

Accepted in *Logos*, October 2023

The Dynamics of Taste: Mapping Brands and Readers in the Context of Capital

Miriam Johnson, Oxford Brookes University

Abstract: In an age of media convergence, publishing brands have evolved from mere symbols of credibility to become navigational beacons within a saturated landscape of content. As they intersect with multiple media formats, these brands not only represent their intrinsic values but also engage in a dynamic relationship with the reader. This relationship is underpinned by the interplay of various forms of capital: economic, social, cultural, and symbolic. Through the lens of Bourdieu's theory of capital and habitus, and Foucault's discourse analysis, this article unpacks the shifting dynamics of power between publishing brands and readers. It explores the complex nature of branding, where readers are both consumers and co-creators of meaning, and where publishing brands serve as both gatekeepers and facilitators of cultural narratives.

Keywords: Cultural capital, power, branding, culture,

The role of brands in the publishing industry has begun to shift to become more than a vague and often intangible selling point. Brands are both a sign and symbol for knowing what a publisher sells, stands for, and what their personality or ethos is. Publishing brands, across all genres of writing, trade and academic, now must exist across multiple formats (audio, visual, print, and digital, etc) and as such, they must navigate the same cultural landscape as other media (tv, radio, podcasts, streaming, social media, etc), while considering how the consumer perceives their brand as a touchpoint for navigating their own self-identity within this landscape.

The role of perspective in the consumer environment

In the current, highly connected, media environment, information is available in overabundance and is readily accessible to most consumers. A publisher or author's branding in this connected world must take on new roles. The branding perspectives

that can be taken around economic, consumer, and that of the wider society's point of view (Swaminathan, et.al., 2020, p. 4) work well in conjunction with a social constructionist approach¹, which relates to defining the "corporate brand through the social interaction between the company and its environment" (Galvin, 2020, p. 13), and that readers "subjectively form realities based on social and experiential constructions (Helal, et.al., 2018) such as these.

It may be tempting to consider a publishing brand in the consumer's cultural landscape from a singular perspective: that of the publisher at a corporate level (Balmer & Gray, 2003; Balmer & Greyser, 2003; Kernstock & Brexendorf, 2009), that of the reader (Keller, 2003; Gómez-Suárez, et.al., 2017; Dwivedi & McDonald, 2020), or of society (O'Guinn, et.al., 2018; Swaminathan, et.al., 2020). However, it is most valuable when perspectives can be combined, as few publishing brands are purely financial, consumer-driven, or society-informed. Because the question of the relative positioning of both publisher and reader in the wider cultural landscape comes into play when we consider who has the authority to speak within this particular discourse, we must also recognise that in all cases how companies, brands, and readers perceive themselves and others are "human constructions; that is, they are all inventions of the human mind and hence subject to human error" (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 108). Simply because the fallibility of human construction is a possibility, this is not to say that we cannot consider what the interplay is between the publishing brand and the reader, and their authority to speak from their position within the landscape.

If we take into account Foucault's archaeological tool for questioning where a publishing brand is positioned within the wider discourse of branding, it enables us to dismiss a linear account of brand building where a publisher or author creates a brand, uses it to sell books to a consumer, who then joins a brand community to be a wider part of the brand itself. Instead, the perspective used in evaluating a publishing brand should take into account the place from which the speaker comes (Foucault, 1989). This allows the subject to speak from within a particular body of knowledge (Topp, 2000) and for those listening to understand what field they are situated in (editorial, finance, marketing, social media, strategy), what organisations or companies they may have an affinity to, and, simply, who they are and what gives them the power to speak (Topp,

¹ For more research on the social constructionist approach to marketing, see Aggerholm, et.al., 2011.

2000). All of this enables the reader to better understand where they are in relation to a publishing brand.

If a reader comes across a content creator's post on a social platform, such as Instagram, TikTok, Facebook, etc., and the post is selling a book, telling others to go and purchase that product, or even simply leaving an honest review, the reader needs to know where that content creator is situated in that wider body of knowledge. Who gives the content creator the authority to speak on behalf of that publisher, book, or author? The hashtag #ad enables the reader to understand that this book might not be one the content creator would have picked up by themselves to share with their audiences, and that hashtag speaks to what relationship the content creator has to the publisher, the book, and their audience. Requirements by the ASA (Advertising Standards Agency) to make ads identifiable as such are key to enabling the reader to know who has given the content creator the authority to speak². The reader can then consider if they find the content creator a trustworthy source of information, based on where the content creator exists within the reader's cultural landscape in relation to their self-identity.

