1 History of qualitative research methods in marketing

Sidney J. Levy

This chapter traces the history of qualitative research methods in marketing. These methods include a variety of techniques such as personal interviewing (sometimes designated as ‘open-ended’, ‘non-directive’, ‘depth’, ‘casual’ etc.); group or focus group interviewing, projective techniques, participant observation, ethnography, case studies, photography and story telling. Also the analysis of data, however gathered and even if they include measurement, may be characterized as a method that is ‘interpretive’, ‘subjective’, ‘hermeneutic’, ‘introspective’ or ‘post-modern’, indicating that it is a qualitative version, as is exemplified by the variety of topics in this Handbook. In this history I have emphasized the early days of qualitative research lest they be lost to the memories of modern students who tend to focus attention on the recent decade of their field.

**Historic roots of qualitative inquiry**

The field of marketing became an academic discipline early in the twentieth century, but its practice and the gathering of intelligence about the market extend far back in time. There have always been explorers, scouts, runners, agents, representatives, salesmen, spies, tax gatherers, census takers, other government functionaries and so on, to provide word of the market. Even Joseph’s interpretation of the Pharaoh’s dream in the Hebrew Bible led to a form of marketing planning for the storage and distribution of grain. Aristotle, Plato, Cicero and other ancients criticized merchants; and throughout history there have been ambivalent attitudes toward the consumption of goods and services. Qualitative analysis of consumption takes various forms because it interests scholars in different disciplines. Historians, economists, anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists and marcologists (scholars who study marketing [Levy, 1976]) have all paid attention to consumption as an outgrowth of concern with human life.

*A History of Private Life: Passions of the Renaissance*, conceived by Phillipe Ariès and edited by Roger Chartier (1989), chronicles changes in consumption in France coming out of the Middle Ages. ‘People learned to read, discovered the seductions of the self, and retreated into domestic intimacy’ (p. 610). Wealth made possible the creation of houses with separate rooms and attention to furnishings and décor; issues of comfort and aesthetics spread from elites to the general public. The elites resisted with sumptuary laws forbidding common folk to emulate them, and they regarded the spread of printed materials as a profanation of knowledge. It is ironic that the growing wealth and freedom of the Enlightenment produced the child-centered family that the wealth and freedom of modern times are often accused of destroying.

The necessity and pleasures of food and eating, their variety and complexity, make them intrinsically appealing. In 1825, Jean Brillat-Savarin (a lawyer and politician) published *The Physiology of Taste*. He is noted for having said, ‘Tell me what you eat and I
will tell you what you are!’ Peter Farb and George Armelagos later wrote a volume, *Consuming Passions: The Anthropology of Eating* (1980), an overview aimed at ‘understanding society and culture through eating’. The great anthropologist, Bronislaw Malinowski (1939) addressed the biological and psychological foundations of need satisfaction. Given his analysis of the Trobriand Island exchange system called the *Kula* (1961), Malinowski may be regarded as one of the founders of the behavioral science approach to marketing. The classic study by his student, Audrey Richards, *Hunger and Work in a Savage Tribe* (1948), illustrates his functional method, as applied to nutrition among the Bantu of Africa.

To accomplish such a comprehensive undertaking in modern societies is hard to conceive, but partial attempts are made. ‘Hunger and work in a civilized tribe’ (Levy, 1978) is regularly addressed by the major food companies. Researchers examine attitudes toward food, the preoccupation with weight control, the relation of diet to health and the use of food to communicate complexities of social status and interaction. For example, *Better Homes and Gardens* has sponsored research on changes in these outlooks; such investigations have been carried out by General Foods, Kraft and so on, usually privately published.

The historian Daniel Horowitz (1985) provides a detailed examination of consumer society in America from 1875 to 1940. He notes the changes in budgets among different social groups, and tells how family behavior was judged by social critics, social workers, home economists and other social scientists. In these materials there is a tension between traditional values of hard work, thrift, the self-controlled family focused on production, and the emerging family with discretionary income seeking new levels of consumption. Many writers disparaged consumers’ responses to more money, appliances, indoor plumbing and advertising as profligate and dissolute, and they exhorted the public ‘to heed the call of prudence and refinement’ (Horowitz 1985, p. 82). The critics hoped that the rigors of World War II might restore traditional morality and sensible frugality.

