

Who Are We Now? The Evolution of Consumer Culture

David J. Burns
Dept. of Marketing
Xavier University
3800 Victory Parkway
Cincinnati, OH 45207
513 745-3956 (office)
513 745-3692 (fax)
Burnsd@xavier.edu

Who Are We Now? The Evolution of Consumer Culture

Unquestionably, the exercise of marketing (and the associated consumer culture) has added to the material welfare of modern society (Dittmar and Drury 2000). As a result of marketing, consumers have access to and can enjoy goods that could not have been foreseen anytime in history. In climate-controlled dwellings, individuals live in their own self-made environments. Food is plentiful – so plentiful that being over-weight is at epidemic proportions. Hundreds of channels of entertainment are available in our homes. Amusement parks, shopping centers, and sporting events beckon us with entertainment. Outwardly this utopia has provided us with lives so freed from physical concerns and so filled with entertainment that it seems obvious that individuals and society have benefited from this transformation. Furthermore, the global percentage of people living in abject poverty and/or suffering from hunger (though definitely still major social issues) is lower today than perhaps ever before.

As a consequence of the pervasiveness of consumer culture in many societies, there is a widespread belief that one's quality of life is a function of the quantity of things that one possesses (Roper Starch Worldwide 1994). This mentality is present in the widespread belief that happiness is based on one's income, or one's ability to acquire possessions and experiences without hindrance (O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy 2002). Empirical research, however, paints a different picture. Numerous studies clearly show that once survival needs are met, additional income and additional possessions do little to improve one's level of happiness (Kottler 1999; Myers 2000). Allen concludes "We have no proof that more material goods such as more cars or gadgets has made anyone happier – in fact, the evidence seems to point in the opposite direction" (Packard 1980, p. 246).

Having been raised in a consumer culture, many individuals, including our students, often do not comprehend the possibility of anything else. The idea of a consumer culture becomes the lens through which many view not only today, but also view the past and the future. Indeed, when students look to the history of humankind, they often do so with a "Flintstones" mentality, or the idea that a consumer culture has always existed with the level of technology (and likewise the level of sophistication of products)

being the only element of change.

The purpose of this paper is to explode the “Flintstones” myth. This will be accomplished by exploring the evolution of consumer culture. Furthermore, how this reality can be addressed in the marketing classroom is discussed.

The Rise of a Consumer Culture

Contrary to popular thought, a consumer culture amongst the masses has not always existed. Indeed, the consumer culture possesses very recent origins. The consumer culture has recently become so pervasive, however, that it has become difficult for many to comprehend life existing in any other environment. To understand the consumer culture and its origins and development, alternative conceptions of reality need to be explored. Consequently, each of the primary philosophies of life will be discussed.

Premodernism

When history is viewed, clearly the dominant philosophy of life for most individuals has been premodernism. Premodernism is characterized by traditionalism and societies marked by relatively little change (Koppl 1996). Life is simple in premodern societies with most involved in subsistence activities, primarily agriculture. The vast majority of individuals’ time is spent on providing for basic needs with little time or resources left to pursue other options. Consequently, in pre-modern times, product acquisition was not a priority, or even a possibility, for most.

the average man’s income was so low that even a poor man’s diet absorbed 60 to 80 percent of that income ... in good times. ... After having bought their food, the mass of the people had little left for their wants, no matter how elementary they were. In pre-industrial Europe the purchase of a garment, or the cloth for a garment, remained a luxury the common people could only afford a few times in their lives (Cipolla 1976, pp. 29-33).

Demos (1970) clearly identifies an average person’s possessions in these societies. As summarized by McKendrick,

The chilling picture of poverty evoked by the inventory of one James Cushman in 1648 can be conveyed by the contents of his kitchen: ‘one small iron pott,’ ‘a small scillite,’ and ‘one small brass scimer.’ The poorest families owned no table linen, little pottery and less cutlery. Spoons

were the one essential, knives turned up more rarely, forks were non-existent. Furniture was small and simple: 'a single fully fledged chair' seems to have sufficed for many families. Feather beds were a mark of wealth, and bedspreads too appear only in the inventories of the wealthy. Even for the more prosperous members of the community who mustered a more impressive inventory, few of the possessions were new and much of the crudely made cookware ... served a family through two or three generations (1982, p. 27).