Likewise, in an offline space, the reader will come across publishing brands and their branded advertisements in which they must determine where the authorisation comes from for those books/product ads to exist. This authorisation is the result of a complex body of research by the publisher that owns the right to produce and sell the book, including the content of the advertisement (image choice, placement, design, wording, CTA, etc.), where the ad is shared, who the target audience is, and what the desired outcome is for the product and overarching publishing house. An ad for the newest book by a bestselling author on the Two Towers West, in London (often known as the billboards on the Hammersmith Flyover), for example, would have a complex stance within the discourse. And some of the complexity of the advertisement will be digested without thought, while others must be considered in relation to all the cultural markers of the advertisement, what the ad is trying to do, and perhaps, physically in relation to the consumer.

It must be noted that not everyone within the cultural landscape is a reader for all publishing brands, all authors, or genres of book; however, publishers continue to exist within the cultural landscape in which these particular readers manoeuvre. The

² It must be acknowledged that questions have been raised as to how much the ASA accurately reflects 'community standards' in their country of practice (Jones, 2003)

reader's cultural landscape can become an overwhelming interplay of culture and brands, and brands that sell culture, making it more difficult for a reader to be able to identify where they are in relation to where they want to be. It is important to question who has the authority to speak for a publisher that a reader does not want to engage with, and, in fact may develop "negative emotional reactions" (Redondo & Aznar, 2018, p. 10) to when forced to engage; therefore, is the value for the publisher more about staking out a space in the cultural landscape rather than identifying with every potential reader who passes by?

Capital as a concept in publishing

The cultural approach popularised by Bourdieu across his work (1986, 1993, 1996) concerns the ebb and flow of power between different elements of capital and their relationship to culture. Using Bourdieu's theories of cultural capital, habitus, and the cultural field – or reader's cultural landscape – as they relate to how publishing brands operate in using the media landscape to change one type of capital into another, facilitates exploring how stories work to connect potential readers to a book, genre, or author, etc. (Mourits, 2021, p. 360). "Bourdieu's concepts allow for a critical analysis of the process whereby actors deploy and legitimise their stocks of economic, social and cultural resources (capital), while being both influenced by, and simultaneously influencing, an arena's (field) socially shared norms, dispositions and behaviours (habitus)" (Reynolds, et.al, 2022). These theories are particularly valuable in the sense that we can utilise them to consider the relationships between the products (books), the brands (the publisher/authors), and the consumer (reader) in terms of their historical development, class, and objective position within the field, in this case the reader's cultural landscape (Johnson, 1993).

The readers themselves are a product of the wider "relatively stable cognitive networks' that are to some degree shared by a social group with similar experiences" (Fournier & Alvarez, 2019, p. 519), and derive cultural meaning from how they interpret their experiences and this "inform[s their] actions in the world" (Fournier & Alvarez, 2019, p. 519). Culture defined as a shared network of similar experiences could, perhaps, be better understood as "culture becomes purely mental" (D'Andrade, 2001, p. 243) where "shared objects and the perceptual features of these objects constitute the basic building blocks of culture" (D'Andrade, 2001, p. 246). These cultural

building blocks such as books, authors, and publishers do not just come to exist based on the shared mental awareness and interpretations of them, but because “individuals and institutions produce shared conventionalized manifestations that make them part of everyday social life and experience” (Fournier & Alvarez, 2019, p. 520). This is evident in the links between books, publishing brands, and the readers in the landscape, and informs their habitus.

The habitus of branding in publishing

“Habitus can be understood to be a series of dispositions, which influences a person’s expectations of social life” (Huang, 2019, p. 48) and consists of the “tastes and distastes, sympathies and aversions, fantasies and phobias which, more than declared opinions, forge the unconscious unity of a class” (Bourdieu, 1996, p, 77). The dispositions within the habitus are developed and continued within a particular field, such as publishing, and do not necessarily carry the same significance or meaning in differing fields (Bourdieu, 1996)³. For instance, a person who is considered well read in one country, may not have the same standing in another country. And, though readers and brands move across these different fields within the cultural landscape, they “tend to incorporate into their habitus the values and imperatives of those fields” (Webb, et. al., 2002, p. 37).