The post-war period instead brought the Consumer Revolution. Accumulation of capital and personal prosperity joined with pent-up demand for consumer goods and desires for liberated forms of self-expression. The impact of increasing education, contraception, sexual freedom, feminism and the assertion of civil rights became more pronounced. In long qualitative essays, critics offered negative depictions of contemporary life. David Reisman regretted the rise of other-directedness in *The Lonely Crowd* (1950), preferring conformity to inner-directedness and tradition. John Galbraith, in *The Affluent Society* (1958), lamented the squirrel-cage character of consumers motivated by advertising rather than by the public good. And Vance Packard (profitably) exposed and viewed with alarm *The Hidden Persuaders* (1957) who were allegedly corrupting consumers with their insidious analyses and advertising subtleties.

Some social science scholars studied consumers in less visibly moralistic fashion. In 1954 and 1955, New York University Press published two volumes titled *Consumer Behavior*, edited by Lincoln H. Clark. Volume I had the subtitle ‘The Dynamics of Consumer Reaction’ and Volume II, ‘The Life Cycle and Consumer Behavior’. These volumes were sponsored by the Committee for Research on Consumer Attitudes and Behavior, and contain thoughtful articles by economists, sociologists and psychologists. Only the editor, Clark, was a professor of marketing. Nelson N. Foote (1954) wrote on
‘The Autonomy of the Consumer’, pointing to economic changes in America: growth of middle-income families, a substantial rise in real income every year, and mounting discretionary income (ibid., p.15). He interprets growing opportunities for consumers to make choices and show self-determination. At the same time, William H. Whyte (1954) writes on 'The Consumer in the New Suburbia’, but emphasizes the conformity he sees among the residents of a development in Park Forest, Illinois.

Scholars in the Clark volumes mainly study choice and decision making. Introducing the discipline of psychological economics, George Katona says that ‘actors on the economic scene have significant latitude or discretion in their behavior . . . (or) . . . there would be hardly any need to introduce psychological variables as explanatory principles of economic behavior’ (1954, p.30). Similarly, James Tobin, a professor of economics, says, ‘Perhaps an even more fundamental and difficult research program would center on the values, aspirations, and goals of families . . . and their effects on consumption behavior’ (1954, p. 108.) Thus, to the agendas of home economists, social workers, Bureau of Labor statisticians and moralists are added the research slates of sociologists, psychologists and the emerging marxologists.

Robert Hess and Gerald Handel (1959) studied family life in a volume titled *Family Worlds: A Psychosocial Approach to Family Life*. Their case studies were derived from intensive interviews with family members, held individually and together, written essays, and projective methods such as Incomplete Sentences and the Thematic Apperception Technique. These qualitative methods illuminated especially the fine dynamic detail and complexity of individual patterns and variations among the families.

The role of marketing research
Following the first US Census in 1790, and spurred by the English work of Charles Booth in 1886, many large-scale projects were carried out (Young, 1939; Parten, 1950). Similarly, psychological testing grew, stimulated by the use of IQ measurement in World War I, adding to the desire to gather data about the public. Awareness of public opinion grew with the writing of Walter Lippmann in the 1920s, with studies of newspapers and their readers. In the 1930s, psychologists (notably Gordon W. Allport and Hadley Cantril) examined the role and impact of radio. The 1940s and 1950s were a golden age of communications study as psychologists, sociologists, political scientists, historians and journalists (led especially by Samuel A. Stouffer, Robert K. Merton and Bernard Berelson) delved into the various media (Klapper, 1960).

The history of qualitative research methods occurs within two main contexts. First, qualitative methods are applied to the marketplace as *marketing research*. Second, academic personnel are drawn to develop theories about the nature of marketing with *research into marketing*. Donald M. Hobart tells how modern marketing research began.

There was a time when marketing research did not exist. About the year 1910 an idea was born . . . The father of this idea was Mr. Stanley Latshaw, at that time the advertising representative in Boston for The Curtis Publishing Company . . . He was not satisfied with the way in which he and his salesmen sold advertising space. Neither they nor their customers knew much about markets and the wants and habits of consumers and dealers . . . The plan was to hire a competent man, turn him loose with a roving commission, and then see what happened. The man whom Mr. Latshaw hired for this untired work was the late Charles Coolidge Parlin, a schoolmaster from a small city in Wisconsin. (Hobart, 1950, pp. 3–4)
We can see here numerous issues arising: the dissatisfaction of a manager with a marketing problem, the nature of salesmanship, the business-to-business relationship, the role of the media and communications, the desire to understand the end users’ motives and actions, involvement of an academic intelligence and the early, open-minded, exploratory attitude.

