



'When people take action' Mainstreaming Malcontent and the Role of the Celebrity Institutional Entrepreneur.

Journal:	<i>Journal of Marketing Management</i>
Manuscript ID:	RJMM-2014-0362.R1
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Article
Keywords (headings not selectable):	Consumer culture < Consumer research, Green marketing < Sustainability, Agricultural and food marketing < Sustainability
Methodologies:	Interdisciplinary/Multidisciplinary research, narrative, discourse analysis
Free Response Keywords:	consumer activism, institutional entrepreneurship

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **'When people take action' Mainstreaming Malcontent and the Role of the Celebrity**
4 **Institutional Entrepreneur.**
5
6
7
8

9
10 **Abstract**

11
12 As the challenges of sustainability intensify at a global level, it is becoming increasingly
13 more important to encourage, support and promote the mainstream adoption of mindful and
14 ecologically-viable consumption. Drawing on institutional theory and an interpretive
15 investigation of Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall's *Fish Fight*, we explore a relatively
16 widespread phenomenon, the celebrity campaign. We consider how such campaigns
17 galvanise mainstream malcontent by creating mythic plots; personalising adversaries; and
18 framing issues to encourage articulation of malcontent. Though malcontent may be fleeting,
19 we argue that this can set in motion institutional change towards sustainable production and
20 consumption. Celebrity campaigns demonstrate the dynamic and interrelated character of
21 consumer and industry groups in a way that might inform other change efforts.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 **Keywords**

31
32 **Sustainability, mainstream consumers, activism, celebrity, institutional**
33 **entrepreneurship, institutional theory**
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

‘When people take action’ Mainstreaming Malcontent and the Role of the Celebrity Institutional Entrepreneur.

Introduction

Attention amongst those who have pursued a cultural understanding of green consumer behaviour and sustainability efforts has focused on groups that Scaraboto and Fischer (2013) might well term as ‘resistant rebels’. Much of the extant work exploring consumers’ co-responsibility for addressing environmental or market-related ecological problems, has revolved around politicised, radicalised or extreme micro-collectives of consumers (Barnard, 2011; Connolly and Prothero, 2008; Kozinets and Handelman, 2004; Thompson and Coskuner-Balli, 2007). Largely these analyses emphasise the place of sustainable consumption within social relations and personal identity projects (Chatzidakis, Maclaren and Bradshaw, 2012). The marginalisation that enables such groups’ identity work, through making sustainable practice unusual or remarkable, presents limitations if we are to be able to understand and influence large scale sustainable change. This is particularly evident in Scaraboto and Fischer’s (2013) proposal that ‘resistant rebels’, who lack market legitimacy, will have minimal effects in bringing about radical change in markets.

On the other hand, research focusing on mainstream consumers reports a persistent attitude behaviour gap, reduced only where behaviours are perceived to be socially normal (Rettie, Burchell and Riley, 2012). This suggests limited transference of behaviours that are perceived as minor, fringe or extreme and limits our hopes for substantial steps towards sustainability. As McDonagh and Prothero (2012, p1196) argue, “we need to know how to get *everybody* to consume more sustainably – how to *engage society* in more sustainable behaviour” (emphases added). To achieve this aim, we must move from studying those for whom sustainability is a cherished and enduring aspect of identity and look also at a mainstream for which sustainability concerns might be more fleeting and less central. Scaraboto and Fischer (2013) suggest that organisations are more likely to react to mainstream malcontent, yet, it is unclear how such malcontent is to be engendered or, in the light of the behaviour gap, be articulated in the case of sustainability change.

This paper addresses the need to understand how to engage society in more sustainable behaviour by using institutional theory which focuses on the field of multiple, linked actors. Institutional fields organise around that which is accepted, or taken-for-granted. To understand change we look at processes that unsettle current understanding or practice

1
2
3 and legitimise an alternative. The approach suggests that long term change, such as that
4 needed for sustainability, arises through the linked actions of organisations and consumers.
5 We use institutional theory to focus on one widespread feature of contemporary life – the
6 celebrity campaign – and conceptualise the celebrity as institutional entrepreneur who can
7 galvanise the mainstream consumer and effect institutional change. Hence our research
8 questions are: 1/how can the celebrity institutional entrepreneur legitimate sustainability
9 efforts and rally mainstream malcontent and 2/ how does the celebrity campaign, as a
10 particular genre, work to effect institutional change?
11
12
13
14
15

16
17 The paper is organised as follows. Firstly, we introduce relevant literatures to outline
18 the relevance of institutional theory for sustainability change. Then, we draw insights on the
19 contemporary ‘ordinary’ celebrity that help us understand how these figures’ ostensible
20 normality bolsters their legitimacy and ability to generate concern and action amongst the
21 mainstream. Following that we move to our empirical material that focuses on Hugh
22 Fearnley-Whittingstall’s *Fish Fight* (UK Channel 4, 2011). After brief explanation of the
23 campaign our analysis attends to the features of celebrity campaign that enable viewer
24 involvement and action. We then consider institutional change in the aftermath of the
25 campaign. Our research questions are directly addressed in our discussion where our
26 contribution is elaborated and we move towards conceptualising sustainability processes
27 through institutional theory.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 36 **Conceptual background**

37 38 *Market change – an institutional approach*

39
40
41 The development of an institutional theory of organisation stems from work conducted
42 around 1980 (eg DiMaggio and Powell, 1983) that sought to explain the regularity and
43 enduring character of social life, although recent attention to the concepts of institutional
44 work and institutional entrepreneurship have accompanied a concern to account for change.
45 Our interest lies in how these latter concepts can help us explain changes towards
46 sustainability; however first we sketch out some core propositions and concepts from
47 institutional theory.
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 Legitimacy is the key category (Clegg, 2010) in an institutional theory of organisation
55 that proposes that organisations seek congruency with the taken-for-granted and act in a
56 manner appropriate to extant conventions to gain legitimacy. Legitimacy is “a generalized
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate
4 within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions.”
5 (Suchman, 1995, p. 574). The site in which such generalised perception holds is termed the
6 institutional field, “an arena, a system of actors, actions and relations whose participants take
7 one another into account as they carry out interrelated activities” (McAdam and Scott 2005
8 p.10). Thus institutional theory explains why an industry, comprising *inter alia* suppliers,
9 retailers and consumers exhibits a high isomorphism, regularity and stability since forms and
10 practices are institutionalised.
11
12

