2007-07-01

A Cultural Models Approach to Service Recovery

Glenn L. Christensen
glennc@byu.edu

Gaby Odekerken-Schröder

Torsten Ringberg

Original Publication Citation

G.L. Christensen, T. Ringberg, G. Odekerken-Schroder. "A Cultural Models Approach to Service Recovery Expectations", Journal of Marketing 7, 27.

Torsten Ringberg, Gaby Odekerken-Schröder, & Glenn L. Christensen

A Cultural Models Approach to Service Recovery

Service recovery research remains conflicted in its understanding of consumers' recovery expectations and of why similar goods or service failures may lead to different recovery expectations. The authors argue that this conflict results from the assumption that consumer recovery expectations are monolithic and largely homogeneous, driven mainly by behavioral, relational, or contextual stimuli. Instead, recovery scenarios involving high-involvement (i.e., self-relevant) goods and service failures may activate closely held, identity-related cultural models that, though ultimately applied to regain balance (a foundational schema), differ according to their sociocultural heritage and create a range of unique consumer recovery preferences. The authors empirically identify three embodied cultural models—relational, oppositional, and utilitarian—that consumers apply to goods or service failures. Furthermore, the authors discuss implications for service recovery research and services marketing practice and introduce adaptive service recovery diagnostics that enable providers to identify and respond to consumers' varying recovery preferences.

Research in consumer behavior suggests that most consumer–provider interactions are fundamentally relational. According to Johnson and Selnes (2004), companies prosper by allocating resources to build enduring interactions with their customers. This preoccupation with enabling and improving relationships is reflected in the services literature as well (see Gwinner, Gremler, and Bitner 1998). Thus, a dedicated relational terminology has evolved, such as "service communality" to explain consumer–provider friendship (Goodwin 1996, p. 292) and "commercial friendship" to describe consumers' perceptions of their relationships with marketers (Price and Arnould 1999). Similarly, McCallum and Harrison (1985) suggest that service encounters are first and foremost social encounters.

The far-reaching assumption within the services literature that most types of consumer–provider interactions are relational has flowed downstream to recovery research. Here, researchers argue that a satisfactory recovery varies according to a range of relational factors, including consumers' brand relationship level (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004), the duration of the relationship (Bolton 1998), and consumers' relational recovery expectations (Anderson and Sullivan 1993).

The findings from these research projects disagree about why one or more recovery initiatives (e.g., apology, empathy, compensation, replacement, explanation, timeliness, assurance of no recurrence) are indispensable in one situation but pointless in another. The jury remains out about the cause of these contradictions (see Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekaran 1998), but we argue that they are the result of the provider failing to account for consumers' cultural models, which create unique recovery preferences and expectations after a goods or service failure. Moreover, our finding that more than one cultural model is in use across a population group speaks to Smith, Bolton, and Wagner's (1999) cautionary remarks that customers may not be as homogeneous as previously assumed in terms of their evaluation of the effectiveness of service recovery attempts. Each identified cultural model sets the stage for a unique customer–provider interaction, and two models contradict the predominantly relationally oriented recovery paradigm. Barnes's (1997) finding that many respondents reported that they were highly satisfied but did not feel close to the provider suggests that not all consumers apply a relationally oriented cultural model in their framing of marketers and, by extension, recovery situations.

Research in cultural psychology supports the notion that understanding and expectations are influenced by how people frame the world (D'Andrade 1992b; Holland 1992; Strauss and Quinn 1997). Cultural models govern most daily interactions, including social, professional, and personal dealings, and are enabled and confined by the larger sociocultural settings within which people exist and through which they traverse. Typically, cultural models are tied in clusters to underlying, embodied foundational schemas (e.g., balance, journey, container) to which they give a range of cultural expressions. By understanding the cultural

Torsten Ringberg is an assistant professor, Department of Marketing, Sheldon B. Lubar School of Business, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee (e-mail: ringberg@uwm.edu). Gaby Odekerken-Schröder is an associate professor, Department of Marketing and Marketing Research, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Maastricht University (e-mail: g.schroder@mw.unimaas.nl). Glenn L. Christensen is an assistant professor, Department of Business Management, Marriott School of Management, Brigham Young University (e-mail: glennc@byu.edu). The authors thank the two anonymous *JM* reviewers and Dwayne Gremler for their many helpful comments. Furthermore, the authors gratefully acknowledge the support of Midwest Airlines and research grants from the Marriott School of Management at Brigham Young University.

To read and contribute to reader and author dialogue on JM*, visit http://www.marketingpower.com/jmblog.*

ISSN: 0022-2429 (print), 1547-7185 (electronic)

models consumers apply to a service recovery context, providers may anticipate consumer recovery expectations, which could enable them to fine-tune their recovery initiatives and improve consumer recovery satisfaction (e.g., Hess, Ganesan, and Klein 2003).

The lack of an overarching theoretical and methodological approach to recovery research has left the field with conflicting findings and no systematic resolution. We propose just such an overarching theoretical approach. In this article, we investigate the cultural models on which consumers rely when they interact with providers during service or goods failures and subsequent recovery initiatives, and we identify three major cultural models: relational, oppositional, and utilitarian. Whereas a cultural model perspective is integrated into some consumer behavior research (Brumbaug 2002; Holt 1998; Thompson 1997), it is largely absent in services marketing (cf. Arnould and Price 1993) and entirely lacking in service recovery research. We argue that applying a cultural models approach to service recovery research (1) offers a novel approach to identify and segment consumer recovery expectations, (2) links the foundational schema of balance to cultural model representations, (3) categorizes consumers' recovery preferences according to how they perceive the provider–consumer interaction, (4) suggests a theoretically grounded explanation of the inconsistencies and contradictions in extant recovery research that may help reduce unexplained variance, (5) enables providers to develop adaptive service recovery initiatives that more closely resonate with consumers' different recovery preferences, and (6) sets the stage for identifying cultural models that are active among consumers engaged with services marketing.

Theoretical Background

Researchers who study the intersection of culture and cognition argue compellingly that cognition consists of subsets of shared cultural models that organize much of how people make sense of the world (D'Andrade 1992a; Dimaggio 1997; Macrae and Bodenhausen 2001; Quinn and Holland 1993; Shore 1996; Strauss and Quinn 1997); yet people in any given social environment are clearly not cognitive clones. Greater social mobility and divergent life experiences inevitably produce heterogeneous "thought communities" (Shore 1996, p. 17), though their divergence is confined to available sociocultural resources. Each thought community is identified by the specific interpretive strategy or cultural model that it applies to make sense of a particular issue. According to D'Andrade (1992b, p. 29), a schema (i.e., cultural model) can be understood as "an interpretation which is frequent, well organized, memorable [and] which can be made from minimal cues, contains one or more prototypic instantiations, is resistant to change, etc." Cultural models are embedded in the flow of discourses and become internalized through experiential (e.g., exposure, practices, social feedback) and conceptual (e.g., media, books) processes (Dimaggio 1997). Thus, cultural models serve as both personal cognitive resources and cognitive templates for people (Macrae and Bodenhausen 2001; Shore 1996) and are typically heterogeneously distributed across a population.

Because cultural models organize people's comprehension, they reduce cognitive dissonance, confirm existing belief systems, and discount contrary evidence (Holland and Valsiner 1988). Accordingly, they provide a directive force that categorizes reality by typifying a person's world view and aspirations, as well as his or her normative expectations about how to act and react to people and situations (see Hundeide 1985; Zaltman 1997). For example, in organizational research, Schminke, Ambrose, and Noel (1997) illustrate how people's moral judgments are guided by the cultural models they apply. In providing "sustenance and justification for reasoning, intentions, and action in life, that is, common sense" (Jensen 1987, p. 24), cultural models also provide people with a sense that they live in a world of comprehensible experiences. Cultural models influence everyday life, including how consumers make sense of the marketplace (Zaltman and Coulter 1995).

Cultural models typically emerge from deeper and more widely shared foundational schemas (Shore 1996). Foundational schemas are the most abstract concepts, commonly derived from concrete, universal, bodily experiences, such as balance, body as container, or journey (see also deep metaphors by Lakoff and Johnson [1980]). For example, the "dreamtime" schema (based on the deep metaphor of journey) underlies many Australian aborigines' cultural practices and cultural models (Ross 1997). In contrast, Samoan cultural practices and models pivot around a center–periphery foundational schema (Shore 1996). As foundational schemas become instantiated, animated, and endowed with different cultural "surface" meanings (i.e., cultural models) in different domains of experience (Holland and Quinn 1987), heterogeneous meaning communities arise. For example, in Thompson and Troester's (2002) analysis of microcultures in the natural health marketplace, the search for harmonious balance (foundational schema) is articulated through a multitude of healing philosophies (i.e., cultural models), from homeopathy and macrobiotics to naturopathy and Ayurvedic approaches. Though articulated differently, the foundational schema of harmonious balance provides at least some members of natural health communities with a deep sensation of related worldviews. However, investigations of cultural manifestations of foundational schemas remain rare, which is unfortunate because if researchers do not engage in the rhythm and flow of the cultural milieu within which a foundational schema is expressed, they overlook remarkable insights that could be garnered from its various and, at times, conflicting cultural manifestations (Csordas 1994).

Cultural expressions of foundational schemas (internalized as cultural models) serve as cognitive tool sets that help people navigate and respond to the world around them and create a sense of self. Typically, they change only gradually (e.g., acceptance of gender equality); dramatic changes often come at the expense of social upheaval and are a threat to the core sense of self. Broadly speaking, two categories of cultural models exist. The first category is peripheral to the sense of self and includes cultural models elicited in response to situation-specific environmental

inputs and feedbacks. These more superficial (to self) cultural models act as scripts within which social norms and ordinary discourse are nested (Bicchieri 2006). They are regularly updated when the gap between their instantiation and the feedback from the environment grows too large.

The second category of cultural models is more centrally related to the core sense of self (i.e., identity related). Although both categories become anchored in neurological pathways, identity-related cultural models tend to be "stickier" and less susceptible to situational amendment. That is, changes to identity-related cultural models constitute the equivalent of a conversion experience (Campbell 1995, p. 113). Informatively, this "stickiness" is associated with "cognitive conservatism" (Hoch and Deighton 1989) and follows research on identity that suggests that the self consists of a supersaturated cluster of core (identity-related) cultural models that tend toward consistency and stability over time (Hogg and McGarty 1990; Wiley and Alexander 1987). In proposing a neurobiological argument, Peracchio and Tybout (1996) argue that cultural models are not easily purged or replaced because of the considerable, ongoing cognitive efforts involved in reconfiguring established neurological–cognitive connections. Research suggests that people apply substantive cognitive processing and deeply held, well-learned, self-pertinent convictions and tropes to situations that interfere with self-relevant goal pursuits (i.e., high self-relevance) (Bandura 1989; Carver and Scheier 1990; Macrae and Bodenhausen 2001, p. 248) and to stressful situations (Kruglanski and Webster 1996).

In relating this personal-relevance threshold insight to recovery research, we argue that consumers who experience high-involvement (i.e., self-relevant) breaches rely on identity-related cultural models (see Hundeide 1985; Thompson 1997; Zaltman 1997). For example, a person en route to an important meeting who is served a lukewarm cup of coffee at a drive-through venue is likely to invoke more superficial cultural models to address the specific issue and thus may simply request a refill (with hotter coffee), essentially paying little heed to the incident. However, had the venue also fumbled with the payment and caused a prolonged delay, the situation would likely turn increasingly self-relevant (i.e., being late to the meeting) because it interferes with personal goal achievement and thus elicits a more profound reaction, bringing forth identity-related cultural models.

