



Omission and Commission as Marketplace Trauma

Journal:	<i>Journal of Public Policy and Marketing</i>
Manuscript ID	JPPM.15.149.R3
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Revised Submission
Topics and Methods:	

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Peer Review

OMISSION AND COMMISSION AS MARKETPLACE TRAUMA

Abstract

This paper discusses the concepts of omission and commission as marketplace trauma within the theoretical framework of cultural trauma theory. Specific attention is given to identifying the meanings and processes of the people, activities, and outcomes likely when marketplace omission and/or commission occur, as well as the factors that raise these events from collective to cultural trauma. Concepts of social structure, collective practices and collective discourse are utilized in exploration of the interconnectivity of marketplace traumas, their actors, victims, and consequences: constrained consumption, damaged marketing systems, and institutional privilege. The same framework is then leveraged in proposing future research and corrective actions.

KEYWORDS:

Omission; Commission; Cultural Trauma Theory; Constrained Consumption; Marketing Systems; Institutional Privilege

In American culture, as in other cultures, individuals carry markers which signify their inclusion in some groups, and exclusion from others (Alexander 2012; Eyerman 2001; Neal 2005). Such markers demarcate the types of past experiences which group members either directly or vicariously experienced as a result of their inclusion within a group. For example, Native Americans and African Americans carry marks of enslavement and oppression; people with disabilities carry marks from a history of being seen as pitiful and incapable of being productive members in society; women carry shame from being seen as or told they are weak and incompetent; people living in poverty carry the stigma from historical perceptions of poor people being intoxicated or lazy; and people in the LGBT community carry sexual or societal stigmas associated with traits viewed as characteristic of the opposite biological sex (Eyerman 2001). Of course, these perceptions are antiquated and clearly not reflective of the experience of what it means to be a human being who happens to possess one of these status characteristics. Yet, we know that people who possess one or more of these markers are much more likely to experience constrained consumption and vulnerability in the marketplace (Baker 2006; Baker, Gentry, and Rittenburg 2005; Bennett, Hill, and Oleksiuk 2013; Hill 2001; Saatcioglu and Corus 2014; Shultz and Holbrook 2009).

Public policies, such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Similarly the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability. In addition, subsequent legislation were introduced to ensure equal participation and to address discrimination in places of public accommodation, including the commercial marketplace/space. While significant gains have been made as a result of these public policies, significant barriers persist for people belonging to certain groups.

Public policies may develop after collective trauma, which happens to particular groups of people, rises to the level of cultural trauma, which alters society's understanding of itself and its identity (Eyerman 2001). That is, collective trauma happens to "them," people with particular status characteristics that are not like "us." In contrast, cultural trauma happens to "us"; who "we" are is reconsidered and expanded, becoming more inclusive (Alexander 2004b; Baker and Baker 2016; Baker and Hill 2013). This paper explores two sources of collective trauma, marketplace omission and marketplace commission. Marketplace omission occurs when marketers chronically fail to engage, intervene, acknowledge, and/or include the experiences and perspectives of diverse individuals and groups, generally occupying a place of out-group status in the broader society. In contrast, in marketplace commission, the experiences of diverse individuals and groups are included, but they are misrepresented, mistreated, and/or essentialized in stereotypical, discriminatory, and unethical ways. Societal elements create the environments in which these traumas occur, as well as the circumstances under which they transform into cultural traumas.

Experiences of omission and commission converge within individuals who have one or more markers that signify their consumer status (Eyerman 2004). These markers, informed by societal factors, determine in-group and out-group membership. While all people may have markers that signify membership in an excluded group in certain situations, the incidence for out-group status increases significantly for particular groups of consumers (Baker, Gentry, and Rittenburg 2005). In-group status grants some groups welcome in places of public accommodation and renders other groups powerless, by making them invisible or unacceptable (Jones 1997). The reinforcement of out-group disadvantage via production and marketplace

design contributes to a lack of access to goods and services and lack of choice in consumption (Hill 2001; Hill et al. 2015).

Our paper begins by reviewing theoretical frameworks useful for examining omission and commission as marketplace traumas and for explaining the inter-connected natures of these phenomena. Next, we discuss the concepts and experiences of omission and commission as marketplace trauma. The paper concludes with recommendations for future research, policy, and practice.

Theoretical Framing

Cultural Trauma Theory

Cultural trauma theory (CTT), from cultural sociology, provides a powerful framework for explaining how social movements and political action, like those that lead to anti-discrimination legislation, come to fruition (Alexander 2012; Breese 2011; Eyerman 2001; Neal 2005). Within this framework, trauma is a “socially mediated attribution” linked to an event, events, or set of effects that abruptly and harmfully affect identity (Alexander 2012, p. 13). Trauma is a “loss of identity and meaning, a tear in the social fabric, affecting a group of people that has achieved some degree of cohesion” (Eyerman 2004, p. 60). In as much, the occurrence of trauma is not constrained by geographic or temporal proximity.

Important in CTT is understanding the difference between collective trauma and cultural trauma. Whereas collective trauma impacts a centralized group of people, people like ‘them,’ cultural trauma happens to ‘us,’ people of a broader culture, nation, or global community (Neal 2005). For example, the mass murder of Jewish people under Hitler’s rule happened to people of the Jewish faith (collective trauma); however, many members of the global community decided

genocide was not just something that happens to a particular group, it happens to all of us (cultural trauma). Cultural trauma evolves from collective trauma, shaking the social structure of society – the progression of social life as we understand and know it (Neal 2005). It is the reconceptualizing of traumas endured by particular groups, the few, as traumas impacting the whole that drives creation of public policy and marketing practices designed to empower and/or protect the traumatized, disenfranchised, and mistreated.

Cultural trauma is located in the dynamic, nonlinear relationship between four key elements of social life: 1) a collective trauma event, events or set of effects experienced by a particular group; 2) collective discourse; 3) social structure; and 4) collective practices (Alexander 2004b; Breese 2011; Smelser 2004). First, a collective trauma, an event or set of events that happens to a centralized group of people, must be brought to the attention of the broader society. The trauma need not be felt or experienced directly by everyone (Eyerman 2004). Further, trauma events can differ in scale, intensity, and scope (Alexander et al. 2004a). An event in and of itself does not create cultural trauma; cultural trauma *perceptions* are negotiated (Alexander 2004b, 2012; Breese 2011; Smelser 2004). Thus, the focus should not be on the events in and of themselves, but rather how and under what conditions claims of trauma, including exclusion and discrimination, or omission and commission, are made. Cultural trauma is “not the result of experiencing pain. It is the result of this acute discomfort entering into the core of the collectivity’s sense of its own identity” (Alexander 2004b, p. 10).

Second, collective discourse centers on the nature of the trauma, the victims, the relationship between trauma victims and broader society, and the assignment of responsibility (Alexander 2004b). Discourses present reality in stylized forms. Discourse tends to normalize and universalize cultures and dictates how certain practices or persons should be treated as

discrepant or not normal (Varman and Costa 2013). Consideration of discourses presents an opportunity to remove the stylized veneer from marketplace trauma and understand the fundamental effects and their relationships.

Through collective discourse people begin to make sense of experiences and recognize their collective identity is in an active state of negotiation (Riessman 2008). Evolving social norms provide the standard for the moral judgment as to whether a particular state of existence is moral and whether something should be done about it (Alexander 2004a). In American culture, collective discourse surrounding trauma often centers on the dominant core values of equality and freedom (Baker and Hill 2013; Eyerman 2001; Tocqueville 1981). When traumatic events or effects are shown to threaten those core values, the circle of 'we' or 'us' is expanded, and people are more likely to take action in response to suffering (Alexander 2004b; Baker and Baker 2016; Baker and Hill 2013).

