This is a peer-reviewed, accepted author manuscript of the following research article: Hamilton, K., & Porteous, H. (Accepted/In press). Some reflections on interdisciplinary CCT research: field boundaries, social impact and the semantics of consumer vulnerability. *Journal of Marketing Management*.

Some Reflections on Interdisciplinary CCT Research: Field Boundaries, Social Impact and the Semantics of Consumer Vulnerability

Abstract

In this commentary we reflect on our experiences of working together on an interdisciplinary project in which, despite our different disciplinary backgrounds, we share many overlapping research interests around themes of marginalisation, inclusion, and well-being. We consider how the labelling of people as consumers raises interesting questions about the often taken-for-granted nature of disciplinary language, and look at how researchers must balance idealistic and pragmatic concerns through processes of applying for funding, conducting research, and publishing findings. Whilst interdisciplinarity offers many benefits, it may also present challenges for early career researchers trying to establish themselves in academia. Furthermore, through combining feminist and CCT perspectives, we question what kinds of activities are valued in assessing the social impact of marketing and consumer research.

Author Bios

Kathy Hamilton is a Professor in Consumption, Markets and Society at the University of Strathclyde, Glasgow. Her research projects have investigated how various contexts of vulnerability, such as poverty, transform market interactions. She is co-chair of the Consumer research with Social Impact Special Interest Group within the Academy of Marketing. Kathy is interested in interdisciplinary research and her work has been published in marketing and consumer research, sociology and tourism journals.

Holly Porteous is a Leverhulme-funded Research Associate at the University of Strathclyde, Glasgow. Since completing a PhD in post-Soviet gender and consumption at the University of

Glasgow, she has worked on Scottish Government- and ESRC-funded projects studying how migrants from former state socialist countries made themselves socially, economically and culturally secure in pre-Brexit Scotland. Her research interests focus on how inequalities are produced and reproduced in society, particularly from a feminist perspective.

2

Introduction

In this commentary, we draw on our personal perspectives to consider how working on a collaborative interdisciplinary project[1] has been a prompt to step outside our comfort zones and reflect on the language we use and the possibilities for social impact through CCT research. After providing some brief theoretical and contextual background, we look at our semantic comfort zones, asking how often, as academic researchers, we really consider how accurately our habitual, discipline-rooted language conveys the meanings we want it to? Furthermore, how often do we take for granted meanings which might be understood differently by non-specialists and the general public? We then move on to look at how combining feminist and CCT approaches can lead to expanded understandings of what constitutes research impact and knowledge exchange.

Project Background

The broader context of this commentary is our ongoing interdisciplinary research project that brings together four researchers, who come from various theoretical and disciplinary backgrounds in the humanities and social sciences, and who each share different intersecting interests with other members of the project team. The initial team included Kathy, Sarah Edwards and Juliette Wilson, who came together through a shared interest in issues of space. Kathy and Juliette are both in a marketing department yet while Kathy focuses on consumer research with previous projects on consumer vulnerability and therapeutic servicescapes, Juliette focuses more on the entrepreneurial perspective with previous research on hybrid organisational structures and alternative and non-mainstream markets. Sarah is a literary critic and cultural historian with a specific research interest in architectural humanities,

[1] The project is being conducted in collaboration with Juliette Wilson and Sarah Edwards. It is funded by the Leverhulme Trust and entitled 'Transformative Servicescapes and Consumer Vulnerability.'

a field that incorporates approaches from historical, literary and design studies to understand how spaces are designed, represented and used in different eras (Bandyopadhyay et al. 2010).

Together, this team developed a research project to explore how well-being is enacted through the construction of the physical space for consumers experiencing vulnerability. Our differing backgrounds enable us to explore space from multiple perspectives, including architect (Sarah), organisation (Juliette), and consumer (Kathy). The project was designed to centre on a case study of a non-profit feminist organisation. The recruitment of Holly, as a feminist researcher, enhanced the project's gendered perspective on the space: her expertise on intersectional feminist perspectives[2] and experience in the domestic abuse sector dovetailed perfectly with the contextual focus of the non-profit feminist organisation on which our project is based. Although the project was designed in advance of her recruitment, our emphasis on ethnographic and historical methods, as well as the focus on a women's space and service users, meant that it corresponded very well with her preferred research methods as well as her theoretical expertise.