If excess resources are acquired by individuals in premodern societies (more than that required for subsistence living), the excess resources are typically saved or are used to acquire additional leisure time – not to acquire additional products (Perkin 1969). Even when faced with available products and the means to acquire them, individuals in premodern societies possess little compulsion to purchase them (Cobbett 1958; McKendrick 1982). Products primarily play a utilitarian role in premodern societies – they serve merely as utensils to aid in the necessary duties of life. Organized marketing activities, therefore, play a minimal role in premodern society, primarily serving only to provide the few items required which can not be constructed by oneself.

Within premodern societies, the focus of attention is not on things, but on relationships. Indeed, the most important component of life in premodern societies is relationships, either with others (family and community) or with God (religion) (Sarup 1996). Relationships, in turn, provide the foundation upon which one's self is based (Wachtel 1989). These relationships are relatively unchanging during one's life in premodern societies (Sarup 1996). One's family, for instance, often determines the nature of one's occupation. With little travel, one remains close to family and community (Koppl 1996). Moreover, religion tends to exercise a consistent and significant influence in one's life (Durkheim 1915). Selfhood, therefore, forms informally through daily interactions made possible through relationships (Hartley 1999). Consequently, one generally has little direct influence or choice over their self, instead, the self tends to be ascribed to individuals by virtue of the external situation (family, community, and religion) into which they were born. As a result, identity problems are relatively unknown in most premodern societies (Baumeister 1986).

For most of human history people lived in closely knit communities in which each individuals had a specified place and which there was a strong sense of shared fate. The sense of belonging,

of being part of something larger than oneself, was an important source of comfort. In the face of the dangers and the terrifying mysteries that the lonely individual encountered, this sense of connectedness – along with one's religious faith, which often could barely be separated from one's membership in the community – was for most people the main way of achieving some sense of security and the courage to go on (Wachtel 1989, p. 61).

Modernism

Modernism, as a philosophy of life, arose relatively recently. The rise of modernism has been associated with the rise of logic and rationality and with several significant historical events (Hartley 1999; Lyon 1999), the primary one being the industrial revolution. In fact, although the industrial revolution was made possible through the newfound emphasis on science and reason characteristic of modernism, it also became modernism's primary driver. The industrial revolution changed the nature of many of the societies in which it was manifest and consequently, the individuals who comprise them. Modernism, for instance, requires profound changes in the structure of society, changes which prompts foundational changes in the composition and meaning of life.

One of the most visible changes prompted by the industrial revolution concerned the geographic structure of society – an industrial society requires an environment significantly different from that needed to support an agrarian society. The industrial revolution, for instance, included the development of large industrial complexes. The population distribution consistent with agrarian societies, however, is primarily rural and is not conducive to industrialization (Mayfield 1949). Consequently, a significant urban migration is required to produce the large concentrations of individuals required by the industrial complexes. Industries are often able to attract the needed workers since industrial employment promises a life not dependent on the variability of the weather and a life offering more than merely subsistence.

The migration which subsequently occurs in societies transitioning from premodernism to modernism acts to disrupt many of the relationships which form the basis of the self in premodernism (Belk, Ger and Askegaard 2003). Moving to a developing city, for instance, acts to strain or sever many of the ties between individuals and their families and communities (Lyon 1999) – in the move, extended families and communities are often left behind. The nature of industrial work tends to exacerbate the

straining of these ties. Individuals find that they were no longer working for themselves with the assistance of family members. Instead, they find themselves working away from the household separate from family members. Moreover, in the instance of the industrial revolution, since the forty-hour work week had not yet been contemplated, individuals often found themselves separated from their families for long periods of time with few if any “days off” and vacations.

