

# Marketing Theory

<http://mtq.sagepub.com>

---

## **Remembering motivation research: toward an alternative genealogy of interpretive consumer research**

Mark Tadajewski

*Marketing Theory* 2006; 6; 429

DOI: 10.1177/1470593106069931

The online version of this article can be found at:  
<http://mtq.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/6/4/429>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

**Additional services and information for *Marketing Theory* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://mtq.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://mtq.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav>

**Citations** <http://mtq.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/6/4/429>



# Remembering motivation research: toward an alternative genealogy of interpretive consumer research

Mark Tadajewski

University of Leicester

**Abstract.** *This article traces the emergence and subsequent decline of motivation research. It argues that contrary to recent opinion that interpretive consumer research emerged in the mid-1980s, an embryonic form of interpretive research can actually be found in the 1930s in the form of motivation research. It demonstrates that there are clear and distinct parallels regarding the ontology, axiology, epistemology, methodology and view of human nature between motivation research, interpretive research and, to a limited extent, critical theory. Not only is motivation research presented as an early form of interpretive consumer research, but in addition, Holbrook's and Hirschman's experiential analysis is shown to be a possible take-off point to make the case that motivation research represents an early root of Consumer Culture Theory. This genealogical exercise resituates the emergence of the CCT discourse by 80 years and interpretive research by 60 years.* **Key Words** ● consumer culture theory ● epistemology of suspicion ● Ernest Dichter ● interpretive consumer research ● motivation research

The maddening fact about motivation research from its very inception has been the difficulty of separating the real from the glittering.

(Martineau, 1961: 198)

## Introduction

In a recent article, Shankar and Patterson (2001) argued that the dominant paradigmatic position in consumer research has historically been some variant of 'positivism' (compare with Calder and Tybout, 1989; Hunt, 1991). They acknowledge the explicit bifurcation of paradigm allegiance in consumer research as stemming largely from the contributions of the Consumer Behavior Odyssey,



whose naturalistic research strategy at swap meets and flea markets (among other sites) across the United States has been an important catalyst for the interpretive turn (Wallendorf and Belk, 1989). At the risk of generalization, proponents of the subjective world (i.e. interpretive) paradigm view the social world as having a precarious ontological status. In questioning the ontological status of social reality, the emphasis in interpretive research is on the de-emphasis of an external concrete social world. In place of assuming an external, concrete reality, interpretive researchers seek to investigate the social world at the level of subjective experience (Arndt, 1985a, 1985b). For interpretive researchers, social reality is seen to be inter-subjectively composed, so that epistemologically, knowledge is not approached from the standpoint of an external, objective position, but from the lived experience of the research co-participant. As a methodological strategy to 'understand' the lived experience of consumers', interpretive researchers generally – although not exclusively – use qualitative methods (e.g. Hudson and Ozanne, 1988; Moore and Lutz, 2000; Thompson et al., 1989).

A more recent turn in this debate has been made by Arnould and Thompson, who have argued in reference to the 'paradigm wars' that one major feature of these debates has been the introduction of 'many nebulous epithets' (Arnould and Thompson, 2005: 868). These include, 'relativist, post-positivist, interpretivist, humanistic, naturalistic, postmodern' labels (Arnould and Thompson, 2005: 868). Where they see a problem with the use of such terms is that they obfuscate, rather than clarify the discussion by failing to 'signify the theoretical commonalities and linkages' (p. 868) within a research tradition that Arnould and Thompson label 'Consumer Culture Theory' (CCT). While this label, like that of interpretive research, represents a variety of research traditions, the common theoretical orientation among them concerns the study of cultural complexity:

Rather than viewing culture as a fairly homogenous system of collectively shared meanings, ways of life, and unifying values shared by a member of society (e.g. Americans share this kind of culture; Japanese share that kind of culture), CCT explores the heterogeneous distribution of meanings and multiplicity of overlapping cultural groupings that exist within the broader sociohistoric frame of globalization and market capitalism . . . Owing to its internal fragmented complexity, consumer culture does not determine action as a causal force. Much like a game where individuals improvise within the constraints of rules . . . consumer culture – and the marketplace ideology it conveys – frames consumers' horizons of conceivable action, feeling, and thought, making certain patterns of behavior and sense-making interpretations more likely than others. (Arnould and Thompson, 2005: 869)

As we shall see later, while Arnould and Thompson's analysis is an important contribution to the paradigm debate(s), at the moment, however, what is interesting for our present purposes is how Shankar and Patterson (2001) offer an important paradox in their opening of a discursive space for their own work. They write, 'The dominant position within consumer research has been, and still is, occupied by positivism and its variants. However this position has been questioned *consistently* within consumer research since the mid-1980s' (Shankar and Patterson, 2001: 482; emphasis added). This, of course, is the chronological point at which interpretive research is generally positioned (e.g. Arnould and Thompson, 2005; Belk,



1995; Goulding, 1999; O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy, 2002; Sherry, 1991; Tadajewski, 2004). Note, however, that they write that it is only recently that the dominant position of positivism has been consistently questioned (Shankar and Patterson, 2001). It follows that at some time in the history of consumer research that the paradigmatic dominance of positivism has been questioned, albeit on an inconsistent basis. As a variety of scholars, from postmodern history (Jenkins, 2003), the history of systems of thought (Foucault, 1984), historical theological studies (de Certeau, 1988), organization studies (Parker, 1998, 2000, 2002) and marketing (Fullerton, 1988; Hollander, 1986) have argued, a closer examination of such narratives often reveals less linear progression than we might expect. In a similar vein, it can be maintained that motivation research has largely been forgotten by consumer researchers. What we mean by this, is that motivation research has been progressively forgotten in relation to more institutionalized forms of knowledge associated with logical empiricism. Indeed, a series of recent papers by Barbara Stern are indicative of precisely how forgotten this history is, with Stern repeatedly drawing attention to the neglect of this discourse within the canon (Fullerton and Stern, 1990; Stern, 1990, 2001, 2004). More recently, Stern (2004) laments the clear neglect of motivation research and Ernest Dichter's contribution to consumer research. Stern, however, is not to be deterred in her project of extending our understanding of motivation research and its central proponent although, as she registers, her earlier research 'is more aimed at justifying his [Dichter's] neglect than on evaluating his contributions and ongoing influence' (2004: 165).

Certainly, when we turn to the literature, those sources that have attempted to establish the paradigmatic position of motivation research are far from reaching a consensus position. Here we might recall Kassarjian's (1989) insightful book review in which he proposed that the motivation research of Herta Hertzog and Ernest Dichter could 'perhaps' be seen as a forerunner of interpretive, qualitative research. Similarly, Levy suggests that motivation research 'died, but, of course, continued to grow as qualitative research' (Levy, 2003a: 104). Likewise, Kernan (1992) sees motivation research as simply qualitative research (see also, Bartos, 1986a; Fullerton and Stern, 1990). This equation of qualitative with motivation research has, however, been questioned by Sampson (1978) who noted that motivation research was not simply qualitative research but was equally amenable to quantification. This narrative does not end here. When we turn to the pages of Murray et al. (1997) these authors suggest that the foundations of motivation research were 'historical-hermeneutic' based (Murray et al., 1997: 101). Similarly, Arndt (1985a, 1985b) offers us further clues that motivation research may indeed be an interpretive approach, by positioning motivation research in the subjective world paradigm (compare with Alvesson, 1994). Arndt's proposal also appears to have the support of Fullerton (1990) who, in his review of Paul Lazarsfeld's early studies of consumer behaviour, asserted that these studies share similar characteristics to phenomenological research in that Lazarsfeld used open-ended questions, required specific concrete examples from respondents and drew upon theory from experimental psychology and psychoanalysis in the interpretation of transcripts.



In light of these comments, it seems fair to suggest, despite Shankar and Patterson's (2001) insistence that the early history of interpretive consumer research has been elevated to the status of 'received wisdom', that the general consensus regarding the historical development of interpretive consumer research is somewhat less clear. Given this ambiguity, it is an appropriate moment to determine the paradigm with which motivation research is most consistent. Now clearly, the worldview presented as embodying the axiological, ontological, epistemological, methodological characteristics of motivation research is a generalization. This is to be expected and has not prevented previous commentators from delineating positivist or interpretivist research in this way (e.g. Burrell and Morgan, 1992[1979]; Holbrook, 1997; Hudson and Ozanne, 1988; Keat and Urry, 1975; Mick and Demoss, 1990; Morgan and Smircich, 1980; Murray and Ozanne, 1991; Szmigin and Foxall, 2000).

Having discussed the recent developments in the paradigm debate and the turn towards CCT, we will now examine the emergence of motivation research. Following this, the axiology, ontology, epistemology and methodology of motivation research is delineated and its historical relationship to interpretive research and CCT outlined.

## Researching the consumer

After the Second World War, the growth in standards of living meant that many consumers found themselves within striking distance of middle-class prosperity, with access to consumer goods that far surpassed those available to even the most prosperous of past centuries (Dichter, 1964; Packard, 1960). In spite of such economic changes, the ability of advertisers to sell their wares to the buying public was being challenged, with consumers becoming ever more discernable customers (Green, 1952). As Green pointed out:

Consumers are beginning to save their money rather than buy merchandise. Durable good sales are down, nondurable sales are slightly up . . . Long accepted advertising techniques are being reviewed in light of new selling concepts. Rapidly changing market patterns are requiring marketing decisions to be made ever more quickly. (Green, 1952: 30)

These difficulties were further compounded by the increasing saturation of the market for consumer durables, thereby leading marketers and advertisers alike to acknowledge that this was indeed a 'buyer's market' (Britt, 1950). In this state-of-affairs, an understanding of buying motives increased in importance, with the growing complexity of the business environment leading many to assert that the early descriptive focus of consumer research was an unsuitable research strategy for use in a dynamic marketplace (Converse et al., 1958).

It was in this context that consumer research as a distinct discipline emerged when a confluence of factors came together (Levy, 2001). Important here is the *wider* acceptance of the marketing concept by the business community (see Hollander, 1986; Klass, 1964; Twedt, 1964). Commensurate with this turn was the realization among the practitioner and academic communities that very little



attention had been devoted to researching what consumers want to buy (see Karesh, 1995). This lacunae stimulated researchers from a variety of disciplines to fill what were 'highly disturbing voids' in relation to consumer needs, wants and general consumption behaviours (Newman, 1955). This focus on actual consumer behaviour was accentuated by the growing awareness that the existing conceptual foundations of consumer research were of dubious veracity, based as they were on notions of rational, economic man; an abstraction that was being challenged by a growing quantity of evidence (see Breyer, 1934; Katona, 1954; Levy, 1959; Mueller, 1954). It was this increasing concern among marketing and advertising professionals that they were losing contact with the marketplace that encouraged them to turn to the methods developed in the social and behavioural sciences as a means to understand consumer needs, wants, desires and fears. In particular, advertisers and marketing managers highly prized the insights available from sociologists, psychologists and psychoanalysts who could provide ideas on conscious and unconscious human motivations. Information that was especially sought after, in particular, related to 'the unconscious or hidden ideas, associations or attitudes of the consumer in connection with . . . [a] particular product' (Weiss and Green, 1951: 36).

It is the translation of psychological theory and concepts into consumer research that is our focus here and this process did involve some subtle changes in emphasis. Psychology, for example, had traditionally placed greater emphasis on the psychological features of motivation at an individual level and devoted far less attention toward the manner in which these motivations reflected wider social values, beliefs and conventions (Cofer and Appley, 1964). The interest in the influence of the structural environment was, in contrast, seen to be the remit of sociologists and anthropologists. Bringing these two distinct areas together was the work of the early motivation researchers. These researchers had received extensive psychological training and perceived the opportunities available in the market and consumer research industry for the application of psychological theory to actual market problems. In addition, they were well placed by virtue of their training to appreciate the epistemological and methodological limitations of consumer research (Dichter, 1979).