Various implications of the cultural models approach emerge for recovery and services research. When identity-related cultural models are initiated, consumers apply them uniformly across contexts, regardless of whether the failure stems from a provider's procedural, interactional, or distributive breach. Moreover, given that the genesis of identity-related cultural models is based within a range of influential sociohistorical discourses, different cultural models lead to divergent consumer perceptions of providers and recovery expectations. We explore the range of these expectations next. On the basis of these findings, we then show how the cultural models approach may help resolve contradictory findings within existing recovery research while assisting providers in developing more individuated and adaptive recovery initiatives.

Method

Twenty-four informants who had experienced goods/service failures were recruited. We aimed for sufficient diversity while ensuring some similarity among subsets of participants to explore relationships to traditional demographics, psychographics, and sociocultural signifiers in identified themes. Fewer informants are needed because cultural models are not private affairs (Gergen 1994), so deeper, collectively held beliefs and values can be identified from a relatively small sample. We identified an equal portion of informants through the customer service department of a major midwestern airline and from fliers posted in public places (e.g., libraries, restaurants). Each informant received $50 as compensation.

We employed the Zaltman Metaphor Elicitation Technique (ZMET; see Zaltman 1997; Zaltman and Coulter 1995), a semistructured, in-depth interview format that focuses on uncovering informants' deep-seated beliefs and values. This approach has been recommended for exploring deeply held and shared cultural models (Keller 2003). We used open-ended wordings to stimulate generally held thoughts and feelings across goods/service failures, as well as informants' expectations of the provider in the wake of a failure. In preparation for the interview, each informant wrote down at least five thoughts and feelings about goods/service failures. The informants shared a range of goods and service experiences that extended across years, which mitigates concerns about context and recency effects. Following the ZMET approach and Quinn and Holland's (1993) recommendation that the elicitation of folk knowledge should include an eclectic exploitation of all possible sources, we also asked the informants to bring pictures that illustrated their thoughts and feelings about goods/service failures. According to Heisley and Levy (1991), photo elicitation techniques both stimulate and bring to the conscious level informants' deeply held thoughts and feelings, providing additional insights into their "hidden minds" (Zaltman 2002). The combination of approaches elicited rich and descriptive insights into the informants' conceptual landscapes. The interviews were slated to take about two hours but often extended beyond this period because of the informants' involvement and interest in sharing their thoughts and feelings.

Analysis

Our interpretive analysis follows the approach outlined by the grounded theory framework (i.e., open, axial, and selective coding) (see also Strauss and Corbin 1990). It is a discovery-oriented system (Wells 1993) that follows a sequential process in which the analyst identifies and labels each unique meaning construct in each narrative. The initial code list is modified and elaborated on as the hermeneutical analysis progresses and as newly encountered meaning constructs inform previously identified ones. The coding process produced more than 200 unique meaning constructs, illustrated by 1200 quotations contained in 405 single-spaced pages of text. No new constructs emerged after the 11th interview, which is largely in line with the findings of Zaltman (1997) and Zaltman and Coulter

(1995). Our independent and double-coding processes converged in most cases; we discussed and resolved any discrepancies.

Following an iterative process, we combined related constructs into metaconstructs. For example, we combined the constructs "feeling exposed," "need to keep your guard up," and "should have been cautious" into the metaconstruct "feeling vulnerable." In turn, we linked metaconstructs within each narrative with one another according to the flow of the narrative, and finally we collapsed them into dominant themes (for details, see Thompson 1997). In addition to the textual analysis, we produced cognitive maps (Christensen and Olson 2002) for each narrative, depicting both core constructs and their linkages as expressed by informants. These cognitive maps provided an additional tool with which to identify themes and clusters both within and across narratives. As the analysis progressed, three dominant cultural models emerged—relational, oppositional, and utilitarian—each of which dominated a subset of narratives (see Table 1).

Findings

Balance

Before discussing the cultural models that influence consumers' recovery expectations and preferences, we briefly address the notion of the foundational schema (i.e., embodied deep metaphor) of balance that underlies all the narratives. Within the United States, the search for balance emerges across various discourses and cultural models, including social and legal justice (Winter 2001); interpersonal norms of fairness (Lakoff and Johnson 1999); and moral, psychological, and physical well-being (Corrigan 1987). Similarly, the balance schema (or deep metaphor) plays an important role in the services literature. For example, in equity theory, parties to an exchange relationship compare the ratios of their exchange inputs with their outcomes to achieve a fair distribution of benefits (Houston and Gassenheimer 1987). That is, consumers' attempts to attain a satisfactory outcome are based on an underlying search for fairness or balance (Bolton, Warlop, and Alba 2003).

The foundational schema of balance influences recovery expectations as well, emerging in various cultural "surface" recovery expectations (i.e., cultural models) available to consumers. Each cultural model establishes a unique understanding of the consumer–provider interaction, stipulating as its fundamental tenets the necessary actions that will reinstate a sense of equilibrium after a breach. As several respondents noted,

> When I experience a failure, I have a need for an explanation: "This is why it happened and I'm sorry. I'll make it up to you." (*Interviewer: And why is that necessary to make it up?*) That keeps things balanced. If I drive this time, you should drive next time. Just to keep things fair. Just to keep things balanced and just to keep one person [from] taking ... advantage of another. I mean not that I'm worried about my friends taking advantage of me, but it's comforting when it puts you and your friends on a more even footing when things are balanced. (William)

> When things aren't balanced, there's one person that's doing more, taking advantage of or being taking advantage of. I believe when things aren't balanced, there's a definite incongruity in how things are. I believe that there should be balance in all things. I do believe that you are entitled to some sort of compensation. They made an offer, and I agreed. I accepted that offer, and I expected them to fulfill that. (Barry)

From a service recovery position, identifying cultural models that guide people's perceptions of balance enables providers to reconcile, reconstitute, and repair (i.e., reestablish balance) goods or service failures better. Next, we identify and discuss three cultural models, each of which represents an imbricated layer of cultural meaning that influences a unique set of consumer recovery expectations and consumer search for balance after a goods or service failure.

Relational Cultural Model

The relational cultural model is applied by people who express a strong desire to maintain emotional ties with the provider, even in the face of adverse events. A rupture in the social fabric (e.g., caused by a self-relevant goods/service breach) introduces an emotional disequilibrium, or liminal state, that these people want to rectify to restore the emotional attachment and sense of self-efficacy. The uneasiness that some informants experienced during a rupture in the relationship with a provider is comparable (at least in kind) to the anxiety experienced during separation (Berman 1988). When describing their anxiety, informants invariably introduced highly affect-laden allegories, such as estrangement, betrayal, or feelings of being slighted, let down, and hurt:

> From my perspective, a product failure is very similar to being let down by a friend because, you know, if you had plans or something and they were supposed to be there or they were supposed to call, and if they don't, you don't think you are worth calling or are that important. So it's like an insult. You don't know what and who to believe in. You feel vulnerable and exposed. (George)

Even relational informants who blame the provider often soften the blame through their willingness to be accommodating and understanding. This blame focuses not on the breakdown in the goods or service (e.g., Folkes and Kotsos 1986) but rather on the potential breakdown in the relational aspect of the interaction. Therefore, among such consumers, the recovery process centers not on restitution or product replacement but rather on reestablishing an emotional bond with the provider. The urge to reestablish emotional bonds is also illustrated by their desire to work through failures, to help the company "patch up ruptures" in the relationship, and to endure rather strong challenges (see Lewicki and Bunker 1995):

> I buy Brand X products, and they take products I return. I feel cared about. Even if it's only a product, their product has established a friendship with me, and I feel that it helps [patch] up our relationship and keep negative occurrences outside of the friendship. (Chad)

To these consumers, the perceived sincerity of an apology and the admission of wrongdoing (and explanation of

TABLE 1
Informants' Demographics and Cultural Models Toward Providers

Pseudonym	Cultural Model	Sex	Age	Marital Status	Household Income	Occupation	Location	Education	Cultural Capital	Political Orientation	Religion	Religious Involvement	Interests
George	*Relational*. Strong sense of loyalty. Equality between provider and customer.	Male	29	Single	25k–30k	Student	Urban	BA	Medium/ high	Independent	Protestant	Low	*The Wall Street Journal*, *GQ*, *Roundel*, fiction, PBS (2–3 hours/day reading/watching)
Chad	*Relational*. Blames self. Wishes for unproblematic relationship. Company is a caretaker.	Male	28	Single	35k–40k	Food service	Urban	Some college	Low/ medium	None	Catholic	Low	*The New York Times*, *USA Today*, *Vibe*, television, PBS (3–4 hours/day reading/watching)
Belle	*Relational*. Important that the company admits its fault. Feels less about self if the company does not. Company caretaker.	Female	40	Married	>100k	Homemaker	Urban	Some college	Medium/ high	Independent	Catholic	Medium	Local newspaper, *Esquire*, *Smithsonian*, television, PBS, movies (2–3 hours/day reading/ watching)
Amy	*Relational*. Enjoys interaction with the company at a personal level.	Female	38	Married	>100k	Homemaker	Suburban	Some college	Low/ medium	Republican	Mormon	High	No news, historical novels, thrillers, classical fiction, television, movies, game shows, talk shows (2 hours/day reading/ watching)
Beth	*Relational*. Views the company as a partner.	Female	37	Married	85k–100k	Homemaker	Suburban	BS	Low/ medium	Republican	Mormon	High	No news, historical novels, religious books, business books, television, sports events (2 hours/day reading/watching)
Erin	*Relational*. Self-blame. Everything is her fault in the relationship.	Female	36	Married	>100k	Homemaker	Suburban	Some college	Low/ medium	Republican	Mormon	High	*American Folk Citizen*, mystery, modern fiction, television, movies, PBS documentaries (2 hours/day reading/ watching)

TABLE 1
Continued

Pseudonym	Cultural Model	Sex	Age	Marital Status	Household Income	Occupation	Location	Education	Cultural Capital	Political Orientation	Religion	Religious Involvement	Interests
Kim	*Relational*. Views herself as a problem-solver partner. Wants to help the company recover their relationship.	Female	42	Married	>100k	Homemaker	Suburban	Some college	Medium	Republican	Mormon	High	Local newspaper, children's books, classical fiction, historical novels, television, movies, PBS documentaries, craft/home shows (2 hours/day reading/watching)
William	*Relational*. Wants to feel respected by being provided with an apology/explanation.	Male	64	Married	>100k	Consulting	Urban	BA	Medium	Independent	Protestant	Low	Business magazines, *USA Today* (0–1 hours/day reading)
Jaime	*Relational*. Recovery closure is like in a relationship, such that a person goes through the rocky moments, but if it is handled right, it is almost a secret loyalty.	Female	33	Married	25k–30k	College instructor	Suburban	MA	Medium/high	Democrat	Mormon	High	*The New York Times*, local newspaper, *Better Homes and Gardens*, church magazines, *Cooking Light*, religious books, parenting/self-help, historical novels, classical fiction, television, PBS documentaries (1 hour/day reading/watching)
Ryan	*Relational*. Does not believe that there should be any difference between person–person and person–company relationships.	Male	63	Married	>100k	Retired	Suburban	Some college	Medium	Republican	Mormon	High	Local newspaper, travel, historical novels, science fiction, church books, television, movies (1 hour/day reading/watching)
Megan	*Relational*. Blames self for failure. Company is supposed to be a caretaker. Inferior.	Female	53	Single	50k–60k	Recruiter	Suburban	MA	Medium/high	Democrat	Protestant	Medium	*Newsweek*, *Journal Sentinel*, fiction, television, dramas (2–3 hours/day reading/watching)
Marianne	*Oppositional*. Companies invade privacy. Feels coerced when it is necessary to confront a service/product breakdown.	Female	40	Married	40k–50k	Education specialist	Urban	BA	Medium/high	Independent	Catholic	Medium	*The Economist*, *The New York Times*, historical novels, movies (2 hours/day reading/watching)

