Annals of Tourism Research 86 (2021) 103072

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Annals of Tourism Research

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/annals

Accumulation by symbolic dispossession: Tourism development in advanced capitalism

James Fitchett [a], Frank Lindberg [b,*], Diane M. Martin [c]

[a] University of Leicester School of Business, UK
[b] Nord University Business School, Norway
[c] School of Economics, Finance and Marketing, RMIT University, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

Associate editor: Antonio Russo

Keywords:
Tourism development
Critical tourism
Symbolic capital
Symbolic power
Accumulation by dispossession
Tourism space

ABSTRACT

We examine the development of tourism in the Lofoten Islands in Norway to show how the operation of symbolic capital transforms the political economy of space. Whereas prior research has explored the role of symbolic capital in the formation and operation of state structures, less attention has been given to its role in neoliberal transformations within states and efforts to open new markets and opportunities for capital. Our empirical findings show that symbolic capital transforms the Lofoten Islands in four distinct ways through the mechanism of accumulation logics: defining territory, commodification of time and space, legitimacy and authorization, and symbolic power and resistance. We discuss how processes of symbolic accumulation emerge as the most enduring and powerful forms of accumulation by dispossession in advanced capitalist contexts and that the struggle for symbolic capital is often the necessary precursor for the expansion of international tourism markets.

Introduction

Commodification of a place brings economic interests to the forefront of conflicts over use. A growing and well-established body of critical tourism literature which analyses tourism development through the perspective of political economy (Bianchi, 2009, 2011, 2018; Britton, 1991; Fletcher, 2011; Young & Markham, 2020) demonstrates that tourism commodification is not fundamentally different to other forms of commodification. In order to better understand the development of tourism economies it is necessary to examine new modes of capitalist accumulation that emphasise the symbolic, political and discursive aspects of economic development. This study considers how the operation of symbolic power and symbolic capital is implicated in the transformation of places into commodities.

Tourism development involves the transformation of pre-existing resources into tourism resources for the purposes of the tourism economy (St. Martin, 2006). Local practices, traditions and institutions as well as many aspects of cultural, social and economic life are transformed through processes of cultural commodification, marketization and privatization (Castree, 2003; Devine, 2017). There are parallels between these processes and theory of primitive accumulation (Marx, 1990) which delineates how resources in the form of labour, land and natural resources are made available to capital. While all of these resources can be said to pre-exist in the sense that they are not created by capital, a wide range of processes and systems must be enacted in order for them to be appropriated and made available for development. Historically, this has included the commodification and privatization of land, the forceful expulsion of

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: j.fitchett@le.ac.uk (J. Fitchett), frank.lindberg@nord.no (F. Lindberg), diane.martin@rmit.edu.au (D.M. Martin).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.103072
Received 18 May 2019; Received in revised form 1 October 2020; Accepted 4 October 2020
Available online 13 November 2020

indigenous populations, the erasure of indigenous knowledge and epistemologies, the conversion of various forms of collective property rights into exclusive property rights, suppression of access to the commons, commodification of labour power, and the suppression of alternative, indigenous forms of production and consumption. It can also be accompanied by an appropriation of assets (including natural resources), monetization and taxation.

While the theory of primitive accumulation provides a powerful explanation that describes how resources were and are made available to and for capital, there is a danger of understanding these processes as primarily historical, relating to periods when non or pre-capitalist social relations were being transformed into capitalist ones. However, when forms of primitive accumulation are acknowledged in contemporary contexts, they are often situated in places and circumstances that have in one way or another existed beyond the boundaries of modern capitalism but are in the process of being marketized and commodified. For example, a large developing body of research in development and peasant studies (Adnan, 2013) documents various instances of "land grab" across the global south found in a global and colonial genealogy of capitalism (Hall, 2013). Harvey (2005) terms these forms of accumulation as "accumulation by dispossession" whereby resources are dispossessed of one set of uses and values and repurposed for the expansion of capital.

Harvey and others point out that the theory of accumulation by dispossession can be extended well beyond particular historical contexts related to early stages of capitalist development. For instance, Britton (1991) demonstrates the wider role and position of tourism in processes of contemporary capitalist accumulation in terms of both territorial competition and geographically uneven accumulation. Others argue that accumulation is a continuous process sustained into present day (De Angelis, 2001; Glassman, 2006; Sassen, 2010), countering an assumption that accumulation processes occurred only at some imagined original pre-capitalist period after which time and other processes of development take over (Brown, 2009; Read, 2002).

Accumulation by dispossession is integral to the on-going operation and functioning of global capitalism (Perelman, 2000, 2007), including tourism development. Emergent opportunities arising from new technologies such as telecommunications bandwidth (Duncan, 2017) and genetic code (Prudham, 2007) exemplify a form of contemporary dispossession of public, common or state resources into privatized and exclusive assets to show how accumulation by dispossession applies to modern industrial and post-industrial economies. Furthermore, while the accumulation process has often involved acts of fraud, violence and theft, it can also apply to more seemingly ethical and progressive tourism initiatives, which Büscher and Fletcher (2014) refer to as accumulation by conservation. For example, Kelly (2011) discusses how conservationists and participating governments use environmental arguments to dispossess indigenous peoples of land under the auspices of protecting and saving fragile natural wildernesses, many of which then become ideal sites for new forms of tourism, such as eco-tourism and sustainable tourism development.

Capitalism needs ever expanding spaces to enable new markets to develop. Capitalist productions establish protected areas to achieve a "natural" and therefore pleasing environment for wildlife tourists. Indeed, Robbins and Luginbuhl (2005) show that some of the earliest enclosures of public property were those that turned wildlife into a commodity. McAfee argues that,

> "By promoting commoditization as the key both to conservation and to the 'equitable sharing' of the benefits of nature, the global environmental-economic paradigm enlists environmentalism in the service of the worldwide expansion of capitalism. It helps to legitimate and speed the extension of market relations into diverse and complex ecosocial systems, with material and cultural outcomes that do more to diminish than to conserve diversity and sustainability." (McAfee, 1999, p. 134)

In these ways, eco-tourism and other more "progressive" tourism initiatives extend the logic of the market as a means to resolve the very crisis "inherent in accumulation process driving the tourism industries" (Bianchi, 2018, p. 97). Simply constituting an appropriate regulatory response to resource degradation caused by mass tourism does not serve the market.

