the separation or individualized characters that customers look for. Purchasers, for instance, can express distinction by they way they assemble certain looks or in the embellishments they utilization. Postmodern thought sees distinction formed by utilizing remarkable items as well as by the varied utilization of institutionalized items. Likewise, Giddens (1991) notes that "mass created apparel still permits people to choose specifically on styles of dress" (p. 200). Independence may be created by utilizing unique items as well as by utilizing mass items as a part of a different way. Holt's (1997) examination recommends that people can and do innovatively utilize whatever is close by to art special ways of life.

An extra concern is that a hefty portion of the customary clarifications show up less erroneous but rather more inadequate. Little is specified about style change in ranges other than ladies' attire constrained however this writing may be (see, e.g., Gartman 1991; Slater 2002; Postrel 2003; Molotch 2003). Have items enhanced at the same pace in these different territories? Conventional clarifications likewise need specificity—they deficiently represent the route drifts in unpredictability and heterogeneity are contrastingly experienced. Conventional clarifications, for instance, slight two conspicuous and related occasions critical for comprehension the fracture in ladies' molds: the more extensive interest of ladies in the paid work power and the ascent of woman's rights. Both occasions thrived amid the sixties and for the most part engaged ladies. Expanded self-sufficiency, additionally expanded commitments joined with work, interprets into new requests not tended to by privileged designs. The changed status of ladies proposes that it might be more beneficial to contemplate the interest for new items as a result not of evolving parts however of the advancement of new parts and new social and social spaces that ladies started to involve.

Regardless of these reservations, expanded assorted qualities likely describes the items in numerous purchaser markets. Basic as this perception shows up, a critical issue is in question. Design implies that items changing in typical importance are vehicles for rivalry. In traditional matters in profit making, similar merchandise are picked on the premise of cost. In any case customer exploration recommends in an unexpected way: as items expand, item rivalry builds and value rivalry decays. "Item separation implies that merchandise are just defective substitutes for one another, so purchasers can no more make immediate value examinations" (Carruthers and Babb 2000:36). A few journalists see this increment in item rivalry as a vital defining moment in the motion of customer markets. Lash and Urry (1987), for instance, propose that contemporary economies are remarkable for the generation of images. In a comparable vein, Featherstone (1992) examines the aestheticization of ordinary life as a power in mass utilization and Postrel (2003) distinguishes feel as changing trade.

At last, shouldn't something be said about buyers? How have they responded to discontinuity in the business for designs? In the event that personality is a venture then buyers should be ever at the vigil for new molds and new styles (Kellner 1992). Indeed, differing designs seem to advance separation and tension. Research has indicated ladies to be dynamic specialists (as opposed to detached exploited people) in expending styles. Brickell's (2002) study demonstrates how imperviousness to mold patterns creates. Thompson and Haytko (1997) see form as a tool compartment deciphered, acknowledged, or released as indicated by the needs and objectives of people. School understudies counsel style magazines yet don't

THE SOCIOLOGY OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

fundamentally take after the styles they advance; likewise, "the rate of ladies . . . inspired by popular styles has relentlessly declined" (Crane 2000:168).

In the meantime, the perspective of blithe shoppers fiddling in styles has limits. One farthest point is that divided style makes vagueness. In Davis' (1992) perspective, the quick pace of progress and the "flood of new forms" imply that few persons know precisely what is "in" and what is "out" (p. 108). Expending design is sincerely charged. Merry however they show up, shoppers report dangers, vulnerability, and nervousness in selecting what to wear (Chua 1992; Thompson and Hirschman 1995). Having numerous choices does not mean choices are not difficult to make (Schwartz 2004).

B. Fabricating Product Diversity: Flexible Production and International Trade

Customer advertises likewise must production differing items. How is this done? Slater and Tonkiss (2001) briefly catch the customary contention with respect to the assembling of assorted, exceptionally individualized items: "New mechanical . . . opportunities were developing that refocused the rationale of creation far from mass fabricate and mass utilization to adaptable responsive generation of more separated scopes of merchandise to constantly socially separated shoppers" (p. 179). The rationale of creation in Slater and Tonkiss' announcement alludes to the development of postfordism or adaptable generation (Piore and Sable 1984; Harvey 1989). Under fordism, machines devoted to a solitary assignment mass produce merchandise; under postfordism, electronic machines produce products different in shades, styles, and sizes. Thus the association between item differences and adaptable innovation.

The connection between "socially separated shoppers" and adaptable creation bodes well yet two focuses need elucidation. The main is that plants (and commercial ventures) don't conveniently fall into classes of prefordist, fordist, and postfordist generation (Vallas 1999). Plants may join prefordist creation with adaptable innovation to make differing items. In the attire business, for instance, mechanized engineering is generally utilized as a part of the outline and preassembly phases of generation; yet to really develop articles of clothing, laborers regularly sew by hand or use sewing machines (Fine and Leopold 1993; Mather 1993). Subsequently, item differences can likewise come about because of requests on untalented specialists to participate in various errands that create diverse things. Taplin (1995, 1996) contends that work not engineering is the adaptable asset in clothing creation; his exploration on attire processing plants reports how untalented, low-wage work is utilized to oblige the changing requests of makers.

A second complexity alludes to the topography of generation. Late research has accentuated worldwide creation notwithstanding adaptable engineering as helping item differences. Gereffi (1994), for instance, proposes that item differences is encouraged by subcontracting generation over a huge and differing pool of production lines scattered over the globe. Subcontracting builds adaptability, permitting producers to minimize their speculations and quest for creation offices to suit their needs. Gereffi's (1994) examination concentrates on merchandise chains that facilitate creation over a decentralized and global system of production lines (see additionally Hassler 2003). In his view, the worldwide extension (as opposed to scale) of creation is discriminating for the assembling of assorted items. More industrial facilities are just accessible to make more and diverse things. Predictable with Gereffi's perspective, Broda and Weinstein's (2004) investigation of import information shows that worldwide exchange has expanded item assorted qualities in the United States by as much as fourfold lately.

C. Publicizing, Brands, and the Cultural Economy

A last venture in this survey of the generation business sector is the typical implying that differing items obtain. Planners and makers propose implications. Products additionally may procure typical implications through utilization. Be that as it may publicizing is the rule path by which items secure importance. As indicated by Mccracken (1988:71–89), publicizing is a methodology of transference: Symbols made or taken from the society are utilized by promoters to arrange a product in social space.