Within the broader team Kathy and Holly's past research experiences are most closely aligned in terms of both theory and methodological preferences: our prior research coalescences around themes of marginalisation, inclusion, and well-being. For Kathy these themes have been framed by theories of consumer vulnerability, marketplace stigma and consumer coping. Holly's PhD thesis had essentially been an analysis of consumer vulnerability which looked at the impact of Western-origin, gendered media on its readers in contemporary Russia. She had also explored consumer vulnerability and themes from Transformative Service Research during a more recent project into how Eastern European migrants in Scotland encounter various kinds of services. Significantly, however, she had not

[2] Intersectionality is the concept, originally expounded by Kimberlé Crenshaw (see Crenshaw & Bonis 2005), that feminist analyses of patriarchy must also be considered in relation to other intersecting aspects of social identity such as race, ethnicity and class.

positioned herself as a scholar within the marketing field; her research had hitherto been framed chiefly by intersectional feminist and post-Soviet perspectives.[3]

Theoretical and Contextual Background

Our project is guided by Transformative Service Research (TSR), a framing that facilitates 'the integration of consumer and service research that centers on creating uplifting changes and improvements in the well-being of consumer entities' (Anderson et al., 2011, p. 3). TSR is well suited to diverse disciplinary perspectives and theoretical orientations (e.g. Anderson & Ostrom, 2015) and we are bringing together different perspectives on space and design to explore the transformative role of community space for users experiencing vulnerability. Architects have drawn on approaches from TSR (Sorenson, 2014), and space has been a focus of prominent feminist scholarship (Massey, 2013). Our project aims to further this exploration via an analysis of the importance of narrative and visual representations of spaces for shaping consumer experiences in a women-centric space. In theorising the built environment, we explore how architects, service providers and users co-create space and collaboratively impact on well-being.

Baker, LaBarge and Baker (2016) offer a comprehensive review of consumer vulnerability literature and identify three commonly adopted analytical perspectives: (1) isolating particular populations of people on the basis of biophysical or psychosocial characteristics such as age, ethnicity or sexual orientation, (2) isolating particular disabling environmental conditions, such as environmental disruption or social problems, and (3)

[3] Post-Soviet studies encompasses perspectives from multiple other fields including cultural studies, economics, politics and Slavic studies, united by specialism in the historical background and contemporary context of former state socialist countries. For example, from a marketing perspective this might involve studies on the transition from a centrally planned economy to a globally integrated market economy, or the development of wider forms of conspicuous consumption during this period.

isolating meanings and processes of vulnerability, a perspective that recognises the situational nature of vulnerability and its variation across both population and environmental conditions.

The third perspective is most in keeping with our project as we consider the dynamic nature of vulnerability through accounting for the 'developmental capacity of individuals' (Baker & Mason, 2012, p. 546) and the way in which the capacity for resilience can be enhanced through different stakeholder groups who can catalyse social change. The organisation we are working with defies easy categorisation: its broadest descriptor is being a feminist organisation and a space where women's experiences are central to its mission and goals. It offers a hybrid servicescape (including exhibition space, museum and library), and has an ethos of offering learning projects to support users experiencing vulnerability. The organisation takes an intersectional approach and aims to extend its impact on the lives of a diverse range of women and non-binary people; for example, it runs events aimed at specific sectors of the community such as women with additional needs, those from socially disadvantaged backgrounds or women surviving domestic abuse. First set up in the 1990s as a tiny community space at the heart of a large city, it has grown from a minor, if ambitious, organisation on the fringes of the local cultural sphere, to a significant player on a national and international level. It is ideally suited to our research because it is a unique community space that has undergone major physical transformations (5 relocations) which have shaped its changing mission and functions.

Recently, Field et al. (2021) suggested that research that explores issues of service access and inclusion for consumers and communities experiencing vulnerability, disadvantage and marginalisation should be a priority. Building on prior research that has identified space as a resource that can be used to gain visibility and recognition for marginalised identities (Maciel & Wallendorf, 2021), our focus enables us to explore the transformative impacts of the politicised construction of space. As we collected interviews (and data via various methods,

including participant observation, archive research, arts-based research and media analysis), we came to a more holistic understanding of the case study organisation which we hoped would help us to understand how it was so able to address issues around consumer vulnerability. CCT scholarship has helped us understand the comparisons our participants make between the non-profit community space within our study and other commercial and community spaces they frequent. Drawing on themes such as commercial place attachment (Debenedetti et al., 2014) and utopian marketplaces (Maclaran & Brown, 2005) has revealed the features that are similar or distinctive to the cultural and ideological shaping of this feminist space to help meet their aim of being a catalyst for change in relation to gender equality.