While motivation research is frequently seen to be the product of Ernest Dichter, the reality is that by the time Dichter arrived in the United States motivation research was already well underway, having been developed in an embryonic fashion by Paul Lazarsfeld in the 1930s (Lazarsfeld, 1935, 1969). Lazarsfeld's importance here cannot be understated given his formative influence in initiating qualitative motivation studies. Of equal importance in terms of the conditions of possibility that contributed to the emergence and sedimentation of this discourse in the United States was the wider political environment that affected Lazarsfeld and, in turn, Dichter. While Lazarsfeld was in the United States pursuing a travelling fellowship provided by the Rockefeller Foundation, in his home country the Conservative Party of Austria rejected their constitution, 'outlawed the Socialist Party, and established an Italian-type fascism' (Lazarsfeld, 1969: 276). This was to have a profound impact on Lazarsfeld when his position in the secondary school



system was cancelled, while his university role remained 'nominally unaffected'. More importantly, 'most members' of his family living in Vienna were imprisoned, a turn of events that gave 'the sympathetic officers of the Rockefeller Foundation the pretext for extending [Lazarsfeld's] . . . fellowship another year' (Lazarsfeld, 1969: 276). This shift in the political environment in Vienna, the imprisonment of family members, the extension of his Rockefeller fellowship ultimately led Lazarsfeld to remain in the United States where he had begun to publish articles devoted to motivation research in the *National Marketing Review*, the precursor to the *Journal of Marketing* (Lazarsfeld, 1935). The Viennese political climate would also influence another important figure in motivation research to move to the relative political and racial stability of the United States. In 1936 Ernest Dichter was working on a research project at the University of Vienna in the *Wirtschafts Psychologisches Institut* (Psychoeconomic Institute) studying the milk-drinking habits of the Viennese. Describing the day he had completed his depth interviews, Dichter (1979: 16–17) recalled entering the department:

The man who stood behind the door . . . was a peculiar looking guy. He asked me whether I was connected with the Institute and what my name was. He had a tone of authority so I did not feel like telling him off. 'You are under arrest,' he growled . . . Without my knowledge, the Institute was used during the Dollfuss & Schuschnigg Fascist rule of Austria as a secret mailing centre from where information was sent to Brno, Czechoslovakia.

Not only was Dichter arrested and imprisoned for a week as a 'subversive', his wife reported to him that the current newspapers 'were full of stories about how market research and public opinion research had been used to cleverly disguise the subversive socialist activities of the underground' (Dichter, 1979: 17). These activities would be reported in the official Nazi newspaper, *Volkische Beobachter*, a move that hints at the potential danger in which these activities placed Dichter, especially given the political, ideological and ethnic tensions at the time. Not only was Dichter Jewish, and thus in a precarious position, his arrest was noted in a list of other subversive influences (some of whom would later flee from the Nazis) including 'Sigmund Freud, Albert Einstein, Karl Marx, [and] Engels' (Dichter, 1979: 18). It was during a meeting with a colleague, who was the head of the Aptitude Testing Institute of the City of Vienna (ATICV), that Dichter realized his time and prospects for business success in Vienna were limited. When, for example, he asked the head what his chances of earning an internship at the ATICV were the response was: 'I would love to give you a job. You have developed a number of new ideas, but you are Jewish are you not?' 'His advice contributed considerably to my leaving the country in early 1937' (Dichter, 1979: 18); a view further compounded by 'some ill brown wind from across the German border' (Dichter, 1979: 21). In his attempt to leave Austria, Dichter discussed his view of motivation research with the American consulate, where he stressed his contribution to the United States:

'I am sure that America is a wonderful country,' I answered. 'But I also know that it has just as many problems as most other countries. Many of these problems need solutions.' We have to understand the real reasons why people do things . . . obviously we all want fewer criminals; we





want people to be happy, interested in their work, we want them to increase their productivity. Some companies want people to buy their products rather than those of their competitors. (Dichter, 1979: 24)

It was the last point with which motivation research has been most closely associated and on the basis of his meeting with the consulate (who assisted Dichter in his application to enter the United States), Dichter was able to transplant himself from Vienna to the United States where he would become the foremost proponent of motivation research.

## Motivation research

Concerned with understanding the motives underpinning consumer (buying and consuming) behaviours, motivation researchers believed that the most pressing task facing researchers was to establish the 'real' motives underpinning consumer behaviour from those that were espoused. Broadly speaking these motives are classifiable, as Converse et al. (1958) proposed, into three broad categories: (1) those of which the consumer is consciously aware and willing to disclose to the researcher; (2) those of which they are aware but are unwilling to divulge to the researcher; and (3) those motives of which the consumer is unaware. For example:

A consumer buys food because her children like it or because it is low in calories. Usually she is willing to give the reasons for such purchases. A middle-income family buys an expensive car because they want to outdo the next-door neighbors. Often they will not disclose the real reason but will say they bought the car because it is heavier and rides easier . . . We often do not know the real reason for many of our actions. Why do we trade at one store rather than another. (Converse et al., 1958: 535)

It is these hidden motives that posed the greatest difficulties for conventional consumer research at the time. While such research typically involved the use of experimental-statistical tools, pre-coded questionnaires and large samples, motivation research questioned the wholesale support of such methods to the neglect of qualitative methods. Dichter's response was unequivocal. Americans, Dichter lambasted, were 'still using outmoded and inefficient methods to determine and understand consumer motivations' (Dichter, 1947: 432). 'They are only scratching the surface of the motivations underlying why humans behave as they do' (Dichter, 1947: 432). For Dichter, this meant that marketers should recognize that when they use such 'outmoded' direct methods such as consumer surveys, they are at 'about the same stage as botany used to be before Linnaeus', that by classifying people by their 'outward phenomenological appearance instead of looking at the general type a person may look and apparently belong to . . . [they may be missing important features because] at a different level, he may be entirely different' (Bartos, 1986b: 19). This, Dichter argued, required consumer researchers to rethink the way they practiced consumer research and in response, he outlined a suitable direction that he thought offered a fruitful way of understanding consumer behaviour – motivation research.





## Axiology

Awareness of the limitations of current (logical empiricist) research practice and the ambiguity of the term 'motivation research' led to intense academy interest, with the University of Michigan sponsoring a conference dedicated to motivation research, as well as this topic occupying an afternoon of debate at the American Marketing Association in Atlantic City in 1953 (Blake, 1954). Given their willingness to borrow the conceptual tools of other disciplines, it was not long before Freud's work and the implications of this for the conceptualization of the consumer were being discussed seriously by scholars (Collins and Montgomery, 1970). Dichter, on the other hand, was quick to dispel interpretations of his work as indicative of a wholesale subscription to Freudian thought, preferring instead to stress the eclectic nature of his own axiological, epistemological and methodological influences (compare with Blankenship, 1965; Kelne, 1955): 'I have often been accused of being a Freudian. I don't see quite why this should be an accusation rather than a compliment. In reality I am not; I am much more of an eclectic. By popular opinion Freud is always associated with sex' (Dichter, 1979: 92). What Dichter's remarks serve to forewarn here is the complex constellation of epistemic values that underpin motivation research. As a discreet community of discourse, however, its main focus is on 'why' questions, with a primary interest towards establishing a better understanding of why consumers engage in certain types of behaviour, and why they view particular products in the manner that they do. As Britt saw the task, 'It is not enough to know that young women use more hand lotions than older women. The point is to find out *why* people have these preferences' (1950: 669; emphasis in original). Communicating the rationale behind the need for marketers to understand their consumer base in greater depth, Britt maintained that '*the consumer is king today*. Our nation has moved from an era of scarcity to an era of plenty, and this makes the role of the consumer more important than ever . . . . Because of his "dollar ballots" the consumer will continue to be king. Everyday he casts his ballots at the cash registers' (Britt, 1960: 36; emphasis in original). Since the actual behaviour of consumers was believed to be the key to greater organizational prosperity and since textbook representations of consumer behaviours were increasingly problematized, motivation researchers (primarily) adopted a research strategy that bore resemblance to 'cultural anthropology'. What this meant in practice was that the major axiological tenant underpinning this form of consumer research was that 'the day-to-day behavior of twentieth century man – even when he lives in Brooklyn, on the outskirts of Paris, or in the south of Italy – is as worthy of study as the Samoans or the Trobrianders' (Dichter, 1971: 2). No more were consumers seen to be 'nice, [and] rational', as this could only lead to disappointment 'when we meet the walking and talking master mold' (Dichter, 1979: 113). What was required to counterpoint such idealistic representations was the careful observation of the consumption behaviour of interest. As an example, Dichter recalled how he used observation, supplemented with extensive photography, when he was interested in the 'why' and 'how' people smoked. He recalled:



Considering myself an anthropologist, I decided to use film clippings, Getch [Dichter's employer] gave me a couple of hundred dollars and I went out and became a roving photographic reporter. I still have the film. I went to Rockefeller Plaza and photographed people in a candid camera fashion while they were ice skating and smoking at the same time. Some people warmed their hands on the cigarette which they held in inverted fashion. Another type smoked and chewed gum at the same time. Some Western Union boys whom I caught in the act were lighting each other's cigarettes in a secretive fashion while goofing off and standing behind the corner. Observing human behavior in this fashion became a hobby and a scientific discovery trip for me. Why did people smoke? Obviously not just because of the addiction to nicotine, but for many other reasons, too. Tightening your lips around a cigarette gives you a feeling of security . . . Therefore, cigarette smoking was a way of combating stress. (Dichter, 1979: 42)

Human behaviour, on this reading, is not only determined by outside forces acting on the individual. Instead, Dichter stressed the complex interplay between the individual, the group and the society in which they are placed. Having gestured towards this, there is far more nuance to the axiology of motivation research than would make this a paradigmatic case of either positivist or interpretive research. Dichter, for instance, evinced little belief in the possibility of explaining consumer behaviour by subsuming it under a universal law.

What motivation theorists did actually propose, is that it is possible for consumer behaviour to be explained and from such explanations that it will become possible to predict what a given cohort of consumers will do in any specific consumption situation. But their attempts to do so are not consistent with what would be the case if this paradigmatic community were positivist. Rather, motivation researchers looked for some underlying thematic association between various consumer segments in order to explain why any given community will view – using the example provided by Haire (1950) – a buyer and consumer of instant coffee as lazy, a bad wife, single and so forth. This type of thematic analysis is undertaken so that the motivation researcher can 'understand' the phenomena that they are investigating by way of identifying the individual associations, meanings and symbolism attached to a given product or consumer environment (e.g. department store). This is achieved via a process of between 50 (Yoell, 1952), 100 to 150 (Yoell, 1950), 500 (Dichter, 1960), 2000 (Dichter, 1964) and 5000 interviews (Dichter, 1955b) in order to discern the pattern of shared meanings in the chosen sample:

the verification or refutation of our hypotheses based on approximately 200 or 250 individual histories, still does not lead us to the same variety and numerical accuracy, e.g., the ability to distinguish between a brand recognition-index of 68 percent or 73 percent, that 2,000 or 5,000 interviews would do. However, what we have is a really thorough understanding of a basic motivational pattern among enough people to indicate that the pattern is significant and lends itself to practical applications. In finding that 80 mothers out of 100 reveal, in multiple waves and multiple tests, when talking about food for their babies that they are as concerned about their own convenience as the nutritional value of the food, we have a finding valid enough to permit any practitioner in advertising or public relations to take advantage of it and act accordingly. (Dichter, 1955a: 32)

The 'patterns' that the motivation researcher excavated were not expected to remain stable in the sense of a law-like generalization.<sup>1</sup> Dichter is instead using this



Table 1

**A summary of positivism, interpretivism, critical theory and motivation research**

	Positivism	Interpretivism	Critical theory	Motivation research
Ontological assumptions (nature of reality)	Objective; tangible; ahistorical; fragmentable; divisible	Socially constructed; multiple; holistic; contextual	'Force-field' between subject and object; dynamic; historical totality	Historically and socially constructed; multiple; contextual
Nature of social being	Deterministic; reactive	Voluntaristic; proactive	Suspend judgment; emphasize human potential	Historically influenced, but voluntaristic emphasis
Axiological assumptions (overriding goal)	'Explanation' via subsumption under general laws; prediction	'Understanding' via interpretation but not necessarily in order to confirm hypotheses	'Emancipation' via social organization that facilitates reason, justice and freedom	Understanding via interpretation; understanding as prerequisite to explanation and prediction
Epistemological assumptions (knowledge generated)	Nomothetic; time-free; context-independent; value-free	Idiographic; time-bound; context-dependent; value-laden;	Forward looking; imaginative; critical/unmasking; practical	Largely idiographic time-bound; value-laden; forward-looking; critical (re: Russia; see note 3)
View of causality	Real causes exist	Multiple; simultaneous; shaping	Reflection; exposure of constraints through dialogue; reconstruction	Multiple; shaping; exposure of potential constraints
Research relationship metaphor	Dualism; separation; detached observer	Interactive; co-operative; translator	Continuing dialogue; liberator	Interactive; co-operative but tempered with suspicion; Dichter as liberator (see note 3)



term to describe the way that general motivational patterns emerge from qualitative data and to indicate that there are certain norms adhered to by a substantial proportion of the population. Depending on the requirements of the client:

Whenever it is desirable and practical, there is no reason why such a pattern cannot be tested on the basis of 5,000 cases. In practice, however, at the end of a study a client will much more frequently accept our recommendation, if it provides him with new insight into his sales and advertising problem. (Dichter, 1955a: 34)

This said, some similarity can still be discerned between motivation research and logical empiricism in the sense that motivation research does aim to demonstrate the underlying systematic association between variables. In conducting depth interviews and observing the consumer segment of interest, Dichter stressed the need to verify, corroborate or refute initial hypotheses. Having made this case, motivation researchers did place very concrete bounds on the extent to which generalization is possible: 'Things that may be learned about one buyer situation in one locality with respect to one kind of product may have little or no applicability to another buyer situation in another locality with respect to another kind of product' (Britt, 1960: 20). Emphasizing these limitations further, 'Actually, every social situation is different from every other and requires a separate analysis' (Britt, 1950: 667). One consequence of this limited generalizability is that the research process can never authoritatively conclude: '*Re-search* is a continued search with the emphasis on the search' (Dichter, 1961: 2; emphasis in original). The task for motivation researchers is that they accept 'the need for continuous testing and observation' if an adequate understanding of a specific consumer behaviour is to be elicited however provisional this will remain (Dichter, 1960: 2).