Accumulation and symbolic power

In advanced capitalist contexts, accumulation by dispossession modes of "creative destruction" (Harvey, 2007) differ not only in terms of the material circumstances of accumulation but also in the form and operation of power. Harvey (2005) identifies the contemporary phase of capitalism as one of new enclosures, of both social and ecological commons in addition to material and productive circumstances (Latorre et al., 2015). A significant feature among forms of accumulation is that they operate not only through economic and material conditions but also within the symbolic field. The neglect of the accumulation literature to consider symbolic power as a central dynamic in the formations of capitalism is not surprising given that its materialist conceptualization serves as the point of departure for most existing accounts of the rise of markets and labour power (Loveman, 2005). However, the operation of symbolic power is equally important to understand the development of modern forms of capitalism and institutions (Dembski & Salet, 2010) and especially in industries such as tourism.

Including the effects of symbolic power in an investigation of the structure of tourism markets does not contradict or reject Marxist insights into processes of commodification. Although the tourist experience appears quite different to a manufactured product or even many commercial service offerings, tourism commodities are commodities like any other. The value of tourism commodities is often thought of as intangible with value derived not through the labour time involved in production but from consumer experience and use value (Young & Markham, 2020). Yet Young and Markham (2020) counter the tendency in tourism research to represent tourist commodities as being in some sense distinct or categorically different to other types of manufactured commodities, arguing that a passing familiarity with Marx's value theory eases these concerns. They argue that "the fact that use values may be immaterial or intangible (i.e. tourist experiences) makes no difference to their ability to satisfy human needs" (Young & Markham, 2020, p. 6) and that commodities with sign-value are commensurable with the Marxian commodity form.

The operation of symbolic power can be applied to any market development in which economic conditions are transforming and

changing. In the case of Lofoten a tourism industry of one form or another has existed for centuries. The focus is not simply on the emergence of new tourism in places where it did not exist previously but also on the transformations that take place from one form of tourism into new forms. These transformations are subtle and can be difficult to observe because many of the physical and material conditions remain and established tourism activities, businesses and tourism labour continue to exist and thrive. Transformations in places where tourism has long existed are predicated on shifting symbolic regimes, i.e. the meaning, legitimacy and classifications of pre-existing forms of tourism as compared to emerging forms.

Pierre Bourdieu defines symbolic power as a form of capital distinct from cultural, economic and social capital. Symbolic power is a subtle and ambiguous form of power that can be exercised only with the complicity of those who are subject to it (Bourdieu, 1991). A limitation of Marxist theory for Bourdieu is that it reduces the social world to the economic field alone (Bourdieu, 1991). In his analysis of *Tourism, Capitalism and Marxist Political Economy*, Bianchi (2011) argues that one of the weaknesses in Marxist thinking is the treatment of non-economic forms of stratification and exploitation. It is important to devise useful ways to interrogate the "structural logics" of power and inequality in twenty-first century capitalist tourism development. Bourdieu's symbolic power offers the additional conceptual tools to examine emerging forms of capital development and capital accumulation, such as tourism, which might otherwise be challenging to explain through Marxist theory.

Marxist scholars have responded to these lines of critique by rejecting the assumption that Marxist theory implies economic reductionism to material production. Eagleton (2011) argues that much critique is not only based on a misunderstanding of Marxist theory but also fails to appreciate that it is in fact capitalism and capitalist ideology that does this most vociferously. Marxist theory does not claim that economic relations are more fundamental to culture, social or political relations. It is therefore understandable that Marxist theorists are sceptical about explanations of social and economic life that rely on Bourdieu and other post-Marxist theory. Yet Desan (2013) rejects the common interpretation that Bourdieusian theory transcends Marxism's narrow economism by extending into the cultural and symbolic spheres. While arguing that while Bourdieu adopts much of the terminology of Marxism (such as the Forms of Capital) he fails to consider that the economic field is itself a sphere of misrecognition. While acknowledging Bourdieu's terminology of cultural and symbolic capital, Harvey is critical about the individual level of analysis on which Bourdieusian theory is based "like atoms floating in a sea of structured aesthetic judgments" (Harvey, 2012, p. 103).

While acknowledging the many disagreements between Bourdieusian and Marxist theory, we follow Desan (2013) and others who suggest that Bourdieu can, in the spirit of theoretical pluralism, be read as an extension to Marxism. Even while extensively criticising Bourdieu, Burawoy (2012) also argues that Marxism did not comprehend its full implications and power and thus missed out on the importance of symbolic domination. He writes,

> "Marxism cannot understand that a classification or representational struggle has to precede class struggle, that is, classes have to be constituted symbolically before they can engage in struggle. Unable to compete in the classification struggle, Marxism loses its symbolic power." (Burawoy, 2012, p. 31)

We concede explanations that attempt to bring together Bourdieu and Marx can be expected to be met with an ambiguous reception by both Marxist and Bourdieusian scholars alike. This is in despite of the fact that in many important respects both theoretical traditions share common concerns and aims and are committed to what we might term the demystification of domination of capital. For Marxists, Bourdieu adds little to what is an already well-established and theoretically consistent analysis of capitalism and the commodity form. For Bourdieusians, there is a need to reconceptualize economic conditions to allow for a greater recognition of the cultural and symbolic practices that constitute capitalist domination. Whereas Marxism together with the theory of primitive accumulation and accumulation by dispossession is ultimately an analysis of class struggle, Bourdieu and the theory of symbolic power supplements this by adding the analysis of the struggle over and for classification. One does not need to debate whether capital accumulation is a class struggle or a classification struggle, it is clearly both. Following Loveman (2005), we suggest that in the case of tourism development, and especially in a context such as Norway, the struggle for classification, which is ultimately a struggle of symbolic power, is the necessary pre-condition for subsequent capital accumulation.