Modernism also acts to strain or even sever the ties to religion for many (Marsden 1994). Modernism’s reliance on logic and rationality and the importance of science makes a dependence upon a Supreme Being seemingly unnecessary (Venkatesh 1999). Modernism tends not to be directly opposed to religion, it just does not have a place in it. The modernist individual sees “essentially a dead universe, constructed and set in motion by the Creator, with subsequent events accounted for by mechanical forces and lawful behaviors” (Harman 1996, p. 283). As a result, in addition to a declining number of individuals regarding themselves as religious or as adhering to a particular religion typical during a transition from premodernism to modernism, religion also generally exercises less effect on those who regard themselves as religious (Gay 1998).

Consequently, with the rise of modernism, the permanency and the level of influence which family, community, and religion exerts on individuals declines significantly. Under modernism, therefore, the bases which individuals used as a foundation for the self under premodernism lose much of their ability to ascribe meaning to life and one’s self. In response, individuals are usually forced to make or develop their own selves. In other words, “who an individual is” is no longer as dependent on the relatively permanent bases as characteristic of premodernism (one’s self was no longer simply ascribed at birth), but instead is increasingly dependent on one’s own choices (Rushing and Frenzt 1995). In place of the relatively permanent, the self is left to be formed through transient, physical realities, primarily through one’s own actions.

In the modern world, we must make an identity for ourselves; we do not inherit one. We have outgrown the tradition that assigns one’s way of life, one’s station, and one’s loyalties at birth. And, for more and more of us, we outgrow the particulars of our backgrounds. That we are from

a particular place or class, or even the sons and daughters of particular mothers and fathers, does not determine who we “are.” In many ways, of course, this is liberating, but it makes an identity something we must achieve (Wachtel 1989, p. 99).

The most prevalent means arising during modernism which act as new foundations for the self include personal achievement and personal presentation through the acts of acquisition and consumption.

Given the personal nature of personal achievement (e.g, achievements in the sports or business worlds), one’s accomplishments is an obvious avenue through which a self can be personally constructed. Constructing one’s self based on personal achievement, however, possesses several significant shortcomings. First, the fleeting nature of personal achievement makes such a basis for one’s self tenuous at best. One may excel in a particular undertaking today, but what will tomorrow bring (Zacharias 1990)? When our skills have declined, what happens to our selves? Furthermore, relying upon personal achievement as a basis for one’s self constrains one’s self to areas to which one can excel. Personal achievement, therefore, also tends to be confining in its ability to act as a foundation for the self.

An alternative to personal achievement which has proven to be a superior basis upon which to build the self is personal presentation. Personal presentation is a personal choice involving the display of one’s chosen self to oneself and to others. The primary avenue through which personal presentation is through consumption activities, as has been recognized for some time (Cooley 1902, 1908). Personal presentation through consumption activities is illustrated in the frequently quoted passage:

The Empirical Self of each of us is all that he is tempted to call ... me. But it is clear that between what a man calls me and what he simply calls mine the line is difficult to draw. We feel and act about certain things that are ours very much as we feel and act about ourselves. ... In its widest possible sense, however, a man’s Self is the sum total of what he CAN call his, not only his body and his psychic powers, but his clothes and his house, ... his reputation and works, his lands and horses, and yacht and bank account (James 1890, pp. 279-80).

Under modernism, therefore, the role of products changes from serving as utilitarian tools to becoming building blocks with which to construct one’s self. This change fundamentally changes the role of marketing. Instead of serving primarily as a function fulfilling the few physical needs of individuals which cannot be fulfilled by individuals’ own actions, marketing moves to a more personal/social role

providing products to fulfill individuals' presentational needs. Consequently, the rise of modernism marks the rise of the consumer culture.