Third, the impact of events/effects on the social structure of community may be reflected in or fueled by carrier groups (Alexander 2012; Weber 1968). Carrier groups (religious, scientific, commercial, media, or governmental institutions; elites, marginalized or disenfranchised groups; generations; and so forth) have ideal and material interests in the survival of their society (Alexander 2012). In essence, members of different social groupings (carrier groups) have a stake in what it means to be a member of a broader society. For example, interests of various social groupings could be reflected in questions a woman may ask about what it means to be a member of an organization, an Asian American might ask about what it means to be American, or an American may ask about what it means to be a member of our global community. The salient status grouping in any given situation will determine the discourse and practices generated (Alexander 2012)

Finally, collective practices may be inspired by the events/effects, discourse, and/or different carrier groups within the social structure. People almost always fight against cultural trauma, as they begin to recognize collective trauma as an authentic threat to the continuation of their society (Smelser 2004). Collective action generally occurs in many different spheres of public life and comes in many different forms including war, boycotts, violent and non-violent protests, media and social media buzz, and local, state, and national government committee investigations. These sorts of activities are instrumental to formal public policy development and passage, which must take into account multiple and competing interests reflective of the various carrier groups existence within a broader society (Alexander 2004b). Consequently, these practices reflect and are influenced by the collective discourse and social structure. In addition, practices may alleviate and/or exacerbate the social construction of trauma (Baker and Baker 2016). By illuminating the dynamic relationship between events/effects, discourses, social structure, and practices, cultural trauma theory provides a powerful conceptual tool to address how people, places, and human experiences are represented in times of trauma.

Though CTT has evolved through investigation of the events and effects of slavery (Eyerman 2001), the Holocaust (Alexander 2012), the impeachment of President Clinton (Neal 2005), and domestic terrorism including the Unabomber, Ruby Ridge, and the Oklahoma City Bombing (Neal 2005), CTT transcends a particular context or experience of trauma creation. CTT explains how collectives make sense of damaged social bonds; however, the theory does not account for how material needs, and marketing and public policies facilitate or impede the social construction of trauma. A growing body of work within our field begins to address how material expectations and realities may be a source of suffering (trauma) for particular social groupings (Baker 2009; Baker and Hill 2013; Hill 2001; Hill et al. 2015; Shultz 2014). Within

this body of work, Baker and Baker (2016) extend cultural trauma theory to include material resources and the marketing systems that provide it. The present paper seeks to further understand marketplace trauma and inspire additional research to address omission and commission in the marketplace, which can then inspire and shape policy and market responses. Cultural trauma theory as well as its extensions provided in the framework subsequently developed here provide a fruitful basis for inspiring such action.

In-group and Out-group Bias in the Marketplace

Essential to the understanding of marketplace trauma is understanding the ways in which discourses, social structures, and practices categorize consumers. A variety of psychological and sociocultural mechanisms work, with compounding effect, to elevate some consumers while debasing others. Specifically, social identity markers, edifices of institutionalized privilege, and instinctual urge for social dominance categorize some consumers as belonging to the in-group, thus protecting them from marketplace trauma, while categorizing others as out-group, underserving of said protections.

Extant literature commonly discusses in-group/out-group membership based on race, ethnicity, ability, religion, age, sexuality, economic class, education, and gender (Burton 2005; Fiske 2000; Oakenful 2013). Larger groups, by virtue of number, are better able to promote the interests of their in-group; thus, in-group status may be determined by historic majority populations as compared to the minority. However, sheer size of a grouping is not the sole determinant of a group's power; power is derived from social status. Consider, for example, that a small minority can become a privileged class, much as the college-educated have in the U.S. or Afrikaners have in South Africa.

The interests of particular groups within the social structure are best served when their particular ideals and interests are given priority over the ideals and interests of others. Social identity theory (SIT) has increasingly influenced how the dynamics and sources of intergroup discrimination are understood (Tajfel and Turner 1986). SIT posits that when an out-group member is considered of equal or lower status, even without a prior history of contact, there will be evaluative and behavioral discrimination in favor of the in-group member. In-group preference is considered a function of favoritism toward the in-group rather than hostility toward the out-group (Brewer 1979).

Collective practices that categorize consumers as in-group or out-group are informed by institutionalized privilege. Institutionalized privilege refers to established laws, customs, and practices that systematically reflect and produce a sense of superiority in society (Jones 1997, p. 438). The concept of institutionalized privilege implies the right to assume the universality of one's own experiences, marking others as different or exceptional, while perceiving oneself as normal (McIntosh 1990). Demographics such as race, class, physical ability, and gender place consumers in distinct institutional niches with varying degrees of privilege and constraint; in-group consumers enjoy more of the former and less of the latter.

Collective discourse often develops via the dominance of in-group members within the social structure (Sidanius and Pratto 1993). Social dominance theory (SDT) makes the supposition that evaluations of and behaviors toward out-groups are driven by the desire to have one's own primary in-group (however defined) be considered better than, superior to, and dominant over relevant out-groups (Sidanius and Pratto 1993). SDT suggests that, among other things, social identity affects in-group favoritism, outgroup discrimination, negative stereotyping of out-groups, and willingness to use violence against out-group members. Social dominance

orientation can depend on who is classified as an in-group member. For example, in a working class neighborhood, lower-middle income residents become an in-group instead of a mainstream outgroup. In the nursing profession or childcare arena, female nurses or childcare providers become the in-group and the male equivalents the out-group, and so forth.

While it seems possible that any consumer could find themselves in a situation that marks them as members of an out-group, there are biophysical, psychosocial, and environmental conditions that increase the likelihood that some identity categories will experience marketplace trauma more frequently than others (Baker, Gentry, and Rittenburg 2005). The co-occurrence of multiple identity markers of membership in out-groups increases the possibility of omission and commission even further (Shultz and Holbrook 2009; Gopaldas 2013; Saatcioglu and Corus 2014).

Insert Figure Here

The Figure illustrates the anatomy of marketplace omission and commission within the theoretical framework of cultural trauma theory. CTT suggests that sense-making occurs at the convergence of four meaningful elements: traumatic event/effects, collective discourse, the social structure, and collective practice (Alexander 2004b, Breese 2011; Smelser 2004). The center depicts the first element, while the outer ring of the figure depicts the remaining three. Marketplace omission and/or commission provide the necessary event/events/set of effects around which collective trauma transpires. Trauma events/effects are represented by the overlapping circles in the figure. Irrespective of the nature of their intent, these events/effects transpire in large part as a result of the social identity markers of the affected consumer(s) (Alexander 2012; Eyerman 2001). The human form at the center of the figure contains a partial

list of markers that can trigger marketplace trauma based on out-group membership. The outer ring presents the environmental elements that contribute to marketplace omission and commission—collective practices, social structure, and collective discourse. As an ecosystem, these four components reflect marketplace trauma with evident deleterious impacts: restricted consumption, damaged marketing systems, and affirmation of institutionalized privilege (Hill et al. 2015). These elements are also essential in the elevation of a collective trauma to a cultural one.

Marketplace Traumas – Omission and Commission

Marketplace traumas impact individuals who carry particular social identity markers (see Figure). These markers can increase the likelihood that people within these groups will experience situations where they are powerless and vulnerable (Baker, Gentry, and Rittenburg 2005; Saatcioglu and Corus 2014).

Marketplace Omission

Marketplace omission refers to behaviors by marketers that chronically fail to engage, intervene, acknowledge and/or include the experiences and perspectives of diverse individuals and groups. Marketplace omission creates events/effects that can engender collective trauma. As a source of collective trauma (it happens to ‘them’) with potential to lead to cultural trauma (it happens to ‘us’), it is necessary to understand how these events interact with the other elements of trauma. To unpack the meanings and processes underlying marketplace omission, it is necessary to understand who is omitted, what they are omitted from, how they were omitted, and with what impact.

Social Structure and Marketplace Signals

Marketing, as an institution, tends to be comprised of and, therefore, favor the dominant in-group (US Bureau of Labor Statistics 2016; Lapchick 2015). This favoritism is reflected within marketing mix elements such as product design, store location and design, merchandising, employee hiring/training practices, prices, modes of delivery, and marketing communications. These elements then serve as signals for the type of customer anticipated and accepted (Baker, Holland, and Kaufman-Scarborough 2007; Grier and Kumanyika 2010; Sirgy, Grewal, and Mangleburg 2000). Such signals from the marketplace may indicate perceptual or attitudinal biases in favor of members of one group over members of other groups, i.e., in-group and out-group bias (Brewer 1979). In-groups have institutional privilege afforded by a marketing mix that signals anticipation and acceptance of their needs. However, these same signals may emit biases that render out-groups experiences invisible in particular contexts (Baker 2006; Choo and Ferec 2010). For example, Naomi, who is a blind widow, regularly has marketplace experiences that are impacted by her disability, a marker of her outgroup membership. As she discusses her restaurant experiences, she notes how the servers send the signal that she is invisible and not a valued consumer in the marketplace:

The one I don't like is when they say, 'What does she want?' [to one of my friends.] I get that now and then. ... I don't know. I just feel degraded. Why don't they talk directly to me? I am a person, and I am there, and I could answer....I want to be treated as if I am the client. [Naomi in Baker 2006, p. 46].