The particular habitus of the overarching publishing brand in the reader’s cultural landscape, can be broken down into two areas: the habitus of the publishing brand and that of the reader, both of which are informed by their history and how they interpret that history within themselves, and the context in which they exist (Schirato & Roberts, 2018). The concept of habitus, generally, is not linear. It shows that “what might otherwise appear to be disparate categories of social phenomena [...] are interrelated and tangled” (Ignatow & Robinson, 2016). Here, the habitus of the publishing brand and the reader’s cultural landscape relate to the social formations as spaces that can be occupied by any player (reader, publisher, author, content creator, bookseller, etc.) within the habitus, “which are based on the distribution of capital” (Grillo, 2018, p. 418). The network of multiple discourses, positions, and readers within the cultural landscape rely on their “distinctive properties by which [...] they] can be

³ It is worth noting that not all scholars agree with Bourdieu’s concept of habitus. For critiques of this theory see: Archer, 2010 and 2012; Jenkins, 1982; Alexander, 1995.

situated relative to other positions” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 30). Even publishing brands in a dominant position rely on the specific conditions enabling them to occupy that location within the landscape, in order to maintain that position (Bourdieu, 1993). Publishing brands that come to exist as symbolic objects that represent equity⁴ must be recognised by others in the shared cultural landscape as such. This allows the publishing brand to manifest themselves as having the power to remain in that particular position.

The role of capital in a reader’s cultural landscape

Much like Bourdieu’s concept of the ‘autonomous sector of the field of cultural production’ (1993) relies on a form of cultural production aimed at the audience of other producers, so too are the publishing brands in the reader’s cultural landscape subservient to maintaining a hierarchy of value of which they are at the top as providers of ‘quality assured works’. Publishing brands are reliant on readers recognising their equity as it is linked to their brand, and valuing the expected quality of those books/products: whether it is the exclusivity of a limited edition, or the publications rights of a widely-read title that enables the reader to feel a part of an in group (such as the zeitgeist around *Fifty Shades of Gray*). This recognition of publisher’s brand equity does not always equate to a reader knowing which publisher produced a specific book, it is instead linked to the wider aspects of curating and gatekeeping content. What allows the publisher, as a brand, to stake out their position as an autonomous producer is the interplay between different forms of capital.

Capital “refers to stocks of internalised ability and aptitude as well as externalised resources which are scarce and socially valued” (Ignatow & Robinson, 2017). The forms of capital valuable in understanding the relationships between the reader and the publishing brand are economic, social, cultural, and symbolic; where different forms of capital can be exchanged to gain access to another, such as economic capital can be exchanged for social capital in the form of a signed copy or rare edition of a book. Likewise economic capital can be exchanged for cultural capital in the form of higher education, which can be exchanged for social capital in sharing learned knowledge at a book group or reading event.

⁴ Brand equity can be defined as brand strength, which consists of the “brand associations held by customers” and brand value, which are the “gains that accrue when brand strength is leveraged to obtain superior current and future profits” (Lasser, et.al., 1995, p. 11). More recent explorations of brand equity can be found in Shariq, 2018; Parris & Gusmán, 2022; Veselinova & Samonikov, 2020; and Vukasović, 2022; among others.

Economic capital can be broadly defined as being in possession of economic means which can be converted into money (Calderon Gómez, 2020, p. 2537), which “provides the conditions for freedom from economic necessity” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 68). Publishing brands which hold economic capital that give them the autonomy to develop exclusive books or products, can seek to develop relationships with readers who possess high levels of economic capital and are willing to exchange it for the social or cultural capital that the publishing brand offers – such as a valuable, limited edition of a book, signed by the author at a small, intimate event. Conversely, publishing brands that have high levels of economic capital are also able to wield that capital in order to reach those readers with less economic capital on a mass scale, which we see with mass market paperbacks, and grocery store and library editions. The lines of economic capital are not clear-cut, especially as they relate to issues of class and habitus where “[t]he hierarchy of the class fractions as regards possession of economic capital [...] is already less visible when, as here, one is only dealing with indices of consumption” (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 116).

Readers who hold economic capital have the “basis of self-assurance” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 68), which frees them to consider obtaining and showcasing other forms of capital, some of which serves the purpose of allowing their self-identity to match their self-projection in the cultural landscape. e.g. filling a large home-library with rare and collectable books as means of allowing others to see them as they see themselves: someone with money and taste. However, the “[a]utonomy based on consecration or prestige is purely symbolic and may or may not imply possession of increased economic capital” (Johnson, 1993, p. 6). In fact, “the structure of the distribution of economic capital is symmetrical and opposite to that of cultural capital” (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 120) and though the economic is always present, it does not always present itself as such (Bourdieu, 2021) and can manifest itself in access and inclusion.