TABLE 1
Continued

Pseudonym	Cultural Model	Sex	Age	Marital Status	Household Income	Occupation	Location	Education	Cultural Capital	Political Orientation	Religion	Religious Involvement	Interests
Krystal	*Oppositional*. Company is at fault. Wants to be right.	Female	21	Single	10k–15k	Bartender/ student	Small town	Some college	Medium	None	Catholic	Medium	Thrillers, television, movies, news (1 hour/day reading/ watching)
Jena	*Oppositional*. Company is at fault. Wants to be right.	Female	48	Single	70k–85k	District supervisor	Urban	Master's	Low/ medium	Independent	Episcopal	Medium	Professional publications (0–1 hours/day reading)
Carley	*Oppositional*. Easily angered. Fights the provider. Not interested in a relationship per se.	Female	30	Single	25k–30k	Sales	Urban	Master's	Medium	Democrat	Muslim	High	*Harper's*, no news, thrillers (2–3 hours/day reading/watching
Erik	*Oppositional*. It is a fight. A grizzly bear is used as a metaphor for companies.	Male	61	Married	>100k	Landlord	Suburban	BS	Low/ medium	Republican	Mormon	High	Local newspaper, scientific, business, travel, television, movies, PBS documentaries, news (2–3 hours/day reading/ watching)
Kevin	*Oppositional*. Wants to be in control.	Male	22	Single	15k–20k	Student	Small town	BA	Medium	Independent	Protestant	Medium	Novels, movies, science fiction (1–2 hours/day reading/watching)
Nick	*Oppositional*. In general, when things go bad, his armor is up. As soon as the company does not comply, it is like a fight.	Male	41	Married	>100k	Landscape contractor	Suburban	Some college	Medium	Republican	Mormon	High	Local newspaper, historical novels, philosophical, self-help, television, PBS documentaries, news, reality television shows (3–4 hours/day reading/ watching)
Joyce	*Utilitarian*. Underlying everything, it is a business relationship.	Female	50	Married	100k	Teacher	Suburban	BS	Medium/high	Republican	Mormon	High	Local newspapers, romance, historical novels, poetry, movies, hour-long dramas, talk shows, television (2–3 hours/day reading/watching)

TABLE 1
Continued

Pseudonym	Cultural Model	Sex	Age	Marital Status	Household Income	Occupation	Location	Education	Cultural Capital	Political Orientation	Religion	Religious Involvement	Interests
Emilia	*Utilitarian*. Product/service breaches equal inconvenience. Compensation is measured against wasted time and money.	Female	22	Single	>100k	Marketing coordinator	Suburban	BA	Medium	Independent	Protestant	Low	*Time*, *Newsweek*, *Cosmo*, travel, television, movies, dating show (2–3 hours/day reading/watching)
Curt	*Utilitarian*. Contractual engagement. Carefully evaluates company response to ensure that he is compensated according to the contract.	Male	39	Married	>100k	Director medical affairs	Urban	MD	Medium/high	Republican	Catholic	Medium	*(The Wall Street Journal*, *PC World*, scientific journals, fiction, television, movies, dramas (1–2 hours/day reading/watching)
Patric	*Utilitarian*. Professionally evaluates service and recovery. Expects certain standards.	Male	39	Married	>100k	Insurance broker	Urban	BA	Medium/high	Republican	Catholic	Medium	*The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, local paper, novels, television, dramas (3–4 hours/day reading/watching)
Barry	*Utilitarian*. Expects to be treated in a professional and contractual manner. Does not express feelings toward provider.	Male	52	Married	>100k	Business owner	Suburban	BS	Medium/high	Republican	Protestant	Low	*The Wall Street Journal*, trade magazines, dramas, television (1–2 hours/day reading/watching)
Shannon	*Utilitarian*. If there is a problem, the company is expected to rectify it. There is an implied (legal) contract.	Female	44	Single	70k–85k	Organizational consultant	Urban	MBA	Medium	Republican	Catholic	High	*Time*, novels, television, talk shows (1–2 hours/day reading/watching)

why things went wrong) by the company are critical for a successful recovery and go a long way toward restoring a damaged relationship because such actions validate the customer's sense of importance and (self-) respect:

> Well, I think the only way for me to feel better about this situation is if they completely admitted to us that this was a frustrating experience, that they're really sorry for how this panned out. You want to be respected, and you want to think that somebody cares about you. It is important that they admit they did it wrong. It makes me feel validated. (Belle)

When these informants experience a satisfactory recovery, their loyalty increases, which is consistent with the recovery paradox (Smith and Bolton 1998). Rather than deterring customers from future purchases, goods/service failures followed by successful recoveries increase customer loyalty for customers who employ a relational cultural model during recovery (see Blodgett, Hill, and Tax 1997; Price, Arnould, and Teirney 1994).

> For example, the product that [Provider Y] sent back was so much better. They really did reengineer this. I saw improvement; therefore, I'm going to continue buying the product. You know, you not only satisfy the problem but you now have me as a stronger customer in some cases because you proved you can come up with your end of the deal when it goes wrong. So that closure is like in a relationship where you go through the rocky moments, but if you handle it right and you reinforce or compensate for what went wrong, then it's almost a secret loyalty. There are couples who never have disagreements and never went through anything that was challenging together, so it didn't really grow that strong. It can be a bonding moment. (Jaime)

As in all interpersonal relationships, a sense of respect, validation, and being cared for restores the social bonds by reestablishing and validating consumers' self-worth and self-esteem (Aron, Paris, and Aron 1995). In addition, these customers do not expect a windfall. As long as no one winds up markedly ahead or takes unfair advantage of the other, satisfaction ensues. George illustrates this position in the following quote:

> Well, whatever it takes to make it even. I'm not looking to get ahead of situations that have gone wrong. If it is a failed thing, the scales are going to be tipped more in the company's favor instead of mine, and if it was the other way—you know, if I got some sort of satisfaction—then they would be tipped maybe slightly more in my favor, at least back to normal. Satisfaction would be getting at least comparable or maybe a little bit more in return from whatever loss you suffered.

Despite partaking in highly asymmetrical relationships with providers, whose intent is often based on nonaltruistic, even calculative motives (see Price and Arnould 1999), relational consumers show forgiveness, forbearance, and tolerance. Having anthropomorphized (i.e., projected emotional qualities onto) the provider, they perceive their relationship as real and entirely plausible.

Conversely, a goods/service failure may lead to a sense of embarrassment, in that the consumer blames him- or herself for choosing the wrong partner. That is, a failure reflects poorly on the consumer's ability to judge others:

> (*Interviewer: Can you describe your thoughts and feelings towards the provider?*) Mad and frustrated combined with a sense of being taken advantage of. You don't want to be slighted, disrespected. It makes me feel bad, like that I wasn't smart enough to see this coming and should have used a different plumber. (Belle)

In general, self-embarrassment can be attributed to meritocratic individualism, an attitude that is particularly prevalent in Western societies, in which personal failures/successes are attributable to the self rather than to sociocultural (dis)advantages (Fassett and Warren 2004). Relationally oriented consumers are particularly vulnerable to feelings of guilt, shame, and fear of losing respect. In turn, they may be more hesitant to share their experiences publicly, which may help explain the well-documented but little-understood observation that some consumers refrain from complaining (Harari 1992).

Although these consumers' actions and expectations are driven by an urge to reestablish a perceived relationship with the provider, consumers may end up leaving the provider if it does not respond in kind. Likewise, and though it does not change these consumers' interactions with other providers, a series of repeated failures by a provider is regarded as showing disrespect for the consumer and eventually dissuades even the most relationally inclined consumer from remaining loyal to a provider. This likelihood parallels findings in social psychology that show that a relationship can withstand only a finite number of transgressions before it dissolves (Rodrigues, Hall, and Fincham 2006). The following quotation from Belle speaks to this issue:

> I think a company is obliged, as far as if something negative happens, to try to fix up the situation. Because it is like you've been friends for years and years and years. If you're holding out your hand trying to patch the friendship up and that person just do you over again, you become angry. You'll begin to wonder, Will we ever be friends again? I mean buying products is a friendship. In the case of the Sony products I bought, not only did the product fail me, but they were very late on their promise—on following up with a voucher so I could buy something instead.

Although providers are not able to influence the relational cultural model that governs interpersonal conduct, some are increasingly exploiting the positive associations this cultural model brings to some consumers' minds. A case in point is Petrof's (1997, p. 26) denunciation of the consumer relationship movement as the "latest gospel" of marketing management, which exemplifies how providers engage in the discourse of consumer relationship management to encourage consumers to buy into a virtual interpersonal relationship.

The sociohistorical antecedents of these consumers' relational cultural model hark back to at least the preindustrial agricultural era (Sheth and Parvatiyar 1995). During this time, the concept of domesticated markets and relationship orientation were dominant; close, cooperative, and interdependent interactions between sellers and buyers were perceived as being of great value (Kalwani and Narayandas 1995). Relational bonding emerged because of the need to conduct business with other trustworthy people and because

ownership was linked with the management of business. Evidence of such clan trading exists today within networks of traders (Sheth and Parvatiyar 1995). Regulations even existed to prevent "hit-and-run" sellers from becoming part of the market system. As permanent retail shops were established, the continuous interaction between owners and consumers necessitated interreliance and trust; these relationships sometimes continued for generations (Sheth and Parvatiyar 1995). However, following the advent of mass production, marketers became increasingly separated from direct contact with consumers, and the relational discourse was largely confined to and enacted in rural neighborhoods with "mom-and-pop" stores (Mayer 1989).

Heightened competition during the first part of the twentieth century forced smaller firms to embrace personal relationships with consumers and the related notion of the sovereign consumer (i.e., the customer is king) as a point of differentiation in their competition with larger mass sellers (Trentmann 2006). Because of producer excesses, abuses, and failures during industrialization, a new legal apparatus was erected to protect consumers, which led to the initiation of the reintegration and reinstatement of relationships with consumers (Everson 2006). This rise in the "sovereign consumer discourse" and the idealization of a rural past and nostalgia for a more interconnected and pristine era, coupled with intense competition for customers and technological advances, caused even larger firms to embrace the relational gospel (Gamble 2006; Petrof 1997). The relatively recent ascent of the relational discourse within commercial life marks a revival of relational norms and has made at least some consumers receptive to the overtures of relational marketing, leading to an embodied relational cultural model and creating a dyad of commercial friendship (Price and Arnould 1999).

Oppositional Cultural Model

In contrast to informants who evinced a relational cultural model, informants with the oppositional cultural model evoked a consistently aggressive position toward providers in the wake of a self-relevant goods or service failure. Although general checks and balances in the marketplace offset the outright exploitation of consumers in general, oppositional consumers believe that marketers would not hesitate to take advantage of, coerce, and control them given the opportunity. Therefore, a goods or service breach is regarded as a potential initiation of this potent process.

Issues related to control and dependence appear in channels literature (Kumar, Scheer, and Steenkamp 1998; Nelson 1976), but services marketing literature is limited with regard to consumer issues related to maintaining control and independence during consumer–provider interactions. For the oppositional consumer, during everyday encounters, social norms often prevent outright antisocial behavior; however, in the case of a self-relevant goods or service failure, the thinness of this veneer cannot sustain the underlying disdain these consumers feel. Essentially, the consumer is ready to burst forth at the moment of a self-relevant transgression, almost as if a truce has been broken.