13
14
15
16
17 Institutional theorists have turned to a more processual approach to address the
18 conundrum that the theory presents; how is institutional change ever possible? (Clegg, 2010).
19 Thus, recent work highlights legitimation rather than legitimacy, institutional work and
20 institutional entrepreneurship. Legitimation is the simple or difficult process through which a
21 concept, product, idea, person or message becomes commonly accepted and normative i.e.
22 *mainstream* (Humphreys and Latour, 2013). Institutional work refers to the “the practices of
23 individual and collective actors aiming at creating, maintaining and disrupting institutions”
24 (Lawrence, Suddaby and Leca, 2011, p.53). Whether intentional or not, institutional work is
25 undertaken by insiders and outsiders, field dominants and more peripheral actors, with
26 outsiders and peripheral actors more likely to disrupt and provoke de-institutionalisation
27 (Maguire and Hardy, 2009). Importantly, these concepts bring social process and greater
28 possibility of agency to the fore in creating, maintaining and disrupting that which is taken-
29 for-granted and mainstreamed.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39
40 Colomy (1998, p.271) describes institutional entrepreneurs as the “movers and
41 shakers” of institutions. They “serve as agents of legitimacy supporting the creation of
42 institutions that they deem to be appropriate and aligned with their interests” (Dacin,
43 Goodstein and Scott, 2002, p.47) by their deployment of resources, building of coalitions,
44 pursuit of particular interests (Greenwood and Suddaby, 2006), creativity (Colomy, 1998)
45 and their work to effect discourse (Phillips, Lawrence and Hardy, 2004). The concept has
46 been criticised as indicating ‘hypermuscular agency’ (Clegg, 2010 p.5) that neglects struggle,
47 conflict and hegemonic power (Clegg, 2010; Khan, Munir and Willmott, 2007). Yet,
48 countering the individualistic account of change, Colomy (1998, p.273) considers the
49 institutional entrepreneur as furthering projects that are “not articulated in a sociological
50 vacuum.” Projects operate through moral and symbolic frames and are pitched against
51 something framed as evil or unjust. The entrepreneur achieves social effect through their use
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of extant myths and formulation of new ones and by drawing across discourses to justify the
4 project to multiple audiences.
5
6
7
8

9
10 *The promise of an institutional theorisation of consumption.*
11

12 Although the institutional field encompasses consumers, consumer theorists have only
13 recently turned to institutional theory as an explanation of market change (Scaraboto and
14 Fischer, 2013; Humphreys 2010a 2010b). This is one approach within a larger current that,
15 by examining ‘the context of context’ (Askegaard and Linnet, 2011), locates consumer
16 behaviour away from the individual and within a broader understanding of markets (see also
17 Giesler, 2012; Giesler, 2008). The movement in general, and institutional theory in particular,
18 has much to offer to an understanding of (un)sustainable practices amongst a broader
19 populace and how these may be changed.
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 Scaraboto and Fischer (2013) consider on-going processes of market change in a
27 study of ‘fashionista’ blogs. Their work highlights the lack of legitimacy of this consumer
28 group and explores the re-framing of issues that does not, however, bring about the desired
29 market change. From this, they theorise differences in outcome when consumers who are
30 considered legitimate demand change (mainstream malcontent) versus those who are
31 stigmatised and lack legitimacy (resistant rebels). They consider celebrities as institutional
32 entrepreneurs (e.g. Beth Ditto) capable of gaining greater influence than corporate
33 organisations (e.g. fashion labels) because consumers are better able to identify with them.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Humphreys’ (2010a, b) work examines legitimisation in the emergence of the casino
41 industry, tracing the role of strategic actions amongst multiple stakeholders (Humphreys 2010
42 a) and changing discursive frames in mediated accounts (Humphreys 2010 b). As such, she
43 provides a comprehensive and broad ranging account whereby something ‘taken-for-granted’
44 is replaced by another understanding and associated practices. In this process, she
45 categorises the strategic actions of market actors as *material* and *rhetorical*. Material actions
46 resemble those highlighted by Greenwood and Suddaby (2006) such as the building of
47 networks and establishment of (trade) associations to influence regulative and normative
48 legitimacy. Rhetorical actions, which might also be termed cultural work (Perkmann and
49 Spicer, 2008), operate through an effect on discourse or by generating credibility for
50 alternative narratives (Phillips et al, 2004) to disrupt taken-for-granted understandings.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Following Humphrey's (2010a) suggestion that institutional theory be further deployed to
4 examine consumer issues with broad societal and policy implications, we believe the theory
5 offers much to marketing's understanding of sustainability change. The institutional field
6 connects consumers and organisations recognising that change emerges from the interplay of
7 the two, thus integrating established foci of marketing research. The focus on processes,
8 change agents and the work through which the taken-for-granted is created, maintained or
9 destroyed allows us to address change towards sustainable consumption in broad society
10 rather than at the individual level.

11
12 We adopt the concepts of legitimisation and institutional work. Specifically we shall be
13 looking at institutional entrepreneurship in the celebrity campaign. We shall argue that the
14 celebrity campaign operates through use of myth and discourse to produce moral and
15 symbolic frames and is thus socially located (Colomy, 1998) rather than hyper-muscular
16 individual agency (Clegg, 2010). Accordingly, we outline a cultural understanding of
17 celebrity.

18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 *The "ordinary" Celebrity and the campaign*

32
33 By virtue of celebrities' critical influence and ascendancy over everyday culture (see Turner,
34 2004, 2006), arguably few other figures in market society possess the same credibility, status,
35 and legitimacy to lead institutional change. For Cashmore and Parker (2003) the notion of
36 "celebrity" encompasses "the process by which people are turned into "things", things to be
37 adored, respected, worshipped, idolized, but perhaps more importantly, things which are
38 themselves produced and consumed" (p.215). Although the celebrity endorsement literatures
39 suggest that consumers would admire celebrities as aspirational, faultless, and superior
40 human beings that personify the cultural ideals of glamour, success or even the deific in
41 society (see Silvera and Austad, 2003), authors such as Wohlfeil and Whelan (2012) and
42 Turner (2006) have indicated that strong attraction to some celebrities is driven by these
43 figures' ordinariness more so than their extraordinariness. This attraction is experienced as a
44 'bond of emotional closeness' that can sometimes be potent enough to elicit within
45 consumers a feeling of 'personal friendship' (Wohlfeil and Whelan, 2012, p.518). Scaraboto
46 and Fischer (2013) draw on the idea of such bonds in recognising Beth Ditto as institutional
47 entrepreneur.