Access to certain spaces in the cultural landscape and inclusion into particular groups is directly related to social capital, which is the “production and maintenance of social connections and networks” (Schirato & Roberts, 2018, p. 185). It is these groups, or social networks that imbue the reader with the “backing of the collectively owned capital” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 246) of the group. For publishing brands, this can be how they are positioned in the market compared to similar publishers, and the books, or services other publishers provide to the readers. This can be in collective, sometimes

loosely defined groups such as the academic publishers, trade publishers, children's publishers, etc. For the reader it can be inherently connected to their economic capital, where they are part of a class of readers that have expendable income and can buy their way into a social group, or it can relate to groups the reader chooses to join, such as brand advocacy groups (PRH's Instagram page, for example) or other communities on- or offline that enable readers to feel part of a something larger than themselves.

Social capital can here develop in many formats and "[m]any communities are rich in one form of social capital but poor in others" (Chetty, et.al., 2022, p. 120). In this way, "capital manifests itself in noneconomic ways" (Yüsek, 2018, p. 1092) that are enhanced and extended by the size of a reader's social connections and the total capital that these social connections have (Yüsek, 2018). Book buyers and readers, as consumers, do not move through their cultural landscape on their own. Their landscapes converge with and diverge from other consumers' cultural landscapes, where much of the underlying architecture and topography may remain the same (e.g. the same top 5 books repeat on their TikTok FY page), but each reader exists in their own individual landscape with pathways, brands, and capital, that are valid for them, (e.g. though the same top 5 books reappear, for one reader book 1 is worth engaging with, whereas for another reader those worthwhile are books 2 and 4). The social capital that a reader has in their networks will influence what books, authors, and publishing brands they interact with.

While social capital can shift into other forms of capital as the reader moves about their networks and cultural landscape in their day to day lives, "social capital is also enhanced and reproduced in a digitally mediated world" (Calderon Gomez, 2021, p. 2546). Economic capital in digital settings can be traded for social capital. Social media platforms are examples of spaces where capital can be exchanged in digital settings.

Social capital in the digital realm is reliant on the affordances of the reader to have the economic capital to pay for access to digital settings and therefore digital products, including the technology to access the internet, the skills to utilise the technology, the ability to seek out the communities and information that a reader wants to locate, and the ability to evaluate what they find and to implement any actions resultant of their digital access (Van Dijk, 2005). And, not all readers have equality of

access to these digital spaces and the capital they can potentially provide⁵. Whereas, “[w]idespread digitalization of products and their easy dissemination through social media [and other digital formats such as ebooks] fundamentally change how people construct and reveal their sense of self online” (Fournier & Alvarez, 2019, p. 526). This is linked to Bourdieu’s concepts of ‘playing seriously’ and ‘the taste for the necessary’ (1996), where those readers in possession of higher social capital are better able to decode cultural aspects with “the internal logic of works that aesthetic enjoyment presupposes” (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 2). In digital settings, those readers with more plentiful capital adopt playful means of moving about their cultural landscape and that can grow a reader’s capital over time. These are the readers who have the time, money, and know-how to access cultural landscapes in a digital setting and can choose to interact with platforms and publishing brands. Whereas those with less capital tend to utilise digital settings as a means to an end, such as locating information or purchasing a book online, and have been found to not gain as much from their cultural landscapes (Robinson, 2009 & Ignatow & Robinson, 2016). These readers are potentially engaging in the cultural landscape in order to “constitute[e] and represent[...] themselves as culturally competent members of our information-age society” (Ignatow & Robinson, 2016).

Much like the possession of economic or social capital, cultural capital is not necessarily equitably distributed in the cultural landscape. In fact, embodied aspects of cultural capital come from previous generations “functions as a sort of advance [...] enables a newcomer to start acquiring the basic elements of the legitimate culture, from the beginning” (Bourdieu, 1996, pp. 70-1). These are the readers which come from a family with some standing and appreciation of culture, and where, perhaps, higher education, a well-paying job, and being ‘well-read’ is an expectation instead of a dream. Publishing brands who possess embodied capital are those which have a long history in the cultural landscape and are recognised as established and trustworthy. These are the Oxford University Presses, Penguin Random Houses, Hachettes and Bloomsburys of the reader’s landscape. While these are only a few examples of publishing brands that consistently provide books and services year on year, publishing brands can develop

⁵ For more research on access and use of digital technology and potential shortcomings, see van Deursen & Helsper, 2015; Witte & Mannon, 2010; Thomas & Wyatt, 2002; Jenkins, et.al., 2006; and Henwood & Wyatt, 2019.

embodied capital over time as they grow into their position in the cultural landscape and become an architectural feature for those readers who use the publishing brand as a touchpoint for identifying where they are and where they want to go.