Symbolic accumulation

Marx sees primitive accumulation as existing outside of and initiating capitalist production, yet Bourdieu's theorization suggests that it is always and ever present. Capital accumulation for Bourdieu concerns the monopolization of symbolic resources as forms of capital (Beasley-Murray, 2000). Bourdieu is concerned with how and under what conditions groups employ strategies of capital accumulation, investment and exchange of various kinds in order to maintain or enhance their position. Symbolic structures, including language and discourse, exercise a structure in power only because they themselves are structured, and thus symbolic power can be thought of as power of constructing reality (Bourdieu, 1991). As Mosedale (2011) notes, the language and discourse of tourism development is instrumental in creating, controlling and circulating certain narratives about the tourism economy. For example, discourse concerning the ecological, cultural, economic, and political effects of tourism has given rise to "responsible tourism" practices designed to ensure that positive potentialities outweigh harmful ones (Grimwood et al., 2015).

Symbolic power involves the display of power and privilege through the form of cultural and economic capital and transformation of the social order (Weininger, 2002). It specifically "categorizes, divides, and separates individuals, and through this, constructs social collectivities" (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 120). In contrasts to materialist approaches to market development which identify how institutional, administrative, legal and policy decisions are mobilized to create markets and embed them, the symbolic power approach requires recognition of other forms of organisation that legitimise and naturalise marketization.

Loveman (2005) notes that nowadays coercive power seems less central to the modern state's power than its capacity to order

social life. Explicit economic and political power is less important than the capacity to order social life through the notion that practices are deemed natural, inevitable, or self-evidently useful – especially in often termed "advanced – developed – capitalist" countries where co-opted, internalised soft power is often most effective. In advanced high-income capitalist economies, processes of accumulation by dispossession such as marketization, privatization and commodification operate within a context of developed mixed economy whereby public and state assets as well as any remaining commons are transformed and enclosed for the purposes of capital accumulation. While such transformations are clearly economic in nature, we argue that forms of symbolic transformation must also be considered alongside economic transformations that operate through symbolic or "structural" forms (Büscher & Fletcher, 2017).

Loveman (2005) argues that while research has focused on the variety of ways that modern state institutions exercise symbolic power, less attention has been given to how they are formed through the acquisition of this power in the first place. How then, do states or corporations acquire or accumulate their symbolic power to manage and develop tourism markets? Also, what are the processes of symbolic dispossession that make this accumulation possible? Symbolic power is utilised to legitimise and naturalise the idea of marketization as necessary, progressive and to a certain extent, inevitable. It also influences what form this marketization and commodification should take, and how the consequences on local communities might be legitimately managed and mitigated (Bianchi, 2018). In the context of the political economy of tourism, it is this symbolic power that is mobilized to frame and naturalise beliefs and practices that promote tourism development.

Symbolic power is the ability to make natural and inevitable that which is a product of historical and political contestation; the power to "constitute the given" (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 170). A principle use of symbolic power is to legitimise authority, to give an entity the right to act. Whereas this legitimacy was once the sole monopoly of the state it is increasingly being transferred to corporate, market and private agents. However, while there are notable differences in the ways that states respond to the challenge of tourism development, in all cases there is a mix of state, corporate and non-corporate involvement (Webster et al., 2011). This raises important questions around the legitimacy of various forms of state and non-state institutions to exert power and influence in the development of the tourism economy.

Contemporary political economy theorists (e.g., Crouch, 2011; Harvey, 2011) have consistently sought to challenge the assumption that neoliberalism constitutes a demise of the state and a rise in corporate or non-state power. While it is clear that certain state institutions and interventions are systematically undermined by neoliberal capitalism, this does not mean that state power is necessarily reduced. It is important to not assume a clear or oppositional distinction between corporate power on the one hand and state power on the other. One can argue that powerful state interventions are even necessary for neoliberal capitalism to be extended. What is significant is not the demise of the state as such, but rather the demise of one form of state legitimacy that characterized many post-war western economies and the emergence of a new form of state legitimacy that is more explicitly committed to the pursuit of neoliberal ideology and institutions.

Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) note the paradox that while symbolic power is the recognition of legitimate authority, it produces authority through forms of consensus and the appearance that little or no power is being enacted at all. For tourism markets to develop in advanced societies symbolic capital must be accumulated so that market-based solutions and initiatives are accepted as legitimate, inevitable and "common sense". The accumulation of symbolic power involves pro-market interests constructing new marketized norms and strategies that redefine social life and expectations in subtle and incremental ways (Swyngedouw, 2006).

Research setting and methods: tourism in Lofoten

We conducted a series of in-depth interviews with a range of stakeholders living and working in the Lofoten community in northern Norway. Our aim was to capture the different attitudes, beliefs and experiences about their roles, impacts and implications associated with the development of the tourism industry. Our main interest was in understanding the ways that future tourism development was understood with a specific focus on the contested and disputed representations of possible tourism futures for the destination.

Interviews were undertaken throughout the summer/autumn of 2015 and spring 2016, periods when several tourism initiatives and proposals became relevant during debates related to the tourism strategy (Steen, 2017). Archive data collected in 2017–18 focused on debates occurring in newspapers and social media regarding plans for new large hotels and tourism resort developments, new larger airport and constructions of hiking routes (aka Sherpa routes). Further week-long participant observations were conducted when the entire research team (in 2015), and later the second author alone (in 2017), visited Lofoten with an aim to investigate ongoing and new tourism initiatives. The team lived as tourists in the towns of Svolvær, Henningsvær and Kabelvåg, and joined activities such as a boat trip and hiking while staying at traditional "fisherman cottages".

Twenty-two interviews of between 60 and 90 min (7 female, 15 male; age range: early 20s–early 60s) were undertaken in total with professionals from Destination Management Organisation (DMO) for North Norway and Lofoten (2 participants); local residents (5 participants, Svolvær and Sortland), experienced domestic visitors (5 participants); local business owners/managers operating in the tourism industry (e.g. hotels; cultural and nature-based activities, 6 participants), officials, managers and advisors from the county (3 participants), and one German guide (e.g. guiding mountain hiking in the Leknes/Svolvær area).

The visitors and local residents were selected and invited to participate based on existing networks and relationships with members of the local community. Other participants were invited with help from "Visit Norway" professionals who had extensive expertise on previous and current developments on the Lofoten Islands. This strategic sampling process allowed us to involve stakeholders who had insights on the Lofoten community and tourism developments (Arnould et al., 2006). In order to ensure anonymity, we refer to the stakeholders according to their roles as described above.