When informants were probed more deeply about this oppositional stance, they conveyed that any consumer–provider interaction represents a potential source of exploitation that must be continuously monitored and quickly counteracted when a transgression surfaces. The following extensive quotation illustrates the oppositional cultural model:

> This picture represents an angry woman. She is plotting a course of action to get the situation resolved. We pay a lot for the meals we eat out; they are not cheap. They served us raw meat. It is like a call to arms. We move to action. We can't let people take advantage of us. We need to be assertive. We're going to talk to the waiter, to the manager. We're not going to be down here. Whatever it takes, we're going to make [Brand Z] do right by us. We're mad. If you're poorly served, we're gonna get mad and tell other people. We want to get back at them. Hey, you screwed us! This picture of a sumo wrestler illustrates that we're making battle plans and maybe we'll get the waiter or cook reprimanded. We're ready to attack the giants. We're the mice in a big den of cats, and the cats have malicious intent. We're on one side of the battlefield trying to figure out how we are going to attack these people. If they are not willing to rectify the situation, then do I boycott them? Do I tell other people? In general, I am not an aggressive person, but when it comes to somebody trying to take advantage of me, then I react. If they don't come through right away, it's time to go to battle. (Erik)

For these informants, the consumer–provider interaction lasts only as long as they feel in control and the service provider meets their recovery expectations. Loyalty comes with a short leash, and these informants exhibit little, if any, interest in forgiving companies for failures or giving up fighting. Only when they achieve control are they pacified. These informants neither entertain nor accept the anthropomorphized view of providers (so prevalent among the relational informants) that "to err is human." Instead, goods or service failures are a battle over resources and evoke a call to arms:

> When things go bad, my armor's up, in general. As soon as they don't comply, it's like now we're in a fight. I'll defend myself for the most part and get things right. I feel that I would be a person that would have more armor up, more resistance, defensive, opposition, ready to oppose. My car needed to be fixed, but they screwed it up. So I just went to the guy in charge and said, "I just watched your guy rip the door panel off the latches." He goes, "We'll glue them back on, that's all we can do," and I'm like, "I want it fixed." Next day, I refused to pay, and when I went to get my keys, the guy jumps on my back and starts to fight. I just slammed him against the wall, though I had no intentions of hurting this guy. (Nick)

The readiness to fight reflected in these comments has been related to mental predispositions or traits (e.g., Richins 1983); however, we argue that these informants are not inherently aggressive. When they talk about friends and family, they convey endearing relational perspectives.

A unique aspect of the oppositional cultural model is its notion of control and not wanting to be at the mercy of the provider. The following quotation highlights this feeling:

> Sometimes, I'll get an airline representative who has a really difficult time with something that seems very simple. So that makes me frustrated. In fact, sometimes I'll ask them if they're new or if they have to check with somebody. They have a difficult time figuring it out. That

> is frustrating because it is out of my hands. I also had frustration with car problems over the years, and I guess that frustration comes from the fact that it puts me at somebody else's mercy. That does not make me feel very good. (Jena)

Consequently, a failure connotes that the provider has gained the upper hand and has the potential to impose demeaning or exploitative actions. Thus, to the oppositional informants, it is always better to be on guard, tentative, skeptical, and even cynical, as represented by Kevin's comment:

> I'm always afraid that they'll pull out a trump. I was helping a friend get her computer up, but there was something wrong with it. I was afraid that they were going to say that their support only covers Windows Millennium Edition. Since this wasn't Millennium Edition, I didn't have an argument for that, and I was concerned about what would happen if they said that. And so it's a confrontational point. I want one thing, they want another. I mean I'm a big Star Trek person. One of my favorite quotes is, "I don't want to stop the exploitation. I want to be the exploiter." I'm not taking that literally, only as far as I like being the person who is in control of a given situation.

This concern of not being in control, and thus being at the mercy of the provider, emerges across contexts and product categories, which suggests a generalized, yet interaction-specific (i.e., stimulated by a self-relevant goods/service failure) cultural model.

These informants' thresholds for becoming antagonistic are low. Underlying the fighting stance is the metaperception that the consumer is the weak, vulnerable, and exploited player in the consumer–provider dyad:

> This is a picture of a boy walking on a pier. There's no real end. This kid's just kind of out there by himself. There are no barriers or railings or anything. So he's just left hanging out there, exposed and vulnerable, like if something fails or doesn't do what it's supposed to. The warranty is expired, and that's about it; there is no protection against failures. It is a feeling of being alone, and there's nothing to stop them from taking advantage of you. You are vulnerable to the forces that you don't have any control over; you are lying down, and somebody is hammering on your head. (Kevin)

A lackadaisical response by the provider to a goods or service failure is likely to be interpreted by an oppositional consumer as an adversarial move. Similarly, when the company stipulates restitution, it is interpreted as an attempt to disenfranchise rather than embrace the consumer. Oppositional informants indicate that the best tactic providers can adopt to ensure a successful recovery is to make customers feel in control throughout the recovery situation, possibly by providing a range of recovery options among which they can choose. Having a choice helps reestablish a sense of consumer empowerment and all-important control. This line of reasoning is reflected by Erik's comment:

> They need to present to me with options: What do you want so that this will be made right for you? Do you want a year's worth of car washes? Do you want us to fix the bumper? Do you want us to fix the bumper and give you the car washes?

Although the oppositional cultural model is just as emotive as the relational cultural model, it is entirely skewed toward the negative vector of the consumer–provider interaction. Although relational informants may be upset with the failure situation, they rarely show contempt for the provider, and if they do, it is likely to be firm specific (i.e., caused by extensive and repeated failures). In contrast, the oppositional consumer's default perspective is that all providers are cunning, and the consumer–provider interaction represents a temporary armistice in which both parties ultimately vie for control.

We argue that the oppositional cultural model neither proceeds from prior relational interactions gone awry nor pivots on specific brands and instances. Instead, it resembles a deeply held ideology, which echoes Holt (2002), who associates consumer opposition with ideological predispositions that lead consumers to be less sympathetic and susceptible to developing and maintaining social ties and networks through the exchange of goods and services.

It is revealing that these informants are relatively congenial until a failure occurs. That is, in general, oppositional consumers remain affable (employing superficial cultural models of codes and social norms) and show no obvious signs of antagonism until the moment of a self-relevant transgression, which prompts their more deep-seated cultural models. Although some consumers eventually turn into activists (see Thompson, Rindfleisch, and Arsel 2006), the majority are likely to focus their gall on unsatisfactory repairs of the breach, as exemplified in Erik's statement:

> I will tell them nicely that something's not right here. I'm listening, what are you coming back with? There's a hope that they will make it right. Probably in 30% of the cases is when I go to battle. In the other 70% of the cases, they will make it right. (*Interviewer: And how does that feel?*) It still feels like a moral and financial victory, even though I did not have to fight.

The adversarial cultural model embraced by oppositional consumers in their framing of self-relevant failures flows from a larger current of consumer distrust and discontent with commercial providers, which, in the spirit of caveat emptor, place the entire responsibility of evaluating a product or service before acquisition on the buyer's shoulders (Holt 2002; Kozinets and Handelman 2004; Thompson, Rindfleisch, and Arsel 2006). Moreover, it is influenced by the Western industrialized legal system, which often sides openly with manufacturers to encourage continued economic expansion (Mayer 1989). This largely asymmetrical division of legal power within commercial exchanges and the abuses it encourages on the part of producers has led many consumers to adopt a caveat emptor, or buyer beware, position as a dominant rule in the marketplace (Nelson 1976).

Further adoption of this cultural model is encouraged by the expositive writings of muckrakers (Protess 1991) and critical sensationalists, such as Vance Packard (1957). These and other writers/activists initiated an oppositional movement to change the laws governing commercial practice that crystallized during the 1960s as consumerism—a coalition of efforts from disparate parties united to protect

and enhance the rights of consumers (Aaker and Day 1982). Although these efforts have resulted in some legal reforms and improved business practices (Aaker and Day 1982), the notion of consumer exploitation remains very much alive in American culture, as articulated and championed by activists such as Ralph Nader (1975) and the self-proclaimed "culture jammers" of the anticommercialism movement (Kozinets and Handelman 2004). As evidence of the contemporaneity of this oppositional cultural model, a recent issue of *Consumer Reports* (Darnow 2005) even instructed readers that marketers should be regarded as opponents and the marketplace as a battlefront.

Additional cultural foundations of the oppositional cultural model are the justice resolution discourse within the U.S. judicial system, which, at its heart, rests on the idea that pitting opposing forces against each other is the best means to ensure justice and the fundamental reestablishment of balance and parity (Van Koppen and Penrod 2003). As cultural members of the United States, people are taught early on that recourse to fairness and balance through remediation in court is not a last but rather a first resort. This belief has led one author to describe the United States as "a nation of adversaries" (Garry 1997). One of our informants even referred to a service recovery incident as "feeling like presenting your case in court." Taken together, ideological, consumer, and legal movements have led to a guarded stance in the minds of some consumers, which is expressed in their basic concerns about control during self-relevant goods and service failures.

Utilitarian Cultural Model

Whereas Fournier (1998, p. 343) critiques attempts to reduce consumer–provider interactions to cognitive utilitarian decision making because it fails to capture "the talismanic relationship consumers form with that which is consumed" (Belk, Wallendorf, and Sherry 1989, p. 31), our findings suggest that the utilitarian aspects of recovery expectations play a significant role among some consumers. The utilitarian cultural model embraces the classical ideal of rationality (Holbrook and Olney 1995) and subjective utility theory (i.e., prospect theory, mental accounting, and resource exchange) (Bolton 1998; Smith, Bolton, and Wagner 1999). The expected duration of a relationship is based on its future benefits weighed against the cost of discontinuing the relationship. These informants neither take self-relevant goods/service failures as a personal attack nor view them as indicative of the providers' antagonism. Rather, failures are regarded as financial and time-related inconveniences. Thus, in general, the success of a recovery situation for these informants depends on the provider's ability to be expedient and offer compensation for the effort and time invested:

> Yesterday, over at the mall in the computer store, we had to get a computer fixed, and it took them about an hour to just take my contact information, put it into the computer, wait for the computer to do it, and so on. In the meantime, they spent my time, which, based on my income, is twice as much as what the computer is worth. The least they could have done is offered something in return for recognizing the time that I had to spend by offering a $100 gift certificate. (Curt)

This informant's interaction might be likened to a business-to-business interaction in which neither party seeks emotional revenge or exchange, and an ongoing interaction persists only because of the extrinsic material benefits that each member accrues (Price and Arnould 1999). A failure is inconvenient and irritating because it prevents these informants from going about their business in an efficient and timely manner (Childers et al. 2001), but it also represents a sign of potential systemic problems. The act of complaining and/or showing irritation serves as a negotiating tool that can be turned on and off and can be graduated according to circumstances. When such an act is deemed useless, these informants are likely to simply take note and move on:

> I go into every association, and I'm talking about service with an expectation of results. I go into a sloppy, greasy restaurant, and the expectation is I'm going to get a quick plate of eggs slapped down in front of me for $2.50. I go to a hotel where I pay 50 bucks a night, [and] I know what I'm going to get. If you go to a doctor's office and a nurse tells you, "You just have to accept that the doctors are 45 minutes late," I don't have to accept that. Sometimes if your flight is delayed, you have to accept it, but I can decide what restaurant I want to go to. I can decide what doctor I want to go to. It's just the way it is. So instead of getting angry and frustrated, I just take note of it. (Patric)

Patric's comment stands in stark contrast with both the relational and the oppositional cultural models, in which even minor failures lead to strong emotional reactions. From a utilitarian perspective, self-relevant goods/service failures and recovery attempts are judged on the basis of rational parameters. If the consumer concludes that it is the company's fault (rather than the fault of external circumstances [e.g., the weather]), the recovery process should follow a set of procedural steps that go from acknowledging and explaining the problem to exchanging or refunding to compensating for the time or energy invested in the recovery process.