Discourses & Practices: Lack of Inclusion, Access and Accommodation

Marketing mix elements often fail to include, anticipate, or signal acceptance of particular customer segments, figuratively, literally, or spatially (Baker 2006; Bennett, Hill and Olesuik 2013; Pavia and Mason 2014; Saatcioglu and Ozanne 2013). Omission occurs when out-

group members' identities and needs are not considered or reflected in marketing messages, design, and delivery. In other words, omission distorts discourses related to impacted consumers. Marketplace omission results in the narratives of many types of consumers not receiving consideration in marketing messages (Russell, Schau and Crockett 2013). Products and services often fail to represent the needs of some segments of consumers (Baker 2006; Baker, Holland and Kaufman-Scarborough 2007). Similarly, employee hiring and training practices regularly fail recognize some segments of consumers (Dobbin, Kalev and Kelly 2007). As a direct result, certain customers have reduced access and/or accommodations in the marketplace.

For example, a nation-wide grocery chain had an English-only policy that mandated that employees must speak English when in the presence of customers and any time they were on the clock and discussing work-related tasks or subjects (Robb 2013). This policy unnecessarily limited the assistance that employees could provide to non-English speaking customers and was only discontinued after consumers threatened to boycott the store. Policies that engender marketplace omission, the discourses surrounding them, and the practices, including potential boycotts, to correct a non-inclusive policy, demonstrate that social norms are developed over time. In the grocer's case, the discourse over the exclusionary policy must be seen within the context of the wider evolving and mounting societal discourse over immigration rights. The interpretation of the existence of such policies, as trauma, must be established over time, and requires mediation and active discourse (Eyerman 2004).

Defining the Scope of Marketplace Omission

Marketplace omission is not simply the act of a particular firm engaging in target marketing practices, which inevitably result in members of non-targeted groups not being served by that firm (Grier and Kumanyika 2010). While it can be said that a firm elected to exclude a

particular segment from its marketing strategy, actively deciding not to engage for the purpose of engendering a positive result is insufficient to qualify as omission. It is legally, socially and normatively acceptable, within reason, for a firm to engage in target marketing. In other words, target marketing results in some groups being omitted, but it is not in and of itself a collective marketplace trauma. A collective marketplace trauma occurs when the entire marketing system fails to include the needs of a segment of society, such as a marketing system that fails to engage people living in poverty (Hill 2001; Viswanathan et al. 2009).

Marketplace omission is not exclusion due to membership criteria restrictions or requirements. Membership can serve to constructively engage a targeted group and may serve as a tactic for strengthening a firm's relationship with its customers (Lieberman 1999; Shani and Sreekanth 1992; Shultz 2014), increasing the attractiveness of an offering for members of the targeted group. However, when marketers within the broader marketing system use targeting strategies or membership exclusivity to disengage with a particular market segment to its detriment, this may lead to marketplace omission that initiates collective trauma.

Impact of Marketplace Omission

Failing to anticipate and accept a specific group of consumers can preclude members of that group from fully engaging in and enjoying the privilege afforded by the marketplace (Baker 2006; Pechman et al. 2011). Marketplace omission is a collective trauma, resulting in restricted choice for the neglected consumers, furtherance of institutional privilege and damaged marketing systems. Recently, Bone, Christensen and Williams (2014) considered the impact of chronic marketplace omission through restricted choice on minority, compared to majority, consumers. They found that majority consumers described the process of applying for and receiving credit as an "even road" or "windfall." In contrast, minority consumers, blacks and Hispanics, felt

“shackled” and oppressed by the institutional structure inherent in the design of financial services. Additionally, prior to the passage of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), the health care system in the United States omitted a large swath of potential consumers. Individuals with pre-existing conditions, the unemployed, and those not fully covered by their employer’s healthcare plans and/or transgender citizens did not have access to basic health care facilities (Sommers et al. 2013). As a consequence, these consumers suffered from poorer health compared to their more privileged peers.

For members of the out-group, lack of inclusion denigrates a relevant social identity, reinforcing institutional privilege. Marketplace omission does not result from marketing mix strategies designed to target specific segments of the population, rather, from failure to acknowledge the presence or recognize the value of particular groups of consumers such that they are invisible in the marketplace. Returning to the previous grocery store/retailer example, a policy that does not reflect the possibility of non-English speaking customers ignores the needs of members of immigrant communities.

Traumas of omission are damaging to the very marketing systems that are expected to better society as a whole (Shultz 2014). When marketers in the aggregate marketing system fail to constructively engage certain segments, they risk systematically excluding groups of consumers, through actions and inactions, resulting in alienation (Andreasen and Manning 1990) and consumer vulnerability (Baker, Gentry, and Rittenburg 2005; Kaufman-Scarborough and Childers 2009; Shultz and Holbrook 2009). Prior to the passing of ACA, uninsured patients endangered the viability of the health care system. Unable to attain coverage for preventative care, these consumers often delayed medical visits until they were in need of urgent and critical care. The uncompensated cost of providing this care to the uninsured negatively impacted the

bottom line of the health care system by \$45.9 billion, annually (American Hospital Association 2012).

Marketplace Commission

Marketplace commission refers to behaviors that explicitly misrepresent, mistreat, and/or essentialize the expressions and perspectives of diverse individuals and groups. In this case, groups are included, but represented or treated in stereotypical, discriminatory, and unethical ways. As a source of collective trauma, it is necessary to understand how commission interacts with the other elements of trauma. To unpack the meanings and processes underlying marketplace commission, we endeavor to understand against whom these behaviors are directed, what types of behaviors are committed and by whom, and the impacts of such behaviors.

Social Structure and In-Group Preference

Marketing as an institution favors the dominant in-group. Marketing professionals tend to be Caucasian and middle to high income, a fact that skews their worldview (U.S. Department of Labor Statistics 2016; Burton 2009). Their worldview and interests of various social grouping are reflected in the design of marketing mix elements, including store layout and design and marketing messages. Attitudinal and perceptual biases favor members of one's own group over members of other groups. Such in-group biases preserve in-group solidarity by justifying exploitation of members of out-groups (Brewer 1979), creating environments that are welcoming to the in-group but may cultivate trauma for out-group members. .

There are factors that increase the likelihood of some groups experiencing collective trauma through marketplace commission more than others (Baker, Gentry, and Rittenburg 2005). For example, institutional privilege decreases the likelihood that members of some groups will experience acts of commission with as great a frequency (Burton 2009; Jones 1997). In other words, members in one of the out-groups identified previously, are more likely to experience

marketplace commission. For example, Sam, a married, professional, white male, in his forties, has one social identity marker that denotes an out-group status, a disability – Sam is blind. Sam is deliberately given incorrect change for a twenty dollar bill by a store attendant during a transaction; an act which is brought to his attention by a fellow customer who witnesses the attempted fraud [Sam in Baker 2006, p. 44]. Further, the existence of more than one identity marker as a member of an out-group within a particular individual increases the possibility of commission (Gopaldas 2013; Saatcioglu and Corus 2014; Shultz and Holbrook 2009).

Discourses & Practices: Misrepresentation and Mistreatment

Marketplace commission can occur either intentionally or unintentionally. A common theme is that the behavior involves an explicit misrepresentation or mistreatment of an out-group segment, either in a marketing message or in the design and delivery of marketplace interactions. In contrast to marketplace omission, in marketplace commission out-group members' identities are represented, but cast in a negative light. In denigrating the identity of out-groups, commission necessarily alters the narratives of these same groups. Marketplace commission also occurs when the presence of a member of an out-group in the marketplace results in intentional or unintentional discrimination, degradation, or denial of opportunity.

Marketplace commission can alter discourses, resulting in the distortion, dilution or disposal of the narratives of consumers who do not carry privileged social identity markers. Research on portrayals of ethnic minorities in advertising is suggestive of persistent stereotypes (Motley, Henderson, and Baker 2003). For example, Taylor, Landreth, and Bang (2005) found that Asian Americans are disproportionately portrayed in ads for technical products, and in business settings and business relationships, as opposed to social settings or family relationships.