In 1926, General Foods established a panel of homemakers for testing new products; in 1932, the Psychological Corporation set up a continuous poll of buying behavior. This survey work was aimed at measuring audience characteristics, with emphasis on learning what people did, and on statistical differences among them in terms of age, sex, education, income, occupation and marital status. The goal of understanding behavior was central, of course, but finding out what the actions were, per se, was an important first step. By comparing the characteristics of groups that did different things, insight was gained, and findings could be speculated about and taken to affirm or question previously held hypotheses.

The rise of qualitative research
Despite the centuries of marketing activity, the Journal of Marketing was first published only in 1922; and, despite all the work after World War II on consumers and communication, the Journal of Marketing Research arrived only in 1964, and the Journal of Consumer Research ten years later. In the 1930s, dissatisfaction with polling and surveying appeared in the marketing literature. The information gained seemed descriptive, mechanical and not explanatory enough. Psychology was moving from a measurement phase to a clinical phase, with personality analyses and projective techniques adding an interpretive dimension to the traditional laboratory focus. Instead of IQ measurement, qualitative personality assessment was emphasized by the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), precursor to the CIA.

The European migration
Harold H. Kassarjian (1994) describes the move to the US in the 1930s of influential researchers such as George Katona, Hans Zeisel and Herta Herzog. Alfred Politz became a successful commercial surveyor who believed that valid marketing research required national probability samples of at least 1200 people; and he opposed qualitative methods. Kassarjian names Paul F. Lazarsfeld for bringing ‘the techniques of introspection as well as introducing qualitative research and small samples to marketing and advertising research’ (p. 269). Kassarjian’s own work as a researcher, teacher, reviewer and editor made major contributions in reports on projective techniques, personality theory and numerous other topics, as is visible in his vita (2005).

Consumer goods companies pioneered, often using research consultants, including academicians who applied behavioral science ideas to business problems. In 1939, Ernest Dichter, Lazarsfeld’s student, carried out qualitative analyses of Ivory Soap and Plymouth cars. He was a leader in qualitative work that came to be called ‘motivation research’ (Dichter, 1947). He was notorious for his free-wheeling approach and psychoanalytic ideas, as well as his popularity among executives; and Lazarsfeld joined in the criticism of Dichter, despite the merits and practical value of Dichter’s ideas.

Having a traditional receptivity to psychology (Scott, 1917), advertising agencies were aware of new work in the communications field (Strong, 1913; Poffenberger, 1925). They
played a major role in the competition among brands and were sensitive to market segmentation. Demographic data were not always sufficient or satisfying. Sometimes there were no significant differences between two user groups in their age, sex and income distributions, so those characteristics did not appear to account for their different marketing behaviors. Often, too, user groups gave the same reasons for different brand preferences, showing that there are discrepancies between what people say they do or think or like and what they actually do, think or like. The reasons people give may not be the whole reason, and they may not be able to explain their own behavior. Because the usual structured questionnaire was often found to be insufficiently informative, research workers found it useful to develop more conversational interviews. Sometimes these interviews were carried out by psychiatric or psychological personnel and were compared to the free association sessions connected with psychoanalytic therapy. Because of this, such interviews were called ‘depth interviews’. Also the work of Carl R. Rogers (1956) gained fame for the ‘non-directive interview’. Despite theoretical differences between Freud and Rogers, both relied on the subject freely introspecting and talking so that thoughts and feelings are explored and brought forth fully.

The post-World War II surge
Social science technology grew fast after World War II. Social Research, Inc. (SRI) was established in 1946 to apply the interests of faculty members of the Committee on Human Development at the University of Chicago: W. Lloyd Warner (social stratification and symbol systems, 1949), Burleigh B. Gardner (human organization, 1945) and William E. Henry (analysis of fantasy, 1956). News of company-sponsored research appeared in trade publications such as Advertising Age, Sponsor, Printers’ Ink and Advertising & Selling. A magazine of advertising, marketing and public relations, Tide (1947), reported SRI’s work that used projective methods and ethnographies adapted from social anthropology and psychology to analyze symbolic meanings of greeting cards and of soap operas.