The following quotation exemplifies the matter-of-fact attitude among utilitarian informants when a breach occurs:

> We got very bad room service, hours after we had asked for it. Next morning, I talked to the manager. I stayed calm and rational. He eventually offered a free night stay in compensation, which I thought was fair for the inconvenience. Had he not done that, it would have come to a point where I would just leave because in the long run, it's not that big a deal. Either people respond well to my complaints or if they don't, I'll just leave and not come back, ever. I don't get upset. (Emilia)

If the likelihood of recovery is slim, rather than investing additional time and energy, these informants walk away from a failure and consider it a sunk cost. Thus, the failure is perceived as neither a betrayal nor a battlefront, nor is it a negative reflection of the self. Saving face is not a primary concern for this group of informants.

Even when these informants have dealt with a company over an extended period, the consumer–provider interaction does not become relationally or emotionally tinged. In contrast to the relational scenario, in which providers' responsiveness, empathy, and assurance over time strengthen satis-

faction (Hart, Heskett, and Sasser 1990) and for which successful recoveries often increase consumers' sense of loyalty, to people with a utilitarian cultural model, each breakdown adds to the risk of future occurrences. Each recovery is recorded and remembered, resulting in an overall lowering of expectations, the extent of which depends on the recovery. For utilitarian-framed recovery incidences, there is little room for the recovery paradox effect:

> They made it up to me, so I'd have to say we are on slightly lower ground because of what happened; just that I feel it's very incompetent to give me back my car three times and not have it fixed two times. But so I guess on that level, I kind of lost a little bit of the confidence in the company, but then hearing what they did for my dad made me go, "Oh, they're not so bad." They really try. I probably would buy a car from them in the future, but it's not where it was before; it never can be. (Emilia)

That utilitarian consumers have little regard for the temporality of the consumer–provider interaction coincides with Bettencourt's (1997) findings, which indicate that duration does not influence the type of relationship but rather contrasts with the assumption that, in general, consumer–provider relationships grow with increased interactions (Hart, Heskett, and Sasser 1990); this offers yet another perspective into the contradictions in recovery research. Utilitarian consumers neither revere nor villainize the provider, and their rational stance applies across recovery instances.

The utilitarian position is supported by Lewicki and Bunker's (1995) findings, which suggest that some consumers maintain a calculus-based level of interaction, and is also present in equity theory (Smith, Bolton, and Wagner 1999). The utilitarian cultural model is also likely related to Dick and Basu's (1994) concept of "spurious loyalty," which refers to a type of customer retention driven not by a strong favorable attitude toward the focal provider but rather by deliberate and calculated choices based on rational criteria.

Although the supremacy of economic rationality (which emerged during the Enlightenment) came under assault by postmodernist reinquiries (Brockway 2001), the affectively cold and calculating ideal of rationality still holds a dominant position within and across Western thoughts and institutional practices. The "rational man" still drives basic assumptions within science and many theoretical models that explore decision making among consumers, including prospect theory, which suggests that people weigh resources according to utility functions (Kahneman and Tversky 1979). The rationalist discourse, with its notions of objectivity, reason, and sound minds, also permeates legal, scientific, and sociopolitical institutions. Informants who employ this cultural model during a recovery scenario rely on a personification of the classical rationalist ideal of *homo economicus*.

Discussion

The cultural models approach we discussed herein focuses on eliciting and identifying shared mental constructs of sociocultural origin (i.e., cultural models) that have become part of people's identity formation and understanding of the world. It introduces an alternative theoretical framework for understanding consumers' market interaction preferences during high-involvement encounters. The enduring and structuring role of cultural models on consumers' recovery preferences has several implications for recovery and services marketing research. First, consumer reactions to breaches are guided by internalized cultural models that serve as cognitive resources. Second, many inconsistencies in existing recovery research may potentially be reduced by controlling for the presence of internalized cultural models. Third, the cultural models approach proposes a new type of segmentation criteria that enables providers to adapt their responses more effectively to consumers' recovery preferences. Fourth, although cultural models derive their motivation from universal dispositions based on embodied (neurocognitive), foundational schemes—in this case, a need for balance—divergent sociohistorical manifestations of these are likely to be available to consumers at the everyday sociocultural surface. Fifth, cultural models are likely to influence consumer perception not only during goods and service breaches but also, and more generally, across high-involvement situations with providers. We discuss each of these points briefly.

Cultural Models as Cognitive Resources

Core cultural models activated in high-involvement situations have remained largely unnoticed in services marketing and have been ignored entirely in recovery research. The prevailing assumption within consumer recovery research is that recovery expectations and preferences are largely monolithic across consumers and are evoked by behavioral, relational, and/or environmental stimuli. Behavioral processes are assumed to be delimited by the type of interaction (e.g., procedural, interactional, distributive; see Greenberg 1990), in which each type of failure leads to a unique recovery preference. For example, interactional failures (e.g., a rude flight attendant) demand interactional recovery initiatives (e.g., an apology). The environmental orientation argues that customer redemption preferences are based on industry or goods/service type, purchase size and price, and brand (Bitner, Booms, and Tetrault 1990; De Ruyter and Wetzels 2000; Maxham and Netemeyer 2002) or the "personality" of the brand (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004).

Whereas behavioral and environmental stimuli influence recovery preferences during less self-relevant goods and service breaches, during high-involvement breaches, recovery preferences appear largely governed by self-relevant, core cultural models. This insight is echoed in Oliver's (1989) proposition that recovery expectations likely vary according to internally held preferences, regardless of the incidence and characteristics of the breach. Similarly, Rust and Verhoef (2005) show that loyalty dispositions toward providers depend on consumers' internal dispositions (i.e., relationship or action oriented).

Cultural Models and Inconsistent Findings in Recovery Research

Cultural models have implications for recovery research findings, because they influence people's reactions to both

situational and self-relevant breaches. Failing to control for the influence of cultural models in experimental and survey research introduces the risk of confounding survey and experimental responses. The risk emerges along two main trajectories that we define as level- and type-dependent cultural models. Level-dependent confounds emerge from a lack of control over the levels of informant self-relevance. The same stimuli in a given study may lead some informants to apply situational (not self-relevant) cultural models and others to use identity-related (self-relevant) cultural models, depending on their level of involvement.[1]

A type-dependent confound emerges from the presence of different types of self-relevant cultural models (i.e., relational, utilitarian, and oppositional) among informants. That is, two studies that rely on identical stimuli (e.g., investigating loyalty after a successful recovery) may produce different results because of type-dependent confounds created by the distribution of different types of cultural models across respondents. Considering the extensive contradictions in recovery research, the cultural models approach proposes a possible resolution, at least in part, to this conundrum, as we illustrate next.

Smith and Bolton (1998) find that an increase in dissatisfaction is due to recovery outcome failures, and in a different study, Smith, Bolton, and Wagner (1999) attribute this increase to recovery process failures. Viewed through the lens of the cultural models approach, this discrepancy may be explained by the presence of cultural model level– and/or type-dependent confounds. That is, the stimuli may not have been perceived as equally self-relevant across the two studies and/or by informants within each study. In addition, informants who regarded the stimuli as self-relevant may apply a different cultural model. As such, the focus on outcome failure observed in Smith and Bolton's study may stem from a majority of informants being utilitarian/oppositional (wanting compensation and control), whereas in Smith, Bolton, and Wagner's study, the focus on process failure may stem from a majority of informants being relationally inclined (wanting an apology and explanation). Even a slight difference in the distribution of self-relevant cultural models across respondents could explain these contradictory findings.[2]

Another extant controversy surrounds the issue of whether prior experience mitigates consumer sentiments toward a poorly handled complaint or botched recovery. This controversy also may be explained by the failure to control for level- and/or type-dependent cultural models among respondents. For example, using a brand equity approach, Aaker (1991) suggests that positive experiences build goodwill that mitigates the effect of a poorly handled complaint. Conversely, Kelley and Davis (1994) find that prior positive experiences lead to increased expectations (expectancy theory), which accentuate the negative effect of a poorly handled complaint. Both level- and type-dependent cultural model confounds may be at play here. The level confound is similar to the foregoing example, whereas the type confound may unfold as follows: The increase in loyalty (i.e., brand equity theory) may result from studies in which the majority of informants hold a relational cultural model, whereas the decrease in loyalty (i.e., expectancy theory) may result from studies in which a larger share of informants hold a utilitarian cultural model (i.e., "no banking" of prior positive experiences). A parallel argument may explain why some studies find industry-specific recovery preferences (De Ruyter and Wetzels 2000) whereas others find no effects at all (Smith, Bolton, and Wagner 1999). In support of the presence of a type-dependent confound and to their credit, De Ruyter and Wetzels (2000) acknowledge a potential unaccounted-for biasing effect from the presence of uncontrolled-for mental dispositions—in this case, varying equity sensitivities, as originally proposed by Oliver (1997).

Another example comes from Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekaran (1998), who find that a majority of their informants perceived excuses negatively because they associated the botched recovery with a failure by the provider to take responsibility and acknowledge the issue. This reaction could also be attributed to a majority of informants holding a utilitarian cultural model toward providers. Conversely, the unique experimental setting may involve a level-dependent confound because it may have stimulated situationally cued rather than identity-related cultural models.[3]

In one of the few studies that controls for level-dependent involvement, Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel (2004) find that among highly involved informants, loyalty depends on brand personality (i.e., an exciting brand leads to high loyalty and a sincere brand to low loyalty). Given the small number of informants per cell (ten), even a slight difference in the distribution among informants' type-dependent cultural models across groups of informants could also explain this effect. That is, rather than the brand personality of the exciting brand driving the successful recovery and observed increase in loyalty, a majority of informants in this group might hold the relational recovery–type cultural model. In this case, loyalty would also end up increasing after satisfactory complaint handling by the provider. Conversely, the sincere brand-personality outcome with a successful recovery and subsequent decrease in loyalty could result if a majority of informants in this group rely on the utilitarian recovery–type cultural model. In this case, loyalty would decrease after a single failure because

[1]If we assume that a survey elicits high-involvement responses, a self-selection bias may emerge because informants with a relational cultural model would be more inclined to respond than informants with oppositional and utilitarian cultural models. Conversely, if payment is offered, it may disproportionately inspire informants with a utilitarian cultural model to respond.

[2]For example, if a slight majority had held utilitarian and oppositional cultural models in the first study, a preference would have emerged for tangible and compensatory redemption, and a lack thereof would have led to a sense of outcome failure. In contrast, if, in the second study, the majority had held a relational cultural model, they would have preferred an explanation and a personal apology, and a lack thereof would have been considered a process failure.