## Ontological assumptions

Although little discussed in the literature, there are brief ontological references relating to the nature of reality for motivation researchers. Conventional research at this time subscribed to a variant of realism and the view that the external, physical world has an existence independent of human perception. In this context, observation was assumed to be fallible, but theory-neutral, rather than theory-laden (Bayton, 1958). Here theories do not impinge on observation, which is seen to be pure and untainted by mediating influences. Subscription to this view, while largely implicit, led consumer researchers to assume that the description of behaviour based on 'directly observable [and] . . . directly ascertainable collections of facts' were likely to corroborate current hypotheses (Dichter, 1978: 54). There is little, if any, ontological depth presumed here, with surface phenomena seen to be connected in directly observable, causal fashion and whose empirical regularities are assumed to be measurable: 'It relies on observations, answers to questions, and recording and registrations of various forms of behaviour. It is, in the sense of modern semantics, based on naïve empiricism' (Dichter, 1978: 55). In practice, this meant consumer researchers emphasized the utility of direct questions in the



research process, with causal relationships assumed to be identifiable between what consumers say they do, and what they actually do, in practice (Politz, 1957). In contrast to this empiricism, motivation researchers espoused an ontological position that is closer to interpretivism than to positivism, although it shares certain aspects of each. For motivation researchers, the social world is seen to embody emergent, historically and temporally stable properties with certain behaviours dating 'back tens of thousands of years' (Dichter, 1979: 107). As Dichter registered, human behaviour is influenced 'by instinctive responses and social norms, or cultural values', and in response to the complexity of their lives consumers create cognitive shortcuts that enable them to move through and manage their everyday lives (Dichter, 1960: 80). One pertinent example of what Dichter is gesturing toward here can be found in a discussion of consumer choice behaviour.

Examining the choice behaviour associated with buying behaviours for soap, Cheskin and Ward attempted to explain why one style of packaging was more popular than another. They concluded: 'it is self-evident that the average housewife does not consciously go to the grocery store to buy package designs; she goes to buy ham, vegetables, soap, canned fruit, and so on. Only rarely does she consciously consider the container in which these items are sold' (Cheskin and Ward, 1948: 573). The implication of this view is that consumers are not necessarily rational information processors or wholly beholden to deterministic forces that dictate appropriate behaviours. Instead, they are capable of exhibiting a degree of voluntarism in that they can refuse their extant categorization systems. Even allowing that this was possible, many consumers will not engage in an extended refusal of all previous knowledge, since as Britt (1960) suggested, this kind of individual would be in need of serious therapy given the decision-making paralysis that such a state would induce. More likely, as a consequence of environmental complexity, consumers will remain willing to engage in sub-optimal behaviours (what Szmigin and Foxall (2000) equate with a mid-point between the determinism of positivist research and the voluntaristic perspective of interpretivism) because it serves a useful purpose in enabling them to negotiate the complexity of everyday life.

In line with this mid-point position, the primary interest for the motivation researcher is how consumer behaviour is determined in part by the environmental conditions and the subjective perception of the consumption situation for the respondent(s). Consistent with this view of the social, whenever we are interested in understanding why a consumer, a group, or a cultural unit behaves in the way that they do, Dichter writes, 'I must use interpretative research. I cannot exclusively rely on asking the people or groups involved why they are doing what they are doing' (Dichter, 1978: 54). Where research seeks to ask a 'why' question (in contrast to the 'what' questions asked by conventional researchers), what they are asking for is an '*interpretation* of human behavior' (Dichter, 1978: 54; emphasis in original). 'We want to find out what motivated, what moved, what influenced these people to do what they did' (Dichter, 1978: 54). Clearly motivation researchers do not ask these 'why' questions directly, given that a very clear



methodological aim of motivation research is concerned with the attempt to sidestep those rationalizations that are likely to emerge when the respondent feels that they have been placed in position where they are being prejudged by the researcher (discussed below). In methodological terms, this involves the formulation of hypotheses, which are:

developed for the purpose of theoretically explaining a particular behavior. It then tests the validity of these various hypotheses, rejecting those which are not confirmed through further research and substituting others until several reasonable and supportable explanations for the behavior to be interpreted have been established. (Dichter, 1978: 55)

After the initial sets of hypotheses have been established, the motivation researcher then uses a battery of projective tests to elicit a description of the subjective processes that a consumer goes through when purchasing specific goods or services. Yoell described his research approach in the following manner:

The technique for discovering . . . buying motives . . . is based on the discovery of behavioral processes. . . . To find the motive, I insist, examine the experiences. What I do in interviewing consumers is to uncover the most recent experience the consumer has had with the product. Then I gradually take the consumer back into experiences – back even until the first usage and experience . . . Reliving the experience gets the individual back into the exact atmosphere under which the events took place. (Yoell, 1952: 86)

Here, the ‘objective’ external world is ontologically marginalized in favour of the subjective interpretation of the behaviour of consumers (Dichter, 1960). The espoused interpretations of their own behaviours by the respondents will not ‘always correspond with reality’ and it is the task of the motivation researcher to negotiate espoused beliefs in favour of those repressed ‘real’, subjective beliefs, opinions and motivations (Britt, 1960).

In a reflection on the process of ontological co-creation Dichter proffers what appears to be an ontological position more in line with social constructionism than logical empiricism. Reflecting on the last stages of the research process, Dichter noted how those involved play a central part in the social construction of the ‘world in which we live, the motivation researcher and the communicator who applies his findings are at the same time participants and formulators of the future world’ (Dichter, 1960: 63). And these players in the business community are ultimately responsive to the consumer. As Britt affirms in his book on motivation research: ‘*American business is not your callous master . . . but rather the servant of you, the American consumer – the spender*’ (Britt, 1960: xii; emphasis in original). It is the spender, the consumer, who is consequently a central participant in the ontological creation of the consumerist society that Dichter (1960, 1971) applauded and Packard (1960) lamented.

## **Epistemological assumptions**

While Dichter does stress the complimentary nature of motivation research to conventional statistical research, he continues to emphasize the importance of



motivation research as a counterpoint for the limitations of conventional consumer research. 'The advertiser has gradually come to realize that by using this tool [statistical methods] alone he has received only part of the information which he requires to make an intelligent and scientifically based decision' (Dichter, 1955a: 27). This said, Dichter is critical of the naïve empiricism that underpins statistical 'nose counting research' that drew upon demographic variables to categorize consumers (Dichter, 1979). More than the use of statistics alone, it is the argument that research could be objective in the sense of being theory-neutral that most perturbed Dichter (compare with Dichter, 1947: 438). By objective research, Dichter (1979) gestured towards research that suggested it was devoid of any interpretation, or otherwise assumes that 'all that is necessary is that the facts speak for themselves' (Bayton, 1958: 289). Rather, what is more scientific is the acknowledgement that researchers will – as the primary research instrument – introduce certain assumptions into their research projects: 'To state the existence of these assumptions, instead of pretending that they are not there, frees the researcher from naïve empiricism' (Dichter, 1961: 2). Commensurate with the positions put forward by Fleck (1979[1935]), Hanson (1960), Kuhn (1962) and Feyerabend (1975) against the possibility of a theory-neutral observation language, an important quotation highlights Dichter's position in relation to naïve empiricism. Let us quote it in full:

Studying human motivation is not unlike Herodotus' problem of studying the reason for the inundation of the Nile. By merely observing a person's behavior it is close to impossible to determine why he does what he does. Herodotus approached his problem by picking out, on the basis of previous knowledge, certain elements in the subject matter which he thought were significant. He felt that the distance covered by the flowing waters, the time at which the inundation began, the time at which the overflow reached its maximum, and the fact that there were no winds or breezes at the river surface were all interesting phenomena, although he did not know what they had to do with each other. In this form they were all meaningless facts, not susceptible to interpretation. Why did he pick these facts rather than others? The answer was he was familiar with certain theories dealing with the behavior of the rivers . . . In the field of human motivation, we approach problems with certain general theories about why people behave as they do. For example, we believe that most people are more concerned with their own egos than with other people; that most people suffer from a degree of insecurity and have as one of their main goals in life self-protection against dangers and anxiety. Applying this theory to a specific problem, we develop a hypothesis. (Dichter, 1955a: 28–9)

To further illustrate the clear divergence between the epistemological presuppositions associated with the 'naïve' empiricism of the 1950s, it is appropriate to acknowledge the use of a version of free association in motivation research. Where free association is used in a clinical environment to treat psychologically mal-adjusted patients, when translated into motivation research it is used to encourage the spontaneity of response by the interviewee. This is because 'encouraging a person with some slight guidance to simply pour out his feelings about a particular subject brings out true motivations [and is] . . . much more reliable . . . *than predetermining the framework in which the answers are to be given*' (Dichter, 1960: 285; emphasis added). Here the respondent is asked 'to summarize for us his own motivations and to give us the interpretation of what he considers normal, usual,





average, etc. What we insist instead is that he report actual events' (Dichter, 1960: 284). This process, however, still needs further qualification because despite the openness of the interpretive framework, motivation researchers did not trust the responses of their respondents. Instead, they subscribed to an 'epistemology of suspicion'.

In *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*, Ricoeur (1970) calls Freud a 'master of suspicion'. By this, Ricoeur is trying to position psychoanalysis as a form of suspicious interpretation. For the psychoanalyst, for instance, the object of interest is distorted in the sense of the repression of sexual or aggressive wishes that are outside the bounds of acceptable behaviour and consequently find themselves manifested in dreams where the censorship of the ego is less influential. In such cases it is the task of the dream analyst to translate the dream language (Freud, 1965[1900]). What this means is that the dream analyst has to unravel the complexity and ambiguity that will be inherent in the complex network of meaningful associations that are condensed in the dream, so that it can be understood. In a similar fashion, Dichter's research style (and that of motivation research) bears the hallmarks of epistemological 'suspicion', where he suggests his own research position in relation to his research co-participants is similar to that of an 'archaeologist', while the personality of the respondent is akin to an 'onion' (Dichter, 1979: 159, 188). What he means is that the espoused responses might not reveal very much because people prefer to make their behaviour appear more rational and more reasonable, so the motivation researcher has to peel away the various layers of ego protection, much like one would peel an onion, in order to reveal the 'true', 'real' beliefs and behaviours.

Psychology has demonstrated that there are several permanent distortion factors which interfere with the objective observation of the motivational field. The most important one is our desire to appear rational to ourselves and to others. When confronted with an investigation of our motives we first search actively for rational explanations. The danger is great, however, that this desire to act rationally results in a pseudo-rational cause for our behavior. (Dichter, 1955a: 36)

While consumers may strive to hide or modify what they might consider irrational behaviours, this is not to suggest that motivation research is concerned only with irrational buying needs, or that all behaviours *have* to be explained with reference to emotion (compare with Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982). Rather, what this epistemological stance holds is that 'people do behave rationally. But rational behaviour also includes acceptance of emotions, such as the fear of embarrassment, as a motivator' (Dichter, 1979: 114). This is not necessarily a function of consumer irrationality, but serves to illustrate that the motivation researcher must devote greater time to making what is normally dismissed as irrational consumption behaviour understandable in terms of the standards of rationality acceptable at the time (Britt, 1960). In a similar manner to the concept of *verstehen* that underwrites interpretive research, motivation research sees buying behaviour as never completely irrational in itself, but only from a particular point of view.