While some may consider such stereotypes as positive, they alter the discourses of minorities in the marketplace.

In the design and delivery of marketplace interactions, mistreatment of an out-group identity constitutes a marketplace commission. This mistreatment often reflects socially normative practices. Research on commission has examined the link between stereotyping in society and explains how it has led to differential treatment in the marketplace based upon cultural, racial, and physical characteristics and assumptions (Crockett, Grier, and Williams 2003). For example, a consumer with a disability whose participation in the marketplace is blocked because of design characteristics, experiences marketplace commission (Baker and Kaufman-Scarborough 2001). Similarly, a transgender individual who is denied access to a unisex bathroom, or to the bathroom of the gender he/she identifies with, because of explicit or implicit retailer policies, also experiences marketplace commission. In each of these examples, the marketplace actor/service provider responsible for committing the mistreatment is being guided by generally accepted societal norms.

Impact of Marketplace Commission

The social implications of discrimination against out-group members while in the marketplace, shopping, attempting to obtain a loan, or purchase housing, create systemic restricted choice (Bone, Christensen, and Williams 2014; Hill 2001; Hill et al. 2015). Furthermore, marketplace commission can be damaging to marketing systems, resulting in consumers seeking legal recourse (Baker and Kaufman-Scarborough 2001), or resentment and violence (Johnson, Meyers, and Williams 2013).

Marketplace commission, in the misrepresentation and/or mistreatment of consumers with out-group social markers, upholds institutionalized privilege. As a consequence,

commission may have negative psychological and social consequences. In the realm of minority portrayals in advertising, members of a stereotyped group, for example Asian Americans being portrayed as technically savvy and mathematically gifted, may feel substantial levels of pressure that affect self-esteem and lead to social problems (Taylor and Lee 1994). Though perceived reality differs from actual reality, portrayals are not likely to change substantially, especially when voices of out-group members are not included in the design of marketing messages, products, and environments (Korzenny and Korzenny 2011; Kumaki, Moran, and Gendinger 2010; Miller 2012). Moreover, repeated exposure to a stereotype can lead the majority to accept the stereotype as reality (Gerbner et al. 1980).

Additive Effects of Marketplace Omission and Commission

What differentiates marketplace omission and commission are the more implicit versus explicit nature of the actions, the degree of intentionality, and the failure to intervene versus deliberate repression. However, these acts are not detached, insulated actions perpetuated by disparate groups with unrelated motivations, but often overlap on various levels of complexity. Easily recognizable instances of this convergence of a set of effects are evident when marketplace omission can lead to marketplace commission and vice versa. The marketing of whiteness creams toward consumers with darker complexions is one such example. Certain marketing practices articulate lighter colored and darker colored consumers in an essentialized manner (Karnani 2007). Such practices misrepresent non-whites as unsuccessful based on their skin color – an act of commission. This act then perpetuates social practices that ultimately exclude people, disproportionately women, based on their skin color, which in turn lead to acts of omission.

Further, the effects of omission and commission converge within individuals who have one or more markers that signify a particular consumer status (Eyerman 2004; Gopaldas 2013; Saatcioglu and Corus 2014; Shultz and Holbrook 2009). Naomi, the blind widow introduced in a previous example, noticed an increase in traumatic marketplace experiences when accompanied by friends, after the passing of her husband; this increase coincided with her assuming membership in a second out-group, the widowed. Marketplace experiences for a consumer with multiple markers of out-group status over time and across circumstances (for example, a blind, aging widow or a young, black, transgender male) can lead to systemic restricted consumption, damaged marketing systems, and affirmation of institutional privilege (Bone, Christensen, and Williams 2004; Hill et al. 2015).

Collective trauma through the marginalization, exclusion, non-inclusion, subordination of certain groups or people in the marketplace may involve both acts of omission and commission. Social structures, discourses, and practices create an environment that can lead to either, or both, types of traumas and their consequences (Eyerman 2001, 2004). Within this environment, communities, firms, policy makers, industries, and even individuals can serve as the perpetrators. Separately and in conjunction, marketplace omission and commission are enacted against individuals and groups, often based on out-group status that can stem from a number of immutable traits, including but not limited to gender, race, ethnicity, physical ability, socio-economic status, religion, and/or sexuality. As LaFrance (1998, p. 136) notes, “the perceived liberation achievable through the marketplace is mainly accessible by western, white, heterosexual, able-bodied, middle-class”. Out-groups engage with the market on the margins of the ideal, experiencing on one hand, an acute sense of omission in terms of their invisibility and on the other, they are misrepresented as flawed and unworthy. These experiences of collective

trauma often translate into restrictive consumption realities, causing psychological stress (Hutton 2015), intra-household inequalities (Cantillon and Nolan 2001), and feelings of societal and cultural separation (Allison 1978; Hamilton 2009). When the symbiotic relationship between marketplace omission and commission and the additive impact of multiple out-group markers are explicitly considered, it is possible to better question the ways that these collective traumas provide the foundations for cultural trauma.

Movement from Collective Trauma to Cultural Trauma

Cultural trauma grows out of collective trauma. Cultural trauma arises when the larger society comes to understand that omission and commission are not just marketplace traumas that impact 'them' (collective trauma) but rather, that they are marketplace traumas that impact all of 'us.' The movement of collective trauma to cultural trauma is influenced by the scale and intensity of a trauma event or set of effects which vary in terms of scale and intensity of discourse, participation from members of different social groupings, and practices. In moments when those outside of the traumatized collectives decide that it is imperative that everyone be granted equal access the most important public policies of our time transpire. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 came about when the faces of oppression were too many and too apparent for us to not realize that the denigration of people based on race or national origin was about the denigration of all of us. The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 was passed when the faces of oppression were too many and too apparent for us to not realize that the denigration of people based on disability was about the denigration of all of us. The 2016 Supreme Court ruling legalizing gay marriage was enacted when society understood that the restrictions facing homosexual couples had become too numerous and too apparent for us not to recognize that

denying the right to marriage was an affront to the institution of marriage. Through events, discourse, practices, and participation across a wide-spectrum of social groupings, we come to realize that public policy and marketing practice can be employed to create lasting, positive, impactful change that improves the wellbeing of the people whose social lives are inextricably linked with the marketing system (Shultz 2014).

A marketplace example of the recognition of the collective trauma inflicted on a particular set of consumers as a cultural trauma impacting society can be found in Target's inclusive policy toward the transgender community. Amidst a national discourse on transgender rights, Target, a nation-wide retailer, announced that consumers and employees can use the restroom or fitting room facility that corresponds with their gender identity. This policy acknowledges the trauma that restrictive policies visit upon transgendered customers/employees and actively creates a practice that rectifies it. In doing so, Target joined the ranks of other retailers, H&M, Urban Outfitters, Hudson's Bay Company and Barnes and Noble, which already have inclusive restroom/changing room policies. These firms are setting the stage for a marketplace, and societal, shift; helping to raise the collective trauma endured by transgendered consumers to the level of cultural trauma.

The political ideology underlying American culture espouses freedom and equality as a normative reference point (Tocqueville 1981); this ideology extends to the marketplace (Baker and Hill 2013). A marketing system whose design continues to foster institutional privilege is not one that is constructively engaged with the human beings it is intended to serve (Shultz 2014). The marketing system, in an ideal world, would serve the needs of all types of consumers, not just those with institutional privilege. When the marketing system chronically fails to engage and/or discriminates against some types of consumer groups, those possessing out-group

markers, the marketing system fails to deliver on its promise of a higher standard of living and life quality for the people it is designed to serve. When the larger society comes to believe that these denigrating and dejecting experiences impact not just consumers who belong to out-groups, such as the disabled, those in the LGBT community, people of color, the poor, but harm the entire market, collective traumas rise to cultural traumas. However, culture is neither univocal nor uniformly consistent in practice. Some narratives and practices may energize the social movement toward inclusion and away from discrimination, while other narratives and practices may resist movements toward social change. Ultimately, the issue relates to distinctions between and responsibilities of people as consumers and people as human beings or citizens of the world.