Equally, our different theoretical perspectives are ideally suited to consider lived consumer experiences with attentiveness to broader socio-cultural, historical and political conditions, what Askegaard and Linnet (2011, p. 396) refer to as 'the context of contexts.' For example, perspectives on intersectional feminism allow us to better interpret the accounts of our participants within broader power structures. Indeed, feminist scholarship has been recognised as a route to rescue interdisciplinary knowledge production from neoliberal university structures (Bergland, 2018). Whilst neoliberalism encourages scholars to 'claim their "academic turf"' through adhering to established paradigmatic boundaries and niche specialisations within their discipline (Bergland, 2018, p. 1033), feminist scholarship that emphasises collaboration and cooperation can offer new paradigmatic choices. A central issue that has emerged during our collaboration has been interdisciplinary semantics.

Interdisciplinary Semantics and Field Boundaries

The main challenges we have encountered in relation to interdisciplinary working have been structural, the most notable so far concerning project funding. Our interdisciplinary framing meant that our funding application fell into the gaps between funding councils and

created challenges in getting it appropriately reviewed. We originally submitted the application to the ESRC who redirected it to the AHRC because it did 'not fit within ESRC's remit.' Although this decision was surprising, we resubmitted to the AHRC as requested but were then instructed to change our primary subject area because our selection of Marketing under 'Management and business studies' was not considered as an AHRC subject. Ultimately, the project was not successful with the AHRC with one reviewer encouraging us to 'try the ESRC'. The timeframe from submission to the ESRC to rejection from AHRC was 14 months. In many ways, we were left with the impression that a single disciplinary approach would have been the easier option as it would have been reviewed by those familiar with an established set of methodologies and theories. We eventually decided to go for one final attempt at funding with the Leverhulme Trust and were successful.

For Holly, the act of creating a new email signature as a member of Strathclyde Business School is remembered as prompting some ambivalent feelings, despite having felt as if this particular project had been designed to suit her interests when she had originally read the job advertisement. She understood that, for many, the word 'business' implies an *embracing* of consumer culture which felt slightly at odds with the critiques of consumer culture she had written from the perspective of post-socialist studies. Being part of a marketing department might imply that she was most interested in finding out how best to *sell* to consumers, rather than necessarily critiquing consumer culture. Although, as mentioned above, she had drawn on CCT in her PhD research, the momentary ambivalence essentially resulted from concerns around popular versus specialist language: she couldn't help wondering how outsiders (and potential research participants) would view a researcher from a business school, rather than from the social science or area studies departments she was accustomed to. Similar issues are covered in Parker's (2015) paper on moving from a sociology department to a business school, where he reflects upon the increasing marketisation of academia itself and the

‘exiled’ sociologists who naturally migrated to better-funded departments. Unlike Parker, who refers to himself as an ‘ex-sociologist’, Holly’s inherently interdisciplinary background means that she doesn’t (yet!) regard herself as an ‘ex-’ anything in particular. However, she is interested in how the different theoretical currents represented in her prior work might converge as she moves to a more permanent role within a marketing department.

Kathy’s early thoughts on this issue were partly inspired by her recent work on another project that explored some of the barriers to transformative consumer research (Piacentini et al., 2019). The project involved interviewing academics from other disciplines about their impressions and understandings of marketing academic research. This had revealed a stereotyped and cynical view of commercial marketing associated with unethical practices, a view which was then transferred to the marketing academic. Having never met Holly before, Kathy was very aware of these stereotypes and in early meetings was keen to emphasise the broader scope of her own interests through using the language of transformation and well-being. Holly initially shared some of these preconceptions about marketing as a discipline, but was attracted to work on the project by its clear focus on exploring community spaces and social impact. In the end, becoming part of the busy (largely online) life of her new department broadened Holly’s own understanding of the range of research perspectives that might belong in a business school, and highlighted the inherently interdisciplinary nature of academic marketing studies. One of the most interesting things since she began working on the project has been to learn more of the history of academic marketing itself; and whilst this has included broadening her own understanding of who might belong in a marketing department, it has also meant becoming more aware that that critical approaches have not always had a place in business schools (Parker, 2015, p. 163) and do not necessarily have a secure foothold in the universities of the future (Parker, 2020).