## Methodological assumptions

The realization that the subjective beliefs of consumers might not mirror those they espoused heralded an important turn within consumer research regarding the conception of 'man', that is, the understanding of human nature that was adopted as a methodological presupposition. Here, Eliasberg (1954) made the important point that since the popularization of Veblen's (1934) conspicuous consumption thesis, it had become clear that consumers were not simply satisfied with the essential products that they must consume such as food or shelter. Instead, their consumption becomes a way of satisfying other socially related ego needs and from this, Eliasberg reasoned, the latest psychological and psychiatric techniques are of particular importance for those interested in consumer behaviour (Eliasberg, 1954; Vicary, 1951). One way that these techniques can be acquired and utilized efficiently, Eliasberg suggested, was for companies to employ psychologists, sociologists and other trained behavioural experts in their consumer research departments.

Despite the occasional direct importation of Freudian thought as an interpretive heuristic (e.g. Bayton, 1958), motivation researchers did not generally import psychoanalytic theory or method *in toto* into consumer research despite accusations otherwise (e.g. Rothwell, 1955; Scriven, 1958; Westfall et al., 1957; Williams, 1957). Nor was motivation research an attempt to uncover and repair neuroses implanted in childhood (Dichter, 1979). A 'much better' description of the relationship between psychoanalysis and motivation research is that both are forms of psychological 'detective' work in which the researcher is viewed as a 'psycho-detective' charged with uncovering consumer motivations through extended depth interviews (Dichter, 1979: 79): 'For the first time in my life I realized that a detective's job was similar to that of a motivational researcher. . . . I often call myself the "Columbo" of human motivations' (Dichter, 1979: 18). Clearly the kind of detective work this involved and the environment in which it took place does not resemble a 'proper' psychoanalytic counselling session but bears more resemblance, Dichter suggested, to a form of 'mini-psychoanalysis' utilizing qualitative research and small samples (Dichter, 1979: 45, 49).

When a particularly interesting behaviour has been discovered in the initial exploratory research, these themes are explored further through lengthy interviews 'in order to prove or disprove our original hypothesis' (Dichter, 1979: 49). Each of these interviews is recorded verbatim and 'every phrase, every gesture, and every intonation of the respondent' noted by the researcher (Dichter, 1960: 285). As an example of the way in which Dichter used such information to support his arguments, let us examine a paper published in the *Harvard Business Review* that investigated word-of-mouth advertising where Dichter and his colleagues conducted depth interviews with 255 consumers in 24 different locations in the United States: 'Respondents were encouraged to recall freely (and in full detail) conversations in which products, services, and advertising had been discussed, including recommendations made as well as received' (Dichter, 1966: 149). In describing the major themes that emerged from these interviews, Dichter pro-



vided a variety of examples that demonstrated how a particular thematic structure is played out in the text. For example, in relation to the theme of product involvement, Dichter writes:

*Of the 352 talking episodes reported by our respondents, 33% belong in this category. This category includes incidents of strongly felt, gratifying experiences with a product or service which make the speaker 'flow over' . . . . In many instances it is talk which confirms for the speaker his ownership and joy in the product, or his discovery of it. For example: 'She asked if I'd ever used Guardsman. She said, "You ought to get some – it's terrific!"' Well, I said I'd try it, and I did. I mentioned to this friend later that I had used it, and she seemed anxious to know if I'd liked it. I told her it seemed to be pretty good, but she was hardly satisfied with that comment, and began to rave about it all over again. I don't rave much as a rule anyway. She seemed convinced she'd done me a huge favor by recommending it, and if I wouldn't get all excited after using it, she had to get excited for me. (Dichter, 1966: 149; emphasis in original)*

Extrapolating from his numerous interviews, Dichter concluded:

I consider the establishment of a close link between successful, everyday Word-of-Mouth recommendations and effective advertising to be one of the . . . findings of the present study. It emphasizes the new role of the advertiser as that of a friend who recommends a trusted product, as against that of a salesman who tries to get rid of merchandise . . . People mold opinion. The glossy, brightly colored magazine page can never replace the influence and the value of a personal recommendation. Were that the case, the consumer public would have to be very passive – simply sitting back and receiving information, and enough of it to permit a proper evaluation. However our recent studies [as indicated in the above citation] have shown quite the opposite: the consumer public is in fact active. Consequently in a buying situation a dynamic interpersonal relationship – where ideas are discussed, opinions are exchanged, questions are asked, and answers given – will frequently exist. (Dichter, 1966: 166)

The logic of this depth approach is succinctly explicated by Newman (1958), who proposed that free association encouraged the consumer to avoid recourse to any extensive logical analysis of the narrative they espoused, and instead permitted the skilled interviewer to uncover those thoughts that have somehow been repressed by the respondent. For instance, in a project that sought to understand why men read the magazine *Esquire*, which at the time Dichter was conducting his study resembled *Playboy* or *Penthouse*, he explained his research approach. 'I would go out and talk at great length to a number of men, but I would not ask them why they did or did not read *Esquire*. I would simply let them tell me their associations, their experiences, their ideas and thoughts while talking and thumbing through the magazine' (Dichter, 1979: 34).<sup>2</sup> In this context, the task of the motivation researcher is to reassure the respondent by 'developing rapport . . . [by] inserting delicate probes, where necessary, to encourage fuller discussion' (Dichter, 1958: 28; compare with Wallendorf and Belk, 1989: 81).

Discussing the depth interview towards the end of his life, Dichter again reminds us how distinct motivation research remains from psychoanalysis – 'it isn't really putting somebody on the couch . . . It's very simple. We don't tell our interviewer what we are interested in, just as the physician does not tell the lab assistant that he suspects that the patient has liver disease' (Bartos, 1986b: 17). Here the emphasis is on the analysis of the subjective accounts that are generated



by researcher immersion in the consumption history of the individuals sampled, with importance placed on letting the emergent nature of the phenomena reveal its characteristics to the researcher. This is in stark contrast to what we would expect if this were a positivist study, whereby the researcher typically works through a conceptual framework identified prior to the fieldwork. Instead, the guiding methodological assumption adopted for the purposes of a motivational research study was an emergent research design alongside an ethos of openness and sensitivity to the nature of the phenomena is all pervasive: 'Researching is a process where open-mindedness, the ability to see seemingly unrelated things as related and in a new light, is the major requirement' (Dichter, 1960: 70). Tools central to examining consumer behaviours in this way included qualitative methods such as depth interviewing, word association tests, sentence completion, role playing, cartoon tests, Thematic Apperception Tests and Rorschach personality tests, which provided the answers to managerial requirements that conventional techniques had failed to yield namely, meaningful results (see, Blake, 1954).

Having noted the variety of tools that were used in motivation research, two, including the Thematic Apperception Tests and the depth interview were often singled out for criticism. Most notably, the depth interview was frequently critiqued as little more than an open-ended interview otherwise semantically cloaked. The idea that these interviews would provide more depth of understanding was, for some, apparently ludicrous (Paradise and Blankenship, 1951; Politz, 1957). Dichter, however, explicitly argued that the depth interview began where open-ended interviewing concluded. Where the open-ended interviewer has faith in the validity of the responses that the respondent provides, the views espoused by the respondent are not, as was noted above, to be taken at face value. At this point, the researcher and the interviewee are equally important *dramatis personae*, with the researcher seen to be the instrument, the 'living seismograph' in this process, who should be sensitive to the comments, gestures and other inflexions that consumers provided during the interviews (Dichter, 1960). As a co-participant in the research process, the researcher is charged with the task of phenomenologically bracketing their own assumptions and this required that the researcher put themselves 'into the shoes of the other person' (Dichter, 1979: 179). This, Dichter admitted, is 'difficult but important' because the further the researcher removes themselves from the actual consumption situation or from the person engaged in the consumption behaviour of interest, then the less likely the desired ideographic knowledge will be generated (Dichter, 1979).

Despite the now obvious appeal of this type of research strategy, it was almost immediately criticized for failing to generate any 'more depth than the "depth" of any conversation with friends, journalists, lawyers' (Politz, 1956–1957: 670). This criticism appears unwarranted when it is counter-pointed with the actual depth interview process as related by Smith (1954). Contrary to the criticism that where the psychoanalyst might take days, weeks, months, or even years to analyse a client, whereas motivation researchers spend very little time on the doorstep with their interviewee (Rothwell, 1955), the psychoanalytic-inspired interviews discussed by Smith (1954) took a minimum of 40 hours and were spread over a two-



week period (see also Britt, 1950). And this could, it might be assumed, *ceteris paribus*, have provided a level of detail slightly more in-depth than Politz or Rothwell were prepared to have acknowledged.

## The politics of translation

As Robertson and Ward (1973) and Hudson and Ozanne (1988) have noted, one problem with the translation of Freud's work into consumer research is that there is some difficulty in operationalizing it. For those consumer researchers who tried to use this body of theory in an applied setting it was, quite naturally, steadily more diluted according to the needs of the client, usually resulting in the use of concepts and methods that were related to 'less-than-conscious motivation, projection and free association' (Newman, 1992: 12). In spite of this, the use of psychological and psychoanalytic tools was frequently misinterpreted and read by critics of motivation research as the direct incorporation of clinical methods into consumer research or otherwise depicted as a 'hodge-podge of jabberwocky, or the line of a glib psycho-salesman bent on selling fifty "depth" interviews for \$50,000' (Scriven, 1958: 65).

In this heated debate, the responses of motivation researchers were not enough to ameliorate the profusion of criticism that coalesced in *The Journal of Marketing* throughout the 1950s (Rothwell, 1955; Westfall et al., 1957; Williams, 1957). While criticism of new and emerging paradigms is a sign of a healthy academic community, much of the criticism directed towards motivation research tended to ignore the substantive content of its intended target. The article by Rothwell (1955) is illuminating in this regard. From the very start, the reader is left in no uncertain terms regarding Rothwell's view of motivation research, when told that the conclusions proffered by motivation researchers are often 'irritatingly round-about' and that their research tools such as projective tests had had doubts cast on their validity for predicting overt behaviour in the clinical literature. More problematic, for Rothwell, was the fact that the interpretations derived from these techniques can be affected by the mood and disposition of the researcher, leading to multiple interpretations of the same data by different researchers. Finally, she adds, there is little available response 'norm' data for participants other than the maladjusted, students or the rich. What this suggested, Rothwell maintained, was that the scientific status of these tools reduced the search for knowledge 'to a mere parlor game' and how, Rothwell questioned, 'could it be otherwise? What market research firm could administer a Thematic Apperception Test or a sound version of it in a few minutes on the door step or in the parlor, to a distracted housewife?' (Rothwell, 1955: 152). Despite the comprehensive discussion above which serves to indicate how Rothwell is misinterpreting the practice of motivation research, Krugman's (1956–7) response is important here: in an important counterpoint in support for motivation research, he made the case that perhaps advertising and marketing executives have added motivation research to their armoury of tools because the scientific rigour associated with statistics was not impressive unless



Table 2

**Four methodological approaches to research<sup>3</sup>**

Research process	Positivism	Interpretivism	Critical theory	Motivation research
Initial stage	Review of existing literature to identify a gap; development of an a priori conceptual framework	Identification of general phenomenon of interest; phenomenon's boundaries are left open and undelineated	Identification of a concrete practical problem; identification of all groups involved with this problem	Research stimulated by practitioners concrete, but often general problem; phenomenon's boundaries are left open; review of existing literature
	Empirically testable hypotheses	'Bracketing' of prior conceptions	The interpretive step: construction of an intersubjective understanding of each group	'Bracketing' of prior or textbook conceptualizations; multiple-perspectival analysis; empirically testable hypotheses
	Hypotheses are tested in a fixed design	Immersion in natural setting for extended time period	The historical-empirical step: examination of the historical development of any relevant social structures or processes	Immersion in as natural a setting as possible
	Data are gathered	Design, questions, and sampling strategies evolve as the phenomena is studied	The dialectical step: search for contradictions between the intersubjective understanding and the objective social conditions	Not usually an a priori framework before fieldwork; design, questions, and sampling strategies evolve as the phenomena is studied
	Strict adherence to scientific protocol	Reliance on the human instrument for generating 'thick description'	The awareness step: discuss alternative ways of seeing their situation with the repressed group(s)	Reliance on human instrument, especially the sensitivity of the researcher for understanding motives



Table 2

**Cont.**

Research process	Positivism	Interpretivism	Critical theory	Motivation research
Data collection stage (cont.)	Statistical analysis of data to yield an explanation	Content or textual analysis to yield an interpretation	The praxis step: participate in a theoretically grounded programme of action to change social conditions	Content or textual analysis to yield an interpretation
Standard data-gathering techniques	Laboratory experiment; large scale survey	Participant observation; in-depth interviews;	In-depth interviews; historical analysis	Depth interviews; participant observation; projective techniques; possible large scale survey
Sample evaluation criteria	Validity and reliability	Length of immersion and creation of thick description	Improvement of the quality of life	Understanding of consumer behaviour; prediction as a benefit of adequate understanding; for Dichter, affirmation of the American Way (see note 3)

they can contribute to interpreting and explaining consumer marketplace behaviours. What executives want, according to Krugman, is a 'little more education with their facts and figures. Facts and figures are very concrete, very hard, yet easy to give with a minimum of explanation' (Krugman, 1956–7: 723). Perhaps, he suggests, conventional consumer researchers will eventually thank the motivation researchers for pointing out that the overriding goal of science is not, in actual fact, *prediction*, but instead, *understanding*. Prediction, on his reading, is simply the test of understanding and the control over any behaviours that result is the reward for the systematic researcher.