1
2
3 Harnessing closeness has been a recurrent strategy throughout the upsurge of
4 popularity for reality television stars and the wider movement of contemporary celebrity
5 culture towards mundane behaviours and the private-self (Turner, 2006; Meyers, 2014). In
6 the United Kingdom (UK), for example, behaviours and interactions in the kitchen have
7 allowed for the celebrity chef to rise to prominence in media culture and everyday life. These
8 individuals' success is evidenced in licensed cookware items, primetime television
9 programming, various cross-category endorsements and media sales. By focussing on the
10 appeals of Nigella Lawson, Hower and Brownlie (2009) describe how her family-centric and
11 homey attempts at 'doing domesticity' in tandem with her "retro-voluptuousness" (p.484) and
12 "friendly and flirtatious affectations" (p.485) make her all the more endearing and enchanting
13 to mass consumer audiences. Fellow celebrity chef Jamie Oliver appropriates familiar tropes
14 of masculinity through his boyish charm, unpolished informality and all around laddishness
15 to effectively give cooking a mass-market appeal for men (Brownlie and Hower, 2007). It is
16 because of these figures' ability to leverage normal identities and lifestyles that they wield the
17 power to legitimate a range of behaviours, or as Turner, Bonner and Marshall (2000) put it:
18 "the individual celebrity persona provides a powerful condensation of meaning which can be
19 attached to commodities and issues; similarly, celebrities can act as prisms through which
20 social complexity is brought back to the human level" (p. 166).

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 Studies of the kitchen celebrity in marketing have attended to printed visuals and
35 texts. Elsewhere, food documentary (eg Richardson-Ngwenya and Richardson, 2013) and
36 celebrity campaigns (Jackson, Watson and Piper 2013; Bell and Hollows 2011; Hollows and
37 Jones, 2010) have been analysed. These studies, focusing especially on Jamie Oliver's child
38 nutrition campaigns, provide a compelling view of the genre as one of heroic narrative.
39 However, filmic devices are deployed to distance a food savvy audience from the feckless or
40 incompetent subjects of the campaign to offer a form of voyeurism underpinned by class
41 difference (Jackson, Watson & Piper 2013; Hollows and Jones, 2010). The case we will
42 study, *Fish Fight*, differs in that the campaign operates through film rather than being
43 documented on film and focuses on what the audience are assumed to eat and to value. We
44 shall return to questions of class which we do see as relevant, but we believe that the film
45 operates by largely erasing questions of class in addressing the audience as the mainstream.
46 We believe that the study therefore provides insight into the process of mainstreaming
47 malcontent. Command over legitimation through ordinariness at high-status level makes the
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 “ordinary celebrity” a powerful resource in mainstreaming malcontent around unsustainable
4 behaviours and in making sustainability efforts actionable at mass-audience level.
5
6
7
8

9 10 **Case, methods and analysis**

11 We focus specifically upon *Fish Fight*, a television docu-series’ treatment of marine
12 conservation and sustainability. Initially we used print media comment to develop an
13 understanding of the campaign and its effects on institutional change (used at the beginning
14 and end of our case presentation). Then, in order to identify the specific features of this TV
15 genre, we followed conventions employed in prior consumption and organisational research
16 studies of filmic or television-based media (see Hirschman and Holbrook, 1993; Holbrook
17 and Grayson, 1986; Parker, 2012; Ryan and McLoughlin, 1999). This began with multiple
18 viewings of the television documentary, which was made available to us by the production
19 company, and a body of notes was compiled. We then moved iteratively between our notes
20 and readings of academic literatures as we built up themes, guided by the overriding view of
21 the film as an actor in (de)institutionalisation processes. Since our analysis was concurrent to
22 literatures we relate the two through our commentary. Thus we move from introduction of
23 the campaign to analysis of the strategies used by the institutional entrepreneur in the
24 documentary and then to examine institutional changes arising in the aftermath of the
25 campaign.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 *The Fish Fight campaign*

42 In October 2010, Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall, a well-known chef, TV personality and long-
43 time food campaigner, launched *The Big Fish Fight*, primarily through a TV documentary
44 series on UK Channel 4 which aired from January 2011. The first series was aired over
45 consecutive evenings and considered several aspects of marine sustainability. Perhaps most
46 widely noted for its stand against EU fish discards (i.e. jettisoned or discarded excesses of
47 fish), the campaign demonstrated Hugh’s ability to draw public attention to an issue and
48 mobilise widespread support with a web-based petition signed by 870,000 people from 195
49 countries (www.fishfight.com). Relatedly, Hugh urged viewers to make more extensive use
50 of those fish that have less popularity in the UK (e.g. dab, mackerel, sardines) and relieve
51 pressure on key maritime species, cod and haddock. ‘Fish fighters’ were urged also to take
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the campaign to the supermarkets when the poor sustainability credentials of tinned tuna were
4 highlighted. Specifically, use of Fish Aggregation Devices (FADs) and purse seine trawling
5 (with large nets) associated with the by-catch of other species, such as turtles, sharks,
6 dolphins and rays were highlighted. Hugh presented pole-and-line caught tuna, which
7 eliminates by-catch, as environmentally preferable. The Fish Fighter's toolkit included
8 contact details for relevant retailers and brand owners. According to the Fish Fight website
9 over 50,000 consumers wrote to a leading brand owner – Princes. The broadcast of the first
10 fish fight series coincided with both with *Jamie's Fish Suppers* (also Channel 4), a series of
11 short films featuring Jamie Oliver cooking lesser known fish species. It also coincided with
12 the release of the Greenpeace *Tuna League Table* covering UK retailers and brands. Issues
13 raised in the fish fight were not new; they had previously been highlighted by Greenpeace
14 and in book and film formats (Clover 2005) The Fish Fight was, however, the first sustained
15 celebrity led campaign on the topic and it is in the context of its high profile that we believe
16 changes within the industry, which we highlight in our discussion, are to be read.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Institutional Entrepreneurship strategies in the celebrity campaign**