The Language of Consumer Vulnerability

Questions about the words we choose to use and the associated disciplinary worlds we feel comfortable (or less comfortable!) in have been prominent from the very beginning of our project. Words are part of the everyday toolkit we use as researchers and writers to portray and critique the contexts we study, but they also are also verbal and linguistic signposts which mark us out as members of particular tribes – academic or otherwise. This can be the case even where disciplines study similar topics using similar methods. Take, for example, a piece of research analysing people who use a community centre and café. Whereas a researcher from marketing might refer to 'consumers' that frequent the space, another from public policy might refer to 'service users'. Depending on the political climate of the time, a welfare agency study might refer to 'clients' or 'recipients' they see receiving assistance from community workers. Staff themselves might have 'regulars,' whom they have both a professional and a friendly, more personal relationship. Clearly, each of these terms carries its own semantic baggage and subtleties of meaning. In accordance with arguments that researchers are involved in value judgements as well as description of the world around us (Gewirtz & Cribb, 2006, p. 142), below we discuss how our experiences during fieldwork and data analysis have led us to be more reflexive about the language we use.

To give the field its due, there have been many ways that the language and theoretical background of CCT (and marketing more generally) have provided a useful basis from which to analyse the impact of the case study organisation. An interesting part of the research has been to see the extent to which a fairly radical non-profit organisation has adopted the language and behaviour of business to thrive within a market economy. For example, its success is in no small part based on the founders' commercial and artistic sensibilities as well as a shrewd understanding of local and international networks. Combining these elements with ongoing social activism, meaningful community work, and the regular semiotic and semantic linking of

their work to historical social movements has enabled the organisation to build a very strong brand identity – one which enables the general public to easily understand what the organisation stands for. Indeed, the fact that many people identify *with* – and feel a desire to be identified as consumers *of* – the case study's brand is evidenced by the popularity of merchandise and material culture (Woodward, 2013) sold in the organisation's shop (e.g. t-shirts, posters, tote bags), as well as enthusiastic online and social media interactions by consumers. In our interviews, people spoke about being physically drawn to the organisation after merely visiting the website. Clearly, some aspects of marketing/CCT originating in analyses of commercial bodies, such as branding and marketing, can be relevant to the not-for-profit sector.

However, as the project went on we also began to think about whether marketing language which inherently implied conceptual dichotomies, such as brand/consumer or service provider/service user, were the best approach in understanding and describing this particular community space. Similar to prior work on the interchangeability of paid and volunteer labour in the non-profit sector (Handy et al., 2008), we now had extensive evidence of the very permeable boundaries between paid staff and volunteers. Unpaid labour is seen as crucial to fill the gaps created by funding cuts or increased demand for services for non-profits (Baines et al., 2017). We also saw overlaps between volunteers and service users and the majority of people we interviewed had moved between two or more of these categories depending on personal circumstances. Clearly, there was no one word which accurately reflected the organisation's relationship with the various people in its sphere of orbit, and it was by no means a given that they would stay on a predictable trajectory over the time of their relationship with the organisation. In essence, perhaps it is the ability of (or funding-based pressure for) such organisations to create more flexible roles which belies any simplistic labelling of the people integral to their success, no matter what kind of disciplinary language we choose to use.

We also had to consider the language preferred by our case study organisation. The question of terminology came up from our very first meetings and it was clear from discussions with staff that the term 'consumers' was not necessarily a good fit for the users of this particular space. Their unease with consumer terminology stemmed from a theory-practice disparity in the meanings associated with the word 'consumer.' Bracken and Oughton (2006) suggest dialects as an important aspect of language that refers to the difference between everyday use of a word and its disciplinary interpretation. According to the Cambridge English dictionary a consumer is 'someone who buys goods or services for personal use,' a definition that seemed to align with the understanding of the staff we spoke to. This is a much narrower interpretation than the CCT *academic* perspective, which emphasises the whole consumption experience and broader implications for society and culture (e.g. Arnould et al., 2019; Cova & Elliott, 2008). We find echoes of Kathy's feeling that she should 'defend' marketing and CCT when hiring Holly for the project, or Holly's impulse to explain her position within a business school to potential research participants. It also became clear that the organisation themselves did not have any one specific word to refer to the people who used and benefited from their space, activities, and other resources. Rather, staff relied on internal 'dialects' swapping between terms as the situation demanded and relying on shared implicit understandings about the nature of the work they did, as well as on often extensive and hard-won knowledge about the people who interacted with their services. These ever-moving dialects were reflected in the organisation's self-representation to outside bodies as staff adapted their language when interacting with different funders (e.g. they might have spoken of 'audiences' in an arts-based context, or 'learners' in an education context).