## The transformation of motivation research

Clearly admitting that bias is introduced into research as a function of our own historical and cultural position was never likely to be a popular view in a discipline





wedded to logical empiricism. Moreover, when such comments emanated from outside of the academy, primarily from practitioners who flouted the extant rules of discursive formation by criticizing the excessive quantification of consumer research, motivation research was ripe for discipline. This was not necessarily a bad thing either, as Dichter himself argued,

There is no doubt that motivational . . . research needs discipline. But it has to be the discipline appropriate to its specific nature as a science. To insist that because you have to research 2,000 people to know how many people have stomach disorders at a given time, that therefore any scientifically proven explanation of the real causes of stomach disorder based on experimentation and an entirely different set of inductive and deductive inferences is invalid, is in itself proof of lack of scientific discipline of a much wider consequence. Prediction of consumer behavior necessitates first understanding his behavior today. (Dichter, 1955a: 37)

Stressing his belief in the value of paradigm pluralism, Dichter appealed for a disciplinary movement towards paradigmatic accommodation, where no one perspective is viewed as the one proper route to scientific truth:

If we can, within the ranks of the broad family of researchers, begin to see that different problems require different research solutions, and that our problems, as researchers, *are* different in . . . many ways, then we shall be in a position at last to unite around a common scientific philosophy which nevertheless recognizes the utility of different approaches and tools. (Dichter, 1958: 23; emphasis in original)

As Dichter (1958) registered at the time, although there was a variety of good and bad motivation research available, unfortunately it was the less rigorous and less systematic research that led to a profusion of criticism from more quantitatively oriented empiricists. Where Dichter called for tolerance and for researchers to assess motivation research on its own paradigmatic basis, those attacking motivation research (e.g. Rothwell, 1955; Scriven, 1958) attacked straw-figures, presenting motivation research and its use of qualitative methods as unscientific, often on the basis of partial readings of the original texts. This was largely a political move with motivation research 'denied, berated, despised . . . [with] Attempts by marketers to disown this child . . . [were] wily and nefarious' (Jameson, 1971: 189). Despite such political and academic pressures Dichter appears to have taken such criticism in his stride:

The accusations and counteraccusations currently rampant in research circles represent more than the healthy, 'competitive' claims and counterclaims or robust research organizations. Instead, they are signs of a dangerous confusion and unease – an unease which may very well be communicated to the ultimate consumer who simply will not know which (if any!) of these techniques to choose or reject. The more we do, therefore, within our own family of researchers to dispel these confusions and doubts among our consumers and ourselves, the more we advance our profession as a whole. It is true that the only kind of research 'worth doing' is research that meets the most rigorous canons of scientific accuracy and honesty. (Dichter, 1958: 23)

In a somewhat surprising development, Theodor Adorno, of Frankfurt School fame, oscillated between praising and criticizing motivation research. He did so by, on the one hand, applauding motivation research for directing attention to the qualitative, subjective reactions of consumers; but he was also equally emphatic in



his criticism of what he saw to be the excessive focus on the subjective reactions of consumers without equal attention being given to the extent to which these are conditioned by the cultural climate and societal structures (Adorno, 1969). Adorno's support and criticism appears to have been largely ignored at the time, with the debate organized around two main camps. On one side, we have Ernest Dichter, the President of the Institute for Research in Mass Motivations, Incorporated and the largest purveyor of motivation research in the world (Dichter, 1979). And on the other, Alfred Politz, the President of Alfred Politz Research Incorporated, an organization dedicated to survey research, accompanied by a heavy emphasis on quantitative, statistical analysis which aimed to produce 'predicts of the causal type' (Politz and Deming, 1953: 1; compare with Packard, 1960: 139). Again, a familiar pattern of animosity and criticism is evident between authors associated with the Institute for Research in Mass Motivations (e.g. Henry, 1958; Vicary, 1951) and those affiliated with Alfred Politz Research (e.g. Politz and Deming, 1953; Politz, 1957; Williams, 1957). Nor was the partisan nature of this critique-rebuttal lost on book reviewers at the time (see also, Blake, 1954: 33). Stryker's comments, in his review of Harry Henry's book, *Motivation Research*, are typical:

It is not surprising that Mr. Henry is a firm advocate of motivation research, since the advertising agency for which he is a director of research (McCann-Erickson) has long used M.R. Techniques; and one of his American colleagues, Dr. Herta Hertzog, is among the most experienced M.R. practitioners in the U.S. (Stryker, 1959: 344)

Newman highlights these political tensions most clearly where he recalls that the lines of 'intense' intellectual 'hostility' were drawn largely along agency lines (1992: 13). New thinking, in this case, was 'not popular, it will be resisted because it typically threatens vested interests – either intellectual or financial or both' as it was, Newman maintained, with motivation research (1992: 13). This hostility was further compounded by the criticism that Dichter faced because he failed to satisfy 'the more rigid scholars and the business-hating intellectuals who tend to see his work as "not really psychological", "not moral"' (Martineau, 1961: 108).

Ultimately, however, the scholarly Dichter of his early writing (e.g. Dichter, 1947, 1949, 1957) became subsumed under the messianic figure of Ernest Dichter with the following comment appearing in print: 'I could cure cancer, solve international conflicts eliminating wars, or to put it very modestly, become a messiah who could use his talents in almost all areas' (Dichter, 1979: 13). This immodesty, Collins and Montgomery (1970) suggest, is one reason for the active turn against motivation research towards the end of the 1950s, early 1960s with Dichter's 'pentacostally fervent advocacy of motivation research . . . [obscuring] its possible usefulness' (Collins and Montgomery, 1970: 10). Certainly, the time came when marketing and consumer scholars were simply not seeing what motivation research had to offer, only the discursive pyrotechnics that Dichter continued to perform. Nonetheless, to simply place the demise of what was an embryonic form of interpretive research at the feet of Dichter is to over-emphasize internal disciplinary conditions to the marginalization of the wider social, economic and



political changes that were taking place and affecting the academy in formative ways. Important here are the Ford and Carnegie reports (Gordon and Howell, 1959; Pierson, 1959) and the funding that followed as an institutional support for the vision of business education that these reports demanded (see, Cochoy, 1998; Hunt and Goolsby, 1988; Kassarian, 1981; Sheth and Gross, 1988; Staelin, 2005). As Tadjewski (2006) has argued, the Gordon and Howell report was part of a larger institutional move by the Ford Foundation – as the most important financial contributor to marketing at the time (Bartels, 1988) – to avoid the criticism that a number of House of UnAmerican Committees and their McCarthyite political pressures had levelled at the Foundation. Commensurate with these pressures, the Ford Foundation engaged in a deliberately cautious philanthropic strategy, whereby they funded the reorientation of marketing theory towards logical empiricism and quantitative methods because business-related subjects and quantitative methods were politically neutral; pressures that were also felt within the university (McCumber, 2001; Schrecker, 1986) with researchers in the social sciences avoiding issues that could be seen as politically contentious (Lazarsfeld and Thielens, 1958). It is hard to understate the influence that McCarthyism had on the academy through the Ford Foundation sponsoring the successful courses run at the Institute of Basic Mathematics for Application to Business. These, Wilkie argued, had ‘a huge impact on the course of research in marketing’ (2002: 144; emphasis in original). As Staelin (2005: 146) registers, the influence of this seminar series ‘helped solidify the infusion of scientific theory, methods and analysis into the field of marketing’. With this change in intellectual climate towards ‘scientific marketing’ and the support of research that adopted the symbolism of advanced mathematics (Kernan, 1995) the motivation researchers were marginalized because the intellectual climate was not yet ready for the propagation of a scientific style that was so different from the extant research culture. Here the comments by Collins and Montgomery (1970) are important in that they acknowledge the ‘risk’ element involved in motivation research.

Where more statistical and logical empiricist inspired research has its ‘anxiety-dissipating rituals’ such as formalized procedures for interpreting statistical descriptions, any similar attempts to formalize qualitative motivation research ‘tends to inhibit the diagnostic function in hand; the supporting structure they provide is inimical to authentic exposure to the phenomena of study’ (Collins and Montgomery, 1970: 9). The inability of researchers like Dichter and Vicary to agree on interpretations of consumer behaviour (see Blake, 1954; Kornhauser, 1941), together with the fact that they still remained reluctant to publish their entire transcripts due to the proprietary nature of the material (see Blake, 1954; Karesh, 1995; Vicary, 1951), meant that it was hardly unexpected that the desire to negotiate the interpretive creativity associated with motivation research was communicated. In light of such calls, motivation research *was* methodologically formalized (Collins and Montgomery, 1970). This type of operation was commonplace at the time, particularly where European perspectives were transplanted into the US context. Like Adorno who experienced similar attempts to operationalize his research in questionnaire format, Dichter was equally reluctant to



subscribe to the 'prescriptive right of way given to quantitative methods of research, to which both theory and individual qualitative studies should at best be supplementary' (Adorno, 1969: 347). While Dichter was equally aware of the potential benefits accruing from both qualitative and quantitative research (Dichter, 1947), motivation research nevertheless rapidly became a supplement to quantitative research (Collins and Montgomery, 1970; Converse et al., 1958; Kelne, 1955).

Reluctant to ignore the opportunities offered by motivation research in understanding complex consumer behaviour, motivation research was not completely replaced and then ignored in the way that the functional paradigm was replaced by a marketing management orientation (see Hunt and Goolsby, 1988). Rather, the influx of social scientists into consumer research following the Ford and Carnegie recommendations whose own research interests were related to the development of qualitative variables that could be tested quantitatively, contributed to the combination of the humanistic orientation of motivation research with the experimental, quantitative survey tradition, thereby creating a composite of the two (Demby, 1974). Given a variety of names, but most frequently termed psychographics, motivation research morphed into one facet of a quantitative research programme that sought to 'place consumers on psychological – as distinguished from demographic dimensions' in order to explain why consumers, in large isolatable market segments, behave in the way they do (Wells, 1975: 197). Where motivation research used small samples and primarily qualitative research, psychographic research used 'precoded, objective questionnaires that can be self-administered or administered by ordinary survey interviewers [since this] . . . Precoding makes the data amenable to complex multivariate statistical analysis' (Wells, 1975: 197); statistical analysis that only became possible due to the greater availability of computer technology in the 1960s and 70s, along with the skills to use such technology (see Alderson and Shapiro, 1963; Belk, 1987; Tadajewski, 2006; Wilkie, 1986).