The role of the field for the reader the publishers

One underlying aspect of cultural capital is that it remains impossible to quantify with an absolute value (Robbins, 2005). “It only possesses value in exchange and the exchange is a social struggle as much as a struggle of cultural value judgment” (Robbins, 2005, p. 23). The cultural field is where the “dynamics of capital” (Huang, 2019, p. 46) exist to explore the concept of value of capital and the shifting power dynamics of possession. Readers, brands, economic concerns, creativity, innovation, and cultural aspects do not “act in a vacuum, but rather in concrete social situations governed by a set of objective social relations” (Johnson, 1993, p. 6). These are the fields which exist in the reader’s cultural landscape as a “structure of objective relationships permitting the accounting of the concrete form of the interactions” (Bourdieu, 1985, p. 18). For players (publishers, authors, readers) in the cultural landscape this indicates the value one reader is willing to put against a book, publisher, author, genre, etc. may not be identical to the value another reader or publishing brand places against the same object or idea. There are a range of “mediating agencies involved in shaping tastes” (Bennett, 2010, p. 107), which vie for power in the cultural landscape, where “[f]ields’ are the building blocks of the social world within which we inhabit” (Mahbub & Shoily, 2016, p. 4).

“Cultural fields are only stable up to a certain point” (Schirato & Roberts, 2018, p. 162) and they change slowly over time, and then suddenly, as they interact with other fields externally and as the internal elements of the field alters their conception of capital and power. It is the shifting commodification of different forms of capital that is “central to an understanding of the dynamics of cultural fields at both the internal and external levels” (Schirato & Roberts, 2018, p. 175); whereas advertising in these fields is “system of discerning or discovering meaning [...which] socialize[s] individuals into a culture of consumption” (Sherry, 1987, p. 445). It is this dynamic in which the reader finds themselves as they move through the cultural landscape, and the power that publishing brands have to position themselves as touchpoints.

Where power sneaks in

When a cultural landscape “acts as both a model *of* and a model *for* reality” (Sherry, 1987, p. 447) the topography of the landscape affects the landscape itself and the readers within it, and brands that exist within that landscape have a role in reflecting and reshaping reality (Sherry, 1987). Both readers and publishing brands produce and utilise cultural goods, such as books, as a means to highlight the symbolic value associated with them. This symbolic value, in turn, enables those publishing brands and readers to recognise others who also belong to the same group of publishers, authors, and/or readers. It is within the exchange that occurs between production, consumption, and symbolic recognition that the question of who wields the power in the cultural landscape resides.

The role of power here is “diffuse and often concealed in broadly accepted, and often unquestioned, ways of seeing and describing the world” (Johnson, 1993, p. 2). This seems obvious when we consider how publishing brands have their brand equity and place in the market. Often we, as readers, do not question why a publishing brand is well-respected and well used. Likewise, consumers regularly associate luxury brands with wealth, status, and quality without questioning whether or not those assertions are likely to be true as “powerful actors [such as brands or influential individuals] can (and do) uphold one subcultural habitus over others” (Rubtsova & Dowd, 2004, p. 30).

Though Bourdieu “conceptualizes capital in all forms of power, whether they are material, cultural, social, or symbolic” (Swartz, qtd in Yüsek, 2018, p. 1091), it is useful to consider the power dynamics held within different forms of capital to be those of an extension of the “logic of economic analysis” (Yüsek, 2018, p. 1092) where we can consider the value of exchange. In the reader’s cultural landscape the value of a collectible book as an item is linked to the ability for certain readers to exchange one form of capital (economic in the case of a collectible/rare book) for other forms of capital that the item embodies, such as the social and cultural capital of ownership of that collectible book symbolises. Furthermore, it is the identification of capital that enables the reader to know where they are in relation to it, which is directly tied to their self-identity and self-projection: a reader sometimes purchases a certain book, genre, or author in order to be seen to have that item (social and cultural capital). This moves the reader’s self-identity and self-projection closer into alignment where others may see a

reader to own a book by a particularly well-respected author and presume that reader has certain levels of social, cultural, and economic capital.