Prior work has offered alternative perspectives on how appropriate it is to label people as consumers, particularly when research involves vulnerable contexts. On the one hand, Kathy's experiences of co-organising an ESRC seminar series on consumer vulnerability had

suggested that the language of business is not always welcome in the non-profit sector (Hamilton et al., 2016). On the other hand, Prior's (2011, p. 710) research with young people accessing counselling services reveals how adopting the subject position of consumer can be viewed as a discursive resource that transforms vulnerability into agency and offers the opportunity to create competent and 'self-enhancing identities'; though the extent to which taking part in consumer behaviour translates into actual agency or power in the face of social structures such as gender or class is debatable (Porteous, 2018).

Another aspect of the project leading us to question market-centric language stems from the intersecting vulnerabilities experienced by the participants in our study. We are hesitant to adopt a consumer conceptualisation for people whose life challenges go far beyond marketplace issues: some participants have experienced such significant trauma that a consumption lens alone cannot fully capture or do justice to their experiences. Saren (2015, p. 568) asks 'if consumption is no longer to be the master narrative, what can replace it?' Our multidisciplinary perspectives suggest that perhaps a better question is: how can multiple narratives coexist? For example, our study has been enriched by combining CCT with theoretical perspectives on care, feminism, hybridity, and organisational studies. Although at times our written research findings will need to shift between different, field-based conventions, by shifting the narrative from replacement to coexistence we might be in a better position to represent lives as they are lived.

Accordingly, as researchers we have found it best to reflect on the semantic neatness that often accompanies disciplinary specialisation; through a process of collaborating between different fields (within our team) and with outside organisations (in our case study), we recognise how settling on one particular term would erase the multiple and complex roles held by people who use our case study organisation. Importantly, Hutton and Heath's (2020, p. 2708) emancipatory praxis framework reminds us that marginalised groups should be

empowered to 'control the naming of their own social reality.' The fact that this language was noticeably varied – both for our project participants and in our own observations – suggests that we need to reflect this as part of our written findings. Fundamentally, our terminology will need to capture the multiple roles people perform when interacting with the organisation, and the ways that these people describe their own roles.

Interdisciplinarity and Social Impact

Brownlie et al., (2007, p. 405) suggest that the pursuit of managerial relevance over wider social relevance has left marketing isolated from other disciplines, perpetuating 'the dangerously myopic view that marketing discourse is somehow safely self-sustaining.' Yet, collaborating across disciplines is claimed as a 'boundary-breaking' opportunity for marketing-relevant consumer research (MacInnis et al., 2020). Transformative consumer research scholarship has made a similar point and recognised the advantages of multidisciplinary teams in tackling complex social problems (Crockett et al., 2013; Tadajewski et al., 2014). A key aim of our project has been to carry out a case study of a women's community organisation which is expansive enough to look at the broader historical and social context in which the organisation has operated, as well as the policy, practice and micro level interactions that have led to the continued social impact the organisation has been able to achieve. It is precisely our mix of disciplines and methodological backgrounds that has enabled us to do so.

However, we have also sought to prioritise different types of impact and knowledge exchange, and to expand beyond traditional academic outputs to increase the impact of the research itself. Whereas traditional research impact prioritises knowledge outputs (e.g., journal articles), social impact adopts a broader perspective. Ozanne et al. (2017) coin this broader perspective a relational engagement approach and promote the more diverse forms of social impact that can stem from sustained and productive interactions between academics and other

14

stakeholders. Many scholars within the Transformative Consumer Research community seek to follow such ways of working for social impact, yet real life examples of these guidelines in practice remain rare. Similarly, within the neighbouring subfield of Consumer Culture Theory, the relevance of academic research continues to be called into question with Holt (2017) arguing that the societal impact of CCT research has been very limited. Holt (2017, p. 215) attributes the lack of relevance 'to the particular way in which CCT's gatekeepers have defined the "right" way to do CCT and the knowledge contributions that we should aim for.' These somewhat similar conversations on the need to broaden the impact of consumer research are largely siloed. If there is limited cross-referencing between neighbouring subfields of consumer research, what might this suggest for multidisciplinary working more broadly?

Our project addresses this limited cross-pollination and calls for a broader definition of social impact and knowledge exchange. Through combining feminist and CCT perspectives, we have sought to question what kinds of activities are valued in social impact and knowledge exchange. Feminist scholarship since the 1970s has encouraged a focus on the micro, the local, on everyday lived experience (Kruks, 2014). Our case study is a grassroots, radical space with a focus on effecting both micro (e.g. individual lives) and macro (e.g. national policy) level change; whereas we saw evidence of the organisation's influence on policymakers and cultural movers and shakers, our interviews, archive and media research also showed us the myriad micro-interactions that take place and the importance of social change on a small group and one-to-one level. Thus to focus on similar interactions in assessing our project's social impact reflects the knowledge exchange that has taken place.