## **From psychographics to experiential consumer research**

As Holbrook and Hirschman (1982) noted, it was the 'poor performance' of personality measures in predicting consumer behaviour that encouraged the turn towards psychographics, the use of lifestyle variables and the information processing view of the consumer. However, in time, the information processing perspective was also perceived to leave certain aspects of consumer behaviour largely untapped. In order to augment the perceived deficiencies of the information processing approach, Holbrook and Hirschman argued forcefully for a focus on the experiential aspects of consumer behaviour. Their experiential view, they maintained, is 'phenomenological in spirit [regarding] . . . consumption as a primarily subjective state of consciousness with a variety of symbolic meanings, hedonic responses, and esthetic criteria' (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982: 132). Now, in promoting a turn towards a more phenomenological scientific style,



Holbrook and Hirschman's article is particularly important as it links motivation research with CCT (Arnould and Thompson, 2005). Since it has already been demonstrated that motivation researchers not only investigated the experiential, social and cultural dimensions of consumer behaviour based on an interpretive paradigmatic style, we now want to argue that motivation research is the historical root of Holbrook and Hirschman's article and, therefore, a historical rhizome of CCT (cf. Arnould, 2006). For the purposes of brevity we will take two examples from Holbrook and Hirschman's analysis – that of consumer cognition and behaviour – which connects motivation research, the experiential view and CCT. In terms of cognition, Holbrook and Hirschman described their experiential perspective thus:

In its treatment of cognitive phenomena, particularly material of a subconscious nature, the experiential view borders somewhat on motivation research (e.g. Dichter, 1960). However, there are two methodological differences. First we believe that much relevant fantasy life and many key symbolic meanings lie just below the threshold of consciousness – that is, that they are subconscious or preconscious as opposed to unconscious – and that they can be retrieved and reported if sufficiently indirect methods are used to overcome sensitivity barriers. Second we advocate the use of structured projective techniques that employ quantitative questionnaire items applicable to samples large enough to permit statistical testing. (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982: 136)

In this quotation, the second point is moot, as motivation researchers have argued that symbolic meaning could be elicited from just below the threshold of consciousness. Such meaning could, Dichter surmised, be deduced using projective techniques and the thematic patterns which emerged, could then used to formulate hypotheses that 'should then be put to test in a second market-analysis' (Eliasberg, 1954: 52). Nor is the first point made by Holbrook and Hirschman particularly problematic because Dichter typically made reference to the unconscious, either in regard to advances in the social sciences or via vague allusions to general human activities. For example,

The social sciences, too, are full of new discoveries, comparable to those of atomic physics and the field of biology. These discoveries seem to violate all common sense and direct observation as stipulated by Aristotle and others as the basis for scientific endeavor [like the] . . . discovery of the unconscious. (Dichter, 1957: 161)

Whereas in other instances, he made ambiguous statements to the 'unconscious desire not to remember' (Dichter, 1947: 432), what would, however, appear to be a common feature in all of Dichter's and the other motivation researchers' work is perhaps best characterized as a movement away from postulating unconscious factors in favour of distinguishing 'between symptoms expressing the superficial rational explanations of an action, and the real, deeper reasons which form the basis of the actions' (Dichter, 1949: 64). Let us take three representative examples. Firstly, in his review of motivation research Blake opined that 'The psychologist scrutinizes the interviews, specializing on individual reactions to conscious and subconscious experience', without making reference to the unconscious (1954: 31). Likewise, Yoell argued that:



It is impossible to bring anyone to remember consciously all his experiences by random digging and probing, no matter how many questions the consumer is asked, and no matter how much time he is given to answer them . . . [this is because] The brain has at least two sections: the *conscious* and *subconscious*. When a new experience or new combination of experiences enters the conscious, it is assimilated and passed on to the subconscious, where it is stored away for future use and reference. That use or reference is seldom conscious. But once the correct stimulus has been presented or exposed to the brain or mind, the *subconscious* immediately reacts to it. Within these experiences lies the key to inducing the consumer to buy your brand. (Yoell, 1950: 38–9; emphases added)

Similarly, in a critique of Packard's representation of motivation research, Bauer argued that motivation research might connect with purchases made for 'non-economic reasons, but such motives are not necessarily unconscious. It is a serious mistake to equate the two' (1964: 43; emphasis in original), as he believed Packard (1960) did.

As our second main example, Holbrook and Hirschman proposed that:

In exploring the nature of that overall [consumption] experience, the approach envisioned here departs from the traditional positivist focus on directly observable buying behavior and devotes increased attention to the mental events surrounding the act of consumption. The investigation of these mental events requires a willingness to deal with the purely subjective aspects of consciousness. The exploration of consumption as conscious experience must be rigorous and scientific, but the methodology must include introspective reports, rather than relying on overt behavioral measures. The necessary methodological shift thus leads towards a more phenomenological approach – i.e., 'a free commentary on whatever cognitive material the subject is aware of'. (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982: 137)

The parallels with motivation research are undeniable here, especially if we reflect on the preceding analysis where axiologically, Dichter was concerned with understanding why consumers buy – or, in this context – what subjective benefit consumers derive from consumption (e.g. Dichter, 1979: 42, 44). Ontologically, direct observation of consumer behaviour was, the motivation researchers bemoaned, largely misleading (e.g. Dichter, 1979: 38) and there was a need to understand the subjective processes that consumers moved through in a buying and consumption situation. This was achieved through the use of a version of free association (e.g. Yoell, 1950, 1952). Epistemologically, Dichter was a master of suspicion, and therefore more critical than Holbrook and Hirschman of the reliability of the espoused views of consumers. It would therefore appear valid to suggest that motivation research is both an embryonic form of interpretive consumer research and a historical root of CCT given its consonance with Holbrook and Hirschman's experiential perspective. To stress these arguments once more, let us conclude with comments from Levy, who in reflecting on the development of consumer research recalled:

Because of the desire to examine consumers' actions, motivations, and perceptions more closely and richly than is done by the usual surveys, statistical regressions, and cognitive experiments, the use of qualitative methods to study consumer behavior has recently grown. (Actually, I have been making that remark optimistically for 50 years.) Use of the more obvious or candid introspections of researchers at work using ethnography, discursive interviewing, or the interpretation of projective techniques arouses anxiety and controversy, with disparagement and



defensiveness on all sides. Some of this noise sounds like the verbal flailing that went on in the 1950s, when . . . motivation research . . . became visible and threatening to the entrenched surveyor. (Levy, 1996: 172)

More recently Levy has attempted to reaffirm this point in still stronger terms, acknowledging like Arnould et al. (2004), Chakarvarti and Staelin (2001), Kassarian (1994) and Sherry and McGrath (1989) that:

all the methods that have been despised and sneered at as 'motivation research' in the 1950s have rebounded. Group interviews became focus groups and depth interviews became phenomenological and hermeneutic, projective techniques propagated collages, and the ancient method of ethnography came into its own . . . The old qualitative research methods, long practiced in the study of history, in anthropology, in the Chicago School of sociology, and by projective psychologists, have become the 'interpretive turn,' which, by its recognition of the constructing nature of human experience and the importance of subjectivity and introspection, has morphed into post-modernism . . . with a continuing struggle between nomothetic and idiographic approaches, a perpetual conflict that was lively when I was a student 50 years ago. (Levy, 2001; compare with Levy, 2003a, 2003b, 2005)

Where Levy talks about the recent turn towards qualitative research, introspection, ethnography and discursive interviewing, we could easily acknowledge Dichter's use of these, in addition to an emergent research design, his use of photography, while adopting an anthropological perspective with attention directed towards consuming, often as part of a multi-method research strategy. Nor are Levy's comments unrepresentative of those held by other influential consumer researchers (see also, Holbrook, 1997; Mick and Demoss, 1990; Sherry and McGrath, 1989; Wallendorf and Belk, 1989). Holbrook, for example, has argued that a psycho-analytically informed research strategy can make the latent meanings of consumption objects available for study. As he concluded,

I believe that the insights drawn from psychoanalytic interpretation can provide rich supplementary explications of the material uncovered by naturalistic inquiry. Through photographs, videotapes, depth interviews, and other field methods, naturalistic inquiry can reveal important themes that permeate consumption experiences. However, the full explication of these themes may require the use of approaches that move beyond the relatively surface level of meaning accessible to the ethnographer to explore the psychoanalytic interpretation of consumption. (Holbrook, 1988: 541)

While Dichter was wary of association with any single theoretical perspective, all of the elements of an embryonic form of interpretive consumer research were present in Dichter's and the other motivation researchers' work. Not only does this suggest a new date for the emergence of this paradigm by 60 years, but it also resituates the emergence of CCT, some 80 years prior to our existing understanding of the emergence of these forms of inquiry.

## Conclusion

In this article, the emergence and subsequent decline of motivation research was traced. It was demonstrated that contrary to recent opinion that interpretive con-





sumer research emerged in the mid 1980s, an embryonic form of interpretive research can be found in the 1930s in the form of motivation research. It was not so much the methods that Dichter and his fellow motivation researchers used that made motivation research an embryonic form of interpretive consumer research, but the complete range of:

thinking, the concepts, the hypotheses and the total range of modern scientific thought processes which characterize the *interpretative* approach in research. But people still say, 'Yes, but what is it that you exactly do?' The detailed discussion of all the steps and the techniques used in interpretive research can fill, of course, a separate textbook. (Dichter, 1960: 283; emphasis in original)

As the summaries of the various research traditions put forward as the main paradigmatic options within the literature suggest, when we compare motivation research against the common characteristics of interpretive research (see Table 1) there are clear and distinct parallels in relation to ontological, nature of social being, axiological, epistemological, views of causality and research metaphors between motivation research, interpretive research and to a limited extent critical theory. As we demonstrated, motivation research gradually developed into psychographics, and with the development and large scale use of the computer, the information processing view of the consumer emerged. In response to the limitations of the information processing approach, Holbrook and Hirschman were seen to make the case for more experientially and phenomenologically oriented research and they indicated a place for motivation research in this tradition. Where, however, Holbrook and Hirschman argued that motivation research focused on unconscious consumer beliefs and rationalizations, and was therefore distinct from their experiential perspective, it was pointed out that while Dichter may have mentioned the unconscious on occasion, a more widespread view (which Dichter supported) was that motivation research tapped into subconscious thought and non-economic values (e.g. symbolic values). In this regard, it was posited that when we reflect on the assumptions underpinning motivation research, that motivation research is one possible early root of CCT. This retraces the emergence of this discourse by 80 years and interpretive research by 60 years. In the context of the transformation of consumer research stimulated by the Ford and Carnegie reports and the subsequent reorientation of the intellectual culture that these occasioned, motivation research was transformed into a scientific style that cohered with the scientific vision of the time. Given this, it is hard not to agree with Fleck (1979[1935]) that a break with a particular 'thought style' is a rare occurrence and one which, we submit, would again be occasioned by the invisible college that formed around 1969 with the Ohio State Workshop on consumer behaviour and the formation of the Association for Consumer Research in the 1970s (Kassarjian, 1981). It would be around this time that interpretive styles of research would re-emerge and a greater importance accorded to qualitative methods.



## Notes

My thanks to Stan Shapiro, Craig Thompson, Sidney Levy and Avi Shankar for comments on a previous draft of this paper. Any mistakes that remain are my own.

- 1 Although it should be acknowledged that Dichter does make occasional reference to 'causal laws' or 'psychological laws' in one paper (1961: 79).
- 2 Packard (1960), presented motivation researchers as using advanced psychological techniques to probe the inner workings of consumers' minds, which in conjunction with subliminal advertising (the two were often seen to be related) could motivate consumers in ways that were advantageous to the specific organization funding the research. Motivation researchers were, Packard asserted, 'doctors of commerce' who 'were called upon to get to the roots of our [consumption] resistance and proscribe corrective measures' (Packard, 1960: 116). Of course to some extent, motivation research, when applied to commercial problems, must have been successful, for Packard lists a variety of cases where following the advice of motivation researchers the sales of products rose. Dichter, never a reluctant marketer (see Collins and Montgomery, 1969, 1971), was somewhat more tempered in his view arguing that 'Motivational thinking, even when applied to commercial problems, does not motivate people, talk them into buying things that they do not need, by twisting their unconscious' (1960: 256). Instead, Dichter (1955a) is concerned with being able to differentiate rationalizations from reason. The criticism directed towards the motivation research community by Packard bore, somewhat paradoxically, similarities to the social conscience communicated by Dichter. Where Packard saw the changing nature of the American character in terms of the decline of the protestant ethic and the growing valorization of materialism and hedonism attributable to marketing, advertising and motivation research; a shift, he believed, made the United States 'unfit for global leadership and placed it in the very real danger of being deposed by a thrifty, self-reliant and hard-working Soviet Union' (Brown, 2001: 32). Dichter espoused a similar radical agenda that Horowitz (1998) equates with a peculiar inflexion of the sentiment espoused by critical theorists, whereby individual consciousness is seen to be subservient to external pressures that imprison the individual. Where the role of the critical marketing scholar involves the critique of these structures in order to emancipate those inhabiting a 'false consciousness' (Alvesson, 1994), Dichter supports a similar perspective albeit given his own twist. Having seen the pernicious influence of state Communism first hand and believing he was participating in the reconstruction of American society in the post-war world, Dichter's (axiological) views reflect common sentiment at this time when the social and political climate was characterized by an internal terror in the form of McCarthyism. This was a context in which McCarthyism was rife and anti-Communist paranoia evoked with movies like *The Invasion of the Body Snatchers* playing at cinemas in 1956 and Soviet technological superiority was keenly felt (Castronovo, 2004). To do this, he made the case that the increased consumption of consumer goods and services was one way of keeping the free enterprise system at the heart of America's economic engine running, when the alternative – economic stagnation or Russian dominance – appeared to be a very real alternative with the Soviet Union 'riding its Sputnik's to new heights' (Dichter, 1960: 277). In his attempt to reaffirm the need to consume, and thereby enhance the American economy, Dichter adopted a stance that sought to emancipate consumers, but in a



direction that does not question the logic of capital accumulation or the continuing spiral of consumer goods and services. Instead he wanted to motivate American consumers to consume increased quantities of durables and services (Dichter, 1955a, 1979).