[3]Informants responded to the survey while at work and after having received encouragement from a senior executive to answer conscientiously. Because the survey was anonymous and no direct gain or loss was at stake, the informants may have relied more on situationally cued than self-relevant cultural models and thus may have applied a rational response.

each breach is conceived to increase the likelihood (in line with rational thinking) of future ones (including uncertainties about a company's continued ability to deliver a successful recovery). It follows that the cultural models approach may explain not only the intermittent presence of the recovery paradox in recovery research (as we explicated previously) but also that of the double-deviation scenario. The double-deviation scenario, in which a product/service breach is followed by a recovery breach, is present only among relationally inclined consumers because only such customers experience a double disconfirmation of expectations (a sense of disappointment and hurt). In contrast, for both oppositional and utilitarian consumers, the double breakdown represents a confirmation of expectations. That is, oppositional consumers expect providers to be cunning, and utilitarian consumers increase their expectations of a second failure on the basis of the occurrence of the first one.

Although the general impact on recovery expectations diverges according to consumers' cultural models in the unique instance of repeated (recovery) failures, both level- and type-dependent cultural models are likely to converge toward a similar outcome—namely, consumer exit.[4] Tellingly, recovery research investigating loyalty and satisfaction after repeated failures consistently supports this result (see Maxham and Netemeyer 2002; Ziethaml, Berry, and Parasuraman 1993).

Finally, the cultural models approach may help explain why the personality trait–based approach (see Best and Andreasen 1977; Hirschman 1970; Richins 1983) has received mixed support across research studies (see also Oliver 1997, p. 374). The cultural models approach illustrates that recovery preferences depend not on idiosyncratic dispositions (i.e., personality traits) but rather on internalized cultural models (see Dimaggio 1997; Shore 1991) related to the specific domain of consumer–provider interactions. Thus, even informants with oppositional cultural models emphasize that they interact differently when with families and friends. In other words, although the persistence of self-relevant cultural models may appear as personality traits at first glance, these "traits" are not applied indiscriminately to all life events but rather are specific to particular institutionalized practices—in this case, the consumer–provider interaction in the marketplace. Similarly, other types of institutionalized practices, such as education (Allen 2002), marriage (Quinn 1987), and health food (Thompson and Troester 2002), are each surrounded by varying conceptualizations caused by unique sociohistorically mediated and embodied cultural models.

Cultural Models as Segmentation Criteria

Segmentation aims to match actionable strategies with unique consumer preferences (Craighead, Karwan, and Miller 2004). In recovery research and elsewhere, such a match has yet to be achieved, not for lack of efforts but rather because efforts have been confined to behavioral, environmental, and sociodemographic segmentation signifiers (Darley and Smith 1995; Iacobucci and Ostrom 1993). A segmentation process guided by cultural models represents a promising consumer-centric approach that captures dispersed mindscapes that show little overlap with more common segmentation signifiers. We argue that this lack of overlap is caused by the uneven and dynamic upward/downward mobility of people across sociodemographic borders, which leads to fragmented representations of self-relevant cultural models within any given population group delimited along these criteria.

Though persistent (because of cognitive conservatism), the tacitness of identity-related cultural models (expressed in high-involvement consumer–provider interactions) makes it difficult to ascertain their patchy distribution. This insight introduces an additional layer of complexity to discursive- and practice-based (hobbies, interests, social classes, brand communities) segmentation efforts (e.g., Holt 1997; Holt and Thompson 2004; Muniz and O'Guinn 2001; Thompson 1997; Thompson and Troester 2002) that explore the role of social structuring of consumer action (see Holt and Thompson 2004).[5] In other words, recovery researchers should delve into and explore consumers' cultural models to reach a fuller understanding of the dispersed distribution of recovery preferences. Although such an approach may introduce methodological challenges (given limited resources) for researchers, it is likely to offer new insights. Similarly, providers may want to create cultural models segmentation maps of consumers to attune their recovery initiatives to consumer preferences more efficiently. Alternatively, providers may try to assess and adapt to consumers' cultural models (recovery preferences) as revealed during the early stages of the recovery interaction. We develop and discuss an adaptive recovery approach that enables providers to ascertain consumers' cultural models immediately following a product and/or service breach in the "Managerial Implications" section.

Cultural Models and Foundational Themes

From a metatheoretical perspective, the cultural models approach links universal foundational themes (i.e., embodied deep metaphors, such as balance) with cultural models (i.e., culturally shaped and internalized representations). Specifically, our findings illustrate how a fundamental biopsychological need (i.e., largely culturally uncommitted) is shaped into cultural models based on prevalent sociocultural/historical influences. This insight bolsters the critique that Holland and Quinn (1987) raise, that it is insufficient to focus solely on foundational themes (or deep metaphors), as some researchers have proposed (e.g., Lakoff and Johnson 1980), because this overlooks their varied cultural manifestations. That said, a categorization of cultural models according to foundational themes enables researchers to link cultural models with universal dispositions (foundational themes) and thus to identify an underlying shared desire (in this case, the desire to restore

[4]Even people with a relational cultural model eventually may leave a provider (as they would in a regular relationship). However, they would maintain their relational orientation toward other providers.

[5]The distribution of cultural models within a given segment remains unknown.

balance). It is possible that additional improvement in recovery practices results from a provider appealing to both the foundational schema of balance and a relevant consumer recovery preference (specified by one of the cultural models). This represents a potentially rich topic for exploration in future recovery research.

Cultural Models and Relationship Marketing

Finally, the cultural models findings have broad implications for services marketing because the identified self-relevant cultural models associated with high-involvement recovery situations are likely to influence self-relevant (i.e., high-involvement) incidences across consumer–provider interactions. For example, consumer–provider interactions during the purchase of high-involvement goods and services, such as a house, a car, or a cruise, are likely to be governed by self-relevant cultural models that specify consumers' preferred treatment by the salespeople. This insight broadens Bendapudi and Berry's (1997) claim that only a utilitarian rationale serves as the primary driver of consumer–provider interactions because it introduces two additional cultural models (relational and oppositional) that involve different sets of consumer expectations and rationales.

Managerial Implications

The cultural models approach introduces several managerial implications for service recovery and services marketing. In recovery instances, providers must first distinguish between low- and high-involvement scenarios. Whereas breaches of less importance allow for superficial or even scripted intervention related to specific situational cues, breaches with high self-relevance require adaptive responses that match consumer recovery (identity-related) cultural models. This implication suggests that the more successful the provider is at creating a self-relevant connection between the service and the consumer, paradoxically, the less flexibility and control the firm has in managing consumers during failures. That is, the more involved a consumer is with a goods or services failure (and with purchases more broadly), the less the response becomes based on situational cues in the environment.

That the adaptive character of the recovery is important is supported not only by these findings but also by research in clinical psychology that suggests that different people benefit from different interventions (Fisher, Beutler, and Williams 1999) and that it is more effective to adjust treatment plans according to people's interpretive outlook than to change their outlook when providing therapy (Roth and Fonagy 1996). The "differentiated therapy" metaphor provides a useful conceptual trope for the cultural models approach because it sensitizes marketers to the benefits of a customized response based on one of the three main recovery preferences (relational, oppositional, or utilitarian) for self-relevant (highly involved) breaches.

The exception to a cultural model–tailored response appears to be in circumstances in which providers are able and willing to invest considerable efforts into the manipulation of people's (self-relevant) cultural models toward providers. More specifically, some research suggests that consumer–provider interactions that involve particularly meaningful, experientially charged events, such as river-rafting trips (Arnould and Price 1993) and intense brandfests (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002), change otherwise well-anchored identity-related (i.e., self-relevant) cultural models. Even such intensive and extraordinary cases are likely to create only provisional and brand-/provider-specific changes that represent mental exceptions to people's identity-related cultural models normally applied to the consumer–provider interaction (see Muniz and O'Guinn 2001, p. 424). With the extensive involvement required to stimulate a "conversion" experience, most providers would be better off identifying and meeting consumers' existing core recovery preferences. Moreover, because these core cultural models all tap into the shared foundational schema of balance, providers may also enhance their interactions with customers and positioning by substantiating their messages with indirect (and perhaps direct) references to the deep metaphor of balance (Zaltman 2002).

Adaptive Service Recovery

The cultural models approach provides a meaning-based segmentation process that resonates with consumers' recovery preferences but demands an intense consumer analysis. The latter is likely to take considerable resources, so instead we suggest that providers should embrace an adaptive service recovery approach implemented at the point of high-involvement goods or services breaches. This approach parallels existing research on sales programs, according to which salespeople are trained to adapt their responses dynamically to the personalities, needs, and presuppositions of their clients (see Table 2) (Weitz, Sujan, and Sujan 1986). In line with Williams, Spiro, and Fine's (1990) finding that customers are more likely to "open up" and engage in dialogue with salespeople who pose relevant questions, recovery specialists presumably could identify customers' recovery preferences by posing relevant questions. Because many frontline employees occupy dual roles as sales and service personnel, this task could be accomplished by incorporating an adaptive recovery element into existing sales training protocols. The training would be similar to the sensitizing of frontline personnel, who take the perspective of the customer (Brooksbank 1995). Speaking to this issue, Lambert, Marmorstein, and Sharma (1990) empirically show that the amount of training frontline personnel receive is related to the accuracy of their perceptions of customers.

The skills that frontline personnel require to identify such cues include heightened introspection (understanding their own presuppositions), reliance on category-based knowledge structures to differentiate among the various cultural models customers employ, the ability to show empathy (take consumers' perspectives), personal efficacy (confidence), and cognitive flexibility to adjust recovery initiatives to resulting expectations (see Lambert, Marmorstein, and Sharma 1990; Spiro and Weitz 1990). Such training increases the likelihood not only of satisfying and retaining consumers but also of improving employees' sense of "wholeness" and empowerment (Bowen and Johnston

TABLE 2
Overview of Consumer Cultural Models and Diagnostics

Consumer Cultural Models	Relational	Oppositional	Utilitarian
A consumer applying this cultural model …	has a strong desire to maintain emotional ties with the provider and "work together" to make things right after a goods and/or service failure.	evokes a suspicious and oppositional position toward providers after a service and/or goods failure.	weighs future benefits of the relationship against the incurred cost (in time and effort) stemming from the goods and/or service failure.
Consumer responses to a failure	•Emotional (looking for consolation) •Anxious (e.g., sense of estrangement; betrayal; or being slighted, let down, and hurt) •Self-attribution •Self-embarrassment •Commitment to solve the problem •Recovery paradox effect possible •Willingness to forgive, absolve, and tolerate	•Emotional (aggressive, distancing) •Caveat emptor •Not willing to forgive •Emotional/angry •Tentative, skeptical, and cynical •Recovery paradox unlikely •Does not forgive easily	•Provider attribution •Equity approach/*homo economicus* •Inconvenient to the achievement of personal goals •Irritated •Recovery paradox unlikely
Managerial diagnostics identifying cultural models. The consumer ...	•Expresses hurt/vulnerability •Looks for consolation •Is helpful •May blame self •Shows understanding •Will work with the provider	•Is antagonistic •Blames provider •Is aggressive (I am being exploited) •Is overly demanding •Shows willingness to fight •Suggests excessive redemption	•Is not emotional, but firm •Is rational •Expects compensation for time/discomfort •Is pragmatic
A consumer's expected recovery initiatives from providers	•Sincere apology •Show respect •Care for the customer •Explanation of why things went wrong •Assert the importance to have consumer as a partner	•Provide a range of recovery options among which the consumer can choose (sense of control) •Resist satisfying excessive demands	•Acknowledge (take responsibility) and explain the problem •Exchange or refund •Compensate for time or energy

1999). We provide an overview of the diagnostics that identify cultural models and the associated consumer recovery expectations in Table 2.

Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

The insights from our research provide a series of avenues for further research. First, it would be useful to investigate whether existing provider recovery strategies lead to groupings (self-selection) of consumers according to their cultural recovery models. For example, providers that emphasize a relational recovery strategy likely disenfranchise consumers with utilitarian and oppositional cultural models. Likewise, it would be worthwhile to study the influence of the identified cultural models on self-relevant (high-involvement) consumer–provider interactions in general. A confirmatory finding of their influence would have repercussions across the marketing field and enable providers to interact with consumers in more adaptive, personalized, resonant, and meaningful ways.

Second, the lack of identification of self-relevant cultural models in existing recovery research makes it difficult to tease out the influence these may have had on current recovery findings. Thus, it would be productive to reinvestigate existing recovery research topics with controls for consumers' cultural models toward providers. We expect that such an investigation would reduce observed inconsistencies and decrease the unexplained variance.

Third, further research would benefit from surveying and comparing more broadly consumer characteristics and the distribution of relational, oppositional, and utilitarian cultural models. The size of our sample is such that we can provide only exploratory evidence regarding the distribution of cultural models within a population group (see Table 1).

Fourth, it would be of interest to tease out further the recovery paradox dynamics across the consumer cultural models scenario. Whereas the relational recovery scenario suggests the presence of a recovery paradox, such a paradox is absent in both the oppositional and the utilitarian scenarios (see Table 2).

Fifth, it would be valuable to ascertain the usefulness of questionnaires for identifying consumers' cultural models preferences before a breach occurs. A prescreening of consumers' cultural models would also be helpful if frontline personnel were poorly trained or few opportunities existed for follow-up interactions with customers during or after a failure/recovery scenario (e.g., online purchases). Such questionnaires could possibly rely on established psychological profiling measures (e.g., Kamakura and Novak 1992) that explore the level of relationship closeness (Berscheid, Snyder, and Omoto 1989), opportunistic behavior (Ping 1993), and utility preferences (Kahneman and Tversky 1979).

REFERENCES

Aaker, David A. (1991), *Managing Brand Equity*. New York: The Free Press.

——— and George S. Day (1982), "Industrywide Responses to Consumerism Pressure," in *Consumerism: Search for the Consumer Interest*, 4th ed., David A. Aaker and George S. Day, eds. New York: The Free Press, 420–25.

Aaker, Jennifer, Susan Fournier, and S. Adam Brasel (2004), "When Good Brands Do Bad," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (1), 1–16.

Allen, Douglas E. (2002), "Toward a Theory of Consumer Choice as Sociohistorically Shaped Practical Experience: The Fits-Like-a-Glove (FLAG) Framework," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (March), 515–32.

Anderson, Eugene and Mary Sullivan (1993), "The Antecedents and Consequences of Customer Satisfaction for Firms," *Marketing Science*, 12 (1), 125–43.

Arnould, Eric and Linda Price (1993), "River Magic: Extraordinary Experience and the Extended Service Encounter," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20 (June), 24–45.

Aron, Arthur, Meg Paris, and Elaine N. Aron (1995), "Falling in Love: Prospective Studies of Self-Concept Change," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69 (6), 1102–1128.

Bandura, Albert (1989), "Self-Regulation of Motivation and Action Through Internal Standards and Goal Systems," in *Goal Concepts in Personality and Social Psychology*, Lawrence A. Perwin, ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 19–85.

Barnes, James G. (1997), "Closeness, Strength, and Satisfaction: Examining the Nature of Relationships Between Providers of Financial Services and Their Retail Customers," *Psychology and Marketing*, 14 (8), 765–90.

Belk, Russell W., Melanie Wallendorf, and John F. Sherry (1989), "The Sacred and the Profane in Consumer Behavior: Theodicy on the Odyssey," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16 (June), 1–38.

Bendapudi, Neeli and Leonard L. Berry (1997), "Customers' Motivations for Maintaining Relationships with Service Providers," *Journal of Retailing*, 73 (1), 15–37.

Berman, William H. (1988), "The Role of Attachment in the Post-Divorce Experience," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54 (3), 496–503.

Berscheid, Ellen, Mark Snyder, and Allen M. Omoto (1989), "The Relationship Closeness Inventory: Assessing the Closeness of Interpersonal Relationships," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57 (5), 792–807.

Best, Arthur and Alan R. Andreasen (1977), "Consumer Responses to Unsatisfactory Purchases: A Survey of Perceiving Defects, Voicing Complaints, and Obtaining Redress," *Law & Society Review*, 11 (Spring), 701–742.

Bettencourt, Lance A. (1997), "Customer Voluntary Performance: Customers as Partners in Service Delivery," *Journal of Retailing*, 73 (3), 383–406.

Bicchieri, Cristina (2006), *The Grammar of Society: The Nature and Dynamics of Social Norms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bitner, Mary Jo, Bernard H. Booms, and Mary Stanfield Tetrault (1990), "The Service Encounter: Diagnosing Favorable and Unfavorable Incidents," *Journal of Marketing*, 54 (January), 71–84.

Blodgett, Jeffrey G., Donna J. Hill, and Stephen S. Tax (1997), "The Effects of Distributive, Procedural, and Interactional Justice on Postcomplaint Behavior," *Journal of Retailing*, 73 (2), 185–210.

Bolton, Lisa E., Luk Warlop, and Joseph W. Alba (2003), "Consumer Perceptions of Price (Un)Fairness," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29 (March), 474–91.

Bolton, Ruth (1998), "A Dynamic Model of the Duration of the Customer's Relationship with a Continuous Service Provider: The Role of Satisfaction," *Marketing Science*, 17 (1), 45–65.

Bowen, David E. and Robert Johnston (1999), "Internal Service Recovery: Developing a New Construct," *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 10 (2), 118–32.

Brockway, George P. (2001), *The End of Economic Man*? New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Brooksbank, Roger (1995), "The New Model of Personal Selling: Micromarketing," *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 15 (2), 61–66.

Brumbaug, Anne M. (2002), "Source and Nonsource Cues in Advertising and Their Effects on the Activation of Cultural and Subcultural Knowledge on the Route to Persuasion," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29 (September), 258–69.

Campbell, Colin (1995), "The Sociology of Consumption," in *Acknowledging Consumption*, Daniel Miller, ed. New York: Routledge, 96–126.

Carver, C.S. and M.F. Scheier (1990), "Principles of Self-Regulation," in *The Handbook of Motivation and Cognition: Foundations of Social Behavior*, Vol. 2, E.T. Higgins and R.M. Sorrentino, eds. New York: Guilford Press, 3–52.

Childers, Terry L., Christopher L. Carr, Joann Peck, and Stephen Carson (2001), "Hedonic and Utilitarian Motivations for Online Retail Shopping Behavior," *Journal of Retailing*, 77 (4), 511–35.

Christensen, Glenn L. and Jerry C. Olson (2002), "Mapping Consumers' Mental Models with ZMET," *Psychology and Marketing*, 19 (6), 477–501.

Corrigan, John (1987), *The Hidden Balance: Religion and the Social Theories of Charles Chauncy and Jonathan Mayhew*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Craighead, Christopher W., Kirk R. Karwan, and Janis L. Miller (2004), "The Effects of Severity of Failure and Customer Loyalty on Service Recovery Strategies," *Production & Operations Management*, 13 (4), 307–21.

Csordas, Thomas J. (1994), "The Body as Representation and Being-in-the-World," in *Embodiment and Experience: The Existential Ground of Culture and Self. Cambridge Studies in Medical Anthropology*, Vol. 2, Thomas J. Csordas and Alan Harwood, eds. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1–26.

D'Andrade, Roy (1992a), "Cognitive Anthropology," in *New Directions in Psychological Anthropology*, Theodore Schwartz, Geoffrey White, and Catherine Lutz, eds. New York: Cambridge University Press, 47–58.

——— (1992b), "Schemas and Motivation," in *Human Motives and Cultural Models*, Roy D'Andrade and Claudia Strauss, eds. New York: Cambridge University Press, 23–44.
——— (1993), "A Folk Model of the Mind," in *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*, Dorothy Holland and Naomi Quinn, eds. New York: Cambridge University Press, 112–50.
Darley, William K. and Robert E. Smith (1995), "Gender Differences in Information Processing Strategies: An Empirical Test of the Selectivity Model in Advertising Response," *Journal of Advertising*, 24 (1), 41–56.
Darnow, Jamie (2005), "Remember Consumer Reports," promotional material, Consumers Union of the United States.
De Ruyter, Ko and Martin Wetzels (2000), "Customer Equity Considerations in Service Recovery: A Cross-Industry Perspective," *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 11 (1), 91–108.
Dick, Alan S. and Kunal Basu (1994), "Customer Loyalty: Toward an Integrated Conceptual Framework," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22 (2), 99–113.
Dimaggio, Paul (1997), "Culture and Cognition," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 263–87.
Everson, Michelle (2006), "Legal Constructions of the Consumer," in *The Making of the Consumer: Knowledge, Power and Identity in the Modern World*, Frank Trentmann, ed. New York: Berg, 99–121.
Fassett, Deanna L. and John T. Warren (2004), "You Get Pushed Back: The Strategic Rhetoric of Educational Success and Failure," *Higher Education. Communication Education*, 53 (1), 21–39.
Fisher, Daniel, Larry E. Beutler, and Oliver B. Williams (1999), "Making Assessment Relevant to Treatment Planning: The STC Clinician Rating Form," *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 55 (7), 825–42.
Folkes, Valerie S. and Barbara Kotsos (1986), "Buyers' and Sellers' Explanations for Product Failure: Who Done It?" *Journal of Marketing*, 50 (April), 74–81.
Fournier, Susan (1998), "Consumers and Their Brands: Developing Relationship Theory in Consumer Research," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24 (March), 343–73.
Gamble, Jos (2006), "Consumers with Chinese Characteristics?" in *The Making of the Consumer: Knowledge, Power and Identity in the Modern World*, Frank Trentmann, ed. New York: Berg, 175–98.
Garry, Patrick M. (1997), *A Nation of Adversaries: How the Litigation Explosion Is Reshaping America*. New York: Plenum Press.
Gergen, Kenneth (1994), *Realities and Relationships: Sounding in Social Constructions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Goodwin, Cathy (1996), "Community as a Dimension of Service Relationships," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 5 (4), 387–405.
Greenberg, Jerald (1990), "Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," *Journal of Management*, 16 (2), 399–432.
Gwinner, Kevin P., Dwayne D. Gremler, and Mary Jo Bitner (1998), "Relational Benefits in Services Industries: The Customer's Perspective," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 26 (2), 101–114.
Harari, Oren (1992), "Thank Heaven for Complainers," *Management Review*, 81 (January), 59–60.
Hart, Christopher W.L., James L. Heskett, and W. Earl Sasser (1990), "The Profitable Art of Service Recovery," *Harvard Business Review*, 68 (July–August), 148–54.
Heisley, Deborah and Sidney Levy (1991), "Autodriving: A Photoelicitation Technique," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18 (4), 257–72.
Hess, Ronald L., Shankar Ganesan, and Noreen M. Klein (2003), "Service Failure and Recovery: The Impact of Relationship Factors on Customer Satisfaction," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31 (2), 127–45.
Hirschman, Albert O. (1970), *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Response to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Hoch, Stephen J. and John Deighton (1989), "Managing What Consumers Learn from Experience," *Journal of Marketing*, 53 (April), 1–20.
Hogg, Michael A. and Craig McGarty (1990), "Self Categorization and Social Identity," in *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and Critical Advances*, Dominic Abrams and Michael A. Hogg, eds. New York: Springer-Verlag, 10–27.
Holbrook, Morris B. and Thomas J. Olney (1995), "Romanticism and Wanderlust: An Effect of Personality on Consumer Preferences," *Psychology & Marketing*, 12 (3), 207–222.
Holland, Dorothy (1992), "How Cultural Systems Become Desire: A Case Study of American Romance," in *Human Motives and Cultural Models*, Roy D'Andrade and Claudia Strauss, eds. New York: Cambridge University Press, 61–89.
——— and Naomi Quinn (1987), *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
——— and Jaan Valsiner (1988), "Cognition, Symbols, and Vygotsky's Developmental Psychology," *Ethos: Journal of the Society for Psychological Anthropology*, 16 (3), 247–72.
Holt, Douglas (1997), "Poststructuralist Lifestyle Analysis: Conceptualizing the Social Patterning of Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 23 (March), 326–50.
——— (1998), "Does Culture Capital Structure American Consumption?" *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25 (1), 1–25.
——— (2002), "Why Do Brands Cause Trouble? A Dialectical Theory of Consumer Culture and Branding," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29 (1), 70–90.
——— and Craig Thompson (2004), "Man-of-Action Heroes: The Pursuit of Heroic Masculinity in Everyday Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 31 (September), 425–40.
Houston, Franklin S. and Julie B. Gassenheimer (1987), "Marketing and Exchange," *Journal of Marketing*, 51 (October), 3–18.
Hundeide, Karsten (1985), "The Tacit Background of Children's Judgments," in *Culture, Communication and Cognition: Vygotskian Perspectives*, James V. Wertsch, ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 306–22.
Iacobucci, Dawn and Amy Ostrom (1993), "Gender Differences in the Impact of Core and Relational Aspects of Services on the Evaluating of Service Encounters," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 2 (3), 257–86.
Jensen, Klaus B. (1987), "Qualitative Audience Research," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 4 (1), 21–36.
Johnson, Michael D. and Fred Selnes (2004), "Customer Portfolio Management: Toward a Dynamic Theory of Exchange Relationships," *Journal of Marketing*, 68 (April), 1–17.
Kahneman, Daniel and Amos Tversky (1979), "Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision Making Under Risk," *Econometrica*, 47 (2), 263–91.
Kalwani, Manohar U. and Narakesari Narayandas (1995), "Long-Term Manufacturer–Supplier Relationships: Do They Pay Off for Supplier Firms?" *Journal of Marketing*, 59 (January), 1–17.
Kamakura, Wagner A. and Thomas P. Novak (1992), "Value-System Segmentation: Exploring the Meaning of LOV," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19 (1), 119–32.
Keller, Kevin Lane (2003), "Brand Synthesis: The Multidimensionality of Brand Knowledge," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29 (4), 595–600.
Kelley, Scott W. and Mark A. Davis (1994), "Antecedents to Customer Expectations for Service Recovery," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22 (1), 52–61.
Kozinets, Robert V. and Jay M. Handelman (2004), "Adversaries of Consumption: Consumer Movements, Activism, and Ideology," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (3), 691–704.