The exercises of sponsors, including their procedures and arrangements with customers, have been abundantly examined. Sponsors meet with makers, distinguish a business specialty in the setting of contending items, and after that concentrating on specific qualities of their item develop a situation connecting their item to a circumstance that shoppers wish (Mccracken 1988:71–89; Hennion and Meadel 1989; Slater 2002). Items subsequently pick up a personality, and contending items with comparative utilizations are separated in significance. Does this work—that is, do advertisements offer? "The customary way of thinking," as Alan Warde (2002b) has noted, is that "makers are not able to control needs through promoting" (p. 11). This is for the most part genuine. Promotions convey data, yet buyers are not clear slates; they have much data and are liable to numerous impacts. Incalculable studies demonstrate that

THE SOCIOLOGY OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

people are differentially responsive to a notice's message—dependent upon things, for example, their mentality to an item or their receptivity to new data (Hirschman and Thompson 1997; Adaval 2003; Brinol, Petty, and Tormala 2004).

A large number of these studies, then again, miss the more extensive impact of promoting on customers. Marked items show what this impact is about. Brands are the essential way sponsors handle item differing qualities. Items are typically separated from one another by enrollment in distinctive groups of products: Dell machines, Ann Taylor suits, Panasonic TVs. Brands are, to a limited extent, built by sponsors and makers. They are vessels that publicists utilize to pass on the typical importance of items. Studies demonstrate that brands are among the most essential ways buyers assess quality, despite the fact that they may not purchase brands if cost is a component (Holt 2004; Zukin 2004). The more mainstream brands are, the more fruitful advertisements have a tendency to be (Campbell and Keller 2003). Some proof additionally recommends that advertisements are more fruitful when items are comparable being used (Hennion and Meadel 1989:194).

Much research additionally shows that it is the brand—not simply the item, its style or quality—that is essential in utilization. At the point when exhibited with a decision between two indistinguishable items one recognized by a well-known or prestigious brand and one that is not—shoppers consistently select the item with the well-known brand name (Behling and Wilch 1988; Hoyer and Brown 1990; McClure et al. 2004). This examination recommends a straightforward however startling conclusion: Individuals are expending images and items.

Brands are steered to market corners to countercultural gatherings, to a white collar class intrigued by dependability, to yuppies excited about design and style. In the meantime, producers much of the time attempt to extend deals to different gatherings of people. In that lies the trouble in making promotions effective apparatuses of influence: how to pass on the typical estimation of an item to distinctive business sector portions. It is well realized that persons with diverse foundations translate broad communications messages in an unexpected way (Shively 1992). It is additionally the case that persons with diverse foundations decipher promotions in an unexpected way (Grier and Brumbaugh 1999). Promoters encounter much trouble in altering advertisements for different groups of onlookers (Kates and Goh 2003). For instance, endeavors to present distinctive promotions to market portions may be straightforward and a reason for imperviousness to a notice's message. The Hell's Angels sorts in Schouten and McAlexander's (1995) examination despised the promotions Harley-Davidson tended to official bikers and in addition to "Dykes on Bikes." du Gay (1997) shows that Sony's starting endeavor to tweak advertisements for its Walkman was unsuccessful; deals raised, in any case, when the advertisements' images were incorporated into the Walkman's outline.

From a sociological viewpoint, promoting introduces an intriguing issue. A primary understanding of the self is that it creates because of existing social edges. Does promoting supply these casings at any rate to some extent? It is safe to say that it is conceivable, as a few researchers have proposed, that publicizing significantly influences our society and mind including the trajectory of our character ventures (Ewen 1977; Williamson 1978)? A few careful investigations demonstrate the extensive impact of promotions on ways of life. Unmistakable here is De Beer's advancement of jewels as the vital accomplice to marriage (Epstein 1982). Otnes and Pleck (2003) follow the ascent of the expensive wedding to publicizing in marriage magazines. Korzeniewicz (1994) credits Nike's prosperity to its promotions filling the blast in wellbeing and wellness. Lamont and Molnar (2001) connection notable utilization operating at a profit white collar class to sponsors. This exploration is reason for thought and concern. Do existing hypotheses of character and social change slight the part of promoting and misrepresent clarifications of utilization? More research is required on this essential issue.

IV. SHOPPER MARKETS 2: SHOPPING AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF GOODS

Retail exchange is the other key market in the shopper society. To Marx ([1867] 1990), retailers were the trivial bourgeoisie, coincidental to the real drives of generation. By complexity, retailers today are more inclined to be real enterprises. Corporate development has incited researchers to reexamine the part of retailing in the economy. They propose that retailers are another wellspring of force in the commercial center. They additionally contend that development and force have been utilized to change shopping, to make it average and engrossing in this manner invigorating deals and energy for items.

A. The Retail Revolution

All eyewitnesses agree that substantial partnerships progressively overwhelm retail exchange (Mills 1951; Chandler 1962; Bluestone et al. 1981; du Gay 1993). Factories (1951:166–69) described the

THE SOCIOLOGY OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

"enormous bazaar" as extensive, solid, and constantly in quest for development, while du Gay (1993:569) reasoned that the retail business is currently "overwhelmed and controlled by vast organizations." In the 1960s, retail firms with 100 or more stores represented 15 percent of all deals as contrasted and the 40 percent they control today (U.s. Agency of the Census 1966, 2001).

Paralleling the development of the firm is the development of the store itself. Stores are progressively ready to stock the assorted wares vital to individualized personality ventures. Numerous stores today are enormous box retail outlets: expansive markdown stores, retail establishments, markets, and "classification executioners" represent considerable authority in a scope of related items, (for example, Home Depot or Office Max). From the retailer's point of view, enormous stores are more practical to run and offer items more productively than "mother and pop stores" (Hahn 2000). Store development is significant. Plants (1951:166-69) evaluated that in the 1950s, Macy's leader store loaded 400,000 things; today, lead stores convey somewhere around 1 and 2 million things (Abernathy 1999:41). As per Walsh (1993:9), grocery stores in the 1950s and 1960s conveyed 5000 to 8000 things as contrasted with the 40,000 with 60,000 things they convey today (Abernathy 1999:41).

Ritzer (1993) and others contend that the development and centralization of retail firms give assets to excusing operations (Noyelle 1987; Gereffi 1994). Huge firms are more modern in transporting merchandise and overseeing stock. Besides, huge retailers request more products and deal all the more successfully with suppliers at lower costs. Volume deals additionally decrease costs. These elements, usually connected with the retail upheaval, make extensive firms more aggressive. Furthermore, the approach of shopping centers in the 1960s and 1970s accentuated rivalry in two different ways: expanding the quantity of extensive attire chains and giving an outlet to these ties to offer corner forms across the country.