3 Table adapted from Murray and Ozanne (1991: 136).

## References

- Adorno, T.W. (1969) 'Scientific Experiences of a European Scholar in America', in D. Fleming and B. Bailyn (eds) *The Intellectual Migration: Europe and America, 1930–1960*, tr. D. Fleming, pp. 338–70. Cambridge: The Belknap Press.
- Alderson, W. and Shapiro, S.J. (eds) (1963) *Marketing and the Computer*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Alvesson, M. (1994) 'Critical Theory and Consumer Marketing', *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 10(3): 291–313.
- Arndt, J. (1985a) 'On Making Marketing Science More Scientific: Role of Orientations, Paradigms, Metaphors, and Problem Solving', *Journal of Marketing* 49(3): 11–23.
- Arndt, J. (1985b) 'The Tyranny of Paradigms: The Case for Paradigmatic Pluralism in Marketing', in N. Dholakia and J. Arndt (eds) *Changing the Course of Marketing: Alternative Paradigms for Widening Marketing Theory*, pp. 3–25. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Arnould, E.J. (2006) 'Service-dominant Logic and Consumer Culture Theory: Natural Allies in an Emerging Paradigm', *Marketing Theory* 6(3): 293–295.
- Arnould, E. and Thompson, C.J. (2005) 'Consumer Culture Theory: Twenty Years of Research', *Journal of Consumer Research* 31(4): 868–82.
- Arnould, E., Price, L. and Zinkhan, G. (2004) *Consumers* (2nd edn). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Augier, M., March, J.G. and Sullivan, B.N. (2005) 'Notes on the Evolution of a Research Community: Organization Studies in Anglophone North America', *Organization Science* 16(1): 85–95.
- Baker, M.J. (2001) 'Introduction', in M.J. Baker (ed.) *Marketing: Critical Perspectives on Business and Management*, pp. 1–25. London: Routledge.
- Bartels, R. (1988) *The History of Marketing Thought* (3rd edn). Columbus, OH: Publishing Horizons.
- Bartos, R. (1986a) 'Ernest Dichter: Motive Interpreter', *Journal of Advertising Research* Feb/March: 15–20.
- Bartos, R. (1986b) 'Qualitative Research: What it is and Where it Came From', *Journal of Advertising Research* 26(3): RC-3–6.
- Bauer, R.A. (1964) 'The Limits to Persuasion: The Hidden Persuaders are Made of Straw', in M.M. Grossack (ed.) *Understanding Consumer Behavior*, pp. 39–52. Boston, MA: The Christopher Publishing House.
- Bayton, J.A. (1958) 'Motivation, Cognition, Learning – Basic Factors in Consumer Behavior', *The Journal of Marketing* 22(3): 282–9.
- Belk, R.W. (1987) 'A Modest Proposal for Creating Verisimilitude in Consumer-Information-processing Models and Some Suggestions for Establishing a Discipline to Study Consumer Behavior', in A.F. Firat, N. Dholakia and R.P. Bagozzi (eds) *Philosophical and Radical Thought in Marketing*, pp. 361–72. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.



- Belk, R.W. (1995) 'Studies in the New Consumer Behaviour', in D. Miller (ed.) *Acknowledging Consumption: A Review of New Studies*, pp. 58–95. London: Routledge.
- Beyer, R.F. (1934) *The Marketing Institution*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Blake, J.K. (1954) 'Consumer Motivation Research', *Dun's Review and Modern Industry* July: 30–46.
- Blankenship, A.B. (1965) 'Freud in Consumerland . . .', *The Journal of Marketing* 29(1): 116.
- Breyer, R.F. (1934) *The Marketing Institution*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Britt, S.H. (1950) 'The Strategy of Human Motivation', *The Journal of Marketing* 14(5): 666–74.
- Britt, S.H. (1960) *The Spenders*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brown, S. (2001) *Marketing – The Retro Revolution*. London: SAGE.
- Brown, S. (2005) *Writing Marketing*. London: SAGE.
- Burrell, G. and Morgan, G. (1992[1979]) *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Calder, B.J. and Tybout, A.M. (1989) 'Interpretive, Qualitative, and Traditional Scientific Empirical Consumer Behavior Research', in E.C. Hirschman (ed.) *Interpretive Consumer Research*, pp. 199–208. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Castronovo, D. (2004) *Beyond the Gray Flannel Suit: Books from the 1950s that Made American Culture*. New York: Continuum.
- Chakravarti, D. and Staelin, R. (2001) 'Remembrance: Joseph W. Newman', *Journal of Consumer Research* 28(3): 512–13.
- Cheskin, L. and Ward, L.B. (1948) 'Indirect Approach to Market Reactions', *Harvard Business Review* 26(5): 572–81.
- Cochoy, F. (1998) 'Another Discipline for the Market Economy Marketing as a Performative Knowledge and Know-how for Capitalism', in M. Callon (ed.) *The Laws of the Markets*, pp. 194–221. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cofer, C.N. and Appley, M.H. (1964) *Motivation: Theory and Research*. London: Wiley.
- Collins, L. and Montgomery, C. (1969) 'The Origins of Motivation Research', *British Journal of Marketing* 3(2): 103–13.
- Collins, L. and Montgomery, C. (1970) 'Whatever Happened to Motivation Research? End of the Messianic Hope', *Journal of the Market Research Society* 12(1): 1–11.
- Converse, P.D., Huegy, H.W. and Mitchell, R.V. (1958) *Elements of Marketing*. London: Sir Issac Pitman and Son.
- de Certeau, M. (1988) *The Writing of History*, tr. T. Conley. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Demby, E. (1974) 'Psychographics and from Whence it Came', in W.D. Wells (ed.) *Life Style and Psychographics*, pp. 11–30. Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association.
- Dichter, E. (1947) 'Psychology in Market Research', *Harvard Business Review* 25(4): 432–43.
- Dichter, E. (1949) 'A Psychological View of Advertising Effectiveness', *The Journal of Marketing* 14(1): 61–7.
- Dichter, E. (1955a) 'Scientifically Predicting and Understanding Consumer Behavior', in R.H. Cole (ed.) *Consumer Behavior and Motivation*, pp. 26–37. Urbana: University of Illinois Bulletin.
- Dichter, E. (1955b) 'What are the Real Reasons People Buy', *Sales Management* 74(Feb): 36–89.
- Dichter, E. (1957) 'Thinking Ahead', *Harvard Business Review* Nov–Dec: 19–162.
- Dichter, E. (1958) 'Toward an Understanding of Human Behavior', in R. Ferber and



- Hugh G. Wales (eds) *Motivation and Market Behavior*, pp. 21–30. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Dichter, E. (1960) *The Strategy of Desire*. New York: Doubleday.
- Dichter, E. (1961) ‘Seven Tenants of Creative Research’, *The Journal of Marketing* 25(4): 1–4.
- Dichter, E. (1964) *Handbook of Consumer Motivations: The Psychology of the World of Objects*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dichter, E. (1966) ‘How Word-of-Mouth Advertising Works’, *Harvard Business Review* Nov/Dec: 147–66.
- Dichter, E. (1971) *Motivating Human Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dichter, E. (1978) ‘Interpretive versus Descriptive Research’, in J.N. Sheth (ed.) *Research in Marketing, Volume 1*, pp. 53–78. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Dichter, E. (1979) *Getting Motivated by Ernest Dichter: The Secret Behind Individual Motivation by the Man Who Was Not Afraid to Ask “Why?”*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Eliasberg, W. (1954) ‘Freud, Veblen and Marketing’, *Printers’ Ink* February 12: 46–52.
- Feyerabend, P. (1975) *Against Method*. London: New Left Books.
- Fleck, L. (1979[1935]) *Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact*, trs F. Bradley and T.J. Trenn. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1984) ‘Nietzsche, Genealogy, History’, in P. Rabinow (ed.) *The Foucault Reader*, pp. 76–100. London: Penguin.
- Freud, S. (1965[1900]) *The Interpretation of Dreams*, tr. J. Strachey. New York: Avon.
- Fullerton, R.A. (1988) ‘How Modern is Modern Marketing? Marketing’s Evolution and the Myth of the Production Era’, *Journal of Marketing* 52(1): 108–25.
- Fullerton, R.A. (1990) ‘The Art of Marketing Research: Selections from Paul F. Lazarsfeld’s “Shoe Buying in Zurich”’, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 18(4): 319–27.
- Fullerton, R.A. and Stern, B.B. (1990) ‘The Rise and Fall of Ernest Dichter’, *Werbeforschung und Praxis* June: 208–11.
- Gordon, R.A. and Howell, J.E. (1959) *Higher Education for Business*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Goulding, C. (1999) ‘Consumer Research, Interpretive Paradigms and Methodological Ambiguities’, *European Journal of Marketing* 33(9/10): 859–73.
- Green, H.E. (1952) ‘Chicago Tribune Ad Forum Relates Social Sciences to Sales’, *Printers’ Ink* May 30th: 30.
- Haire, M. (1950) ‘Projective Techniques in Marketing Research’, *The Journal of Marketing* 24(5): 649–56.
- Hanson, N.R. (1960) *Patterns of Discovery: An Inquiry into the Conceptual Foundations of Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Henry, H. (1958) *Motivation Research: Its Practice and Uses for Advertising, Marketing, and Other Business Purposes*. London: Crosby Lockwood and Son.
- Hirschman, E.C. (1985) ‘Scientific Style and the Conduct of Consumer Research’, *Journal of Consumer Research* 12(2): 225–39.
- Hirschman, E.C. (1986) ‘Humanistic Inquiry in Marketing Research: Philosophy, Method and Criteria’, *Journal of Marketing Research* 23(3): 237–49.
- Holbrook, M.B. (1988) ‘Steps Towards a Psychoanalytic Interpretation of Consumption: A Meta-Meta-Meta-Analysis of Some Issues Raised by the Consumer Behavior Odyssey’, in M.I. Houston (ed.) *Advances in Consumer Research* 15, pp. 537–42. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.