Contributions, Future Directions, and Implications

In this paper, we have highlighted the complex relationship between marketplace omission and commission, their interplay with other elements of the trauma process, including discourse, social structures, and practices, and their consequences for multiple-marginalized groups, using specific examples of exclusion and discrimination based on social categories such as race, disability, and gender identity. The ultimate consequences of marketplace omission and commission are restricted choice for a subset of consumers, damaged marketing systems, and reinforcement of institutionalized privilege.

Contributions and Future Directions

Our paper contributes in three important ways. First, we offer cultural trauma theory extended into the marketing and public policy literature as a promising framework for generating interesting and useful research questions and directions. Trauma claims are made when something of sacred value, for example what it means to be a human being, is believed to be

treated as profaned. Attributions for the debasing of a particular social identity category are linked to a particular event or set of effects; thus, suggesting assignment of responsibility and a course for corrective action. For example, if people with disabilities are denied choice or access within the marketplace, then marketplace trauma occurs. The Americans with Disabilities Act specifies that people with disabilities are worthy of choice and access and requires that both be provided within the commercial marketplace (Baker and Kaufman-Scarborough 2001). Omission and commission directed toward people with disabilities is no longer seen as something that happens to them, the onus is on all of us, including providers in the commercial marketplace, to provide accommodation and alleviate the trauma caused by omission and commission.

When the event/effects of omission and commission along with collective discourse, social structure, and collective practices are represented, the process of making claims about a social reality is illuminated. Trauma is not an event; trauma is a collective decision to see an event/set of effects as traumatizing. This decision is then linked to demand for psychological, institutional, and cultural preparation and reconstitution (Alexander 2012). It is only when particular traumas of omission and commission are recognized that resources and actions are directed toward it. We encourage additional research surrounding particular traumas and policy responses, particularly those linked to restricted consumption, damaged marketing systems, and institutional privilege.

Second, we explain the difference between collective and cultural trauma, and begin to highlight the process by which a trauma elevates from a collective trauma to a cultural trauma. Omission and commission that happens to “them,” fails to engage the broader public. In contrast, omission and commission that relates their suffering to our suffering, represents a threat to identity and spurs collective discourse and practices. Future research on the particular

mechanisms that raise the level of trauma from collective to cultural trauma is warranted. What environmental elements engender a cohesive narrative on cultural trauma? Future research and dialogue on how exclusion and discrimination of people like “them” translates to a responsibility for all of “us” is sorely needed. How many and what types of people are needed to move the focus from trauma about “them” to trauma about “us?” What types of claims are most believable?

Further research on the types of claims of suffering that have the most leverage would be beneficial. Likewise, how does the environmental context play a role in the validity and believability of different claims of trauma? And, what individual and cultural differences influence the trauma creation process? Contingent emotions and reactions of the targeted individuals are likely to vary based on the stability or frequency of incidences of marketplace omission and commission, in addition to perceptions of blame and intentionality (Weiner 2012). Cross-cultural differences in value and ethics can cause significant differences in the interpretation of experiences (Paul, Roy and Mukhopadhyay 2006). Hence, actions of omission and/or commission are most likely to be interpreted and acted upon based upon the ascriptions or attributions made by the targeted individuals, as well as members of different carrier groups who may have ideal or material interests at stake.

Third, this paper highlights three potential consequences of omission and commission: restricted consumption, damaged marketing systems, and institutional privilege. By highlighting these sets of effects of omission and commission, our work contributes to the discourse about the impact of such effects on wellbeing. The marketing system signals the acceptability of different identities in the marketplace. When a marketing system that excludes or discriminates against

people in certain groups, it fails to deliver a desirable standard of living to such groups, resulting in restricted consumption and the continuation of institutional privilege.

Implicit marketing biases and insensitivities stemming from a lack of diversity of perspectives ultimately damage marketing systems. Rendering some groups as practically invisible or noticeable only in certain depictions reveals a lack of societal awareness of diverse others, resulting in non-representation or mis-representation of segments of the population in media, film, and corporations. Additionally, ignorance of the norms and needs of others ultimately leads to a restriction of consumption choices, in terms of products and venues for those in the stigmatized groups, especially when no alternative exists. For example, ambient scent in stores and malls often mars the shopping experience for those with high olfactory sensitivity, leading to future avoidance of those venues or others located near offending sites (Cross, Lin and Childers 2015). The absence of unisex bathrooms or fitting rooms in public places also detracts from the shopping experience for transgender consumers. Traumas like this, whether careless or intentional, serve to reinforce institutionalized privilege, often leading to a lack of repeat purchase, patronage, or advocacy for the brand or establishment.

We encourage additional research surrounding particular traumas and policy responses that oppress and constrain particular groups, particularly research that enhances our understanding of the human experience of suffering and the possible ways that marketing and public policies could be engaged to alleviate trauma. Why do some traumas exist for decades with no remedy, but then all of the sudden a particular case sparks change? For example, why did the case of Matthew Shepard, a victim of sexuality-based hate crime, spark the collective imagination at that particular moment in time?

Implications for Policy and Practice

Forward-thinking organizations and policy makers realize the business and societal case for diversity and the current and future consequences of omission and commission as marketplace traumas. As society moves forward, researchers, marketers and policy makers need to more closely examine the instances and effects of these current and future consequences on consumer choice, consumer wellbeing, and the longevity of marketing systems. Progressive societies should, and *must*, investigate the forces that leave all involved (perpetrators, bystanders, and victims), whether members of perceived in-groups or out-groups, more vulnerable to the evolution of a dysfunctional society. The marketing system functions best when marketers, retailers and consumers understand and work together to mitigate the biases and societal pressures that result in the armoring of self, suspicion deep-seated anger, resentments and fear among consumer groups (Shultz 2014).

The remedy for marketplace trauma lies within the same environmental elements that beget it: social structure, collective practices and collective discourse. It is essential that the wider society plays a major role in holding perpetrators accountable, by assuming the role of carrier group, helping to develop and enforce policies and regulations, and following acts of injustice with corrective action. Practices that encourage fairness in marketplace interactions with all groups, also reinforce the notion of being a good corporate citizen and helps to mitigate alienation of minority groups at a societal level. Thus, monitoring, surveillance, and vigilance of employee-customer interactions, through methods such as mystery shoppers, needs to be part of on-going employee training, as retailers and corporations work harder to coach and empower employees to be fair and vigilant. Consumers also need to engage in constructive discourse, permitting them to become better educated and confident about their individual and collective rights as buyers. This may involve the use of prominent displays in retail settings, or the public

actions or statements by powerful marketplace retailers, like Target, that communicate that non-inclusion of certain consumer groups is not an option. These actions would help to empower consumers – both marginalized and non – to act when injustices occur.

There are, of course, also legal remedies and actions. Federal, state and local authorities must continue to be vigilant in prosecuting acts and crimes on both domains. In instances of marketplace omission, authorities have continued to monitor “redlining” cases of denying housing and home-improvement loans, mortgages, insurance, failure to open branches in minority neighborhoods, or even deliver food to mostly low income minority populations and neighborhoods (D’Rozario and Williams 2005; Squires 2011). Technological advances require that authorities remain vigilant in identifying instances of marketplace trauma as the manifestation of discrimination continues to undergo a metamorphosis. For example, some banks have proposed apps that filter potential borrowers by assessing their creditworthiness based on their social media presence such as their stock of *Facebook* friends (Bhattacharya 2015; Gumbus and Meglich, 2013). The use of such “weblining” and other technologically enabled techniques should also be monitored by governmental agencies as potential acts of omission.

Traumas of commission should also continue to be monitored by relevant regulatory agencies. These agencies must endeavor to protect all segments of consumers from mistreatment in the marketplace. An example of this type of protection can be found in a Colorado Court of Appeals’ recent ruling that deemed it unlawful for a local baker to refuse to provide a wedding cake for a same sex couple (Eckholm 2015). This ruling upholds a Colorado law that prohibits public accommodations from refusing service on the basis of factors such as race, sex, marital status or sexual orientation. In another example, the U.S. Justice Department issued an announcement aimed at the protection of the financial wellbeing of impoverished citizens.

Calling on state judges to eliminate the use of arrest warrants as a way to collect fees, the Justice Department offered \$2.5 million in grants to help courts effect change (Apuzzo, 2016). Cited as unconstitutional, such policies can lock poor individuals in a cycle of debt, increasing the likelihood that they would be arrested, jailed and fined repeatedly.