Qualitative research methods were not readily accepted in academic marketing departments, despite their common use in history, anthropology, sociology and literary criticism. The receptivity by business offended people who look down on business and its minions. Morris Holbrook (1995) said that such consultants were obsequious dogs (p. 303). In The Theory of the Leisure Class, that pioneering study of consumption, Thorstein Veblen (1899) commented that ‘knowledge of latter-day men and things is . . . “lower”, “base”, “ignoble” – one even hears the epithet “sub-human”, applied to this matter-of-fact knowledge of mankind and of everyday life’ (p. 391). Some contemporary sociologists have an awakened interest in studying consumers, but they commonly ignore work in the marketing literature, at times as a result busying themselves re-inventing the wheel. A professor of finance recently raved in my presence that he hated the behavioral people he asserted were ruining his field.

In ‘Alternative Approaches in the Study of Complex Situations’, Robert Weiss (1966) calmly and objectively contrasts research methods. But contention and lack of scientific objectivity about methods persist. Dominant paradigm people often resist, show hostility and, at many schools, refuse to hire or promote faculty who are qualitatively oriented. They are defensive, unrealistically acting as though their livelihoods are jeopardized by the projective techniques and ethnographies that they imagine will replace their surveys,
regressions and multivariate methods. At the 1998 conference of the Association for Consumer Research, such persons complained that qualitative researchers were taking over the conference.

Nevertheless, results of the early work on social-psychological aspects of consumer behavior worked their way into the academic literature. Warner and Henry (1948) published ‘The Radio Day Time Serial: A Symbolic Analysis’, in *Genetic Psychology Monographs*. The *Harvard Business Review* published Dichter’s ‘Psychology in Marketing Research’ (1947), illustrating the distinction between ‘rationalized’ explanations for actions and customers’ deeper, unconscious reasons. Such thinking attempted to get past the ‘lists of motives’ that used to make up much of the psychological approach to explaining customer behavior (Kornhauser, 1923; Copeland, 1924; Duncan, 1940).

The kind of indirectly derived insight that a projective method might yield was famously dramatized for the marketing profession by a single simple experiment reported by Mason Haire in 1950. He showed samples of women a brief shopping list and asked for a description of the woman who had prepared the list. The list was varied by including or omitting a brand of instant coffee. Subjects who saw instant coffee on the list projected their ideas about instant coffee by describing the buyer as less oriented to home and family, compared to the descriptions given by those who saw the list without instant coffee (Haire, 1950).

**Motivation research**

S.I. Hayakawa’s *Language in Action* (1941) introduced me to General Semantics, announcing that words and things were different. Hayakawa led me to a weighty and esoteric tome, *Science and Sanity*, by Count Alfred Korzybski (1933), and his model of the Structural Differential. This interest foreshadowed the attention to semiotics that flared up years later (Umiker-Sebiok, 1987). With this background, I was drawn into interdisciplinary study with the Committee on Human Development at Chicago, and in 1948 at SRI began my career of investigating the significance to people of companies, products, brands, media, advertisements, persons and life styles. I was increasingly struck by the way motivation interacts with perception: that is, how people’s motives lead them to perceive meaning in the objects they encounter and how the meanings of those objects affect their motives. I studied the Thematic Apperception Technique with William Henry (1956), learning to interpret people’s story telling. I saw how they symbolize their lives in the products and brands they consume, and how they tell each other stories in pursuit of their aims.

The excitement about behavioral science methods and theories spread in the mid-1950s, linking marketplace behavior with personality traits, exploring consumer motivations and analyzing perceptions of products and brands. *The Chicago Tribune*’s Pierre D. Martineau commissioned from SRI basic studies of beer, cigarettes, soaps and detergents, and automobiles, which he publicized via numerous industry presentations, where they were usually the first of their kind. We called these studies ‘motivation research’.