The project's emphasis on women is also important in terms of recognising different kinds of social impact. Women's stories have been historically marginalised, and women themselves are still socialised not to speak out, to minimise rather than highlight their skills and talents, a point that was noticeable in many of our interviews. Feminist research has often

looked at methodology and questioned the notion of objectivity, and has sought to create a more balanced approach to knowledge creation via drawing on marginal perspectives (Letherby, 2003, p. 44). In addition, recent research has shown that women researchers are more read – but, critically, less cited – *because* they more often engage in research for societal progress (Zhang, Sivertsen, Du et al., 2021). Through sharing findings from CCT *and* feminist research with a focus on women – and particularly on the everyday impact of work in community development, where women are overrepresented and often underpaid – our project aims to have social impact from a feminist and equalities perspective. We have planned several 'meet the researcher' events at the community space itself which we will publicise to relevant local stakeholders, and seek to present our research on community learning and development best practice to other community groups with similar aims and goals to our case study, an approach Holly has drawn on in previous projects to increase the impact of research outside academia. We are also in the process of planning joint online and in-person events with the organisation to showcase the valuable community contributions of staff and volunteers through short films and participant-produced artworks. In the long term we hope that the outside evidence our project can provide would be helpful in sustaining the case study organisation's important feminist and equalities work through providing evidence of their own social impact from an external source to potential funders of their work.

The impact of feminist thought on our project has also been that we want to emphasise not only the project's social impact in terms of influencing policy and practice (though we certainly hope to do this as well), but on reciprocity in the researcher/researched relationship (Harrison et al., 2001) and on positive feedback we have collected via the smaller, microlevel interactions we ourselves have had throughout the project. For example, some volunteers and staff spoke about feeling a kind of validation simply from being included in a project which implicitly and explicitly recognised the importance of their work and its impact on individual

lives. Although it obviously cannot make up for the wider socio-economic problems of a lack of job stability and lower wages experienced by many talented arts and community development professionals, we hope to contribute to a greater sense of recognition for our case study staff and volunteers, many of whom went above and beyond their (volunteer or paid) role descriptions because they cared deeply about their work and the vulnerable communities they worked with.

Concluding Reflections

Throughout the project, Kathy has found herself reflecting on the development of consumer research and its place within the marketing discipline more broadly. Kathy was a doctoral student when CCT emerged as a brand and she recalls using market-centric language very deliberately to legitimise her research at the time with 'low-income consumers.' Despite a long trajectory of research on the inequities faced by people experiencing poverty (e.g., Andreasen, 1975; Hill, 2001), it was perceived as somewhat unusual with the management school she was part of to prioritise social implications over managerial ones.

For Holly, who is just recently entering marketing in an explicit sense (rather than just implicitly via her research), it has been important to learn the history and development of a field which, without this knowledge, she might have perceived as inherently interdisciplinary. Perhaps in common with our case study organisation there is undoubtedly pressure as an early career researcher to create your own 'brand' and – yes – to market this in the search for job stability. Although interdisciplinarity is often viewed as a route to research success, the team's efforts to secure funding for this project, and Holly's own experience of working short term contracts between various departments (including area studies, sociology, human geography, and marketing) suggest that it may be harder for your career to 'fall between the cracks' if your publishing and research record fits more neatly within a particular discipline. Interdisciplinary

ECRs who fail to 'settle down' and commit to a particular field, including building the necessary networks, may risk being perceived as indecisive rather than theoretically expansive!

In planning for the academic dissemination of our CCT-focused research, we are fortunate today that there is growing acceptance of new ways of thinking and new ways of representation (e.g. Coffin and Hill, forthcoming). Equally, various journals, including the *JMM* are open to research that spans disciplinary boundaries and value the contributions that interdisciplinary research can offer (Tadajewski, 2018). However, in trying to capture the multiple roles people perform when interacting with the organisation, and the ways that these people describe their own roles, we risk confusing readers with a babble of competing concepts. Perhaps it becomes easier to fall back on convention and adopt the terminology of whatever journal we are targeting at the time, somewhat similar to the way our case study drew on their contextual sensitivity to adapt their language for different funding bodies. This would certainly ease the route to publication, which is itself a necessity to demonstrate to our funding organisation that their resources have been put to good use. Being idealistic about use of language is not always an option when dealing with the pressure to publish, and it may be necessary to be more pragmatic so ensure that projects with a social impact can get funding in the first place.