Kruglanski, Arie W. and Donna M. Webster (1996), "Motivated Closing of the Mind: 'Seizing' and 'Freezing,'" *Psychological Review*, 103 (2), 263–83.

Kumar, Nirmalya, Lisa K. Scheer, and Jan-Benedict E.M. Steenkamp (1998), "Interdependence, Punitive Capability, and the Reciprocation of Punitive Actions in Channel Relationships," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 35 (May), 225–35.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson (1980), *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

——— and ——— (1999), *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.

Lambert, Douglas M., Howard Marmorstein, and Arun Sharma (1990), "The Accuracy of Salespersons' Perceptions of their Customers: Conceptual Examination and an Empirical Study," *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 10 (February), 1–9.

Lewicki, Roy and Barbara Benedict Bunker (1995), "Trust in Relationships: A Model of Development and Decline," in *Conflict, Cooperation and Justice*, Barbara Benedict Bunker and Jeffrey Z. Rubin, eds. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass, 133–73.

Macrae, J. Neil and Galen Bodenhausen (2001), "Social Cognition: Categorical Person Perception," *British Journal of Psychology*, 92 (1), 239–55.

Maxham, James G. and Richard G. Netemeyer (2002), "A Longitudinal Study of Complaining Customers' Evaluations of Multiple Service Failures and Recovery Efforts," *Journal of Marketing*, 66 (October), 57–7l.

Mayer, Robert N. (1989), *The Consumer Movement: Guardians of the Marketplace*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.

McAlexander, James H., John W. Schouten, and Harold F. Koenig (2002), "Building Brand Community," *Journal of Marketing*, 66 (January), 38–54.

McCallum, Richard J. and Wayne Harrison (1985), "Interdependence in the Service Encounter," in *The Service Encounter: Managing Employee/Customer Interaction in Services Businesses*, John A. Czepiel, Michael R. Solomon, and Carol F. Surprenant, eds. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 35–48.

Muniz, Albert M. and Thomas C. O'Guinn (2001), "Brand Community," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27 (4), 412–33.

Nader, Ralph (1975), *Unsafe at Any Speed*. New York: Grossman.

Nelson, Eve (1976), *Caveat Emptor*. New York: Arno Press.

Oliver, Richard (1989), "Processing of the Satisfaction Response in Consumption: A Suggested Framework," *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 2, 1–16.

——— (1997), *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*. New York: Richard D. Irwin/McGraw-Hill.

Packard, Vance Oakley (1957), *The Hidden Persuaders*. New York: D. McKay Co.

Peracchio, Laura A. and Alice M. Tybout (1996), "The Moderating Role of Prior Knowledge in Schema-Based Product Evaluation," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 23 (3), 177–93.

Petrof, John V. (1997), "Relationship Marketing: The Wheel Reinvented?" *Business Horizons*, 40 (6), 26–31.

Ping, Robert A. (1993), "The Effects of Satisfaction and Structural Constraints on Retailer Exiting, Voice, Loyalty, Opportunism, and Neglect," *Journal of Retailing*, 69 (3), 320–52.

Price, Linda and Eric Arnould (1999), "Commercial Friendships: Service Provider–Client Relationships in Context," *Journal of Marketing*, 63 (October), 38–56.

———, ———, and Patrick Teirney (1994), "Going to Extremes: Managing Service Encounters and Assessing Provider Performance," *Journal of Marketing*, 59 (April), 83–97.

Protess, David (1991), *The Journalism of Outrage: Investigative Reporting and Agenda Building in America*. New York: Guilford Press.

Quinn, Naomi (1987), "Convergent Evidence of a Cultural Model of American Marriage," in *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*, Dorothy Holland and Naomi Quinnn, eds. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 173–92.

——— and Dorothy Holland (1993), "Culture and Cognition," in *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*, Dorothy Holland and Naomi Quinn, eds. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 3–42.

Richins, Marsha (1983), "An Analysis of Consumer Interaction in the Marketplace," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10 (June), 73–82.

Rodrigues, Amy E., Julie H. Hall, and Frank D. Fincham (2006), "What Predicts Divorce and Relationship Dissolution?" in *Handbook of Divorce and Relationship Dissolution*, Mark A. Fine and John H. Harvey, eds. Mahwah: NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 85–112.

Ross, Glen (1997), "'Dreamtime,' Who's Time? A.P. Elkin and the Construction of Aboriginal Time in the 1930s and 1940s," *Journal of Australian Studies*, 54–55, 58.

Roth, Anthony and Peter Fonagy (1996), *What Works for Whom*. New York: Guildford Press.

Rust, Roland T. and Peter C. Verhoef (2005), "Optimizing the Marketing Interventions Mix in Intermediate-Term CRM," *Marketing Science*, 24 (3), 477–90.

Schminke, Marshall, Maureen L. Ambrose, and Terry W. Noel (1997), "The Effect of Ethical Frameworks on Perceptions of Organizational Justice," *Academy of Management Journal*, 40 (5), 1190–1207.

Sheth, Jagdish N. and Atul Parvatiyar (1995), "Relationship Marketing in Consumer Markets: Antecedents and Consequences," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23 (4), 255–71.

Shore, Brad (1991), "Twice-Born, Once Conceived: Meaning Construction and Cultural Cognition," *American Anthropologist*, 93 (1), 9–27.

——— (1996), *Culture in Mind: Cognition, Culture, and the Problem of Meaning*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Amy K. and Ruth N. Bolton (1998), "An Experimental Investigation of Customer Reactions to Service Failure and Recovery Encounters: Paradox or Peril?" *Journal of Service Research*, 1 (1), 65–81.

———, ———, and Janet Wagner (1999), "A Model of Customer Satisfaction with Service Encounters Involving Failure and Recovery," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 26 (August), 356–72.

Spiro, Roseann L. and Barton A. Weitz (1990), "Adaptive Selling: Conceptualization, Measurement, and Nomological Validity," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 27 (February), 61–69.

Strauss, Anselm and Juliet Corbin (1990), *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Strauss, Claudia and Naomi Quinn (1997), *A Cognitive Theory of Cultural Meaning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tax, Stephen S., Stephen W. Brown, and Murali Chandrashekaran (1998), "Customer Evaluations of Service Complaint Experiences: Implications for Relationship Marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, 62 (April), 60–76.

Thompson, Craig (1997), "Interpreting Consumers: A Hermeneutical Framework for Deriving Marketing Insights from the Texts of Consumer' Consumption Stories," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34 (November), 438–55.

———, Aric Rindfleisch, and Zeynep Arsel (2006), "Emotional Branding and the Strategic Value of the Doppelgänger Brand Image," *Journal of Marketing*, 70 (January), 50–64.

——— and Maura Troester (2002), "Consumer Value Systems in the Age of Postmodern Fragmentation: The Case of the Natural Health Microculture," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (March), 550–71.

Trentmann, Frank (2006), *The Making of the Consumer: Knowledge, Power and Identity in the Modern World*. New York: Berg.

Van Koppen, Peter J. and Steven D. Penrod (2003), "Adversarial or Inquisitional: Comparing Systems," in *Adversarial Versus Inquisitorial Justice: Psychological Perspectives on Criminal Justice Systems*, Peter J. van Koppen and Steven D. Penrod, eds. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 1–19.

Weitz, Barton A., Harish Sujan, and Mita Sujan (1986), "Knowledge, Motivation, and Adaptive Behavior: A Framework for Improving Selling Effectiveness," *Journal of Marketing*, 50 (October), 174–91.

Wells, William D. (1993), "Discovery-Oriented Consumer Research," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19 (March), 489–505.

Wiley, Mary Glenn and C. Norman Alexander Jr. (1987), "From Situated Activity to Self Attribution: The Impact of Social Structural Schemata," in *Self and Identity: Psychosocial Perspectives*, Krysia Yardley and Terry Honess, eds. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 105–117.

Williams, Kaylene C., Rosann L. Spiro, and Leslie M. Fine (1990), "The Customer–Salesperson Dyad: An Interaction/Communication Model and Review," *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 10 (Summer), 29–43.

Winter, Steven L. (2001), *A Clearing in the Forest: Law, Life, and Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zaltman, Gerald (1997), "Rethinking Market Research: Putting People Back In," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34 (November), 424–37.

——— (2002), "Hidden Mind," *Harvard Business Review*, 80 (June), 1–3.

——— and Robin A. Coulter (1995), "Seeing the Voice of the Customer: Metaphor-Based Advertising Research," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 35 (4), 35–51.

Ziethaml, Valarie A., Leonard L. Berry, and A. Parasuraman (1993), "The Nature and Determinants of Customer Expectations of Service," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 21 (1), 1–13.