It is likewise the case that retailers are all the more vertically coordinated, more included in assembling than was valid in the fifties and sixties. Gereffi (1994) discusses style retailers as "purchaser driven" and Murray (1989) contends that new machine innovation permits retailers to better track shopper request and manage supply. Blumer (1969) proposes that form is an arrangement of aggregate choice in which key guards planners, retail purchasers, promoting examiners choose what looks great and what does not. These guardians are progressively noticeable in retail networks. Affixes are more sensitive to and mindful to the requests of their customer base. Statistical surveying has gotten to be noteworthy in creating styles. Crane (2000) notes that achievement in the business relies on upon being "ready to recognize ways of life that reverberate with people in general" (p. 168). Rubinstein (1995) comparatively watches that "the gainful method for working together . . . is to study the clients, discover what they need, and make and business it" (p. 237). As retailers got to be more proficient about their customer base, they are additionally ready to make new strength specialties as outlined in the late development of business sectors for kids and young people (Cook 2004; Cook and Kaiser 2004)

The strength of retail networks has headed analysts to infer that "the parity of relative force has moved immovably to the side of the retailer" (du Gay 1993:570) (Crewe and Davenport 1992; Wrigley 1992). While size does help control, this conclusion must be qualified in a few ways. In any case, however the autonomous single-unit retail firm is in no way, shape or form overwhelming, not one or the other is it a relic. Autonomous single-unit stores today include 60 percent of the aggregate number of all stores and record for around 40 percent of all deals (U.s. Agency of the Census 2001:307). Moreover, in parts where customized administrations are popular, chains may be less noticeable (Stillman 2003). In the restaurant business, for instance, 70 percent of all organizations are single, independently claimed stores and record for around 50 percent of offers (Nelson 2001). At last, in a few areas, vehicles and lodging, for instance, makers firmly control retail operations.

In the second place, retail power may not decipher into higher benefits in any event when contrasted and the benefits of producers (Messinger and Narasimhan 1995). Ailawadi, Borin, and Farris (1995) report that just Wal-Mart has dissolved producers' benefits yet different retailers have not. Blossom and Perry (2001) recommend a further capability: Large producers improve when managing Wal-Mart however littler ones endure.

A third issue includes the perspective of the retail transformation as a mechanical change (Noyelle 1987). History has proven time and again that substantial chains progressively utilize machine innovation to screen stock, customer interest, and deals. It is additionally the case that retailers are more profitable than previously (Sieling, Friedman, and Dumas 2001). Profit, in any case, is a capacity of both engineering and the way work is utilized. Well known brands diminish work costs through selfservice deals where purchasers as opposed to deals faculty "reach for the item" (Twitchell 1999:189). Organization toward oneself deals may be "the absolute most essential component in containing work costs" in retail exchange (du Gay 1993:572). Shockingly, organization toward oneself procedures have been insulted in seeing how substantial chains have ended up gainful, aggressive, and effective.

B. Shopping

Much research recommends that notwithstanding checking stock and deals, retailers have attempted to modify the knowledge of customers. Their procedures go well past the stunning showcase of products retail establishments utilized as a part of the past (Williams 1982). Shopping centers today generally have film theaters, themed restaurants, youngsters' rides, and skating arenas to enthrall clients. Control instruments are incorporated into the configuration of malls; they run from the arrangement of lifts to the utilization of lighting to the mix of stores. All are intended to expand introduction to items, stretch the time used shopping and empower motivation purchasing. Late research focuses to hightech advancements utilizing media and excitement situations of moving light, cheery sound, and different feature screens—as often as possible welcoming buyers to take part in games related dreams (Sherry et al. 2001; Kozinets et al. 2002, 2004).

Ritzer (2005) sees these developments as new advertising controls used to upset utilization in an "embittered world." He sees shopping centers as "houses of God of utilization," both vindicated and modern in their impact on purchasers. Shopping centers are essential; they contain the retail networks indispensable in way of life shopping (Shields 1992). Much research proposes that a store's picture is a critical wellspring of fascination in shopping (Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman 1994; Zimmer and Golden 1988). Research discoveries for shopping centers are tantamount. Shoppers who discover shopping centers engrossing and energizing likewise demonstrate that they are avid to return (Finn and Louviere 1996; Wakefield and Baker 1998). A little number of buyers use shopping to unwind. As anyone might expect, more utilitarian customers are less inclined to visit shopping centers (Roy 1994). The themed environment in numerous shopping centers is intended to energize dreams (Gottdiener 1997). Exploration demonstrates that fantasizing about material merchandise is normal (Fournier and Guiry 1993) and further that people who enjoy such dreams likely shop much of the time and enthusiastically (O'guinn and Faber 1989). From a sociological viewpoint, dream permits purchasers to play with and investigate diverse presentations of self.

Shopping is additionally seen as time to go through with family and companions (Arnold and Reynolds 2003). On the off chance that shopping earlier was (women's) work, it is presently additionally utilized for amusement and recreation. At the point when buyers do shop to unwind, they are less inclined to consider value (Wakefield and Inman 2003). Shopping with companions is prevalent with teens; it builds their happiness furthermore the cash they use (Mangleburg, Doney, and Bristol 2004). Social shopping has two extra, however apparently conflicting impacts. At the point when in a gathering, customers look for more mixture in their decisions to inspire others with their distinction (Ratner, Kahn, and Kahneman 1999; Ariely and Levav 2000). Customers likewise request guidance from their shopping accomplices on whether their determinations are adequate and proper (Chua 1992). Shopping with others in this manner gives both the distinction and the aggregate associations that Simmel ([1904] 1957) saw as fundamental to form and utilization.

In outline, numerous customers appear to reflect the planned effect of the shopping center's configuration. They see shopping as relaxation as opposed to work, are entertained at the shopping center, and will probably return there to shop once more. In the meantime, it is unjustifiable to presume that most customers look like the cliché "shop 'til I drop" buyer. The more extensive connection here is that realism is not higher in the United States than different nations (Ger and Belk 1999) and that using on things has not expanded over the past—the converse is actually the case (U.s. Authority of Labor Statistics 2005).

A more exact rundown is that retailing reflects a melange of stores and an assortment of customers. It might be a retail world upset or changed yet the change is incomplete and deficient. Customers purchase in retail shopping centers as well as from family, companions, and neighbors (Frenzen and Davis 1990; Dimaggio and Louch 1998). While they use all the more in the organization of companions, customers likewise stretch thrift as an ideals (Miller 1998; Zukin 2004). Much shopping, especially twice-a-week visits to markets, scarcely qualifies as way of life shopping (Miller 1997). Moreover, nearby the individuals who shop to unwind are utilitarian customers; they visit shopping centers rarely yet when they do, it is to purchase an option that is instead of to be entertained (Bloch, Ridgway, and Dawson 1994; Roy 1994).