At varying levels of analysis, this theoretical framework can be expanded to include not just consumer traits and characteristics, but also linkages between societal acts of omission and commission that lead to the ostracism of some consumers, simultaneously in both the marketplace and the wider society. Given the human tendency to segregate and create an outgroup (Sibley 1995), researchers must not only consider the potential inevitability, of acts of omission and commission in the marketplace, but also the inevitable interconnectedness of the societal forces that paradoxically drive and mitigate these acts. The forces that typically foster acts of omission and commission (social discourse, boycotts and policies) are typically the same forces that counter these acts, as our examples have shown.

Throughout the paper, our examples used to demonstrate marketplace acts of omission and commission, and the suggestions given thus far to prevent or offset these acts, indicate that potential actions to help avoid, mitigate or correct these marketplace traumas revolve around what we term the “3 E’s”: exposure, education, and empathy. Exposing the public to the fact that acts of omission and commission *do* exist and educating them on the detrimental nature of these acts on certain members of society can provide the first impetus for change and stimulate consensus around an issue. This is often done through social discourse, relevant research, encouraging people to actively engage in their broader communities, age appropriate educational content at all levels, and public statements by prominent figures and members of both out-groups and in-groups denouncing these acts. Garnering social support for change often disempowers

counterarguments. Encouraging empathy by reminding marketers that the American Marketing Association (AMA)'s values include the simple mandate of "Do no harm" can awaken marketplace sensitivity to the potential harm actions may cause. The media – news media, advertisers and film producers – can also play a role by 1) empathically reflecting the diversity in society and highlighting the similarities across diverse consumers; 2) providing balanced portrayals of individuals and consumers of both in-groups and out-groups; 3) showcasing marginalized individuals as nuanced, complex and multi-faceted, rather than narrow, stereotypical and deviant from the norm. Using the 3 E's framework (exposure, education and empathy) to foster simple unveiled recognition of overt and subtle acts of marketplace omission and commission can have a positive, empowering effect, fueling individual drive to succeed, and rallying societies or groups together for a cause.

Conclusion

Increasingly, scholars are advocating for research in marketing and public policy which addresses the tensions and experiences of exclusion and marginalization, together with how market tactics contribute to these circumstances (Pechmann et al. 2011). Our paper contributes by illuminating omission and commission as marketplace trauma, by explaining when collective trauma rises to the level of cultural trauma, and by offering a theoretical framing that provides a valuable basis for future research as well as policy and practice refinement. However, much work remains to be done. The tasks of identifying the local and historically particular configurations of marketplace traumas created by traumas of marketplace omission and commission, their overlapping effects within individuals and social groups, and how to attend to these traumas so that bringing the agency of the disadvantaged into focus does not leave the actions of the powerful out of sight remain.

While, this paper has advanced marketers and researchers' understanding of the nature of marketplace acts of omission and commission, as well as their relationship, we have not fully exhausted an investigation of the constructs. A distinct challenge from the transformative consumer perspective remains: how to interrogate the overlapping effects of marketplace omission and commission more closely, in order to identify how deficit and privilege are made, sustained, justified and reified over time, with a keen eye toward their unmaking. Ultimately, advancing understanding of the dimensions and the relationship between these marketplace phenomena will permit us to enact policies and practices aimed at eradicating them.

References

- Alexander, Jeffrey C. (2004a), "On the Social Construction of Moral Universals," in *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*, Jeffrey C. Alexander, Ron Eyerman, Bernard Giesen, Neil J. Smelser, and Piotr Sztompka (Eds.), Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 196-263.
- Alexander, Jeffrey C. (2004b), "Toward a Theory of Cultural Trauma," in *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*, Jeffrey C. Alexander, Ron Eyerman, Bernard Giesen, Neil J. Smelser, and Piotr Sztompka (Eds.), Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1-30.
- Alexander, Jeffrey C. (2012), *Trauma: A Social Theory*, Cambridge UK: Polity Press.
- Allison, Neil K. (1978), "A Psychometric Development of a Test for Consumer Alienation from the Marketplace," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 565-575.
- American Hospital Association (2014), "Uncompensated Hospital Care Fact Sheet." [available at <http://www.aha.org/content/14/14uncompensatedcare.pdf>]
- Andreasen, Alan R. and Jean Manning (1990), "The Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior of Vulnerable Consumers," *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 3, 12-20.
- Apuzzo, Matt (2016), "Justice Department Condemns Profit Minded Court Policies Targeting the Poor," *The New York Times*.
- Baker, Stacey Menzel (2006), "Consumer Normalcy: Understanding the Value of Shopping through Narratives of Consumers with Visual Impairments," *Journal of Retailing*, 82 (1), 37-50.
- Baker, Stacey Menzel and Courtney Nations Baker (2016), "The Bounce in Our Steps from Shared Material Resources in Cultural Trauma and Recovery," *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research*, 1 (2), 314-335.

- Baker, Stacey Menzel, James W. Gentry, and Terri L. Rittenburg (2005), "Building Understanding of the Domain of Consumer Vulnerability," *Journal of Macromarketing*, 25 (2), 128-39.
- Baker, Stacey Menzel and Ronald Paul Hill (2013), "A Community Psychology of Object Meanings: Identity Negotiation during Disaster Recovery," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 23 (3), 275-87.
- Baker, Stacey Menzel, Jonna Holland, and Carol Kaufman-Scarborough (2007), "How Consumers with Disabilities Perceive 'Welcome' in Retail Servicescapes: A Critical Incident Study," *Journal of Services Marketing*, 21 (3), 160-73.
- Baker, Stacey Menzel and Carol Kaufman-Scarborough (2001), "Marketing and Public Accommodation: A Retrospective on Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 20 (2), 297-304.
- Bhattacharya, Ananya (2015), "Facebook Patent: Your Friends Could Help You Get a Loan- or Not," [available at: <http://money.cnn.com/2015/08/04/technology/facebook-loan-patent/>].
- Bennett, Aronté Marie, Ronald Paul Hill, and Daniel Oleksiuk (2013), "The Impact of Disparate Levels of Marketplace Inclusion on Consumer-brand Relationships," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 32 (special issue), 16-31.
- Bone, Sterling A., Glenn L. Christensen, and Jerome D. Williams (2014), "Rejected, Shackled, and Alone: The Impact of Systemic Restricted Choice on Minority Consumers' Construction of Self," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41 (2), 451-74.
- Breese, Elizabeth Butler (2011), "Claiming Trauma through Social Performance: The Case of Waiting for Godot," in *Narrating Trauma: On the Impact of Collective Suffering*, Ronald Eyerman, Jeffrey C. Alexander, and Elizabeth Butler Breese (Eds.), Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 213-236.

- Brewer, Marilyn B. (1979), "In-group Bias in the Minimal Intergroup Situation: A Cognitive-motivational Analysis," *Psychological Bulletin*, 86 (2), 307-324.
- Burton, Dawn (2005), "New Course Development in Multicultural Marketing," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 27 (2), 151-162.
- Burton, Dawn (2009), "'Reading' Whiteness in Consumer Research," *Consumption, Markets and Culture*, 12 (2), 171-201.
- Cantillon, Sara and Brian Nolan (2001), "Poverty within Households: Measuring Gender Differences Using Nonmonetary Indicators," *Feminist Economics*, 7 (1), 5-23.
- Choo, Hae Yeon and Myra Marx Ferree (2010), "Practicing Intersectionality in Sociological Research: A Critical Analysis of Inclusions, Interactions, and Institutions in the Study of Inequalities," *Sociological Theory*, 28 (2), 129-49.
- Crockett, David, Sonya A. Grier, and Jacqueline A. Williams (2003), "Coping with Marketplace Discrimination: An Exploration of the Experiences of Black Men," *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 4, 1-18.
- Cross, Samantha, Meng-Hsien Lin, and Terry L. Childers (2016), "Sensory Identity: The Impact of Olfaction in Consumption," in *Research in Consumer Behavior* 17, Russell Belk, Jeff Murray, and Anatasia Thyroff (Eds.), Emerald Publishing Group.
- Dobbin, Frank, Alexandra Kalev and Erin Kelly (2007), "Diversity Management in Corporate America," *Contexts*, 6 (4), 21-27.
- D'Rozario, Denver and Jerome D. Williams (2005), "Retail Redlining: Definition, Theory, Typology, and Measurement," *Journal of Macromarketing*, 25 (2), 175-86.