- Holbrook, M.B. (1997) 'Romanticism, Introspection, and the Roots of Experiential Consumption', *Consumption, Markets and Culture* 1(2): 97–164.
- Holbrook, M.B. and Hirschman, E.C. (1982) 'The Experiential Aspects of Consumption: Consumer Fantasies, Feelings and Fun', *Journal of Consumer Research* 9(2): 132–40.
- Hollander, S.C. (1986) 'The Marketing Concept: A Déjà vu', in G. Fisk (ed.) *Marketing Management Technology as a Social Process*, pp. 3–29. New York: Praeger.
- Hollander, S.C., Rassuli, K.M., Jones, D.G.B. and Dix, L.F. (2005) 'Periodization in Marketing History', *Journal of Macromarketing* 25(1): 32–41.
- Horowitz, D. (1998) 'The Émigré as Celebrant of Consumer Culture: George Katona and Ernest Dichter', in S. Strasser, C. McGovern and M. Judt (eds) *Getting and Spending: European and American Consumer Societies in the Twentieth Century*, pp. 149–66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hudson, L.A. and Ozanne, J.L. (1988) 'Alternative Ways of Seeking Knowledge in Consumer Research', *Journal of Consumer Research* 14(4): 508–21.
- Hunt, S.D. (1991) 'Positivism and Paradigm Dominance in Consumer Research', *Journal of Consumer Research* 18(1): 32–44.
- Hunt, S.D. and Goolsby, J. (1988) 'The Rise and Fall of the Functional Approach to Marketing: A Paradigm Displacement Perspective', in T. Nevelt and R.A. Fullerton (eds) *Historical Perspectives in Marketing: Essays in Memory of Stanley C. Hollander*, pp. 35–51. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Jameson, C. (1971) 'The Theory and Nonsense of Motivation Research', *European Journal of Marketing* 5(4): 189–97.
- Jenkins, K. (2003) *Re-Thinking History*. London: Routledge.
- Karesh, M.A. (1995) 'The Social Scientific Origins of Symbolic Consumer Research: Social Research, Inc.', in K.M. Rassuli, S.C. Hollander and T.R. Nevelt (eds) *Marketing History: Marketing's Greatest Empirical Experiment: Proceedings of the 7th Conference on Historical Research in Marketing & Management Thought*, pp. 95–111. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Kassarjian, H.H. (1981) 'Presentation of the ACR award: "Fellow in Consumer Behavior" to J.A. Howard and James F. Engel', in K. Monroe (ed.) *Advances in Consumer Research* Volume 8, pp. 6–8. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Kassarjian, H.H. (1989) 'Review of "Philosophical and Radical Thought in Marketing"', *Journal of Marketing* 43(1): 123–6.
- Kassarjian, H.H. (1994) 'Scholarly Traditions and the European Roots of American Consumer Research', in G. Laurent, G.L. Lillien and B. Pras (eds) *Research Traditions in Marketing*, pp. 265–79. Boston, MA: Kluwer.
- Katona, G. (1954) 'A Study of Purchase Decisions: Part 1. The Research Design', in L.H. Clark (ed.) *Consumer Behavior Volume I: The Dynamics of Consumer Reaction*, pp. 30–6. New York: New York University Press.
- Keat, R. and Urry, J. (1975) *Social Theory as Science*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kelne, N. (1955) 'Politz vs. Dichter on Motivation', *Printers' Ink* July 22: 37–40.
- Kernan, J.B. (1992) 'On Debts Due: Presentation of ACR Fellow-in-Consumer-Behavior Awards', in *Advances in Consumer Research* 19, pp. 7–8. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Kernan, J.B. (1995) 'Declaring a Discipline: Reflections on the ACR's Silver Anniversary', in F. Kardes and S. Mita (eds) *Advances in Consumer Research* 22, pp. 553–60. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Klass, B. (1964) 'Understanding Why They Buy', in M.M. Grossack (ed.) *Understanding*





- Consumer Behavior*, pp. 67–76. Boston, MA: The Christopher Publishing House.
- Kornhauser, A.W. (1941) 'The Role of Psychological Interpretation in Market Research', *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 5(July): 187–93.
- Krugman, H.E. (1956–7) 'A Historical Note on Motivation Research', *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 20(4): 719–23.
- Kuhn, T.S. (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lazarsfeld, P.F. (1935) 'The Art of Asking WHY in Marketing Research', *National Marketing Review* 1(1): 32–43, reprinted in Lazarsfeld, P.F. (1972) *Qualitative Analysis: Historical and Critical Essays*, pp. 183–202. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Lazarsfeld, P.F. (1969) 'An Episode in the History of Social Research: A Memoir', in Fleming, D. and Bailyn, B. (eds) *The Intellectual Migration: Europe and America, 1930–1960*, pp. 270–337. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Lazarsfeld, P.F. and Thielens, W. (1958) *The Academic Mind*. Illinois: Free Press.
- Levy, S.J. (1959) 'Symbols for Sale', *Harvard Business Review* 37(4): 117–24.
- Levy, S.J. (1983) 'Interdisciplinary Marketing Study', in R. Bagozzi and A. Tybout (eds) *Advances in Consumer Research* 10, pp. 9–11. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Levy, S.J. (1996) 'Stalking the Amphibia', *Journal of Consumer Research* 23(3): 163–76.
- Levy, S.J. (2001) 'Whence and Whither Consumer Research', *ACR News* Fall. URL: (consulted December, 2004) <http://www.acrweb.org/acrnews/FALL-01/WISD.html>
- Levy, S.J. (2003a) 'Roots of Marketing and Consumer Research at the University of Chicago', *Consumption, Markets and Culture* 6(2): 99–110.
- Levy, S.J. (2003b) 'An Interview with Sidney J. Levy', *Consumption, Markets, and Culture* 6(2): 111–13.
- Levy, S.J. (2005) 'The Evolution of Qualitative Research in Consumer Behavior', *Journal of Business Research* 58: 341–7.
- Martineau, P.D. (1961) 'Respectable Persuasion', *The Journal of Marketing* 25(4): 108–10.
- McCumber, J. (2001) *Time in the Ditch*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Mick, D.G. and Demoss, M. (1990) 'Self-Gifts: Phenomenological Insights from Four Contexts', *Journal of Consumer Research* 17(3): 322–32.
- Moore, E.S. and Lutz, R.J. (2000) 'Children, Advertising, and Product Experiences', *Journal of Consumer Research* 27(1): 31–49.
- Morgan, G. and Smircich, L. (1980) 'The Case for Qualitative Research', *Academy of Management Review* 5(4): 491–500.
- Mueller, E. (1954) 'Part 2. The Sample Survey', in L.H. Clark (ed.) *Consumer Behavior Volume I: The Dynamics of Consumer Reaction*, pp. 36–87. New York: New York University Press.
- Murray, J.B. and Ozanne, J.L. (1991) 'The Critical Imagination: Emancipatory Interests in Consumer Research', *Journal of Consumer Research* 18(2): 129–44.
- Murray, J.B., Evers, D.J. and Janda, S. (1997) 'Marketing, Theory Borrowing and Critical Reflection', *Journal of Macromarketing* 15(2): 92–106.
- Newman, J.W. (1955) 'Looking Around', *Harvard Business Review* 33(1): 135–44.
- Newman, J.W. (1958) *Motivation Research and Marketing Management*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School, Division of Research.
- Newman, J.W. (1992) 'Some Observations on a Developing Field', in J. Olson (ed.)





- Advances in Consumer Research* 19, pp. 12–14. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- O'Shaughnessy, J. and O'Shaughnessy, N.J. (2002) 'Postmodernism and Marketing: Separating the Wheat from the Chaff', *Journal of Macromarketing* 22(1): 109–35.
- Packard, V. (1960) *The Hidden Persuaders*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Paradise, L.M. and Blankenship, A.B. (1951) 'Depth Questioning', *The Journal of Marketing* 15(3): 274–88.
- Parker, M. (1998) *Organizational Culture and Identity*. London: SAGE.
- Parker, M. (2000) 'The Sociology of Organizations and the Organization of Sociology: Some Reflections on the Making of a Division of Labour', *The Sociological Review* 48(1): 124–46.
- Parker, M. (2002) 'Future Challenges in Organization Theory? Amnesia and the Production of Ignorance', in J. S. Jung (ed.) *Rethinking Administrative Theory: The Challenges of the New Century*, pp. 37–52. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Pierson, G.W. (1959) *The Education of American Businessmen*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Politz, A. (1956–1957) "'Motivation Research" from a Research Viewpoint', *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 20(4): 663–73.
- Politz, A. (1957) 'Science and Truth in Marketing Research', *Harvard Business Review* 35(1): 117–26.
- Politz, A. and Deming, W.E. (1953) 'On the Necessity to Present Consumer Preferences as Predictions', *The Journal of Marketing* 18(1): 1–5.
- Ricoeur, P. (1970) *Freud & Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*, tr. D. Savage. New Haven, CT: Yale.
- Robertson, T.S. and Ward, S. (1973) 'Consumer Behavior Research: Promise and Prospects', in S. Ward and T.S. Robertson (eds) *Consumer Behavior: Theoretical Sources*, pp. 3–42. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rothwell, N.D. (1955) 'Motivational Research Revisited', *The Journal of Marketing* 20(2): 150–4.
- Sampson, P. (1978) 'Qualitative Research and Motivation Research', in R.M. Worcester and J. Downham (eds) *Consumer Market Research Handbook* (2nd edn), pp. 25–48. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.
- Schrecker, E.W. (1986) *No Ivory Tower*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Scriven, L.E. (1958) 'Rationality and Irrationality in Motivation Research', in R. Ferber and Hugh G. Wales (eds) *Motivation and Market Behavior*, pp. 64–74. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Shankar, A. and Patterson, M. (2001) 'Interpreting the Past, Writing the Future', *Journal of Marketing Management* 17(5/6): 481–501.
- Sherry, J.F. (1991) 'Postmodern Alternatives The Interpretive Turn in Consumer Research', in T.S. Robertson and H.H. Kassarian (eds) *Handbook of Consumer Research*, pp. 548–91. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Sherry, J.F. and McGrath, M.A. (1989) 'Unpacking the Holiday Presence: A Comparative Ethnography of Two Gift Stores', in E.C. Hirschman (ed.) *Interpretive Consumer Research*, pp. 148–67. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Sheth, J.N. and Gross, B.L. (1988) 'Parallel Development of Marketing and Consumer Behavior: A Historical Perspective', in T. Neveit and R.A. Fullerton (eds) *Historical Perspectives in Marketing: Essays in Honor of Stanley C. Hollander*, pp. 9–33. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Smith, G.H. (1954) *Motivation Research in Advertising and Marketing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.



- Smith, G.H. and Vitriol, H.A. (1952) 'Why We Use Group Explorations', *Printers' Ink* 18 July: 46–8.
- Staelin, R. (2005) 'Eras III and IV My Reflections', *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing* 24(1): 146–9.
- Stern, B.B. (1990) 'Literary Criticism and the History of Marketing Thought: A New Perspective on "Reading" Marketing Theory', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 18(4): 329–36.
- Stern, B.B. (2001) 'Book Review: The Why of Consumption: Contemporary Perspectives on Consumer Motives, Goals, and Desires', *Journal of Advertising Research* 41(4): 83–5.
- Stern, B.B. (2004) 'The Importance of Being Ernest: Commemorating Dichter's Contribution to Advertising Research', *Journal of Advertising Research* 44(2): 165–9.
- Stryker, P. (1959) 'Motivation Research, by Harry Henry', *The Journal of Marketing* 23(3): 344–5.
- Szmigin, I. and Foxall, G. (2000) 'Interpretive Consumer Research: How Far Have We Come?', *Qualitative Market Research* 3(4): 187–97.
- Tadajewski, M. (2004) 'The Philosophy of Marketing Theory: Historical and Future Directions', *The Marketing Review* 4(3): 307–40.
- Tadajewski, M. (2006) 'The Ordering of Marketing Theory: The Influence of McCarthyism and the Cold War', *Marketing Theory* 6(1): 163–99.
- Thompson, C.J., Locander, W.B. and Pollio, H.R. (1989) 'Putting Consumer Experience Back into Consumer Research', *Journal of Consumer Research* 16(2): 133–47.
- Twedt, D.W. (1964) 'The Consumer Psychologist', in M.M. Grossack (ed.) *Understanding Consumer Behavior*, pp. 53–63. Boston, MA: The Christopher Publishing House.
- Veblen, T. (1934) *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Random House.
- Vicary, J.M. (1951) 'How Psychiatric Methods can be applied to Market Research', *Printer's Ink* 11 May: 39–48.
- Wallendorf, M. and Belk, R.W. (1989) 'Assessing Trustworthiness in Naturalistic Consumer Research', in E.C. Hirschman (ed.) *Interpretive Consumer Research*, pp. 69–84. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Weiss, E.H. and Green, H.E. (1951) 'Unique Human Motivation Library is Centre of Thought in this Agency', *Printers' Ink* 6 February: 36–7.
- Wells, W.D. (1975) 'Psychographics: A Critical Review', *Journal of Marketing Research* 12(2): 196–213.
- Westfall, R.L., Boyd, H.W. and Campbell, D.T. (1957) 'The Use of Structured Techniques in Motivation Research', *The Journal of Marketing* 22(2): 134–9.
- Wilkie, W.L. (1986) *Consumer Behavior*. New York: John Wiley.
- Wilkie, W.L. (2002) 'On Books and Scholarship: Reflections of a Marketing Academic', *Journal of Marketing* 66(3): 141–52.
- Williams, R.J. (1957) 'Is it True What They Say About Motivation Research?', *The Journal of Marketing* 22(2): 125–33.
- Yoell, W.A. (1950) 'Base Your Advertising on the True Buying Motive', *Printers' Ink* 8 September: 38–9.
- Yoell, W.A. (1952) 'Make Your Advertising Themes Match Consumer Behavior', *Printers' Ink* 21 March: 82–7.



**Mark Tadajewski** is Lecturer in Critical Marketing at the University of Leicester. His research interests are wide-ranging and include: the history of marketing thought, the politicized nature of marketing theory, objectivity, theory-choice and incommensurability, consumer culture and recent debates in the history and philosophy of science and their implications for marketing theory. Address: Management Centre, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH, UK. [email: [mt66@le.ac.uk](mailto:mt66@le.ac.uk)]