V. CONCLUSION

The standard of a customer society is more than an umbrella covering the assorted qualities of purchaser exploration. Not at all like neo-Marxist sees, the standard highlights the fulfillments and joys of wares. Dissimilar to utilitarian perspectives, the standard highlights the imagery wares have. Not at all like robotic perspectives, the standard highlights the interdependency of shoppers and markets, while in the meantime seeing people as dynamic specialists and society as basic to social life.

This standard has been progressed by a huge resurgence of examination archiving the criticalness

THE SOCIOLOGY OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

of purchaser conduct without commending consumerism itself. Approach issues have not been fundamental to the purchaser society standard, yet the issues of customer credit (Ritzer 1995), the nature's turf (Wilk 2001), political challenge (Holt 2002), and separation connected with race, class, and sex have all been tended to (Caplovitz 1963; Ayres and Siegelman 1995). Normal to these arrangement concerns is an arraignment of the free buyer business sector connected with private enterprise.

All standards have defects, and the purchaser society is no exemption. Utilization is essential in contemporary social orders; yet social orders are so mind boggling it would be impossible be called buyer social orders any more than they can be called modern social orders, postindustrial social orders, or postmodern social orders (Kumar 1995; Warde 2002a). By depicting social orders as purchaser social orders, the ideal model gleams over vital varieties discriminating to investigate. For instance, much is thought about utilization and character at the same time, shockingly, minimal about the individuals who have determined or overall minimized personality issues. How and what do these people expend? Comparable issues of oversight torment the other key term in the standard: the business. Customer scrutinize overwhelmingly concentrates on attire and sustenance. By differentiation, different items have been insulted (however not so much disregarded). A few pundits have contended that products differ in their significance to personality (Ilmonen 2001). Others recommend that business sectors work contrastingly for every merchandise (Fine and Leopold 1993). Notwithstanding the value of these reactions, a typology of items may be a helpful approach to study numerous diverse products and advance the skeleton specialists utilization.

Taking everything into account, specialists of utilization have battled a tough and progressively effective fight. They have recovered a range since a long time ago consigned to the no man's land of sociological exploration. They likewise have joined in an interdisciplinary exertion including social studies, human sciences, money making concerns, advertising, and retailing. However the disgrace connected with considering utilization in humanism may even now continue; at this point, the extremely top examination diaries in American social science occasionally distribute look into on shopper conduct. The test in the following decades will be to build this present territory's noticeable quality and bring to it the consideration it merits.

Search all sample exploration papers or see the rundown of human science examination paper subjects.

REFERENCES:

1. Abernathy, Frederick H. 1999. *A Stitch in Time: Lean Retailing and the Transformation of Manufacturing: Lessons from the Apparel and Textile Industries*. New York: Oxford University Press.
2. Adaval, Rashmi. 2003. "How Good Gets Better and Bad Gets Worse: Understanding the Impact of Affect on Evaluations of Known Brands." *Journal of Consumer Research* 30:352–67.
3. Ailawadi, Kusum L., Norm Borin, and Paul W. Farris. 1995. "Market Power and Performance: A Cross-Industry Analysis of Manufacturers and Retailers." *Journal of Retailing* 71:211–48.
4. Alexander, Jeffrey C. 1990. "Analytical Debates: Understanding the Relative Autonomy of Culture." Pp. 1–27 in *Culture and Society: Contemporary Debates*, edited by J. C. Alexander and S. Seidman. New York: Cambridge University Press.
5. Appadurai, Arjun. 1986. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
6. Ariely, Dan and Jonathan Levav. 2000. "Sequential Choice in Group Settings: Taking the Road Less Traveled and Less Enjoyed." *Journal of Consumer Research* 27:279–90.
7. Arnold, Mark J. and Kristy E. Reynolds. 2003. "Hedonic Shopping Motivations." *Journal of Retailing* 79:77–95.
8. Arnould, Eric J. and Craig J. Thompson. 2005. "Consumer Culture Theory (CCT): Twenty Years of Research." *Journal of Consumer Research* 31:868–82.
9. Arvidsson, Adam. 2001. "From Counterculture to Consumer Culture: Vespa and the Italian Youth Market 1958–78." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 1:47–71.
10. Ayers, Ian and Peter Siegelman. 1995. "Race and Gender Discrimination in Bargaining for a New Car." *American Economic Review* 85:304–21.
11. Baker, Julie, Dhruv Grewal, and A. Parasuraman. 1994. "The Influence of Store Environment on Quality Inferences and Store Image." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 22:328–39.
12. Barber, Bernard and Lyle Lobel. 1953. "Fashion in Women's Clothes and the American Social System." Pp. 323–32 in *Class, Status, and Power*, edited by R. Bendix and S. M. Lipset. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
13. Behling, Dorothy U. and Jennette Wilch. 1988. "Perceptions of Branded Clothing by Male Consumers." *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal* 6:43–47.