References

Anderson, L., Ostrom, A.L., & Bitner, M.J. (2011). Surrounded by services: A new lens for examining the influence of services as social structures on well-being. Working paper. W. P. Carey School of Business, Arizona State University.

Anderson, L. and Ostrom, A.L. (2015). Transformative service research: Advancing our knowledge about service and well-being. *Journal of Service Research*, 18(3), 243-249. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670515591316

Andreasen, A. (1975). *The Disadvantaged Consumer.* The Free Press.

Arnould, E., Press, M., Salminen, E. & Tillotson, J.S. (2019). Consumer culture theory: Development, critique, application and prospects. *Foundations and Trends in Marketing*, 12(2), 80-166.

Askegaard, S. & Linnet, J.T. (2011). Towards an epistemology of consumer culture theory: Phenomenology and the context of context. *Marketing Theory*, *11*(4), 381-404. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593111418796

Bandyopadhyay, S., Lomholt, J., Temple, N. & Tobe, R. (2010), *The humanities in architectural design: a contemporary and historical perspective.* Routledge.

Baker, S.M., LaBarge, M. & Baker, C.N. (2016). On Consumer Vulnerability: Foundations, Phenomena, and Future Investigations. In K. Hamilton, S. Dunnett & M. Piacentini (eds.), *Consumer Vulnerability: Conditions, Contexts and Characteristics*, Routledge, 13-30.

Baker, S.M. & Mason, M. (2012). Towards a process theory of consumer vulnerability and resilience: Illuminating its transformative potential. In D. G. Mick, S. Pettigrew, C. Pechmann & J. Ozanne (eds), *Transformative Consumer Research for Personal and Collective Well-being*, Taylor & Francis/Routledge, 543-563.

Baines, D., Cunningham, I. & Shields, J. (2017). Filling the gaps: Unpaid (and precarious) work in the nonprofit social services. *Critical Social Policy*, *37*(4), 625-645. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018317693128

Bergland, B. (2018). The incompatibility of neoliberal university structures and interdisciplinary knowledge: A feminist slow scholarship critique. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *50*(11), 1031-1036. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2017.1341297

Bracken, L.J. & Oughton, E.A. (2006), 'What do you mean?' The importance of language in developing interdisciplinary research. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 31(3), 371-382. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4639981

Brownlie, D., Hewer, P. & Ferguson, P. (2007). Theory into practice: meditations on cultures of accountability and interdisciplinarity in marketing research. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *23*(5-6), 395-409. https://doi.org/10.1362/026725707X212739

Coffin, J. & Hill, T. (forthcoming). Presenting Marketing Differently: Developing Devices to Disseminate Post-Representational Research. *Journal of Marketing Management,* https://www.jmmnews.com/presenting-marketing-differently/

Cova, B. & Elliott, R (2008). Everything you always wanted to know about interpretive consumer research but were afraid to ask. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 11(2), 121-129. https://doi.org/10.1108/13522750810864396

Crenshaw, K. & Bonis, O. (2005). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Cahiers du Genre*, 39, 51-82. https://doi.org/10.3917/cdge.039.0051

Crockett, D., Downey, H., Fırat, A.F., Ozanne, J.L. & Pettigrew, S. (2013). Conceptualizing a transformative research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, *66*(8), 1171-1178. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.08.009

Debenedetti, A., Oppewal, H. & Arsel, Z. (2014). Place Attachment in Commercial Settings: A Gift Economy Perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40 (February), 904-923. https://doi.org/10.1086/673469

Field, J.M., Fotheringham, D., Subramony, M., Gustafsson, A., Ostrom, A.L., Lemon, K.N., Huang, M.H. & McColl-Kennedy, J.R. (2021). Service Research Priorities: Designing Sustainable Service Ecosystems. *Journal of Service Research*, *24*(4), 462-479. https://doi.org/10.1177/10946705211031302

Gewirtz, S. & Cribb, A. (2006). What to do about values in social research: The case for ethical reflexivity in the sociology of education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *27*(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690600556081

Handy, F., Mook, L. & Quarter, J. (2008) The interchangeability of paid staff and volunteers in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *37*(1), 76-92. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764007303528

Hamilton, K., Dunnett, S. & Piacentini, M. (2016). *Consumer Vulnerability*: *Conditions, Contexts and Characteristics*, Routledge.