Postmodernism

More recently, in many societies modernism has been replaced with postmodernism (Vitz 1998; Winter 2002). In a postmodern environment, the presence of relatively permanent anchors upon which to base the self used in premodernism (family, community, and religion) have all but vanished (Cova 1996, Kee 1999). Consequently, the importance of products and consumption activities exponentially increases. Consumption becomes the channel through which a self can be developed (or in actuality, purchased) (Ahponen 1990). Indeed, consumption comes to mean everything under postmodernism. In other words, materialism becomes the only source of personal meaning.

All consumption becomes conceivable as the desire for, as well as the desire of, the self. ... We then seek, in consuming such objects (products), to incorporate an idealized self, to make the self more real, and to end the inner despair of not having a self (Ferguson 1992b, p. 27-28).

Actually, in postmodernism, the self, as a single concrete reality, arguably no longer exists. "If postmodernism will not allow the world to be pinned down, it can not abide the equivalent conception of the individual identity. The reality of the individual is as questionable as that of his or her context" (Cummins 1996, p. 70). Instead of speaking of a singular self, therefore, it is more common to refer to multiple roles or images, where individuals are encouraged to consume symbols consistent with the role or image desired at any particular time. The self, therefore, exists merely to display – to display the articles which portray a desired image (Firat and Venkatesh 1993). As a result, consumption becomes the defining feature of postmodern societies and consumer culture reigns supreme (Holt 2002). Within postmodernism then, marketing achieves an unforeseen level of societal significance. Instead of focusing on identifying and meeting consumer wants and needs, the focus is instead on providing consumers with the building blocks necessary to build personal images and to construct desired realities (Cooper, McLoughlin and Keating 2005). The utilitarian properties of most products become relatively meaningless. Instead, what is important are the images associated with the products – image which can

be used to develop a desired self (Venkatesh 1999). “The image *is* the substance. Through a planned interplay of signs, the image becomes the essence a customer seeks in a product or service. ... Technology exists merely to create images” (Cova 1996, pp. 496-7). Indeed, “in a quite real sense, every commodity becomes identical, the necessary but inconsequential carrier of ultimate value” (Ferguson 1992a, p. 174).

The logical outcome then, is a societal focus on pleasure and on attempts to acquire it during this earthly life (“Let’s eat and drink and be merry for tomorrow we die”) – clearly a primary quality of today’s consumer culture. Similarly, as pleasure in itself proves to be insufficient to meet the fundamental needs of individuals, a logical outcome is a growth of hopelessness and despair, again common qualities in today’s culture.

Yet this mall-based allocation of goods and dreams, gratifications and identities, provides no more than intermittent palliatives for underlying anxiety and appropriation of, if annihilation of, subjectivity. ... Given the plurality of life, worlds with multiple and often contradictory and hyper-real practices of everyday life, selfhood has become more enfeebled and thus seeks more and more mall-based empowerment and recognition (Langman, 1992, pp. 67, 66).

In the rush of modern industrial society, and in the attempt to maintain our image as successful persons, we feel that we have lost touch with a deeper, more profound part of our beings. Yet, we feel that we have little time, energy, or cultural support to pursue those areas of life that we know are important (Dass 1981, p. 14).

All indications seem to point to fatal problems in the basis of a consumer culture – the consumer culture appears to be unable to deliver what it promises. Although it very successfully increases standards of living beyond initial comprehension and provides products with forms of comfort and entertainment alternatives which were inconceivable only a few years ago, it is unable to bring increased happiness and increased fulfillment to people’s lives. The continuing desire to increase consumption necessitates ever increasing levels of income (Needleman 1991). The need for ever-increasing levels of income in turn, leads to the need to maximize time spent in work activities, usually at the expense of leisure and social activities. This is why, even the face of significant gains in productivity, the amount of time spent working has risen steadily and substantially over the past forty years in societies characterized by a consumer culture (Schor 1991). We have become prisoners to the need to make greater incomes –

relationships and the needs of others have been cast aside in the striving to obtain more belongings.

What is the Appropriate Response?