THE SOCIOLOGY OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

14. Belk, Russell W. 1988. "Possessions and the Extended Self." *Journal of Consumer Research* 15:139–68.
15. Belk, Russell W., Melanie Wallendorf, and John F. Sherry, Jr. 1989. "The Sacred and the Profane in Consumer Behavior: Theodicy on the Odyssey." *Journal of Consumer Research* 16:1–38.
16. Bloch, Peter H., Nancy M. Ridgway, and Scott A. Dawson. 1994. "The Shopping Mall as Consumer Habitat." *Journal of Retailing* 70:20–44.
17. Bloom, Paul N. and Vanessa G. Perry. 2001. "Retailer Power and Supplier Welfare: The Case of Wal-Mart." *Journal of Retailing* 77:295–97.
18. Bluestone, Barry, Patricia Hanna, Sarah Kuhn, and Laura Moore. 1981. *The Retail Revolution: Market Transformation, Investment, and Labor in the Modern Department Store*. Boston, MA: Auburn House.
19. Blumer, Herbert. 1969. "Fashion: From Class Differentiation to Collective Selection." *Sociological Quarterly* 10:275–91.
20. Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
21. Brickell, Chris. 2002. "Through the (New) Looking Glass: Gendered Bodies, Fashion and Resistance in Postwar New Zealand." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 2:241–69.
22. Brinol, Pablo, Richard E. Petty, and Zakary L. Tormala. 2004. "Self-Validation of Cognitive Responses to Advertisements." *Journal of Consumer Research* 30:559–73.
23. Broda, Christian and David E. Weinstein. 2004. "Variety Growth and World Welfare." *American Economic Review* 94:139–44.
24. Callero, Peter L. 2003. "The Sociology of the Self." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:115–33.
25. Campbell, Colin. 1987. *The Romantic Ethic and the Spirit of Modern Consumerism*. New York: Blackwell.
26. Campbell, Colin. 1996. "The Meaning of Objects and the Meaning of Actions." *Journal of Material Culture* 1:93–105.
27. Campbell, Margaret C. and Kevin L. Keller. 2003. "Brand Familiarity and Advertising Repetition Effects." *Journal of Consumer Research* 30:292–304.
28. Caplovitz, David. 1963. *The Poor Pay More*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
29. Caplow, Theodore. 1984. "Rule Enforcement without Visible Means: Christmas Gift Giving in Middletown." *American Journal of Sociology* 89:1306–23.
30. Carruthers, Bruce G. and Sarah L. Babb. 2000. *Economy/Society: Markets, Meanings, and Social Structure*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
31. Chandler, Alfred D. 1962. *Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the Industrial Enterprise*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
32. Cheal, David J. 1988. *The Gift Economy*. New York: Routledge.
33. Chua, Beng Huat. 1992. "Shopping for Women's Fashions in Singapore." Pp. 114–35 in *Lifestyle Shopping: The Subject of Consumption*, edited by R. Shields. New York: Routledge.
34. Cook, Daniel T. 2004. "Beyond Either/Or." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 4:147–53.
35. Cook, Daniel T. and Susan B. Kaiser. 2004. "Betwixt and be Tween: Age Ambiguity and the Sexualization of the Female Consuming Subject." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 4:203–27.
36. Crane, Diana. 2000. *Fashion and Its Social Agendas: Class, Gender, and Identity in Clothing*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
37. Crewe, Louise and Eileen Davenport. 1992. "The Puppet Show: Changing Buyer–Supplier Relationships within Clothing Retailing." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 17:183–97.
38. Crompton, Rosemary. 1996. "Consumption and Class Analysis." Pp. 113–32 in *Consumption Matters*, edited by S. Edgell, K. Hetherington, and A. Warde. Cambridge, England: Oxford University Press.
39. Davis, Fred. 1992. *Fashion, Culture, and Identity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
40. DiMaggio, Paul and Hugh Louch. 1998. "Socially Embedded Consumer Transactions: For What Kinds of Purchases Do People Most Often Use Networks?" *American Sociological Review* 63:619–37.
41. Douglas, Mary and Baron C. Isherwood. 1979. *The World of Goods*. New York: Basic Books.
42. du Gay, Paul. 1993. "'Numbers and Souls': Retailing and the De-Differentiation of Economy and Culture." *British Journal of Sociology* 44:563–87.
43. du Gay, Paul. 1997. *Doing Cultural Studies: The Story of the Sony Walkman*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
44. Epstein, Edward J. 1982. *The Rise and Fall of Diamonds: The Shattering of a Brilliant Illusion*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
45. Ewen, Stuart. 1977. *Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of the Consumer Culture*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
46. Faris, Robert E. L. 1964. *Handbook of Modern Sociology*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
47. Featherstone, Mike. 1992. "Postmodernism and the Aestheticization of Everyday Life." Pp. 265–90 in

THE SOCIOLOGY OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

- Modernity and Identity, edited by S. Lash and J. Friedman. Cambridge, England: Oxford University Press.
48. Fine, Ben and Ellen Leopold. 1993. *The World of Consumption*. New York: Routledge.
49. Finn, Adam and Jordan J. Louviere. 1996. "Shopping Center Image, Consideration, and Choice: Anchor Store Contribution." *Journal of Business Research* 35:241–51.
50. Fournier, Susan and Michael Guiry. 1993. "'An Emerald Green Jaguar, a House on Nantucket, and an African Safari': Wish Lists and Consumption Dreams in Materialist Society." *Advances in Consumer Research* 20:352–58.
51. Frank, David and John W. Meyer. 2002. "The Profusion of Individual Roles and Identities in the Postwar Period." *Sociological Theory* 20:86–105.
52. Freitas, Anthony, Susan Kaiser, Joan Chandler, Carol Hall, Jung- Won Kim, and Tania Hammidi. 1997. "Appearance Management as Border Construction: Least Favorite Clothing, Group Distancing, and Identity . . . Not!" *Sociological Inquiry* 67:323–35.
53. Frenzen, Jonathan and Harry L. Davis. 1990. "Purchasing Behavior in Embedded Markets." *Journal of Consumer Research* 17:1–12.
54. Frenzen, Jonathon, Paul M. Hirsch, and Philip Zerillo. 1994. "Consumption, Preferences, and Changing Life Styles." Pp. 403–25 in *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*, edited by N. J. Smelser and R. Swedberg. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
55. Gartman, David. 1991. "Culture as Class Symbolization Or Mass Reification? A Critique of Bourdieu's Distinction." *American Journal of Sociology* 97:421–47.
56. Ger, Guliz and Russell Belk. 1999. "Accounting for Materialism in Four Cultures." *Journal of Material Culture* 4:183–204.
57. Gereffi, Gary. 1994. "The Organization of Buyer-Driven Global Commodity Chains: How U.S. Retailers Shape Overseas Production Networks." Pp. 95–122 in *Commodity Chains and Global Capitalism*, edited by G. Gereffi and M. Korzeniewicz. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
58. Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
59. Goffman, Erving. 1951. "Symbols of Class Status." *British Journal of Sociology* 2:294–304.
60. Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
61. Goffman, Erving. 1971. *Relations in Public; Microstudies of the Public Order*. New York: Basic Books.
62. Gottdiener, Mark. 1997. *The Theming of America: Dreams, Visions, and Commercial Spaces*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
63. Gouldner, Alvin W. 1960. "The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement." *American Sociological Review* 25:161–78.
64. Grier, Sonya A. and Anne M. Brumbaugh. 1999. "Noticing Cultural Differences: Ad Meanings Created by Target and Non-Target Markets." *Journal of Advertising* 28:79–93.
65. Grusky, David B. and Kim A. Weeden. 2001. "Decomposition without Death: A Research Agenda for a New Class Analysis." *Acta Sociologica* 44:203–18.
66. Hahn, Barbara. 2000. "Power Centres: A New Retail Format in the United States of America." *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* 7:223–31.
67. Halle, David. 1992. "The Audience for Abstract Art: Class, Culture, and Power." Pp. 131–51 in *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*, edited by M. Lamont and M. Fournier. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
68. Harvey, David. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. New York: Blackwell.
69. Hassler, Markus. 2003. "The Global Clothing Production System: Commodity Chains and Business Networks." *Global Networks* 3:513–31.
70. Hebdige, Dick. 1979. *Subculture, the Meaning of Style*. London, England: Methuen.
71. Heffetz, Ori. 2004. "Conspicuous Consumption and the Visibility of Consumer Expenditures." Department of Economics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ. Unpublished manuscript.
72. Hennion, Antoine and Cecile Meadel. 1989. "The Artisans of Desire: The Mediation of Advertising between Product and Consumer." *Sociological Theory* 7:191–209.
73. Higgins, Ross. 1998. "A La Mode: Fashioning Gay Community in Montreal." Pp. 129–61 in *Consuming Fashion: Adorning the Transnational Body*, edited by A. Brydon and S. Niessen. Oxford, England: Berg.
74. Hirschman, Elizabeth C. and Craig J. Thompson. 1997. "Why Media Matter: Toward a Richer Understanding of Consumers' Relationships with Advertising and Mass Media." *Journal of Advertising* 26:43–60.
75. Holt, Douglas B. 1997. "Poststructuralist Lifestyle Analysis: Conceptualizing the Social Patterning of Consumption in Postmodernity." *Journal of Consumer Research* 23:326–50.
-