- Eckholm, Erik (2015), "Baker who Denied Cake to Gay Couple Loses Appeal," *The New York Times*. [available at http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/14/us/colorado-court-rules-against-baker-who-refused-to-serve-same-sex-couples.html?_r=0]
- Eyerman, Ron (2001), *Cultural Trauma: Slavery and the Formation of African American Identity*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Eyerman, Ron (2004), "Cultural Trauma: Slavery and the Formation of African American Identity," in *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*, Jeffrey C. Alexander, Ron Eyerman, Bernard Giesen, Neil J. Smelser, and Piotr Sztompka (Eds.), Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 60-111.
- Fiske, Susan T. (2000), "Stereotyping, Prejudice, and Discrimination at the Seam between the Centuries: Evolution, Culture, Mind, and Brain," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30 (3), 299-322.
- Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Michael Morgan, and Nancy Signorielli (1980), "The 'Mainstreaming' of America: Violence Profile No. 11," *Journal of Communication*, 30 (3), 10-29.
- Gopaldas, Ahir (2013), "Intersectionality 101," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 32 (special issue), 90-94.
- Grier, Sonya A. and Shiriki Kumanyika (2010), "Targeted Marketing and Public Health," *Annual Review of Public Health*, 31, 349-69.
- Gumbus, Andra and Patricia Meglich (2013), "Abusive Online Conduct: Discrimination and Harassment in Cyberspace," *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 14 (5), 47-56.
- Hamilton, Kathy (2009), "Those Left Behind: Inequality in Consumer Culture," *Irish Marketing Review*, 20 (2), 40-54.

- Hill, Ronald Paul (2001), *Surviving in a Material World: The Lived Experience of People in Poverty*, Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Hill, Ronald Paul, Justine Rapp, Michael L. Capella, and Gramercy Gentlemen (2015), "Consumption Restriction in a Total Control Institution: Participatory Action Research in a Maximum Security Prison," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 34 (2), 156-172.
- Hutton, Martina (2015), "Consuming Stress: Exploring Hidden Dimensions of Consumption-related Strain at the Intersection of Gender and Poverty," *Journal of Marketing Management*, 31 (15-16), 1695-717.
- Johnson, Guillaume D., Yuvay J. Meyers, and Jerome D. Williams (2013), "Immigrants Versus Nationals: When an Intercultural Service Encounter Failure Turns to Verbal Confrontation," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 32 (special issue), 38-47.
- Jones, James M. (1997), *Prejudice and Racism*, New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Jussim, Lee (1990), "Social Reality and Social Problems: The Role of Expectancies," *Journal of Social Issues*, 46 (2), 9-34.
- Karnani, Aneel (2007), "Doing Well by Doing Good—Case Study: 'Fair & Lovely' Whitening Cream," *Strategic Management Journal*, 28 (13), 1351-57.
- Kaufman-Scarborough, Carol and Terry L. Childers (2009), "Understanding Markets as Online Public Places: Insights from Consumers with Visual Impairments," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 28 (1), 16-28.
- Korzenny, Felipe and Betty Ann Korzenny (2011), *Hispanic Marketing: Connecting with the New Latino Consumer*, New York, NY: Routledge.

- Kumaki, Robert, Jack Moran, and Bruce Bendinger (2010), *Many Cultures, One Market: A Guide to Understanding Opportunities in the Asian Pacific American Market*, Chicago, IL: Copy Workshop.
- LaFrance, Melisse (1998), "Colonizing the Feminine: Nike's Intersections of Postfeminism and Hyperconsumption," *Sport and Postmodern Times*, 117-39.
- Lapchick, Richard (2015), *The 2015 Super Bowl Advertisement Study*, Orlando: The Institute for Diversity in Ethics and Sport.
- Liebermann, Yehoshua (1999), "Membership Clubs as a Tool for Enhancing Buyers' Patronage," *Journal of Business Research*, 45 (3), 291-97.
- McIntosh, Peggy (1990), "Unpacking the Knapsack of White Privilege," *Independent School*, 49 (2), 31-36.
- Miller, Pepper (2012), *Black Still Matters in Marketing: Why Increasing Your Cultural IQ about Black America is Critical to your Company and your Brand*, Ithaca, NY: Paramount Market Publishing.
- Motley, Carol M., Geraldine R. Henderson, and Stacey Menzel Baker (2003), "Exploring Collective Memories Associated with African-American Advertising Memorabilia—The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly," *Journal of Advertising*, 32 (1), 47-57.
- Neal, Arthur G. (2005), *National Trauma and Collective Memory: Extraordinary Events in the American Experience*, second edition, Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Oakenfull, Gillian W. (2013), "What Matters: Factors Influencing Gay Consumers' Evaluations of 'Gay-Friendly' Corporate Activities," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 32 (special issue), 79-89.

- Paul, Pallab, Abhijit Roy, and Kausiki Mukhopadhyay (2006), "The Impact of Cultural Values on Marketing Ethical Norms: A Study in India and the United States," *Journal of International Marketing*, 14 (4), 28-56.
- Pavia, Teresa M. and Marlys J. Mason (2014), "Vulnerability and Physical, Cognitive, and Behavioral Impairment Model Extensions and Open Questions," *Journal of Macromarketing*, 34 (4), 471-85.
- Pechmann, Cornelia, Elizabeth S. Moore, Alan R. Andreasen, Paul M. Connell, Dan Freeman, Meryl P. Gardner, Deborah Heisley, R. Craig Lefebvre, Dante M. Pirouz, and Robin L. Soster (2011), "Navigating the Central Tensions in Research on At-risk Consumers: Challenges and Opportunities," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 30 (1), 23-30.
- Riessman, Catherine Kohler (2008), *Narrative Analysis for the Human Sciences*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Robb, Walter (2013), "Our Revised Team Member Language Guidelines," [available at <http://www.wholefoodsmarket.com/blog/our-revised-team-member-language-guidelines>].
- Russell, Cristel Antonia, Hope Jensen Schau, and David Crockett (2013), "Cultural Diversity in Television Narratives: Homophilization, Appropriation, and Implications for Media Advocacy," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 32 (special issue), 119-30.
- Saatcioglu, Bige and Canan Corus (2014), "Poverty and Intersectionality A Multidimensional Look into the Lives of the Impoverished," *Journal of Macromarketing*, 34 (2), 122-32.
- Saatcioglu, Bige and Julie L. Ozanne (2013), "A Critical Spatial Approach to Marketplace Exclusion and Inclusion," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 32 (special issue), 32-37.
- Shani, David and Sujana Chalasani (1992), "Exploiting Niches Using Relationship Marketing," *Journal of Services Marketing*, 6 (4), 43-52.


- Shultz, Clifford J. (2014), "The Ethical Imperative of Constructive Engagement in a World Confounded by the Commons Dilemma, Social Traps, and Geopolitical Conflicts," in *Handbook on Ethics in Marketing*, Alexander Nill (Ed.), Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 188-219.
- Shultz, Clifford J. and Morris B. Holbrook (2009), "The Paradoxical Relationships between Marketing and Vulnerability," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 28 (1), 124-27.
- Sibley, David (1995), *Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West*, London: Routledge.
- Sidanius, Jim and Felicia Pratto (1993), "The Inevitability of Oppression and the Dynamics of Social Dominance," *Prejudice, Politics, and the American Dilemma*, 173-211.
- Sirgy, M. Joseph, Dhruv Grewal, and Tamara Mangleburg (2000), "Retail Environment, Self-congruity, and Retail Patronage: An Integrative Model and a Research Agenda," *Journal of Business Research*, 49 (2), 127-38.
- Smelser, Neil J. (2004), "Psychological Trauma and Cultural Trauma," in *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*, Jeffrey C. Alexander, Ron Eyerman, Bernard Giesen, Neil J. Smelser, and Piotr Sztompka (Eds.), Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 31-59.
- Sommers, Benjamin D., Thomas Buchmueller, Sandra L. Decker, Colleen Carey, and Richard Kronick (2013), "The Affordable Care Act Has Led to Significant Gains in Health Insurance and Access to Care for Young Adults," *Health Affairs*, 32 (1), 165-74.
- Squires, Gregory D. (2011), *From Redlining to Reinvestment: Community Responses to Urban Disinvestment*, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Tajfel, Henri and John C. Turner (1986), *The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior*, Burnham Inc. Publishing.