31
32 The documentary film collapses the boundary between 'fact' and 'fiction' producing a hybrid
33 form (Parker, 2012) that must be convincing to have any effect, but differs in important ways
34 from, for example, the style associated with factual, impartial news coverage. Our
35 presentation emphasises the hybridity of the genre, and is similar in style to other treatments
36 of film as a creative and emotive medium (see Richardson-Ngwenya and Richardson, 2013).
37 Through our analysis we identify three generic strategies that, we shall argue, create
38 mainstream malcontent and enable effective institutional entrepreneurship. These strategies
39 are: Mythologising, Personalising an Adversary and Framing the Issues.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 *Narrative, Story & Intrigue: The creation of the mythic plot.*

51 *"There's a problem in our seas, a problem caused by our unstoppable appetite for*
52 *fish. Over the past three months I've been on a journey to see just how bad that*
53 *problem is. And what I've found out is it's not just bad; it's mad."*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The formation of a story capable of providing – and enchanting – the average consumer with
4 meanings and metaphors has the potential to serve multiple ideological agendas (Thompson,
5 2004). Such stories are often made possible by drawing on *mythic* archetypes and plotlines.
6
7 Myths are commonly recognised and easily understood characters (e.g., the saviour, the
8 villain, the fighter) and narratives (e.g., heroic journeys, struggles between good and bad)
9 (Hopkinson and Hogarth-Scott, 2001) that structure texts, stories and actions while charging
10 them with emotion: “In reading fairy tales, as a first example, the reader (consumer) reacts
11 directly with ideas and feelings” (Levy, 1981, p.50). Advertising, brand management, PR and
12 the media have historically borrowed liberally from these elements to produce compelling
13 images, characters, and promotional appeals (Holt, 2003; Johar, Holbrook, and Stern, 2001).
14 This recipe, we argue, is no different to the institutional efforts of the celebrity campaigner.
15 The epitaph at the beginning of this paragraph, when spoken by Hugh Fernley-Whittingstall
16 and set to an ominous sound score complemented with obscure imagery of industrialised
17 fishing practices across expansive oceans, becomes the narrative introduction we, the
18 viewers, are first treated to when tuning in to *Fish Fight*. This bold statement is neither
19 delivered in text at the header of a corporate marine sustainability report nor does it take the
20 form of a researcher’s commentary in an academic paper. Instead it is conveyed to a mass
21 audience as a soundbite designed to “grab us with its power” (Goodman, 2004). This
22 soundbite dramatically primes us to expect a quest; a journey; an *adventure*. The journey is
23 supported and maintained through the perpetuation of several familiar mythic themes
24 (Colomy, 1998) – quite specifically, the sole hero and the journey to enlightenment. Relative
25 to the classic literature on mythology, here in the opening sequence the ‘hero’ receives a “call
26 to adventure” whereby his “familiar life horizon has been outgrown; the old concepts, ideals,
27 and emotional patterns no longer fit” (Campbell, 2008, p. 43). It is a time when “destiny has
28 summoned the hero and transferred his spiritual centre of gravity from within the pale of
29 society to a zone unknown” (ibid, p. 48). Within this section, we shall argue that the
30 evolution of this heroic adventure into the unknown to restore balance is dramatically
31 scripted to provide an attractive and compelling narrative, capable of concealing its own
32 contradictions, but also spurring the viewer to action.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Although Hugh is shown in numerous social situations, throughout the film we are
53 very aware that this battle is *his*. He is depicted as the lone activist working largely through
54 personal use of his phone and email. While the purpose of his campaign is to gain social
55 support, to popularise malcontent and to ultimately rally the troops for collective action,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 solitude is an important narrative device to position the thought-leader or campaigner as
4 single-handedly taking on a personal mission. His mission is playfully constructed to
5 highlight how his efforts introduce change, but in a way that does not compensate on vitality,
6 stubborn independence, and virile yearning to argue and battle amongst other men. Consumer
7 culture idealizes the “man-of-action hero” (Holt and Thompson, 2004); the mythic figure
8 who operates within the realm of rules, bureaucracy, and professionalization but according to
9 his own rugged individualism and adventurous spirit. He is an average law-abiding citizen
10 like the rest of us; only he has the societal platform, risk-taking tendencies and high degree of
11 personal autonomy to champion change. Thus we catch Hugh in the very normal
12 surroundings of everyday life and communication, phoning Tesco from the train or emailing
13 ministers, retail companies and so on. These are intimate moments when the audience
14 watches Hugh, brought from his home into ours, an ordinary man performing ordinary
15 activities, albeit with extraordinary mission. It is also from these moments of intimacy that
16 Hugh most directly addresses the home viewer, ‘breaking the fourth wall’ to look directly at
17 the camera and address the viewer, demanding attention and action. The heroism on-screen is
18 dramatically conveyed as something the viewer can emulate – Hugh sends off an email to
19 Tesco and encourages us at home to join in.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Other sequences lessen the lone activist’s “entrepreneurial independence” (Holt and
33 Thompson, 2004, p.438) to cast Hugh as the interdependent leader, a paragon of social
34 guidance who recognises he needs assistance and support. This break in narrative is
35 developed more as an evolution of the man-of-action hero rather than a contradiction in
36 character. Within marketing’s appropriation of the hero myth, Veen (1994) refers to this as a
37 logical stage in one’s “role shift”, whereby the hero is moving away from his call to
38 adventure (or “point of separation”), to move into a state of “initiation” where he begins to
39 instigate change. We see this clearly in rallies about European discards where Hugh directs
40 the crowds’ dissent through his words over a megaphone.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The state of initiation is further convoluted through a second aspect of mythology
49 whereby the film draws on Hugh’s role as ‘the journeyer’; both in metaphoric but also very
50 real terms. From fishing boats and coastal towns around Britain to sites of power in Europe,
51 Hugh also travels to Thailand and, of relevance to the tuna theme, to the Maldives. Through
52 the journey he swims with manta rays, voyages on fishing vessels, travels by speedboat and
53 enters foreign canning factories. Across his exploits he meets with Greenpeace, government
54 ministers, fish industry workers and others. Not only do we, through Hugh’s journey, have
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the vicarious experience of places we are unlikely to visit personally, but we also follow as if
4 with Hugh the metaphoric journey of increasing knowledge and increasing outrage. Yet, at
5 the same time our experience is mediated by the film and the flow of knowledge along with
6 its content is orchestrated by Hugh and the production team.
7
8
9