Harrison, J., MacGibbon, L., & Morton, M. (2001). Regimes of trustworthiness in qualitative research: The rigors of reciprocity. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(3), 323. https://doi.org/10.1177/107780040100700305

Hill, R.P., (2001). Surviving in a material world: Evidence from ethnographic consumer research on people in poverty. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *30*(4), 364-391. https://doi.org/10.1177/089124101030004002

Holt, D.B., (2017). Consumer culture strategy. In J.F. Sherry & E. Fischer (eds.), *Contemporary consumer culture theory,* Routledge. pp. 215-224.

Hutton, M. & Heath, T. (2020), Researching on the edge: emancipatory praxis for social justice. *European Journal of Marketing,* 54(11), 2697-2721. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-02-2019-0150

Kruks, S. (2014). Women's 'Lived Experience': Feminism and Phenomenology from Simone de Beauvoir. In M. Evans, C. Hemmings, M. Henry, H. Johnstone, S. Madhok, A. Plomien & S. Wearing (eds.), The SAGE Handbook of Feminist Theory, 75-92.

Letherby, G. (2003). Feminist Research in Theory and Practice. Open University Press.

MacInnis, D.J., Morwitz, V.G., Botti, S., Hoffman, D.L., Kozinets, R.V., Lehmann, D.R., Lynch Jr, J.G. & Pechmann, C. (2020). Creating Boundary-Breaking, Marketing-

Relevant Consumer Research. *Journal of Marketing*, *84*(2), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242919889876

Maciel, A.F. & Wallendorf, M. (2021). Space as a Resource in the Politics of Consumer Identity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 48(2), 309–332. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucab002

Maclaran, P. & Brown, S. (2005). The Center Cannot Hold: Consuming the Utopian Marketplace. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32 (Sept), 311-323. https://doi.org/10.1086/432240

Massey, D. (2013). Space, place and gender. John Wiley & Sons.

Ozanne, J.L., Davis, B., Murray, J.B., Grier, S., Benmecheddal, A., Downey, H., Ekpo, A.E., Garnier, M., Hietanen, J., Le Gall-Ely, M., Seregina, A., Thomas, K.D. & Veer, E. (2017). Assessing the societal impact of research: The relational engagement approach, *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing,* 36(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.14.121

Parker, M. (2015). Between sociology and the business school: critical studies of work, employment and organization in the UK. *The Sociological Review*, *63*(1), 162-180. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-954X.12166

Parker, M. (2020). The Critical Business School and the University: A Case Study of Resistance and Co-optation. *Critical Sociology,* 47(7–8), 1111–1124. https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920520950387

Piacentini, M. G. Dunnett, S., Hamilton, K., Banister, E., Gorge, H., Kaufman-Scarborough, C., & Nairn, A. (2019). Exploring the Relations in Relational Engagement: Identifying Challenges and Overcoming Barriers. *Journal of Business Research*, 100 (July), 327-338. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.12.032

Porteous, H. (2018). 'A Woman Isn't a Woman When She's Not Concerned About the Way She Looks': Beauty Labour and Femininity in Post-Soviet Russia, in M. Ilic (ed.) *The*

Palgrave Handbook of Women and Gender in Twentieth-Century Russia and the Soviet Union. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Prior, S. (2012). Overcoming stigma: How young people position themselves as counselling service users. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, *34*(5), 697-713. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9566.2011.01430.x

Saren, M. (2015). 'Buy buy Miss American Pie' The day the consumer died. *Marketing Theory,* 15(4), 565-569. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593115607943

Sorenson, K.B. (2014). Transformative Services Design: Inviting Customers to Have Artful Dialogues About Money. *Touchpoint*, 5 (3): 54-60. https://www.service-design-network.org/touchpoint/touchpoint-vol-5-no-3-beyond-necessity-the-beauty-of-service/transformative-service-design

Tadajewski, M. (2018). Impact factors, journal rankings, interdisciplinary research and 'the state of the art' in marketing theory and practice. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 34 (1-2), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2018.1453695

Tadajewski, M., Chelekis, J., DeBerry-Spence, B., Figueiredo, B., Kravets, O., Nuttavuthisit, K., Peñaloza, L. & Moisander, J. (2014). The discourses of marketing and development: towards 'critical transformative marketing research'. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *30*(17-18), 1728-1771. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2014.952660

Woodward, S. (2013) "Material Culture". https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199766567/obo-9780199766567-0085.xml

Zhang, L., Sivertsen, G., Du, H. et al. (2021). Gender differences in the aims and impacts of research. *Scientometrics* 126, pp. 8861–8886. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-04171-y

24