THE SOCIOLOGY OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

76. Holt, Douglas B. 1998. "Does Cultural Capital Structure American Consumption?" *Journal of Consumer Research* 25:1–26.
77. Holt, Douglas B. 2002. "Why Do Brands Cause Trouble? A Dialectical Theory of Consumer Culture and Branding." *Journal of Consumer Research* 29:70–90.
78. Holt, Douglas B. 2004. *How Brands Become Icons: The Principles of Cultural Branding*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
79. Horkheimer, Max and Theodor W. Adorno. 1972. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. New York: Herder and Herder.
80. Hoyer, Wayne D. and Steven P. Brown. 1990. "Effects of Brand Awareness on Choice for a Common, Repeat-Purchase Product." *Journal of Consumer Research* 17:141–48.
81. Ilmonen, Kaj. 2001. "Sociology, Consumption and Routine." Pp. 9–23 in *Ordinary Consumption*, edited by J. Gronow and A. Warde. London, England: Routledge.
82. Kaiser, Susan B., Carla M. Freeman, and Joan L. Chandler. 1993. "Favorite Clothes and Gendered Subjectivities: Multiple Readings." *Studies in Symbolic Interaction* 15:27–50.
83. Kaiser, Susan B., Richard H. Nagasawa, and Sandra S. Hutton. 1991. "Fashion, Postmodernity and Personal Appearance: A Symbolic Interactionist Formulation." *Symbolic Interaction* 14:165–85.
84. Kates, Steven M. and Charlene Goh. 2003. "Brand Morphing: Implications for Advertising Theory and Practice." *Journal of Advertising* 32:59–68.
85. Kellner, Douglas. 1992. "Popular Culture and the Construction of Postmodern Identities." Pp. 141–95 in *Modernity and Identity*, edited by S. Lash and J. Friedman. Cambridge, England: Oxford University Press.
86. Kimle, Patricia A. and Mary L. Damhorst. 1997. "A Grounded Theory Model of the Ideal Business Image of Women." *Symbolic Interaction* 20:45–68.
87. Kingston, Paul W. 2000. *The Classless Society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
88. Knorr Cetina, Karin. 1997. "Sociability with Objects: Social Relations in Postsocial Knowledge Societies." *Theory, Culture, and Society* 14:1–30.
89. Korzeniewicz, Miguel. 1994. "Commodity Chains and Marketing Strategy: Nike and the Global Athletic Footwear Industry." Pp. 247–65 in *Commodity Chains and Global Capitalism*, edited by G. Gereffi and M. Korzeniewicz. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
90. Kozinets, Robert A., John F. Sherry, Benet DeBerry-Spence, Adam Duhacheka, Krittinee Nuttavuthisit, and Diana Stormb. 2002. "Themed Flagship Brand Stores in the New Millennium: Theory, Practice, Prospects." *Journal of Retailing* 78:17–29.
91. Kozinets, Robert V., John F. Sherry Jr., Diana Storm, Adam Duhachek, Krittinee Nuttavuthisit, and Benet DeBerry-Spence. 2004. "Ludic Agency and Retail Spectacle." *Journal of Consumer Research* 31:658–72.
92. Kumar, Krishan. 1995. *From Post-Industrial to Post-Modern Society: New Theories of the Contemporary World*. Cambridge, England: Blackwell.
93. Lamont, Michele. 1992. *Money, Morals, and Manners: The Culture of the French and American Upper-Middle Class*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
94. Lamont, Michele and Marcel Fournier. 1992. *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
95. Lamont, Michele and Annette Lareau. 1988. "Cultural Capital: Allusions, Gaps and Glissandos in Recent Theoretical Developments." *Sociological Theory* 6:153–68.
96. Lamont, Michele and Virag Molnar. 2001. "How Blacks Use Consumption to Shape their Collective Identity." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 1:31–45.
97. Lamont, Michele, John Schmalzbauer, Maureen Waller, and Daniel Weber. 1996. "Cultural and Moral Boundaries in the United States: Structural Position, Geographic Location, and Lifestyle Explanations." *Poetics* 24:31–56.
98. Lash, Scott and John Urry. 1987. *The End of Organized Capitalism*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
99. Lynd, Robert S. and Helen M. Lynd. 1937. *Middletown in Transition: A Study in Cultural Conflicts*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
100. Mangleburg, Tamara F., Patricia M. Doney, and Terry Bristol. 2004. "Shopping with Friends and Teens' Susceptibility to Peer Influence." *Journal of Retailing* 80:101–16.
101. Marx, Karl. [1867] 1990. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. New York: Penguin Books.
102. Mather, Charles. 1993. "Flexible Technology in the Clothing Industry: Some Evidence from Vancouver." *Canadian Geographer* 37:40–47.
103. Mauss, Marcel. 1954. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. New York: Norton.