There is an exchange of power in the move towards a particular publishing brand, even if the reader does not purchase the brand's book. By being in the vicinity of a publishing brand in the reader's cultural landscape, they are able to appropriate aspects of the capital of that brand, and of other readers nearby. One does not have to be wealthy to feel wealth-adjacent by window shopping at Goldsboro Books or in going in to have a browse; though it is worth noting that there is a level of economic and social privilege assumed in being able to get to the physical London-based location, or in even considering the opportunity of going inside.

In the exchange of power and capital, there is also a change in the self-identity and self-projection of the reader. As a reader moves through the cultural landscape, they are developing their identity as they are and as they wish to be perceived. Readers can gain power in the exchange of capital, with the accumulation of certain forms of capital enhancing their self-identity or altering how they wish to present themselves. The goalposts of self-identity and self-projection in the cultural landscape are often moving, when one level of capital is achieved, the reader uses that as a base to continually develop their identity and projection further, because the exercise of capital and power "requires legitimisation" (Yüsek, 2018, p. 1093) – as does a reader's sense of self-identity and projection.

There is a cost to the transformation of capital, but transformation is "needed to produce the type of power effective in the field in question" (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 252). Foucault indicates that the layers of the discourse do not exist in isolation and must be related to other layers, practices, etc (Foucault, 1989) and his consideration that "power is tolerable only on the condition that it masks a substantial part of itself" (Foucault, 1978, p. 86) is valuable as a lens to viewing the power dynamics of capital in the wider cultural landscape. Power in the reader's cultural landscape cannot "operate without the delineation of subject positions" (Widder, 2004, p. 423) which allows some actors in the landscape to possess forms of power, in this case capital, that can be used over or against others within that landscape (Widder, 2004). However, not all power is forcefully wielded and power can be defined in these spaces as "the capacity to influence other individuals' states" (Ten Brinke & Keltner, 2022, p. 1) which draws in

aspects of status and class⁶ and their relationship to possession of different forms of capital.

What this indicates is that “[p]ower comes from below; [...] there is no binary and all-encompassing opposition between rulers [brands] and ruled [consumers] at the root of power relations” (Foucault, 1978, p. 94); meaning that within the reader’s cultural landscape the power that is wielded with the exchange of forms of capital is imbued by the influence that possession of capital, and therefore power, entails. Because power is malleable and does not come “from the top down” (Foucault, 1978, p. 94), the wielding of such power ebbs and flows between publishing brands and readers. Who has the power within this space alters depending on the position of the readers, the publishing brands, and the topography of culture, including the mass connectivity of digital technology which gives performative platforms to all those who own, or seek to own, capital in the cultural landscape.

Conclusion

Bourdieu's theories on capital and habitus offer a valuable lens through which we can examine the relationship between publishing brands and readers. Economic, social, cultural, and symbolic capital are not just static resources owned by publishers or readers; they are dynamic assets, constantly being traded, leveraged, and redefined in the cultural landscape. Publishing brands, in their quest to remain relevant and influential, can find themselves seeking to simultaneously accumulate and deploy these different forms of capital. Readers, on the other hand, empowered by digital tools and platforms, are no longer passive consumers. They are active participants, co-creators of meaning, and wield power and influence in their own right. Publishing brands utilise power and capital in order to cement themselves as touchpoints in the wider cultural landscape where their impact can go beyond that of the economic. They have the power to shape narratives, influence taste and become a beacon for readers to better define their own identities.

⁶ For more reading on class, status and power relations see: Sørensen, 2019; Anderson, et.al., 2015; Mahalingham, 2003; and Aronowitz, 2003.