10 Throughout the narrative, the mythic plot is continuously complicated as we are
11 presented with the contradiction between the lonely leader figure with whom we can
12 associate and the extraordinariness of the social paragon and his role as journeyer. The hero's
13 seemingly unlimited access to people, places and resources for filming, and our gradual
14 realisation of the requirements for a considerable travel budget, sizeable film crews and
15 equipment to capture expensive and difficult shots (for example underwater) in one way
16 diminishes the audiences ability to relate to this figure. However in another way, because this
17 hero is played by a well-known celebrity, we are acceptant at least as fans of this elite
18 figure's capabilities to embark on extraordinariness and are more willing to assent to the
19 power of the overall mythic plot.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 *Personalising the adversaries: redemption not resistance*
29

30 Within studies of 'heroic' subcultures which form on the basis of a collectively experienced
31 problem, a common enemy is often enough to encourage active, confrontational and
32 sometimes belligerent resistance (Muggleton and Rupert Weinzierl, 2003). This very
33 aggression may define the fringe nature of subcultural formations and is often a step too far
34 for the average consumer with legitimacy in the marketplace to take. Colomy (1998)
35 nevertheless sees the construction of something or someone to oppose, through their framing
36 as unjust or evil, as important to institutional entrepreneurship. In order to bring about
37 mainstream acceptable social action, the celebrity campaigner needs to somehow identify a
38 contest against a common enemy in a way that is not suggestive of direct, full-blown and
39 rebellious opposition. The enemy is constructed as something that we, the viewers under
40 Hugh's leadership, can redeem as opposed to resist. In contrast to the forceful perdition that
41 fringe activists seek upon the corporations, policy-makers and businesses that offend their
42 values, mainstreaming malcontent may favour redemption for these organisations as they
43 align to their new-found values. It is very clear throughout *Fish Fight* that this careful
44 rationalisation of how 'we' should face a common enemy has been considered and laced into
45 Hugh's heroic journey.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In the development of the mythic plot, it becomes clear that a key adversary for Hugh
4 – and therefore our suggested shared enemy – is Tesco (or, as Hugh terms it, 'Pesco'),
5 Britain's biggest neighbourhood retailer and well-known household brand name. In terms of
6 enhancing the celebrity figure's own heroism and credibility in going up against a worthy
7 adversary, the focus on Tesco allows Hugh to highlight prior grievances he had with the
8 retailer over low-welfare chicken and to light-heartedly joke about himself as a formidable
9 antagonist. Camera footage (obtained through the investigative work of Greenpeace)
10 demonstrating turtle, shark and dolphin by-catch associated with Tesco's tuna supplier in
11 Ghana enables the nomination of this particular adversary, yet set within generalised concern
12 about the industry. Focusing on the marine sustainability claims made on Tesco tinned tuna,
13 claims which have now been revealed as dubious, the battle, at this stage, becomes personal.
14 The narrative is cast carefully to remind and problematize (rather than attack) Tesco's efforts
15 to reinvent itself as a caring retailer interested in the quality and ethics of the food it sells.
16 Tesco is not presented as a faceless institution that, by virtue of its anonymity, will attract the
17 ire of activism. Rather it is a well-known institution ingrained in local communities – its
18 employees are visible and, as Hugh reports, "are keen to talk" (even though he cautions the
19 viewer that Tesco's executives are "most keen to talk off camera"). As discussed by
20 Richardson-Ngwenya and Richardson (2013, p.347) such candour operates as a strategic
21 trope in documentary to facilitate "the restoration of personhood" for otherwise bureaucratic
22 or unknowable market actors.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 The story is comprised of constant encounters with regular hard-working, if corporate,
38 individuals who are not overly observant of the effects their behaviour has on the
39 environment. These recurring motifs of normality and ignorance are designed to confront us
40 with the reality that the sustainability problem is perpetuated by people just like us. While the
41 narrative is developed through Tesco and its suppliers, it allows for wider audience action;
42 the fish fight kit encourages action with respect to a wider group of retailers and brand
43 owners. Hugh suggests consumers need clearer, simpler information about the fish that they
44 are buying, that retailers have a duty to inform them and that they need to recognise who the
45 gatekeepers towards change are. Armed with the filmic evidence provided by Greenpeace,
46 Hugh aims to query Tesco's claims that they are fully committed to fishing methods that
47 protect the marine environment. This is illustrated through a simple journey to an average
48 local Tesco supermarket (not to corporate offices) to meet John Gorman, Tesco's UK
49 technical and trading law manager. In this scene, we are treated to surroundings and workers
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 similar to those we encounter in our own neighbourhood supermarket, and it is also here we
4 see the trading law manager, as a regular person, in obvious discomfort at the line of
5 questioning. Rather than being a well-equipped, industrial standard of professionalism, the
6 manager somewhat clumsily feeds back corporate lines that are not well adapted to particular
7 questions. For example, in one instance Hugh queries whether Tesco intends to retract its
8 claims that its fish are sustainably caught and is met with a panicked response on Tesco's
9 dedication to revising labelling information according to consumer feedback. Such a scene,
10 while perhaps chosen for inclusion based on its comedic value, serves to heighten the
11 disjunction between impersonal institution and the personhood of the people who make up
12 the institution. The scene ends on a note where the Tesco representative appears 'optimistic'
13 about reassessing the situation based on his conversation with Hugh. This decision has the
14 effect of demonstrating the possibility of redemption and thereby urging us to take 'small
15 actions' that enable this.
16
17

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 *Framing the issues: Simplifying, channelling and silencing*
26

27
28 In this section we consider how myth and the personalised adversary relate to the cultural
29 work (Humphreys 2010b; Perkmann and Spicer, 2008) that allows Hugh to specify what we,
30 as fish fighters, should be against and should do. This involves looking at, not only what was
31 in the film, but also what was not.
32
33