A large part of Norway's wealth today is derived from export revenues from oil and gas which make up 38% of total exports and 15% of GDP (2017) (norskpetroleum.no). However, the Norwegian government faces challenges of having to plan and invest for the

post-oil futures which, in addition to other industries, involves the tourism industry (Mjøset & Cappelen, 2011). Government initiatives have resulted in public debates about dispossession of nature for the benefit of various issues including windmill parks, both on land and at sea, power plants, power pylons and over-tourism. Important factors supporting Norway's ability to turn natural resource abundance into economic prosperity include an educated work force, the adoption of advanced technology, stable and reliable institutions, and social democracy (Grytten, 2008).

Lofoten is organised into the six municipalities and has a resident population of around 25,000 people (2018). Its international reputation for natural beauty arises from its dramatic coastal scenery, impressive mountain ranges, ocean vistas, long unspoiled beaches and wilderness landscape. Long an important base for the cod fishing industry, the relative economic importance of fishing has declined somewhat in recent years while tourism has continued to grow. Lofoten and with other locations in the Nordland region have enjoyed greater levels of growth in the tourism economy than other parts of Norway. The current phase of tourist development of Lofoten dates to the early 1990s when the Norwegian government selected Lofoten as one of three areas that would be developed as an iconic tourism destination in Norway. One of the governmental advisors responsible for allocating the funds discussed how many tourism development ideas were supported in the "let the many flowers bloom" strategy for Lofoten. These include a fishing museum in the town of Å, an aquarium in Great Vågan close to Svolvær, and a Viking museum in Borg. Throughout the 2010s further government support was provided for company projects (e.g., Innovation Norway-start-ups, experience-based product development), public development and tourism infrastructure (e.g., hiking trails) including "national tourist roads" initiatives.

Reports from a variety of sources agree that around half a million visitors came to Lofoten in 2016. This influx led local politicians to back proposals for a new tourist tax to finance necessary infrastructure and services associated with the burden of tourism (Eilertsen, 2016). Local media sources reported concerns and frustrations from residents and farmers who feel that the region cannot accommodate further growth. During the tourist seasons from 2015 to 2018, media headlines echoed these concerns: "We need to organise for tourism" (lacking proper infrastructure) and "Lofoten is soon destroyed" (too much littering and tourist misbehaviour) (Lofotposten.no; dn.no; nrk.no; an.no). Various stakeholders argued that Lofoten needs to plan for "tourism so tourists can go kayaking, fishing with dream boats and other things in nature that they are willing to pay for" (DMO professional) which increased calls for building structures such as "hiking trails" and "a bigger airport" (Manager). Evidently, Lofoten needs to be prepared for increased tourism in a post-oil future of Norway.

Defining territory

Viewed from the outside, Lofoten appears to be a relatively unified place. The local residents however describe a much more localised and regionalised understanding of the priorities among the islands. The differing interests of each of the municipalities are rarely aligned and interviewees expressed concern about how the benefits and costs of future tourism developments were likely to be distributed. For instance, local media reports about plans for five new large hotels in Lofoten raised concerns about how increased profits would benefit some local communities while other communities would have to shoulder the burdens of over-tourism (vny.no, 2018). The legitimacy to define how the region should be recognised and understood is a necessary precondition of the potential capital accumulation. The mayor of the municipality Moskenes complains how tourism that redefines the meaning of harbours and ports for the benefit of tourist experiences (lofotposten.no, 2016). Citizens feel that tourists "are worth more" in decisions about housing in Svolvær (lofotposten.no, 2019). Tourism development initiatives which legitimate the treatment of Lofoten as a more or less coherent whole rather than a collection of varying local interests will not only make certain forms of development easier to implement but also threatens to dispossess some existing communities of their ability to retain a sense of autonomy, difference and uniqueness. The indigenous population demands that external interests acknowledge and recognise regional differences is an example of a struggle over symbolic power and a resistance against potential symbolic dispossession.

Several business managers we interviewed expressed their frustration with small-minded attitudes and petty differences between different municipalities and how these impeded important initiatives needed to secure necessary investment for the development of the tourism industry. In discussing plans to develop the international airport that would make it possible for much larger numbers of tourists to come to Lofoten, a hotel manager commented:

> "In this small community it's small talk about little things…if you stand outside you can't understand what there is to argue about, because it would mean a lot for the tourist industry to get a bigger airport."

A DMO professional suggested that growing the tourism potential of the area would ultimately have to rely on capital coming in from outside, and that local concerns were either unable or disinterested in taking an active and central role:

> "A lot of people in the [tourism] industry are not from the Lofoten islands. They are people coming from the outside and seeing the opportunities because local people get blind or they don't care."

External actors justify their tourism development initiatives on the grounds that local interests are unable or unwilling to see the value of growing the tourism sector. These sentiments align progressive, modernising forces clearly with market development and national and international capital interests by invoking an ideology of consumption and consumers: "It is about working with the industry to make experiential concepts that tap more into customer values…which we don't do because it's so fragmented." (DMO professional).

This implies that local, non-market development sentiments are necessarily regressive and non-modern. A DMO professional notes:

> "My impression is that there are people from outside who both see the value of the landscape more clearly than the local people and also they understand the customer needs because they have lived, and they are raised in the south of Norway. They can see the values that this [development] would bring easier than the local people."

This discourse of market progressiveness legitimates the framing and defining of the natural environment and the social life on Lofoten as an underutilised resource that with proper investment and management know-how can be transformed into a range of valuable commodities for the international tourism market. This accumulation logic frames local efforts slow tourism growth as intransigent, a regressive impediment and functions to de-legitimation symbolic power of Lofoten residents.

A topic frequently discussed during interviews is the importance of the natural environment as a commodity that adds value to core business objectives. Some argue that nature must be organised and formally managed in order to preserve it, and that commercial interests are needed to care for the safety and security of larger numbers of tourists (tourism consultant). In order to utilise the natural environment of Lofoten as a tourist commodity, business managers/owners and DMO professionals argue for the need to professionalise nature-based tourism products as well as some prohibitions/restrictions in order to safeguard the welfare of visitors and to protect the fragile natural environment. Investment and support for businesses operating in the tourism experience economy are generally considered to be the most qualified organisations to achieve these safeguards:

> "There are some places in Lofoten…where the paths are ruined because there are too many people walking there [now]…we have one path that has been there for centuries… when it's wet people [tourists] just try to find another path over the grass which causes erosion. Which is a big problem now in Reine." (Local business owner)

A firm (Stibyggjaren AS) was commissioned to build a hiking path up to the popular peak Reinebringen peak. Money both from government and private businesses funded the construction, and the mountain was "reopened" in July 2019 (nrk.no), so tourists could visit the iconic pinnacle, the "Svolvær goat". Debates in social and local media about building tourist paths are based on concerns that development will make the experience uninteresting and predictable for many hikers, while others think the natural environment will suffer (lofotposten.no, 2017). For example, the mayor of Flakstad argues for dedicating certain nature areas to tourists, yet local farmers complain in public meetings and the media how farmland is being designated as hiking paths by tourists (nrk.no, 2018).