Bibliography

- Aggerholm, H.K., Andersen, S.E. and Thomsen, C., 2011. Conceptualising employer branding in sustainable organisations. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 16(2), pp.105-123.
- Alexander, J. C., 1995. *Fin de siècle Social Theory: Relativism, Reduction, and the Problem of Reason*. New York: Verso.
- Anderson, C., Hildreth, J. A. D., & Howland, L., 2015. Is the desire for status a fundamental human motive? A review of the empirical literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141, 574 – 601. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038781>.
- Archer, M. S., 2010. Routine, Reflexivity, and Realism. *Sociological Theory*, 28, 272–303. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9558.2010.01375.x>
- _____. 2012. *The Reflexive Imperative in Late Modernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aronowitz, S., 2003. *How class works: Power and social movement*. Yale University Press.
- Balmer, J.M. and Gray, E.R., 2003. Corporate brands: what are they? What of them?. *European journal of marketing*.
- Balmer, J. and Greyser, S., 2003. *Revealing the corporation: Perspectives on identity, image, reputation, corporate branding and corporate level marketing*. Routledge.
- Bennett, T., 2010. Culture, power, knowledge: between Foucault and Bourdieu. In *Cultural Analysis and Bourdieu's Legacy* (pp. 114-128). Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P., 1985. The Genesis of the Concepts of 'Habitus' and of 'Field'. *Sociocriticism*, 2 (2): 11-24.
- _____. 1986. 'The Forms of Capital', trans. R. Nice. In J. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood Press (FFP 1983, FEP 1986).
- _____. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Columbia University Press: New York.
- _____. 1996. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.
- _____. 2021 [2016]. *Forms of Capital. General Sociology, Volume 3: Lectures at the Collège de France 1983–1984*. Translated by P. Collier. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Calderon Gomez, D., 2021. The third digital divide and Bourdieu: Bidirectional conversion of economic, cultural, and social capital to (and from) digital capital among young people in Madrid. *New Media & Society*, 23(9), pp.2534-2553.

Chetty, R., Jackson, M.O., Kuchler, T., Stroebel, J., Hendren, N., Fluegge, R.B., Gong, S., Gonzalez, F., Grondin, A., Jacob, M. and Johnston, D., 2022. Social capital I: measurement and associations with economic mobility. *Nature*, 608(7921), pp.108-121.

D'andrade, R., 2001. A cognitivist's view of the units debate in cultural anthropology. *Cross-cultural research*, 35(2), pp.242-257.

Dwivedi, A. and McDonald, R.E., 2020. Examining the efficacy of brand social media communication: a consumer perspective. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 28(4), pp.373-386.

Foucault, M., 1978. *The History of Sexuality, vol. 1, An Introduction*, tr. Robert Hurley, p. 86. New York: Pantheon Books.

Fournier, S. and Alvarez, C., 2019. How brands acquire cultural meaning. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 29(3), pp.519-534.

Galvin, J., 2020. The definition of branding and its impact on modern society research.

Gómez-Suárez, M., Martínez-Ruiz, M.P. and Martínez-Caraballo, N., 2017. Consumer-brand relationships under the marketing 3.0 paradigm: a literature review. *Frontiers in psychology*, 8, p.252.

Grillo, C.M., 2018. Revisiting Fromm and Bourdieu: Contributions to habitus and realism. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 48(4), pp.416-432.

Guba, E.G. and Lincoln, Y.S. (1994), "Competing paradigms in qualitative research", in Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 105-117.

Helal, G., Ozuem, W. and Lancaster, G., 2018. Social media brand perceptions of millennials. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*.

Henwood, F. and Wyatt, S., 2019. Technology and in/equality, questioning the information society. *Digital Culture & Society*, 5(1), pp.183-194.

Huang, X., 2019. Understanding Bourdieu-cultural capital and habitus. *Rev. Eur. Stud.*, 11, p.45.

Ignatow, G., & Robinson, L. (2017). Pierre Bourdieu: Theorizing the Digital. *Information, Communication & Society*, 20, 650–966.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1301519>

Jenkins, R., 1982. Pierre Bourdieu and the Reproduction of Determinism. *Sociology*, 31, 270–281.

Jenkins, H.; Clinton, K., Purushotma, R., Robison, A. J. & Weigel, M., 2006. *Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century*. Building the

Field of Digital media and Learning, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Chicago, pp. 1–68. [Online] Available at: http://www.nwp.org/cs/public/download/nwp_file/10932/Confronting_the_Challenges_of_Participatory_Culture.pdf?x-r¼pfile_d [Accessed on 28 October 2022].

Johnson, R., 1993. Introduction. In *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Columbia University Press: New York.

Jones, S.C., 2003. Sexism is in the eye of the beholder: Does the Advertising Standards Board reflect "community standards"?

Keller, K. L., 2003. Brand Synthesis: The Multidimensionality of Brand Knowledge, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29(March), 595 - 600.

Kernstock, J. and Brexendorf, T.O., 2009. Implications of Habermas's "theory of communicative action" for corporate brand management. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*.

Lassar, W., Mittal, B. and Sharma, A., 1995. Measuring customer-based brand equity. *Journal of consumer marketing*.