34
35 Hugh's ability to make the topic of marine sustainability newsworthy via prime time
36 TV programming seems almost tautological. Yet this overlooks a public popularity cultivated
37 over a variety of media and an existing familiarity with Channel 4, noted as a TV station with
38 an extensive and often critical approach to food issues. The media prominence of the film and
39 the cultivation and leveraging of relationships are bound together. Hence appearances by high
40 profile individuals such as Jamie Oliver and Prince Charles provide moments of excitement
41 and legitimise the campaign. On the other hand, government ministers and Tesco
42 representatives in effect have little choice than to appear. Reviews in the general and relevant
43 trade press intensify newsworthiness. Therefore, much of what is considered as strategic or
44 material action (Humphreys, 2010a), such as the building of coalitions and rallying of
45 resources, that are central to institutional entrepreneurship (Dacin, Goodstein & Scott, 2002;
46 Greenwood and Suddaby, 2006) is evident in realising newsworthiness in a mainstream.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 The selection of what is to be known about the issues greatly differentiates this form
57 of campaign. The film avoids an overtly didactic tone through the insertion of humour and
58
59
60

1
2
3 the development of character. Relatively few statistics are given and those that are used are
4 repeated; 'marine biologists' are used without further specification to endorse points;
5 conflicts of science are not elaborated. There is total absence of the approach standard to
6 news reportage where opposed 'experts' debate conflicting views or introduce problematic
7 elements such as, perhaps, the economic effects on local livelihoods. Such simplification is
8 not, however, problematic in the context of a film that seeks to inspire action. Indeed, in the
9 first episode, Hugh is very explicit when discussing fish discards: "*I think there's a lot of*
10 *people out there who have a sense that all is not well out there in the sea. But they really*
11 *don't know what they can do about it and they rightly think the issues are horribly*
12 *complicated, and they are. But here's a simple one: let's end discards". In this way,*
13 admission of complexity stands as a barrier to action and Hugh's legitimacy allows him to
14 filter out such complexity, channel anger, and provide simple action. Thus, *Fish Fight* strives
15 to channel the information necessary for inspiring social action against the various
16 adversaries. This process is made all the more simple through the provision of the fish fighter
17 toolkit.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 In the process of making a campaign attractive and newsworthy whilst simplifying
30 complexity to the point where required actions become obvious, much is omitted from the
31 film. Striking, from our point of view, is the relative absence of consideration of the
32 institutional context that is to deliver the brave new world of sustainable fishing. How the
33 eradication of discards will operate alongside fish quotas is not addressed – fuller
34 consideration is not necessary to inspire action. Likewise, we are shown the very different
35 scale of pole-and-line tuna fishing in the tropical holiday paradise of the Maldives and the
36 industrialised fishing methods of Ghana. The ready appeal of a system, shot almost in
37 travelogue style, lends authenticity to the product and almost nostalgia for food pre-dating
38 industrialisation. The economic viability of pole-and-line fishing, comparative impacts on
39 local communities and viable levels of supply of pole-and-line caught tuna are left
40 unquestioned. Neither is the desirability of specific changes or alternative methods to reach
41 greater marine health discussed. The campaign has been strongly criticised by some industrial
42 voices for its failure to address such 'institutional realities' (eg *The Grocer* 15.2.2011;
43 5.3.2011). Alternatively, we believe this highlights an important aspect of institutional
44 entrepreneurship in the celebrity campaign. Namely that the campaign is largely aimed at
45 legitimisation in the socio-cognitive realm – whereby discards *are* wasteful, pole-and-line *is*
46 better than other tuna, FADs *are* bad. With mainstream malcontent focusing upon a simple
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and clear moral code, and with an easy means to express moral indignation to relevant
4 organisations, the responsibility to develop legislation and institutional norms which enable a
5 clearly articulated endpoint is thrown entirely upon others.
6
7
8
9

10
11 *Post-script – change in the institutional field*
12

13
14 *Fish Fight* ushered in some significant changes for fish suppliers and retailers during 2011.
15 Sales of less known species increased. Sainsbury's, for example, reported an increase of
16 between 31% (bass) and 207% (pollock) in fresh sales of lesser used species (The Grocer
17 13.8.2011); range availability increased also in frozen fish with national brand Young's
18 introducing frozen battered mackerel (The Grocer 11.3.2011) and coley (The Grocer
19 6.8.2011). However, the continued growth in usage of lesser known species may not relate to
20 greatly diminished usage of former favourites and represent a new market rather than market
21 shift (The Grocer, 29.4.2013). Since the campaign, 'exotic' species sales such as Tilapia and
22 Mahi have increased (The Grocer, 29.4.2013). The *Fish Fight* (and cooking oriented *Fish*
23 *Dinners*) appear, then, to have leveraged the legitimacy that celebrity chefs bring in terms of
24 food choices. Supply chains have been established or re-oriented and these depend upon
25 sustained demand: the fish fight seems to have sparked a significant food trend.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 The tuna issue is of particular interest since here Hugh did not request that consumers
36 change their personal consumption never, for example, suggesting an alternative to the
37 nation's 'favourite fishy sandwich filler'. Rather, viewers were to become activists
38 demanding change and making someone else responsible to bring that about – the
39 effectiveness of this demonstrated by the speed of announcements regarding pole-and-line
40 tuna throughout the industry as shown in Table 1.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Date	Organisation	Action
11 th Jan	Channel 4	First Fish Fight episode airs
11 th Jan	Tesco	Pledged to move all tuna to pole-and-line by the end of 2012
10 th March	Princes	Announced all tuna to be from pole-and-line and FAD-free sources by end 2012
10 th March	Asda	Announced elimination of use of FADs for tuna by end 2014
12 th April	Morrison's	Announces movement towards pole-and-line or FAD-free sources for own-brand tuna and products including tuna
20 th April	SSC	Sustainable Seafood Coalition formed
14 th May	Princes	Announced first branded range of pole-and-line caught tuna

Table 1: Chronology of institutional changes with particular reference to Tuna (Source: adapted from The Grocer May 21st 2011).

Notably, two new institutions have been introduced to the field, trade associations (as noted also by Humphreys 2010a) amongst competitors at retail and supplier levels. In April 2011 the Sustainable Seafood Coalition (SSC) was also formed to operate under the secretariat of Client Earth with involvement from Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall. By October 2014 the SSC had released voluntary guidelines on the precise definitions to be used where sustainability claims are made with respect to fish (www.sustainableseafoodcoalition.org), thus responding to the problems Hugh identified at Tesco. In 2012, the International Pole-and-Line Federation, a UK charity, was established to collate research, provide support and stimulate pole-and-line fisheries internationally, in an attempt to meet demand with supply (www.ipnlf.org). In these ways, the institutional field coalesces around standards and practices in response to mainstream, temporary activism.