On one hand this debate appears to be primarily concerned with environmental protection and tourism welfare. On another hand however, disagreements are essentially about the legitimacy of maintaining free access to the wilderness for both locals and visitors even though this may increase certain risks if existing practices and local knowledge are not respected and followed. From the perspective of local interests, it is legitimate to expect tourists to take personal responsibility and a duty to learn, understand and conform to existing social and cultural practices and norms. They are welcome guests but have to accept certain responsibilities as well as their status as novices in a potentially hostile, fragile and dangerous setting. The other perspective challenges the legitimacy of this position by maintaining that emerging tourism realities require these prior expectations to be superseded with seemingly progressive initiatives aimed at protecting and safeguarding consumers who have a legitimate requirement for their understandable lack of knowledge of local custom, knowledge and practices to be accommodated and catered for, even if this potentially diminishes the enjoyment for locals and existing visitors. The underlying logic and contestation that is manifest through these kinds of disagreements is often misidentified.

This contestation is primarily a struggle over the right to exercise symbolic power to define the space, use and duties of tourists. Even the use of the terms, "visitor", "hiker" or "tourist" are implicated in this symbolic power play. Bourdieu's view of symbolic power stresses that legitimate understandings of the social world are imposed by dominant interests which are internalised by others in the form of practical taken-for-granted understandings. Symbolic power is the capacity to impose classifications and meanings as legitimate (Swartz, 2013) which here includes how to classify the visitor/tourist/hiker, how to assign rights, duties and responsibilities, as well as who has the most legitimate authority over the protection and safeguarding of the natural environment.

The tension being articulated here between the tourist as a valuable source of income on the one hand and a cause of environmental damage on the other, illustrates the logic of symbolic dispossession as a means to grow the tourism market. The pre-existing social contract across Lofoten that is perceived to have sufficed for centuries and inscribed in law (Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment, Outdoor Recreation Act, 1957/1996) with all of its common freedoms and common responsibilities, is deemed to be no longer adequate to respond to the needs, wants and demands of a modern tourist industry. This in turn justifies various acts of symbolic enclosure that serve to delimit, discipline and control what and how visitors should and should not act, where they can go and how they can go there, as well as legitimising the need to greater involvement from a host of tourism-related services and products in the form of authorized tour guides and experience economy businesses that can organise and manage tourists both for their own safety and the protection of the natural environment.

Commodification of time and space

Symbolic accumulation on Lofoten takes the form of a changing mind set as well as the idea that some existing cultural practices need to be adapted and perhaps abandoned altogether. One local resident talked about how the rhythm and pace of life on Lofoten was the consequence of the century old legacy of seasonal cod fishing together with the climate and seasons associated with its northern latitude. Long periods of relative inactivity and dormancy are interjected with shorter periods of frantic, intense activity of the cod fishing season during the winter months. Many Lofoten residents use the quieter, colder and darker months to travel and undertake their own tourist activities in warmer, sunnier destinations. This annual cycle is felt by many residents to be deeply embedded in the culture and way of life of Lofoten but is not necessarily compatible with the demands of the modern international tourism industry.

A tourism business manager described how their organisation was developing strategies aimed specifically at targeting Asian

tourists as a source of future growth to solve the problem of low occupancy during the winter months. The fall and spring months were already busy with attendees for conferences and events, while the summertime vacancies are filled by the established tourism market. The accumulation logic operating here dictates whereby periods of time that were previously outside the market (i.e., the winter months) are now being brought into the productive economy. The smaller, local supply of accommodation for tourists and visitors that pre-existed the arrival of large hotels was sustained without the need to capitalise on the otherwise slow and quiet winter months. The considerable capital investment required to build large hotels means that international operators are less willing to sustain long periods of under-occupancy and must therefore search for new opportunities to utilise spare capacity.

In one interview a local resident involved in various business development initiatives talked about how the owners/operators of a local museum on Lofoten were reluctant to expand the operating season beyond September and thus open up new employment opportunities, saying "To be honest, we are all having five months off in Spain… we couldn't afford [to keep the museum open all year] so actually it's fine as it is." He identified the lower numbers of off-season tourists as a major disincentive for tourist businesses to extend, invest and expand into the shoulder seasons:

> "They [tourism operators] are closed outside the main summer season. That's another problem…they'd like many more [tourists] to come before they open up the doors because that's the main problem…They do want tourists. Just the right way… With lots of money and a genuine interest of the place they are visiting." (Local resident)

Challenging these expectations and lifestyle norms is a major obstacle that needs to overcome by making better use of collaborations with organisations beyond and outside of Lofoten. A tourism consultancy manager commented,

> "We would like to have close participation with the university because…. we need the universities to make tourism more service orientated…. We don't have that in Lofoten. If you do outdoor activities in Norway, it's much more about philosophy and being in and understanding nature and the heritage you bring with you as a Norwegian, the culture and heritage you have and so on. You speak more about these things than you speak about the modern way of [organising] outdoor activities."

The Lofoten area represents a considerable opportunity for businesses wishing to service tourists, and the overall economic development of the region is an important priority in terms of regional development and sustainable communities. This includes implementing greater professionalisation of the existing tourism industry and thinking about it as an "industry" rather than some kind of amorphous "way of life" which necessitates introducing a more coherent service culture and expanding service-based employment opportunities (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006). A DMO manager commented:

> "I think we need clever people to be in [the tourism experience economy] —because you have transportation, accommodation, eating/dining, and you have the experiences. This is the place where people are willing to put their money but it's also challenging to be able to produce world-class experiences. So, you need good, educated people, and people who understand how to be a good guide."