- Taylor, Charles R., Stacy Landreth, and Hae-Kyong Bang (2005), "Asian Americans in Magazine Advertising: Portrayals of the 'Model Minority,'" *Journal of Macromarketing*, 25 (2), 163-74.
- Taylor, Charles R. and Ju Yung Lee (1994), "Not in Vogue: Portrayals of Asian Americans in Magazine Advertising," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 239-45.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de (1981), *Democracy in America*, New York: Mentor Books.
- US. Department of Labor (2016), "Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey", [available at <http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat11.htm>].
- Varman, Rohit and Janeen Arnold Costa (2013), "Underdeveloped Other in Country-of-origin Theory and Practices," *Consumption, Markets, and Culture*, 16 (3), 240-65.
- Viswanathan, Madhubalan, Srinivas Sridharan, Roland Gau, and Robin Ritchie (2009), "Designing Marketplace Literacy Education in Resource-Constrained Contexts: Implications for Public Policy and Marketing," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 28 (Spring), 85-94.
- Weber, Max (1968), *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Weiner, Bernard (2012), "An Attribution Theory of Motivation," *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*, 1, 135-55.



Figure

System of Marketplace Trauma: Omission and Commission





**Response to AE Report on Omission and Commission as Marketplace Trauma
JPPM 15.149.R2**

Thank you for the clear, helpful comments that have helped elevate our paper to the publication standards required of JPP&M. Our responses to these comments are in bold below.

The authors were generally responsive to the reviewers' requests. The paper is now improved with better definitions of terms and additions of more examples. The paper reads better. The argument is more refined.

We would like to conditionally accept this paper for publication. Please clean up these few issues and return this manuscript back by July 9th. The requests are pretty focused and are doable in the short turnaround time.

Thank you for shepherding our paper through the review process. We have worked hard in our short time window to provide a manuscript consistent with the aims of TCR and public policy and marketing.

Resolvable Issues

1). Social structure: On page 6, when you are theoretically defining social structure, it was consistent with how social structure is traditionally defined. But under your discussion of marketplace omission and commission, social structure morphs into marketplace signals for no apparent reason? Your discussion here ranges from attitudes, perceptions (i.e., individual factor), and interpersonal factors (e.g., how the sales clerk treats the customer). Your examples within the marketing mix are not really lining up with your theory that uses social structure. This same problem exists on page 16 (and I am not sure how in-group preferences lead to fraud). You might be on safer ground if you could talk about institutional forces within marketing or social roles reinforced by training, for example, to move this to a more social structural level. Could you be trying to say that marketing as an institution tends to favour the dominant in-group and then this gets manifest in sales training that is perhaps less sensitive to outgroups? You are stronger when your argument is more narrow and on point.

The manuscript has been clarified. We adopt the language provided by the AE. S/he is correct in what we were trying to say, but not saying very well. Marketing as an institution tends to favor the dominant in-group. This institutionalized favoritism is reflected in the design of the marketplace and market space, marketing messages, brand personalities and appeals, and so forth. All of these factors influence perceptions, etc. We have made slight changes to the sub-section headings and added points to try and show how we were calling upon both CTT and in-group/out-group bias in our explanation here. Bias often comes from institutionalized norms, such as those reflected in the design of marketing mix elements.

2). Remove the discussion of intersectionality: Please search for the 6-8 times you use phrases, such as intersect, intersecting, intersectionality, ... You can replace this idea with the additive or cumulative or overlapping effects of possessing different markers. There is nothing in your framework that helps guide us understanding how different markers interact. I mentioned at the end of the AE report the problem with such an approach. Drop your attempt to link this to intersectionality theory. It is muddled and at cross purposes with your

theoretical approach. You have created the in-group and out-group distinction. What you are bringing up is that the out-group has nuance and distinctions that might get in the way of a feeling of collective trauma; you don't offer any explanation or refinement here. This is a very different theoretical story. In particular, see the section called, "The Intersection of Marketplace Omission and Commission," where you will be on safer theoretical ground if you just call this the additive influence.

Our usage of the term intersection was not meant to imply a usage of Intersectional Theory as our theoretical platform for analysis. To avoid this misunderstanding, we do not use the term intersection, or any variant of it, within the paper. Instead with use terminology such as convergence, overlapping effects (as in a set of effects in CTT), etc.

3). Implications for Policy and Practice: Please make another pass here. There are some fun, clever, and interesting examples. But I had a hard time seeing how many of them really derived from your theoretical framework. Many seemed like boiler plate progressive agenda. For example, great example of the UDJ trying to do away with this policy that leads to a sort of debtor prison, but this doesn't seem to be driven by collective or cultural trauma forces that you delineate in your paper. I would make this shorter and more aligned with what your framework covers.

We have made another pass at this section, attempting to tie it more clearly to our theoretical framework. We've also revisited a few of the examples with the same intent. There is a fine line here in our doing this as the paper now really only includes the voices of three, or perhaps four, people. The discussion is really the only place where the voice of the group had been retained.

Minor Copyediting

p. 2 Delete the phrase "trauma by virtue of omission or commission." You haven't defined these terms and it is confusing.

DONE. This was deleted.

p. 2, paragraph 2, first sentence. Please break this five-line sentence up into a couple of sentences. It is hard to follow and an awkward sentence to read in the first page.

DONE. This sentence was changed to three sentences.

p. 15 I think you are over stating your case. This is a conceptual paper and I don't think you have evidence to back up the following claim: "Tenants of capitalism would suggest that marketers endeavor to restore destructed systems such as those that grow out of omission. With this in mind, the persistence of marketplace omission on the basis of social identity markers suggests that capitalism may not be as strong of a force in creating the trauma of marketplace omission as are the discourses, social structures, and practices that underlie marketplace omission."

DONE. This passage has been deleted.

Please see bottom of page 19—can you dial this back a little? I see how it would restrict consumption and affirm institutional privilege, but how would it destroy marketing systems? “Marketplace experiences for a consumer with multiple markers of out-group status over time and across circumstances (for example , a blind, aging widow or a young, black, transgender male) can lead to systemic restricted consumption, destructed marketing systems, and affirmation of institutional privilege (Bone, Christensen, and Williams 2004; Hill et al. 2015). In fact, given how resilient market systems are, might this be more accurately labelled “damaged marketing system” rather than “destroyed marketing system”? Your call.

Good call. As suggested, this phrasing was changed to damaged marketing system, rather than destructed marketing system, throughout the manuscript, including in the figure.

Paragraph beginning at the bottom of page 19. This is the type of addition that is strengthening the paper. Again, this is a conceptual paper. We don't fully understand these patterns and just when events spark a “Black Lives Matter” movement. It might be nice to have a sentence to this affect arguing for more research in this matter. You wrap it up a bit tidily in terms that a critical mass of people finally reaches a tipping point. But that isn't really true given the back lash in some parts of the country on transgendered citizens. For example, when you call for more research on page 24, you might be more specific on the need to understand the various processes through which collective traumas move to cultural ones and policy actions—likely there are dozens if not hundreds of pathways: “We encourage additional research surrounding particular traumas and policy responses, particularly those linked to restricted consumption, destructed marketing systems, and institutional privilege.” [To be fair, you do bring up this point later in the paper.]

At the end of the section “Movement from Collective Trauma to Cultural Trauma” we now include the following sentences to highlight the polyvocal nature and behavioural diversity of culture.

However, culture is neither univocal nor uniformly consistent in practice. Some narratives and practices may energize the social movement toward inclusion and away from discrimination, while other narratives and practices may resist movements toward social change. Ultimately, the issue relates to distinctions between and responsibilities of people as consumers and people as human beings or citizens of the world.

Additionally, we have encouraged additional research on the topic within the section “Contributions and Future Directions” with the addition of the following sentence.

Future research and dialogue on how exclusion and discrimination of people like “them” translates to a responsibility for all of “us” is sorely needed.

p. 26 I don't think you mean “faux pas,” which is more of a breach in etiquette.

DONE. The term was removed.