The important point emerging from a review of changes is that the viewer and consumer are implicated in different ways. Expanded markets for lesser used fish depend upon long term commitment to more sustainable consumption and presuppose that the consumer continues to be aware and consumed. New approaches to fish labelling enable such a consumer to make appropriate choices. Tuna initiatives, however, alter the institutional environment to the extent that, once implemented, the consumer is called on to do nothing other than continue consuming, since there will be little availability of less sustainable

1
2
3 variants. This has been brought about through mobilisation of the mainstream consumer as
4 temporary activist.
5
6
7
8

9 10 **Discussion, contributions and conclusions**

11
12 This paper sought to develop understanding of mainstream malcontents (Scaraboto and
13 Fischer 2013) through analysis of a television celebrity campaign as institutional
14 entrepreneur. This advances Humphrey's (2010b) discussion of the media's role in
15 institutionalisation by looking at legitimisation strategies in a genre that blurs fact and fiction to
16 drive viewer action. While conventional attempts to promote responsible and mindful change
17 are often driven by factual evidence and appeal to our ethical and civic responsibilities as
18 citizen consumers (Hansen and Schrader, 1997); the celebrity institutional entrepreneur
19 shapes and transforms attitudes towards sustainability through the telling of a story that
20 encourages and legitimises us to become, what Richardson-Ngwenya and Richardson (2013,
21 p.345) describe as, "more-than-consumers, as humanitarians". Where Scaraboto and Fischer
22 (2013) have suggested that marketers will respond when mainstream malcontent threatens
23 profit, we submit that normalising dissatisfaction with current institutional behaviour requires
24 a lead actor to operationalise this threat. By exploring Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall's journey
25 to provoke primetime television viewers' dissatisfaction, we have gained an understanding of
26 how the celebrity institutional entrepreneur legitimates sustainability efforts. Celebrity
27 campaign operates through action-paced narrative, simplification of issues, nomination of
28 solutions and the identification of a common enemy that we can bring to redemption. The
29 viewer at home is located as 'ordinary', or mainstream, yet capable of at least a moment of
30 extraordinariness once rallied to malcontent with current institutions.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Through the transformative aspect of the celebrity campaign, sustainable consumption
46 and production is transformed into a compelling marketing issue and consumer participation
47 becomes normalised, desirable. To stand behind this claim, one may consider Thompson and
48 Coskuner-Balli's (2007) study of countervailing market responses to commercialisation.
49 Although they focus upon the counterculture attenuated by a more small-scale and resistant
50 consumer collective, they find that consumer mobilization is effected by the efforts of
51 thought-leaders such as community-supported agriculture pioneer Eliot Coleman or more
52 local farmers and informed consumers with whom others can identify and draw inspiration.
53 Where we differ from Thompson and Coskuner-Balli is that while they suggest pockets of
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 localised resistant-rebels will mobilise because of the prospect “of participating in an intimate
4 and human-scaled market structure” (2007, p.150), we contend that the mainstream mass-
5 audience is mobilised not for reasons of desired marginality and close-knit sociality, but to
6 share in the mass-mediated prospect of ‘heroism’. Through crafting mythic plots, staking out
7 adversaries and simplifying complexity, activism becomes normalised rather than a fringe
8 issue linked only to the evangelical identities of a resistant few (see Kozinets and Handelman,
9 2004). These features, which are specific to the celebrity campaign and are arguably
10 inadmissible in other forms of media, constitute the reasons that market change is effected
11 and institutional fields altered, through both mindful consumption and mainstream temporary
12 and channelled activism.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 The viewer at home, the average mainstream consumer, is rallied to feel malcontent
22 towards current institutions and through the prospect of joining high-legitimacy figures like
23 the ‘ordinary’ celebrity in his/her heroism, there is a desire to shape new institutions. As a
24 caveat it is worth reflecting on this non-invasive particularity of the Fish Fight campaign.
25 Mainstream malcontent in this case was arguably galvanized to such an incredible extent
26 partly from the lack of burden or obligation it required from its primetime television
27 audience. These individuals were simply encouraged to voice their outrage from the comfort
28 of their sofas through popular social media applications and were expected not to incur any
29 real losses spare possibly a small increase in the price they pay for their fish. Unlike other
30 activist efforts like boycotts, which are typically ongoing and require “individuals to forgo a
31 preferred product on a repeated basis” (John and Klein, 2003, p.1197), there is nothing that
32 ‘Fish Fighters’ could no longer consume as they used to. This is suggestive that beyond the
33 legitimacy hard-won through mythologizing the celebrity institutional entrepreneur, the
34 attribution of personhood to his adversaries and the selective framing of issues, rallying
35 mainstream malcontent is largely dependent on carefully avoiding interference with
36 immediate and experienced day-to-day schemas. Therefore shaping consumers’ institutional
37 expectations of production to improve sustainability efforts is contingent on maintaining their
38 expectations of consumption.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Importantly, up to now, we have left unquestioned who the ‘mainstream’ is, treating
53 them as other than the committed fringe. Our analysis reveals the institutional agency of an
54 amorphous mainstream rallied to temporary actions. This temporality allows us to suggest
55 that a focus on process might provide a powerful means to think about ‘the mainstream’ and
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sustainability change. Accordingly we might look at *mainstreaming* malcontent rather than at
4 mainstream malcontent as a stable category.
5
6

7 Firstly, we note that Fish Fight called on viewers and consumers with a carefully
8 crafted and non-invasive particularity and with an inclusivity that evades questions of class
9 and different interests. The heroic journey permits a singular focus on an identified problem
10 and allows neglect of debate about alternative views or the means through which a solution
11 might be realised. Issues such as economic effects for fishing communities or the price of
12 tuna on the supermarket shelf are excluded. Fish Fight, we believe, mainstreams malcontent
13 by allowing the audience (however inaccurately they might represent the population) to see
14 themselves as a collective mainstream acting for a generalised and non-partisan cause. Non-
15 invasive participation is facilitated. Outrage can be voiced immediately from the comfort of
16 the sofa through popular media applications. Fish fighters carry light burdens and obligations.
17 Extant consumption of 'the nation's favourite fishy sandwich filler' can be continued if
18 institutions change. Fish Fighters are introduced to lesser known and cheaper species,
19 evidence perhaps that the call was embraced, but perhaps not to the intended detriment of cod
20 and haddock sales.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Therefore, it is fruitful to think of celebrity campaign as a process that galvanises an
32 audience to relatively non-invasive action precisely because it allows them to see and
33 experience themselves as mainstreamed malcontent. Mainstreaming is largely dependent on
34 limited interference with immediate and day to day schemas. It can be back to life as normal
35 if temporary actions provoke changes in the institutional field that embed greater
36 sustainability in normal consumption.
37
38
39
40
41