Given this reality, what should be the role of marketing in Christian education? First, students must become knowledgeable of the environment existing in the marketplace today. Indeed, a key to being successful in marketing is to possess an in-depth knowledge of customers – only by possessing an in-depth knowledge of customers can marketers hope to satisfy their wants and needs in the marketplace. If presented in correct format, within the guise of truly understanding what drives consumers in the marketplace, information on the role of products and marketing in today’s postmodern culture is generally well received by students. If students see the reality of the role that products play in their own lives, they can easily apply the reality to consumers in general in postmodern societies.

Second, students need to see the problems inherent in our consumer culture and be able to analyze it and to examine their own lives within it. All indications seem to point to fatal problems in the basis of a consumer culture – the consumer culture appears to be unable to deliver what it promises. Although it has very successfully increased standards of living beyond initial comprehension and has provided products which offer forms of comfort and entertainment alternatives which were inconceivable only a few years ago, it has been unable to bring increased happiness and increased fulfillment to people’s lives. Instead, what we have is what Elliott and Wattanasuwan call a “looming state of personal meaningless (1988, p. 131).

The final consequence of materialism is the loss of the essential loss. Because of the emphasis on external symbols of status and identity, on projecting an image that is defined by what is owned, there is less opportunity for people to face who they are, stripped of trappings. Problems are addressed not by examining underlying issues but by choosing materialistic self-medication (Kotler 1999, p. 62).

Hence, instead of being confined within a self ascribed to one at birth and being free to operate within that self (a situation characteristic of premodernism), the present situation consists of freedom to choose a desired self, but imprisonment to the self construction process. If happiness or personal fulfillment is used as the criterion to determine the desirable situation, the evidence is clear – individuals

express significantly higher levels of happiness and fulfillment within a premodern philosophy of life.

Students, however, generally believe that happiness and fulfillment is only available in the marketplace since the postmodern philosophy of life is often the only philosophy of life they know.

Regarding students' orientations reported by Naylor, Myers states

With few exceptions, what they wanted fell into three categories: money, power and things – very big things. ... Their request to the faculty was: Teach me to become a moneymaking machine. All else was irrelevant, reported Naylor, including concern's for one's family, one's spirituality, one's workers, one's ethics, and social responsibility (Myers 1992, p. 32).

Recently, Burns and Warren (2003) recognized and examined the competitive nature of self construction in today's culture and the role of this competition in today's hyperconsumerism. They concluded that many individuals in our society are focusing much of their attention on accumulation of large quantities of meaning-laden products to aid them in their self construction process in a way which differs little from the stockpiling of arms in international arms races. Indeed, they raise the question of whether the activities of marketers today differ from those of arms dealers. Are we teaching marketing students to be the arms dealers of postmodern society?

What should our response be as Christian professors of business? Numerous remedies have been suggested to address the "postmodern condition" including redefining work (e.g., Benton 1987), redefining marketing (e.g., Dholakia, Firat and Bagozzi 1987), and changing the nature of advertising (e.g., Pollay 1986). It is doubtful that any of the suggestions, however, will produce lasting change.

What should our role be? Schwartz suggests:

If as individuals we are too vulnerable and as a nation we are too unresponsive to restrain the influence of the market and change our collective social direction, where else can we turn? A possible candidate, suggested by Tocqueville, is our religious institutions. As he pointed out almost two hundred years ago, it is religious commandments – largely mediated by the family and, within the family, by its women – that rein in the pursuit and abuse of political and economic power. By strengthening our religious institutions, and by strengthening our commitment to participation in those institutions, we might thus be able to reintroduce the language of responsibility and morality into our public life. Membership in religious communities might protect us from the very harsh consequences we would otherwise face if we chose as individuals to reject the pursuit of material wealth as our primary objective in life. As religious communities might become a significant force in our social and political life, redirecting the state in a way that restrains the market and restores and protects nonmaterial values that people in our society

cherish (Schwartz 1994, p. 318).