THE SOCIOLOGY OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

104. McAlexander, James. H. 1991. "Divorce, the Disposition of the Relationship, and Everything." *Advances in Consumer Research* 18:43–48.
105. McClure, Samuel M., Jian Li, Damon Tomlin, Kim S. Cypert, Latane M. Montague, and P. Read Montague. 2004. "Neural Correlates of Behavioral Preference for Culturally Familiar Drinks." *Neuron* 44:379–87.
106. McCracken, Grant D. 1988. *Culture and Consumption: New Approaches to the Symbolic Character of Consumer Goods and Activities*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
107. McGrath, Mary Ann, John F. Sherry, Jr., and Deborah D. Heisley. 1993. "An Ethnographic Study of an Urban Periodic Marketplace: Lessons from the Midville Farmer's Market." *Journal of Retailing* 69:280–319.
108. McKendrick, Neil, John Brewer, and J. H. Plumb. 1982. *The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of Eighteenth-Century England*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
109. Merton, Robert K., Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. 1959. *Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects*. New York: Basic Books.
110. Messinger, Paul. R. and Chakravarthi Narasimhan. 1995. "Has Power Shifted in the Grocery Channel?" *Marketing Science* 14:189–22.
111. Miles, Steven. 1996. "The Cultural Capital of Consumption: Understanding 'Postmodern' Identities in a Cultural Context." *Culture & Psychology* 2:139–58.
112. Miller, Daniel. 1997. "Consumption and its Consequences." Pp. 13–64 in *Consumption and Everyday Life*, edited by H. McKay. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
113. Miller, Daniel. 1998. *A Theory of Shopping*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
114. Mills, C. W. 1951. *White Collar; the American Middle Classes*. New York: Oxford University Press.
115. Mills, C. W. 1953. "Introduction to the Mentor Edition." Pp. vi–xix in Thorstein Veblen. *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions*. New York: New American Library.
116. Mintz, Sidney W. 1985. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. New York: Viking.
117. Molotch, Harvey L. 2003. *Where Stuff Comes from: How Toasters, Toilets, Cars, Computers, and Many Others Things Come to Be as They Are*. New York: Routledge.
118. Muniz, Albert and Thomas C. O'Guinn. 2000. "Brand Communities." *Journal of Consumer Research* 27:412–32.
119. Murray, Robin. 1989. "Benetton Britain: The Economic Order." Pp. 54–64 in *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s*, edited by S. Hall and M. Jacques. London, England: Lawrence and Wishart.
120. Nelson, Joel I. 2001. "On Mass Distribution: A Case Study of Chain Stores in the Restaurant Industry." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 1:119–38.
121. Noyelle, Thierry J. 1987. *Beyond Industrial Dualism: Market and Job Segmentation in the New Economy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
122. O'Guinn, Thomas C. and Ronald J. Faber. 1989. "Compulsive Buying: A Phenomenological Exploration." *Journal of Consumer Research* 16:147–57.
123. O'Guinn, Thomas C. and L. J. Shrum. 1997. "The Role of Television in the Construction of Consumer Reality." *Journal of Consumer Research* 23:278–94.
124. Otnes, Cele and Richard F. Beltrami. 1996. *Gift Giving: A Research Anthology*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press.
125. Otnes, Cele and Tina M. Lowrey. 1993. "Till Debt Do Us Part: The Selection and Meaning of Artifacts in the American Wedding." *Advances in Consumer Research* 20:325–29.
126. Otnes, Cele and Elizabeth H. Pleck. 2003. *Cinderella Dreams: The Allure of the Lavish Wedding*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
127. Piore, Michael J. and Charles F. Sabel. 1984. *The Second Industrial Divide: Possibilities for Prosperity*. New York: Basic Books.
128. Postrel, Virginia I. 2003. *The Substance of Style: How the Rise of Aesthetic Value Is Remaking Commerce, Culture, and Consciousness*. New York: HarperCollins.
129. Ratner, Rebecca K., Barbara E. Kahn, and Daniel Kahneman. 1999. "Choosing Less-Preferred Experiences for the Sake of Variety." *Journal of Consumer Research* 26:1–15.
130. Richardson, Jane and Alfred L. Kroeber. 1940. "Three Centuries of Women's Dress Fashions: A Quantitative Analysis." *Anthropological Records* 5:111–53.
131. Ritzer, George. 1993. *The McDonaldization of Society: An Investigation into the Changing Character of Contemporary Social Life*. Newbury Park, CA: Pine Forge Press.
132. Ritzer, George. 1995. *Expressing America: A Critique of the Global Credit Card Society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