Mahalingam, R., 2003. Essentialism, culture, and power: Representations of social class. *Journal of Social Issues*, 59(4), pp.733-749.

Mahbub, R. and Shoily, K.F., 2016. The place of Pierre Bourdieu's theories in (popular) cultural studies.

Mourits, B., 2021. In search of the most effective way of branding: the label 'literature' as a means to an end. In eds. van den Braber, H., Dera, J., Joosten, J. and Steenmeijer, M., *Branding Books Across the Ages*. Amsterdam University Press: Amsterdam.

O'Guinn, Thomas C., Albert M. Muñoz Jr., and Erika Paulson (2018), "Brands and Branding: A Critique of Extant Brand Research and the Need for a Sociological Conception of Brands," in *The Oxford Handbook of Consumption*, Frederick Wherry and Ian Woodward, eds. New York: Oxford University Press.

Parris, D.L. and Guzmán, F., 2022. Evolving brand boundaries and expectations: looking back on brand equity, brand loyalty, and brand image research to move forward. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, (ahead-of-print).

Redondo, I. and Aznar, G., 2018. To use or not to use ad blockers? The roles of knowledge of ad blockers and attitude toward online advertising. *Telematics and Informatics*, 35(6), pp.1607-1616.

Reynolds, L., Koenig-Lewis, N., Doering, H. and Peattie, K., 2022. Competing for legitimacy in the place branding process:(re) negotiating the stakes. *Tourism Management*, 91, p.104532.

Robbins, D., 2005. The origins, early development and status of Bourdieu's concept of 'cultural capital'. *The British journal of sociology*, 56(1), pp.13-30.

Robinson, L., 2009. A taste for the necessary: A Bourdieuan approach to digital inequality. *Information, Communication & Society*, 12(4), pp.488-507.

Rubtsova, A. and Dowd, T.J., 2004. Cultural capital as a multi-level concept: the case of an advertising agency. In *Legitimacy Processes in Organizations* (Vol. 22, pp. 117-146). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Schirato, T., & Roberts, M., 2018. Bourdieu: a critical introduction. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Shariq, M., 2018. Brand equity dimensions-a literature review. *International Research Journal of Management and Commerce*, 5(3), p.312.

Sherry, J.F., 1987. Advertising as a cultural system. *Marketing and semiotics: New directions in the study of signs for sale*, pp.441-461.

Sørensen, A., 2019. The basic concepts of stratification research: class, status, and power. In *Social stratification* (pp. 287-300). Routledge.

Swaminathan, V., Sorescu, A., Steenkamp, J.B.E., O'Guinn, T.C.G. and Schmitt, B., 2020. Branding in a hyperconnected world: Refocusing theories and rethinking boundaries. *Journal of Marketing*, 84(2), pp.24-46.

Ten Brinke, L. and Keltner, D., 2022. Theories of power: Perceived strategies for gaining and maintaining power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 122(1), p.53.

Thomas, G. and Wyatt, S., 2002. Access is not the only problem: Using and controlling the Internet. In *Technology and inequality* (pp. 33-57). Routledge.

Topp, W., 2000. Knowledge System Diagnostics: Applying Foucault's Archaeological Framework to Organizations. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 17, pp. 365-374.

van Deursen, A.J.A.M. and Helsper, E.J., 2015. The third-level digital divide: who benefits most from being online? *Communication and Information Technologies Annual (Studies in Media and Communications, Vol. 10)*.

Van Dijk, J.A., 2005. *The deepening divide: Inequality in the information society*. Sage publications.

Veselinova, E. and Samonikov, M.G., 2020. Defining the Concept of Brand Equity With Radical Transparency. In *Global Branding: Breakthroughs in Research and Practice* (pp. 1-17). IGI Global.

Vukasović, T., 2022. Customer-Based Brand Equity: Conceptual model. *Management*, 19, p.21.

Webb, J., Schirato, T., & Danaher, G., 2002. *Understanding Bourdieu*. Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Widder, N., 2004. Foucault and power revisited. *European Journal of Political Theory*, 3(4), pp.411-432.

Witte, J.C. and Mannon, S.E., 2010. *The Internet and social inequalities*. Routledge.

YÜKSEK, D.A., 2018. Evaluating the Importance of Social Capital for the Conversion of the Forms of Capital: A Critical Approach to the Bourdieusian Model. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 17(3), pp.1090-1106.