In order for these priorities to be achieved symbolic dispossession takes place whereby previously accepted norms, practices and institutions are de-normalized, delegitimised and allowed or facilitated to disappear so that new market-based norms and institutions and practices can be established. Marketization and growth, i.e. development of tourism, is contingent first on a form symbolic accumulation in which commodification as well as some privatization are normalized.

Legitimacy and authorization

Symbolic power is the power to legitimise and is accomplished by simultaneous acts of de-legitimisation and de-authorization. The distillation of what are contingent and potential courses of action into legitimate, "practical" and "common-sense" solutions takes place first and foremost through symbolic regimes – through utterances, argumentation and specialised discourse. Symbolic power takes a subtle, and "low-level" form that can only ever be evidenced in the analysis of "everyday" speech and justification. Only once this symbolic transformation is achieved does it become possible to realise initiatives through economic, political, institutional and material processes. The following comment from a tourism business manager illustrates this sensemaking in action:

> "The problem is that there are a lot of small companies [operating in the tourism economy] … and they are very much occupied in doing business for today. They are eager to spend money and time for resources, but they don't have the funds to do it. …. They have the skills and the knowledge, but the business is basically too small."

This justification attempts to rationalize the perception that one of the main obstacles to achieving the necessary growth in tourism development stems from a business environment characterized by too much fragmentation and too many locally operated small businesses. There is a lack of concentration of capital and professional expertise, and too much of a focus on short term immediate operational considerations at the expense of long-term strategic ones. Positive attitudes towards tourism development by existing local providers and a will to develop is not and cannot be sufficient. The implication here is that it logically and reasonably follows that the desired development can *only* be achieved through the consolidation of existing small businesses into larger corporate entities or by attracting larger national and multinational organisations to take a larger strategic role in tourism development. The consequences of such a course of action would inevitably result in a fundamental dispossession for some if not many of the current "small" local providers of their livelihoods and current modes of operation. Symbolic dispossession is evident through the opaque and subtle justifications that different stakeholders use to explain and qualify what they see as the most appropriate and legitimate forms of tourism and tourist development.

Symbolic power and resistance

Resistance to marketized tourism by locals and residents frequently appears to centre on a struggle over the symbolic legitimacy of a perceived set of values and qualities and how these are potentially threatened by competing symbolic regimes around tourism development. A local resident explained,

> "You have to remember that tourism is not an industry in Norway. It's a way of life. It's not to make money. The main motive is to get to know people from other countries with other interests… You [the tourist] are my personal guest…Work with the farmer take part in the daily life. That is more like the tourist in Norway."

Underpinning these voices is the general commitment to the continuation of the Norwegian model of consensual capitalism characterized by the predominance of small and medium-sized companies rather than global capital and corporate interests (Bieler, 2012).

A DMO manager discussed how many local service providers lack the necessary disposition and outlook to fully capitalise on the tourism potential for the region, implying that this mind set needed to be challenged and overcome in order to make any significant progress. Discussing public transport provisioning she commented:

> "Transport operators don't see themselves as providing tourism. They see themselves as primarily a transporter from A to B for the local people. That's some of the criticism…that they don't look at themselves as a tourism company. They don't see themselves as providing this kind of service."

The general feeling that pervades attitudes among many Lofoten stakeholders, is that tourism is and should continue to be understood as secondary to the priority of fishing and other industries. Locals contend that tourists to Lofoten should not be granted any particular or exclusive status as compared to other visitors, migrants and locals. Resistance towards developing service-culture norms indicate a struggle which involves the legitimacy to say how things "are" and how things "should be". This is the struggle for symbolic power, a classification struggle, over the definition of what is to be the most legitimate form of capital for a particular field. It is not only a struggle for valued resources but also struggle over defining just what a resource is and how it should be valued (Swartz, 2013).

These acts of resistance to symbolic power draw upon multiple discourses and stories as means of justification, such as the need to protect and preserve the fragile natural wilderness from the likely damage caused by large numbers of tourists who have no real commitment to the sustainability of the region. Locals position themselves as stewards with a selfless custodial responsibility to defend and protect the environment and their own way of life from the deleterious effects caused by the potential influx of ill-informed, self-interested and vulnerable tourist consumers who are only interested in their own short term, immediate gratification, enjoyment and leisure.

Tourism development interests that include national and international businesses as well as government agencies tasked with developing the region, frame modern tourism as a priority driver for economic growth and sustainability. These arguments appear convincing in a situation when other industries (e.g., fishing) face changing economic futures. Apparent objections, intransigence and resistance from locals are perceived as out-dated, obstructive and old fashioned, which in turn justifies marketization and development as forms of social and economic progress. Disagreements about the economic and cultural development of tourism on Lofoten can be characterized as struggles over symbolic capital, establishing legitimacy and authority to determine possible scenarios for future tourism development. Local residents frequently question the legitimacy of the label "tourist", preferring to discuss the long tradition on Lofoten of hosting and welcoming visitors as guests. Whereas the tourist suggests a person with demands and needs that local providers are required to service and supply, the "guest" on other hand is mutually obliged to respect and try to fit into local traditions and practices and accept the authority and legitimacy of local knowledge and interests. Tourism business interests thus evoke different, albeit equally vague, myths to legitimise their own position, many of which essentialise market and private interests as inevitable, progressive and common sense. These struggles for symbolic power play out in the broader cultural context of Norwegian identity and society where respect for the collective and inclusive representation along with the avoidance of conflict are important shared symbolic values.

Conclusion

Our analysis of the contestations and debates about the growth of tourism in Lofoten shows how understanding the demands of modern capitalism can be enhanced by considering the way that symbolic capital structures the debate around tourism development. Whereas prior research has explored the role of symbolic capital in the formation and operation of state structures (Loveman, 2005) less attention has been given to its role in neoliberal transformations within states and efforts to open new markets and opportunities for capital.