THE SOCIOLOGY OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

133. Ritzer, George. 2005. *Enchanting a Disenchanted World: Revolutionizing the Means of Consumption*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
134. Roy, Abhik. 1994. "Correlates of Mall Visit Frequency." *Journal of Retailing* 70:139–61.
135. Rubinstein, Ruth P. 1995. *Dress Codes: Meanings and Messages in American Culture*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
136. Sahlins, Marshall D. 1976. *Culture and Practical Reason*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
137. Schor, Juliet. 2000. *Do Americans Shop Too Much?* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
138. Schouten, John W. and James H. McAlexander. 1995. "Subcultures of Consumptions: An Ethnography of the New Bikers." *Journal of Consumer Research* 22:43–61.
139. Schwartz, Barry. 2004. "The Tyranny of Choice." *Scientific American* 290:70–75.
140. Sherry, John F., Jr., Robert V. Kozinets, Diana Storm, Adam Duhachek, Kritinee Nuttavuthisit, and Benet DeBerry-Spence. 2001. "Being in the Zone: Staging Retail Theater at ESPN Zone Chicago." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 30:465–510.
141. Shields, Rob. 1992. "Spaces for the Subject of Consumption." Pp. 1–20 in *Lifestyle Shopping: The Subject of Consumption*, edited by R. Shields. New York: Routledge.
142. Shively, JoEllen. 1992. "Cowboys and Indians: Perceptions of Western Films among American Indians and Anglos." *American Sociological Review* 57:725–34.
143. Sieling, Mark, Brian Friedman, and Mark Dumas. 2001. "Labor Productivity in the Retail Trade Industry 1987–1999." *Monthly Labor Review* 124:3–14.
144. Silver, Ira. 1996. "Role Transitions, Objects, and Identity." *Symbolic Interaction* 19:1–20.
145. Simmel, Georg. [1904] 1957. "Fashion." *American Journal of Sociology* 62:541–58.
146. Slater, Don. 2002. "Capturing Markets from the Economists." Pp. 59–77 in *Cultural Economy: Cultural Analysis and Commercial Life*, edited by P. du Gay and M. Pryke. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
147. Slater, Don and Fran Tonkiss. 2001. *Market Society: Markets and Modern Social Theory*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
148. Smelser, Neil J. 1988. *The Handbook of Sociology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
149. Solomon, Michael R. 1983. "The Role of Products as Social Stimuli: A Symbolic Interactionism Perspective." *Journal of Consumer Research* 10:319–29.
150. Stillman, Todd. 2003. "McDonald's in Question: The Limits of the Mass Market." *American Behavioral Scientist* 47:107–18.
151. Stone, Gregory P. 1962. "Appearances and the Self." Pp. 86–118 in *Human Behavior and Social Processes*, edited by A. M. Rose. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
152. Taplin, Ian M. 1995. "Flexible Production, Rigid Jobs: Lessons from the Clothing Industry." *Work and Occupations* 22:412–38.
153. Taplin, Ian M. 1996. "Rethinking Flexibility: The Case of the Apparel Industry." *Review of Social Economy* 54:191–220.
154. Thompson, Craig J. and Diana L. Haytko. 1997. "Speaking of Fashion: Consumers' Uses of Fashion Discourses and the Appropriation of Countervailing Cultural Meanings." *Journal of Consumer Research* 24:15–42.
155. Thompson, Craig J. and Elizabeth C. Hirschman. 1995. "Understanding the Socialized Body: A Poststructuralist Analysis of Consumers' Self-Conceptions, Body Images, and Self-Care Practices." *Journal of Consumer Research* 22:139–53.
156. Thompson, Craig J. and Maura Troester. 2002. "Consumer Value Systems in the Age of Postmodern Fragmentation: The Case of the Natural Health Microculture." *Journal of Consumer Research* 28:550–71.
157. Titmuss, Richard M. 1971. *The Gift Relationship: From Human Blood to Social Policy*. New York: Pantheon Books.
158. Turner, Bryan S. and June Edmunds. 2002. "The Distaste of Taste: Bourdieu, Cultural Capital and the Australian Postwar Elite." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 2:219–39.
159. Twitchell, James B. 1999. *Lead Us into Temptation: The Triumph of American Materialism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
160. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2005. *Consumer Expenditure Survey*. Retrieved August 9, 2014. (<http://www.bls.gov/cex/1991/standard/multiyr.pdf> and <http://www.bls.gov/cex/2003/standard/multiyr.pdf>).
161. U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1966. *Census of Business 1963, vol. 1, Retail Trade—Summary Statistics, Part 1*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
162. U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2001. *1997 Economic Census: Retail Trade—Subject Series*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.
163. Vallas, Steven P. 1999. "Rethinking Post-Fordism: The Meaning of Workplace Flexibility." *Sociological Theory* 17:68–101.

THE SOCIOLOGY OF CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

164. Veblen, Thorstein. [1899] 1953. *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions*. New York: New American Library.
165. Wakefield, Kirk L. and Julie Baker. 1998. "Excitement at the Mall: Determinants and Effects on Shopping Response." *Journal of Retailing* 74:515–39.
166. Wakefield, Kirk L. and J. Jeffrey Inman. 2003. "Situational Price Sensitivity: The Role of Consumption, Occasion, Social Context and Income." *Journal of Retailing* 79:199–212.
167. Wallendorf, Melanie. 2001. "Literally Literacy." *Journal of Consumer Research* 27:505–11.
168. Wallendorf, Melanie and Eric J. Arnould. 1988. "'My Favorite Things': A Cross-Cultural Inquiry into Object Attachment, Possessiveness, and Social Linkage." *Journal of Consumer Research* 14:531–47.
169. Walsh, John P. 1993. *Supermarkets Transformed: Understanding Organizational and Technological Innovations*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
170. Warde, Alan. 2002a. "Production, Consumption, and 'Cultural Economy.'" Pp. 185–200 in *Cultural Economy: Cultural Analysis and Commercial Life*, edited by P. du Gay, and M. Pryke. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
171. Warde, Alan. 2002b. "Setting the Scene: Changing Conceptions of Consumption." Pp. 10–24 in *The Changing Consumer: Markets and Meanings*, edited by S. Miles, A. Anderson, and K. Meethan. New York: Routledge.
172. Warner, W. L. and Paul S. Lunt. 1941. *The Social Life of a Modern Community*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
173. Weber, Max. [1922] 1959. "Class, Status, and Party." Pp. 180–95 in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, edited by H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills. New York: Oxford University Press.
174. Wilk, Richard. 2001. "Consuming Morality." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 1:245–60.
175. Williams, Rosalind H. 1982. *Dream Worlds: Mass Consumption in Late Nineteenth-Century France*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
176. Williamson, Judith. 1978. *Decoding Advertisements: Ideology and Meaning in Advertising*. London, England: Boyars.
177. Wrigley, Neil. 1992. "Antitrust Regulation and the Restructuring of Grocery Retailing in Britain and the USA." *Environment and Planning* 24:727–49.
178. Zelizer, Viviana. 2005. "Culture and Consumption." Pp. 332–353 in *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*, edited by N. J. Smelser and R. Swedberg. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
179. Zimmer, Mary R. and Linda L. Golden. 1988. "Impressions of Retail Stores: A Content Analysis of Consumer Images." *Journal of Retailing* 64:265–93.
180. Zukin, Sharon. 2004. *Point of Purchase: How Shopping Changed American Culture*. New York: Routledge.
181. Zukin, Sharon and Jennifer S. Maguire. 2004. "Consumers and Consumption." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30:173–97.



Ashok Shivaji Yakkaldevi

Assistant Professor A.R. Burla Vartishta Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Solapur.

Publish Research Article International Level Multidisciplinary Research Journal For All Subjects

Dear Sir/Mam,

We invite unpublished Research Paper, Summary of Research Project, Theses, Books and Books Review for publication, you will be pleased to know that our journals are

Associated and Indexed

- PDOAJ
- Directory of Research Journals Researchbib
- SocioSite
- Tjdb

Frequency: Monthly

International Research Directions Journal

Review & Advisory Board :

Research Directions Journal is seeking scholars.

Those who are interested in our serving as our volunteer Editorial Review Board, Editorial Board and Advisory Board.

Call for editorial board:

All of faculties, experts and researchers are invited to join us as member of editorial board.

For applying, send your CV at researchdirection2013@gmail.com / researchdirection@yahoo.com.

We welcome you in research documentation.

Email: researchdirection2013@gmail.com / researchdirection@yahoo.com

Research Direction Journal

Editor-in-Chief:

Prof. Santosh P. Rajguru

Address for Correspondence

56, 'PARASHURAM' Ayodhya Nagari, Near Reliance Office,
Hydrabad Road, Dahitane,

Solapur-413006. (Maharashtra)

Email: researchdirection2013@gmail.com

cell: 9822870742