*Cigarettes: Their Role and Function* analyzed the physical, psychological, sociological, and cultural significance of cigarettes and smoking. *Motivations Relating to Soaps and Chemical Detergents* analyzed how these products helped housewives cope with and control negative aspects of their social role. *Automobiles: What They Mean to Americans* explored the ramiﬁed signiﬁcance of the automobile in people’s lives as an extension of the self, in terms of its
practical use, economic value, social status symbolism, psychological motives, and perceptions of the cars’ images. (Newman, 1957)

In the 1960s and 1970s, the excitement moderated. Attention shifted to the systematic measurement that was aided by the rise of the computer. New promise came from the experiments of cognitive psychology, not from depth psychologies. Motivation research (like Freudianism and God) was said to have died. Still, motivation research never died. It settled down to be carried out by Dichter and other workers, including my associates at Social Research, Inc. and myself, under the heading of motivational studies, qualitative analyses, sociopsychological studies and the like.

The 1970s saw the rise of the focus group. This method had a history in the study of group dynamics (Lewin, 1947), small groups (Bales, 1950) and convenient survey methods (Parten, 1950). It showed up in marketing literature with a piece by Alfred Goldman (1962) on the group depth interview in the Journal of Marketing and in reports in the Marketing News and other trade press. The business community loved the focus group. In many organizations it was (and is) considered synonymous with qualitative research and was the only method used to get qualitative information. Marketing managers need information to nourish their decisions, and focus groups are the fast food of marketing research.

At times, hostility to the new methods and practitioners was intense. Motivation researchers were accused of offering false panaceas or, conversely, dangerously effective insights. The vice of subjectivity, with its supposed lack of validity and reliability, was especially emphasized. The conflict can be seen in titles of news articles of the period: ‘Politz Tags Motivation Research “Fake”, “Hah!” Hahs Dichter Group’, Advertising Age (1955b); ‘Battle of Embittered Ph.D.s’, Advertising Age (1955a); ‘Research Rivals Trade Blows’, Business Week (1955); ‘Is motivation research really an instrument of the Devil?’ (William D. Wells, 1956).

By 1958, the pros and cons had been pretty thoroughly reviewed. A compendium of these views was compiled by Robert Ferber and Hugh G. Wales (1958) in Motivation and Market Behavior. Joseph Newman (1957) also provided a comprehensive view. Using a case approach, he shows the breadth of understanding that was sought in qualitative studies. The results of personality studies were critically reviewed (Kassarjian and Sheffet, 1975). Books by Martineau (1957), George Horsley Smith (1954), Harry Henry (1958) and Vance Packard (1957) presented concepts, methods, applications, criticism and defense.

**Pioneers in qualitative research**

Two sets of pioneers were especially important in fostering the initial wave of motivation/qualitative work. Such figures as Ernest Dichter; my colleagues Burleigh B. Gardner, Steuart Henderson Britt and Harriett Bruce Moore; Dietrich Leonhard, Hal Kassarjian, Louis Cheskin, Herta Herzog, Virginia Miles, William D. Wells and several others, were knowledgeable and spread the word. The second group who played a special role were the daring business people who had the curiosity and imagination to support innovative research projects, who were willing to learn about unconventional methods. These included George Reeves and Sandy Gunn of J. Walter Thompson, Henry O. Whiteside of Gardner Advertising and later J. Walter Thompson, Hugh McMillan and Jack Bowen of
Campbell-Ewald, Leo Burnett of Leo Burnett Advertising, Pierre D. Martineau of The Chicago Tribune, Gerhardt Kleining of Reemstma in Germany, Dudley Ruch of Pillsbury, John Catlin of Kimberly-Clark, Robert Gwynn and Dan Bash of Sunbeam Corporation, George Stewart of Swift and Company, Beland Honderich of the Toronto Star, Margaret Rogers at N.W. Ayers, and many more.

The influence of Social Research, Inc.
The work at Social Research, Inc., where I became a principal, spread qualitative research methods in both practical and theoretical directions. We embedded projective devices (Levy, 1985) within the more or less nondirective approach of the so-called ‘depth interview’. These were variants on the clinical techniques of the time, such as the TAT, the Rorschach, Sentence Completion, Word Association, Draw-A-Person and the curious Szondi test (Rainwater, 1956). We created devices such as matching people, animals, cars, pictorial symbols and soliciting dreams. We took pictures of houses and living rooms, we sent interviewers to spend days observing and making detailed notes on what respondents did and said. Essentially, we engaged in accumulating case studies, personal histories and ethnographies; and we conducted group interviews before they came to be called ‘focus groups’. A later variation on these methods is reported in ‘Autodriving: A Photoelicitation Technique’ (Heisley and Levy, 1991). Gerald Zaltman (2003) has recently combined pictures in collages, metaphors and story telling in his Zaltman Metaphor Elicitation Technique.