Our findings show that symbolic capital transforms the Lofoten Islands in four distinct ways through the mechanism of accumulation logics: 1) defining territory, 2) commodification of time and space, 3) legitimacy and authorization, and 4) symbolic power and resistance. The first, and most obvious perhaps, is how the territory is redefined, for example from being a local and regional area with six united municipalities to becoming one entity with great symbolic differences depending on the degree of success in tourism. Second, commodification of time and space are evident in how symbolic accumulation takes the form of a changing mindset as well as the idea that some existing cultural practices need to be adapted and perhaps abandoned altogether. For example, the annual cycle of Lofoten which was a consequence of the old legacy of seasonal cod fishing, is not necessarily compatible with the demands of the modern international tourism industry.

Third, symbolic power is the power to legitimise and is accomplished by simultaneous acts of de-legitimisation and de-

authorization. Accumulation logics take a subtle, and "low-level" form that over time imparts symbolic transformation, enabling initiatives through economic, political, institutional and material processes. We show how this may happen when larger national and multinational organisations' role in tourism development are slowly legitimised because local tourism businesses are deemed too small and consequently lack capital and professional expertise. Finally, symbolic power and resistance refer to how locals resist marketized tourism through struggle over the symbolic legitimacy of a perceived set of values and qualities. For example, we show how the resistance towards developing a professional service-culture norm indicates a struggle for symbolic power, a classification struggle, over what a resource is and how it should be valued.

In broader terms, tourism is a sector in which capitalism conceals its contradictions, such as the idea that nature, wildernesses and wildlife can be best protected and saved by privatizing, commodifying and exploiting them (Duffy, 2015). Symbolic accumulation is arguably no more disruptive than other forms of dispossession, but the violence is of a symbolic nature (Parker, 1999) which Bourdieu terms "symbolic violence". In tourism contexts, developments through privatization, marketization and commodification of various aspects of organic social life are forms of disruption (Büscher & Fletcher, 2017). These disruptions are often imperceptible and invisible even to those that are affected most because accumulation logics are exerted for the most part through communication, recognition, or even feeling (Bourdieu, 1991).

Our analysis contributes to calls by leading political economy theorists in tourism research to move beyond what Bianchi (2018) recently referred to as the theoretically-barren debates over tourism's contribution to development. Our research illustrates how processes of symbolic accumulation emerge as the most enduring and powerful forms of what Harvey (2005) terms accumulation by dispossession in advanced capitalist contexts and that the struggle for symbolic capital is often the necessary precursor for the expansion of capitalism more generally.

The demand for new types of accumulation implies new forms of dispossession. This includes the transformation of existing tourism economies into more professionalised forms of tourism. Our research demonstrates how forms of symbolic dispossession need to take place in order for tourism to develop and change. To achieve these transformations, interests of global capital and the state collaborate to solidify credibility which relies upon the accumulation of symbolic capital and symbolic power. In communities like Lofoten, these transformations are experienced as struggles over legitimacy; the power to determine what is necessary and desirable as well as what needs to be given up for the sake of development and growth. As tourism grows and changes, the struggle over symbolic power, which can be thought of as "struggles of classification", can be expected to become more significant as new symbolic regimes are needed to justify and legitimate on-going commodification in the tourism economy.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

This article is dedicated to the memory of professor Per Østergaard who was supposed to be co-authoring this article. He worked at the Department of Marketing and Management, University of Southern Denmark. Sadly, he passed away during the work with the research project. We dedicate this article to his memory.

References

Adnan, S. (2013). Land grabs and primitive accumulation in deltaic Bangladesh: Interactions between neoliberal globalization, state interventions, power relations and peasant resistance. *The Journal of Peasant Studies, 40*(1), 87–128.
Arnould, E. J., Price, L., & Moisio, R. (2006). Making contexts matter: Selecting research contexts for theoretical insights. In *Handbook of qualitative research methods in marketing* (pp. 106–125).
Beasley-Murray, J. (2000). Value and capital in Bourdieu and Marx. In N. Brown, & I. Szeman (Eds.), *Pierre Bourdieu: Fieldwork in culture* (pp. 100–119). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
Bianchi, R. V. (2009). The "critical turn" in tourism studies: A radical critique. *Tourism Geographies, 11*(4), 484–504.
Bianchi, R. V. (2011). Tourism, capitalism and Marxist political economy. In J. Mosedale (Ed.), *Political economy of tourism: A critical perspective* (pp. 17–38). London: Routledge.
Bianchi, R. V. (2018). The political economy of tourism development: A critical review. *Annals of Tourism Research, 70*, 88–102.
Bieler, A. (2012). Small Nordic countries and globalization: Analysing Norwegian exceptionalism. *Competition and Change, 16*(3), 224–242.
Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Polity Press.
Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Polity Press.
Britton, S. (1991). Tourism, capital and place: Towards a critical geography of tourism. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 9*, 451–478.
Brown, T. (2009). The time of globalization: Rethinking primitive accumulation. *Rethinking Marxism, 21*(4), 571–584.
Burawoy, M. (2012). Marx meets Bourdieu. In *Karl Von Holdt & Michael Burawoy, Conversations with Bourdieu: The Johannesburg moment* (pp. 31–35). Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
Büscher, B., & Fletcher, R. (2014). Accumulation by conservation. *New Political Economy, 20*(2), 273–298.
Büscher, B., & Fletcher, R. (2017). Destructive creation: Capital accumulation and the structural violence of tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 25*(5), 651–667.
Castree, N. (2003). Commodifying what nature? *Annual Review of Sociology, 33*, 273–297.
Crouch, C. (2011). *The strange non-death of neoliberalism*. London: Polity Press.
De Angelis, M. (2001). Marx and primitive accumulation: The continuous character of capital's enclosures. *The Commoner, 2*, 1–22.
Dembski, S., & Salet, W. (2010). The transformative potential of institutions: How symbolic markers can institute new social meaning in changing cities. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space, 42*(3), 611–625.
Desan, M. H. (2013). Bourdieu, Marx, and capital: A critique of the extension model. *Sociological Theory, 31*(4), 318–342.
Devine, J. A. (2017). Colonizing space and commodifying place: tourism's violent geographies. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 25*(5), 634–650.