In conclusion, the answers are not simple. Clearly, students need to be aware of the consumer culture and their place within it. There is no simple solution as to how to optimally address and deal with these issues in our classes as we are preparing them to succeed in business in a consumer culture. At the very least, our students need to be exposed to and gain an understanding of the market as it presently exists and its advantages and its inherent problems. Such an understanding will aid students in their quest to achieve “success” in business in a postmodern society. More importantly, however, students will be better able to see and consider the ethical and moral ramifications of the decisions made by businesses in the marketplace and, consequently, they hopefully will possess the tools to ultimately make better decisions not only for their future employers, but for society and for individuals comprising society.

References

- Ahponen, Pirkkoliisa (1990), "Signifying the Signs – Simulating Cultural Political Subjectivity in Postmodernity," *Acta Sociologica*, 33, (4), 341-357.
- Baumeister, Roy F. (1986), *Identity: Cultural Change and the Struggle for Self*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Belk, Russell W., Güliz Ger and Sren Askegaard (2003), "The Fire of Desire: A Multisited Inquiry into Consumer Passion," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30 (December), 326-351.
- Benton, Raymond, Jr. (1987), "Work, Consumption, and the Joyless Consumer," in *Philosophical and Radical Thought in Marketing*, A. Fuat Firat, Nikhilesh Dholakia and Richard P. Bagozzi, eds. Lexington MA: Lexington Books, pp. 235-250.
- Burns, David J. and Homer B. Warren (2003), "Are Marketers Nothing More Than Arms Dealers? The Role of Marketing in Consumer Warfare," in *Expanding Marketing Horizons into the 21st Century*, Brenda J. Ponsford, ed. Greenville PA: Association of Marketing Theory and Practice, 4.3:1-2.
- Cipolla, Carlo (1976), *Before the Industrial Revolution: European Society and Economy, 1000-1700*. New York: Norton.
- Cobbett, William (1958), *Rural Rides with Economical and Political Observations*, ed. by E. W. Martin. London: Macdonald.
- Cooley, Charles Horton (1908), "A Study of the Early Use of Self-Words by a Child," *Psychological Review*, 15, 339-357.
- Cooley, Charles Horton (1902), *Human Values and Social Order*. Chapter 5. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Cooper, Steve, Damien McLoughlin and Andrew Keating (2005), "Individual and Neo-Tribal Consumption: Tales from the Simpsons of Springfield," *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 4 (5), 330-344.

- Cova, Bernard (1996), "What Postmodernism Means to Marketing Managers," *European Management Journal*, 14 (5), 494-499.
- Cummins, Walter (1996), "Love and Liqueur: Modernism and Postmodernism in Advertising and Fiction," in *Advertising and Culture: Theoretical Perspectives*, Mary Cross, ed. Westpoint CT: Praeger, 61-74.
- Dass, Ram (1981), "Introduction" in *Voluntary Simplicity: Toward a Way of Life That is Outwardly Simple, Inwardly Rich* by Duane Elgin. New York: William Morrow & Co., pp. 13-19.
- Demos, John (1970), *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dholakia, Nikhilesh, A. Fuat Firat, and Richard P. Bagozzi (1987), "Rethinking Marketing," in *Philosophical and Radical Thought in Marketing*, A. Fuat Firat, Nikhilesh Dholakia and Richard P. Bagozzi, eds. Lexington MA: Lexington Books, pp. 373-384.
- Dittmar, Helga and John Drury (2000), "Self-Image – Is It in the Bag? A Qualitative Comparison Between 'Ordinary' and 'Excessive' Consumers," *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 21 (April), 109-142.
- Durkheim, Emile (1915), *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, Joseph Ward Swain, ed. London.
- Elliott, Richard and Kritsadarat Wattanasuwan (1998), "Brands as Symbolic Resources for the Construction of Identity," *International Journal of Advertising*, 17 (2), 131-144.
- Ferguson, Harvie (1992a), *Religious Transformation in Western Society: The End of Happiness*. New York: Routledge.
- Ferguson, Harvie (1992b), "Watching the World Go Round: Atrium Culture and the Psychology of Shopping," in *Lifestyle Shopping: The Subject of Consumption*, Rob Shields, ed. London: Routledge, pp. 21-39.
- Firat, A. Fuat and Alladi Venkatesh (1993), "Post-Modernity: The Age of Marketing," *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 10 (3), 227-249.