Using Warner’s Index of Status Characteristics (Warner et al., 1949), we classified our respondents to examine the effects of social class on consumer behavior. Workingman’s Wife, by Lee Rainwater, Richard P. Coleman and Gerald Handel (1959), was based on studies of readers of romance publications for Macfadden-Bartell Corporation. We taught clients about social stratification in American society. Along the way, to apply my multidisciplinary training, I wrote one article to show the use of sociological concepts (‘Social Class and Consumer Behavior’, Levy, 1966), another arguing for the psychological perspective (‘Mammon and Psyche’, Levy, 1968) and another to show the relevance of anthropology (‘Hunger and Work in a Civilized Tribe’, Levy, 1978). Assisting in the spread of ideas from SRI, Lee Rainwater (1974) became a professor of anthropology and sociology at Harvard; Gerald Handel taught sociology at CCNY; and Richard Coleman and I taught in marketing departments, he at Kansas State and I at Northwestern and now the University of Arizona.

The brand image
One concept that emerged from our work was that of the brand image. I remembered William James (1892) writing that ‘a man has as many social selves as there are individuals who recognize him and carry an image of him in their mind . . . But as the individuals who carry the images fall differently into classes we may practically say that there are as many different social selves as there are distinct groups of persons about whose opinion he cares (p. 180)’. At SRI we saw that this idea was true for organizations, their products and their brands, and the notion of imagery as a marketing apperception was used to interpret them. Consequently (with Burleigh B. Gardner), I wrote ‘The Product and the Brand’, for the Harvard Business Review (1955), explaining that each product or brand exists in people’s minds as a symbolic entity, an integrated resultant of all their
experiences with it in the marketplace. The notion was seized upon by the advertising community and, if I may immodestly (or guiltily) say so, the brand image idea subsequently swept the world, becoming part of the lingua franca of modern times.

Symbolic analysis
The brand image was also a vehicle for spreading the notion of symbolic analysis. Reinforced by Warner’s work on symbol systems (1959), the symbolic interactionists at the University of Chicago, and experience with projective methods, our consumer studies were exercises in the interpretation of symbols and symbolic behavior. Ira O. Glick and I wrote *Living with Television* (1962, re-issued in 2005), based on studies of television shows’ audiences conducted for Chevrolet and Campbell-Ewald, its advertising agency. Warner described it as a ‘contribution to our body of knowledge about the meanings and function of the symbol systems commonly shared by most Americans’ (p. 6). We did the first qualitative study for the Coca-Cola Company on why people drink soft drinks, the first study for AT&T on the meaning of the telephone. For the Wrigley Company we studied what baseball meant to Cubs fans. A study for FTD, the flower delivery system, analyzed the poignancy of flowers in representing the life cycle, symbolizing its beauty, its fragility and the inevitability of death. With this work in mind, I wrote the article ‘Symbols for Sale’ (1959) and other related reports: ‘Symbolism and Life Style’ (1963) and ‘Interpreting Consumer Mythology: A Structural Approach to Consumer Behavior’ (1981).

Broadening the concept of marketing
From the variety of SRI’s innovative qualitative research for corporations, hospitals, schools, banks, associations, politicians and government agencies, it became evident to me that marketing was a function of all individuals and organizations. Philip Kotler and I wrote ‘Broadening the Concept of Marketing’, that appeared in the *Journal of Marketing* (1969). The broadening idea created a stir. Our article led to the ‘broadening’ title being given to the 1970 American Marketing Association Summer Educators’ Conference, and diffused the marketing concept into the management of education, health, government and the arts. It was criticized by some people as obvious, wrongheaded and evil. One piece (Laczniaik and Michie, 1979) accused us of creating social disorder by distorting the definition of marketing. In reply (Levy and Kotler, 1979), we defended the ‘uses of disorder’ (Sennett, 1970).