Duffy, R. (2015). Nature-based tourism and neoliberalism: Concealing contradictions. *Tourism Geographies, 17*(4), 529–543.
Duncan, J. (2017). Accumulation by symbolic dispossession: The Digital Terrestrial Television transition in South Africa. *Media Culture and Society, 39*(5), 611–629.
Eagleton, T. (2011). *Why Marx Was Right*. Yale University Press.
Eilertsen, H. (2016). Lofoten's big headache – We need to take control. Retrieved from. High North News. http://www.highnorthnews.com/lofotens-store-hodepine-na-ma-vi-ha-handa-pa-rattet/.
Fletcher, R. (2011). Sustaining tourism, sustaining capitalism? The tourism industry's role in global capitalist expansion. *Tourism Geographies, 13*(3), 443–461.
Glassman, J. (2006). Primitive accumulation, accumulation by dispossession, accumulation by "extra-economic" means. *Progress in Human Geography, 30*(5), 608–625.
Grimwood, B., Yudin, O., Muldoon, M., & Qiu, J. (2015). Responsibility in tourism: A discursive analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research, 50*, 22–38.
Grytten, O. (2008). The economic history of Norway. In R. Whaples (Ed.), *EH.Net encyclopedia*. Retrieved from http://eh.net/encyclopedia/the-economic-history-of-norway/.
Hall, D. (2013). Primitive accumulation, accumulation by dispossession and the global land grab. *Third World Quarterly, 34*(9), 1582–1604.
Harvey, D. (2005). *The new imperialism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 610*(1), 21–44.
Harvey, D. (2011). *The enigma of capital and the crisis of capitalism*. Croydon, UK: Profile Books.
Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution*. London: Verso.
Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2006). More than an "industry": The forgotten power of tourism as a social force. *Tourism Management, 27*, 1192–1208.
Kelly, A. B. (2011). Conservation practice as primitive accumulation. *Journal of Peasant Studies, 38*(4), 683–701.
Latorre, S., Farrell, K. N., & Martínez-Aliera, J. (2015). The commodification of nature and socio-environmental resistance in Ecuador: An inventory of accumulation by dispossession cases, 1980–2013. *Ecological Economics, 116*, 58–69.
Loveman, M. (2005). The modern state and the primitive accumulation of symbolic power. *American Journal of Sociology, 110*(6), 1651–1683.
Marx, K. (1990). *[1867]. Capital, Volume I. Ben Fowkes (Trans.)*. London: Penguin Books.
McAfee, K. (1999). Selling nature to save it? Biodiversity and the rise of green developmentalism. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 17*, 133–154.
Mjøset, L., & Cappelen, A. (2011). The integration of the Norwegian oil economy into the world economy. In L. Mjøset (Ed.), *The Nordic varieties of capitalism (comparative social research)* (pp. 167–263). Emerald Group Publishing.
Mosedale, J. (2011). Re-introducing tourism to political economy. In J. Mosedale (Ed.), *Political economy of tourism: A critical perspective* (pp. 1–14). London: Routledge.
Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment. (1957/1996). Outdoor Recreation Act, 28 June 1957, no. 16. Retrieved from https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/outdoor-recreation-act/id172932/.
Parker, G. (1999). Rights, symbolic violence, and the micropolitics of the rural: The case of the parish paths partnership scheme. *Environment and Planning A, 31*(7), 1207–1222.
Perelman, M. (2000). *The invention of capitalism: Classical political economy and the secret of primitive accumulation*. London, UK: Duke University Press.
Perelman, M. (2007). Primitive accumulation from feudalism to neoliberalism. *Capitalism Nature Socialism, 18*(2), 44–61.
Prudham, S. (2007). The fictions of autonomous invention: Accumulation by dispossession, commodification and life patents in Canada. *Antipode, 39*(3), 406–429.
Read, J. (2002). Primitive accumulation: The aleatory foundation of capitalism. *Rethinking Marxism, 14*(2), 24–49.
Robbins, P., & Luginbuhl, A. (2005). The last enclosure: Resisting privatization of wildlife in the Western United States. *Capitalism Nature Socialism, 16*, 45–61.
Sassen, S. (2010). A savage sorting of winners and losers: Contemporary versions of primitive accumulation. *Globalizations, 7*(1–2), 23–50.
St. Martin, K. (2006). Disrupting enclosure in New England fisheries. *Capitalism Nature Socialism, 16*(1), 63–80.
Steen, T. (2017). *Strategiplan - Lofoten som reisemål 2017–2022 (Strategy - Lofoten as destination 2017–22)*. Svolvær, Lofoten: Destinasjon Lofoten og Lofotrådet.
Swartz, D. (2013). *Symbolic power, politics and intellectuals*. Chicago, USA: University of Chicago Press.
Swyngedouw, E. (2006). Dispossessing H2O: The contested terrain of water privatization. *Capitalism Nature Socialism, 16*(1), 81–98.
Webster, C., Ivanov, S., & Illum, S. (2011). "The paradigms of political economy and tourism policy: NTOs and state policy". In J. Mosedale (Ed.), *Political Economy and Tourism* (pp. 55–73). Oxford: Routledge.
Weininger, E. B. (2002). Pierre Bourdieu on social class and symbolic violence. In E. Olin Wright (Ed.), *Approaches to class analysis* (pp. 119–179). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Young, M., & Markham, F. (2020). Tourism, capital, and the commodification of place. *Progress in Human Geography, 44*(2), 276–296.

James Fitchett is a Professor of Marketing and Consumer Research at University of Leicester, UK. Email: j.fitchett@le.ac.uk. His research has been published in Journal of Marketing Management, Journal of Consumer Behaviour, Marketing Theory, Journal of Macromarketing, European Advances in Consumer Research, Consumption, Markets and Culture, Business Ethics: A European Review, European Journal of Marketing and British Journal of Management.

Frank Lindberg is a Professor of Marketing at Nord University Business School, Norway. Email: frank.lindberg@nord.no. He earned his PhD in 2001 at Copenhagen Business School, Denmark. Since then he has worked as Associate Professor at University of Nordland and University of Gothenburg, and Vice Dean and Dean at Bodø Graduate School of Business. His research covers areas such as the dynamics of tourism markets and tensions and challenges of consumption.

Diane M. Martin is a Professor of Marketing in the School of Economics, Finance and Marketing at RMIT University. Email Diane.Martin@RMIT.edu.au. Her research focuses on consumer culture, market development, gender and sustainability. She has published in the Journal of Consumer Research, Consumption, Markets & Culture, the Journal of Business Ethics, the Journal of Macromarketing, Qualitative Marketing Research, the Journal of Applied Communication Research and Communication Research Reports.