- Gay, Craig M. (1998), *The Way of the (Modern) World*. Grand Rapids MI: William B. Eerdmann.
- Harman, Willis W. (1996), "Creating a Sustainable Global Society – The Evolutionary Path," *World Futures*, 47 (4), 277-310.
- Hartley, John (1999), *Uses of Television*. London: Routledge.
- Holt, Douglas B. (2002), "Why Do Brands Cause Trouble? A Dialectical Theory of Consumer Culture and Branding," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29 (June), 70-90.
- James, William (1890), *The Principles of Psychology*, vol. 1. New York: Henry Holt.
- Kee, Alistair (1999), *Nietzche Against the Crucified*. London: SCM Press.
- Koppl, Roger (1996), "Man Has Fallen and He Can't Get Up: An Essay on Postmodernism and Advertising," in *Advertising and Culture: Theoretical Perspectives*, Mary Cross, ed. Westpoint CT: Praeger, 75-84.
- Kottler, Jeffrey A. (1999), *Exploring and Treating Acquisitive Desire: Living in the Material World*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.
- Langman, Lauren (1992), "Neon Cages: Shopping for Subjectivity," in *Lifestyle Shopping: The Subject of Consumption*, Rob Shields, ed. New York: Routledge, pp. 40-82.
- Lyon, David (1999), *Postmodernity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Marsden, George M. (1994), *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief*. New York: Oxford Press.
- Mayfield, Frank M. (1949), *The Department Store Story*. New York: Fairchild Publications.
- McKendrick, Neil (1982), "Commercialization and the Economy," in *The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of Eighteenth-Century England*, Neil McKendrick, John Brewer and J. H. Plumb, eds. Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, pp. 9-194.
- Myers, David G. (2000), *The American Paradox: Spiritual Hunger in an Age of Plenty*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.
- Myers, David G. (1992), *The Pursuit of Happiness: Who is Happy and Why*. New York: William Morrow

and Company.

Needleman, Jacob (1991), *Money and the Meaning of Life*. New York: Doubleday.

O'Shaughnessy, John and Nicholas Jackson O' Shaughnessy (2002), "Marketing, the Consumer Society and Hedonism," *European Journal of Marketing*, 36 (5/6), 524-547.

Packard, Vance O. (1980), *The Hidden Persuaders*. New York: Pocket Books.

Perkin, Harold (1969), *The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880*. New York: Routledge.

Pollay, Richard W. (1986), "Quality of Life in the Padded Sell: Common Criticisms of Advertising's Culatureal Character and International Public Policies," *Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 9 (nos. 1&2), 173-250.

Roper Starch Worldwide (1994), *Survey of America's Inner Financial Life*. New York: Roper Starch Worldwide.

Rushing, Janice Hocker and Thomas S. Frenz (1995), *Projecting the Shadow: The Cyborg Hero in American Film*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sarup. Maden (1996), *Identity, Culture and the Postmodern World*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Schor, Juliet B. (1991), *The Overworked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure*. New York: Basic Books.

Schwartz, Barry (1994), *The Costs of Living: How Market Freedom Erodes the Best Things in Life*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Venkatesh, Alladi (1999), "Postmodernism Perspectives for Macromarketing: An Inquiry into the Global Information and Sign Economy," *Journal of Macromarketing*, 19 (December), 153-169.

Vitz, Paul C. (1998), "The Future of the University: From Postmodern to Transmodern," in *Rethinking the Future of the University*, David Lyle Jeffrey and Dominic Manganiello, eds. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 105-116.

Wachtel, Paul L. (1989), *The Poverty of Affluence: A Psychological Portrait of the American Way of Life*. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.

Winter, Richard (2002), *Still Bored in a Culture of Entertainment*, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Zacharias, Ravi (1990), *A Shattered Visage: The Real Face of Atheism*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.