Recent history
Historically, marketing departments had one major qualitative method. Emulating Harvard by using case studies was accepted as a respectable tradition. However, in the late 1950s and 1960s, scientific research hit marketing departments, affecting the personnel and the nature of their work. Northwestern University hired a stream of social scientists with qualitative interests, such as Steuart Henderson Britt, then me, Philip Kotler, Gerald Zaltman, Bobby Calder and John Sherry. Doctoral program graduates who did qualitative work include John Myers (1968), Thomas Robertson (1967), Richard Bagozzi (1974), Fuat Firat (1978), Dennis Rook (1985, 1987), Aaron Ahuvia (1998), Güliz Ger (1992), Douglas Holt (1995) and Deborah Heisley (1990). Marketing scholars at other schools similarly recognized the contribution of the behavioral sciences, and some among them turned to qualitative work.
From the establishment of the Association for Consumer Research in 1970 and the *Journal of Consumer Research* in 1974, there has been a steady flow of reports from the qualitative workers of the last 35 years. Major integrations were provided by Engel, Kollat and Blackwell in 1968, with *Consumer Behavior*, by Howard and Sheth in 1969, with *The Theory of Buyer Behavior*, Joel B. Cohen’s editing of *Behavioral Science Foundations of Consumer Behavior* (1972) and lately by Shay Sayre (2001). Michael Solomon (2005), in his textbook, gives an overview of the progress that has been made in studying consumption, including the work of qualitative researchers. In the critical vein, consumers are still blamed for their supposedly unhappy materialism, but postmodernists tend to find greater villainy in corporate power and policies, and the negative hegemonies of the age (Firat and Dholakia, 1998; Askegaard and Firat, 1997).

Feeding these currents was a second major wave of European influence. The French stand out for the contributions of Roland Barthes (1957), Michel Foucault (1969), Jean Baudrillard (1981) and Pierre Bourdieu (1987); and the whole semiotic movement, for which see David Mick (1986) and Hanne Larsen et al. (1991). Dominique Bouchet (2005) has fostered the qualitative approach at the University of Southern Denmark, along with his students and colleagues Per Østergaard (1991) and Søren Askegaard (1991). From Ireland came the provocative voices of Stephen Brown and Darach Turley (1977).

Not all contributors to qualitative research can be listed, regrettably, but some are notable for promoting the modern entrenchment of qualitative endeavors. To describe the remarkable productivity of Russell E. Belk could fill a chapter, as Belk is an industry in himself. Readers are referred to his vita (2005) to see his publications, both in text and in film. His leadership led to *Highways and Buyways: Naturalistic Research from the Consumer Behavior Odyssey* (1991) a milestone in qualitative research history. Morris B. Holbrook (1981, 1995) stands out for his prolific contributions as he veered between systematic technical work and his qualitative interest in symbolic materials, expressed especially in his love of animal metaphors. Individually and jointly, he and Elizabeth C. Hirschman (1992) illuminated a great variety of topics. Barbara Stern (1988), Edward McQuarrie (1991), John Schouten (1991) brought their special literary sensibilities to bear on marketing communications.

Along the qualitative trail are the distinctive contributions of anthropologists: John Sherry (1995, 1998), Eric Arnould, Linda L. Price and Cele Otnes (1999), Eric Arnould (2001), Grant McCracken (1988) and Annamma Joy (1982), with creative and provocative work. Robert V. Kozinets (2002) brings his acuity to cultural phenomena such as *Star Trek and Burning Man*. Emphasizing postmodern thinking and its application are Fuat Firat and Alladi Venkatesh, editors of the journal *Consumption, Markets and Culture*. A prominent figure in the qualitative field is Melanie Wallendorf, with an important stream of work, individually (1980) and jointly with Arnould (1991), Belk (1987), Sherry (Belk, Wallendorf and Sherry 1989), Zaltman (1983), and others. Among contemporary colleagues are Craig Thompson (Thompson, Loccander and Pollio, 1989) and Douglas Holt (Holt and Thompson, 2002) whose work together and individually illuminates diverse cultural issues such as baseball, Starbucks and masculinity. Cele Otnes and Richard F. Beltramini (1996) and Mary Ann McGrath (1989) have highlighted gifting; and Jeffrey Durgee makes lively and thoughtful connections between qualitative theory and application (2005). These scholars and several others speak further for themselves in the subsequent chapters of this *Handbook*. 
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