42 The effectiveness of this change is bound up with industrial competition, illustrated
43 by the rapid movement amongst competitors to pole-and-line tuna and the extension of
44 species range amongst retailers and food brands. In outlining some of these developments,
45 albeit without direct research within such organisations, we suggest that where
46 mainstreaming malcontent provokes consumer action and media attention, organisations act
47 to diffuse malcontent and defend their consumer base. We suggest that marketing scholars
48 can contribute to a better understanding of change towards sustainable ends by integrating
49 our knowledge of consumer malcontent with that of organisational actions to more fully
50 illuminate institutional fields.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Our study contributes to institutional theory, especially as this has been developed
4 amongst consumer researchers by bringing the institutional entrepreneur to the fore. We have
5 sought to demonstrate a distributed agency operating through the connections between actors
6 and considered how this operates in the specific case of the celebrity campaign. Scaraboto
7 and Fischer's (2013) framework has been important in developing our ideas and we have
8 suggested may also be directed to the consideration of process. In turn, the processual view
9 might allow marketers to integrate understandings of competition and activism to address
10 sustainability change. We have been unable to explore process amongst the more radical or
11 across radical and mainstream malcontent. These neglected areas might form the basis of
12 further research.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Acknowledgements

24
25 We would like to sincerely thank the special issue editors and the two anonymous reviewers
26 for their insightful and thought-provoking comments on an earlier version of this paper. We
27 would also like to extend our thanks to [anonymised] for sharing her invaluable advice and
28 insights with us during the early planning stage for this topic.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 References

- 36
37 Askegaard, S., & Linnet, J. T. (2011). Towards an epistemology of consumer culture theory:
38 Phenomenology and the context of context. *Marketing Theory*, 11, 381-404. doi:
39 10.1177/1470593111418796.
40
41
42
43 Barnard, A. V. (2011). "Waving the banana" at capitalism: Political theatre and social
44 movement strategy among New York's "freegan" dumpster divers. *Ethnography*, 12,, 419-
45 444. doi: 10.1177/1466138110392453.
46
47
48
49 Bell, D., & Hollows, J. (2011). From River Cottage to Chicken Run: Hugh Fearnley-
50 Whittingstall and the class politics of ethical consumption. *Celebrity Studies*, 2(2), 178-191.
51 Doi: 10.1080/19392397.2011.574861
52
53
54
55 Brownlie, D., & Hower, P. A. (2007). Prime beef cuts: culinary images for thinking 'men'.
56 *Consumption, Markets and Culture*, 10, 229-250. doi: 10.1080/10253860701365371
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Campbell, J. (2008 / 1949). *The hero with a thousand faces*. California: New World Library.
- 4
5 Cashmore, E., & Parker, A. (2003). One David Beckham? Celebrity, masculinity, and the
6
7 soccerati. *Sociology of Sport*, 20, 214-231. ISSN 0741-1235.
- 8
9
10 Chatzidakis A., Maclaran, P., & Bradshaw, A. (2012). Heterotopian space and the utopics of
11
12 ethical and green consumption. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 28, 494-515. Doi:
13 10.1080/0267257X.2012.668922
- 14
15 Clegg, S. (2010). The state, power, and agency: Missing in action in institutional theory?
16
17 *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 19, 4-13. doi: 10.1177/1056492609347562.
- 18
19
20 Clover, C. (2005). *The end of the line: how overfishing is changing the world and what we*
21
22 *eat*. London: Ebury Press.
- 23
24 Colomy, P. (1998). Neofunctionalism and neoinstitutionalism: Human agency and interest in
25
26 institutional change. *Sociological Forum*, 13, 265-300. Doi: 10.1023/A:1022193816858.
- 27
28 Connolly, J., & Prothero, A. (2008). Green consumption life-politics, risk and contradictions,
29
30 *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 8, 117-145. Doi: 10.1177/1469540507086422.
- 31
32 Dacin, M.T., Goodstein, J., & Scott, W. R. (2002). Institutional theory and institutional
33
34 change: Introduction to the special research forum. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 45-
35
36 56. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2002.6283388.
- 37
38 DiMaggio P., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism
39
40 and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147-
41
42 160. Doi: 10.2307/2095101
- 43
44 Giesler, M. (2008). Conflict and compromise: Drama in marketplace evolution. *Journal of*
45
46 *Consumer Research*, 34, 739-753. Doi: 10.1086/522098.
- 47
48 Giesler, M. (2012). How doppelganger brand images influence the market creation process:
49
50 Longitudinal insights from the rise of Botox cosmetic. *Journal of Marketing*, 76, 55-68. doi:
51 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jm.10.0406>
- 52
53
54 Goodman, P.S. (2004). Filmmaking and research. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 13, 324-
55
56 335. doi: 10.1177/1056492604270795.
- 57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Greenwood, R. & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutional entrepreneurship in mature fields: The
4 big five accounting firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 27-48. doi:
5 10.5465/AMJ.2006.20785498.
6
7

8
9 Hansen, U. & Schrader, S. (1997). A modern model of consumption for a sustainable society.
10 *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 20, 443–68. Doi: 10.1023/A:1006842517219.
11

12
13 Hewer, P. & Brownlie, D. (2009). Culinary culture, gastrobrands and identity myths:
14 'Nigella', an iconic brand in the baking. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 36, 482-487.
15

16
17 Holbrook, M. B., & Grayson, M. W. (1986). The semiology of cinematic consumption:
18 Symbolic consumer behaviour in Out of Africa. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13, 374-381.
19 doi: 10.1086/209076
20

21
22 Holbrook, M .B., & Hirschman, E. C. (1993). *Semiotics of consumption*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
23

24
25 Hollows, J., & Jones, S. (2010). 'At least he's doing something': Moral entrepreneurship and
26 individual responsibility in Jamie's Ministry of Food. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*,
27 13, 307-322. Doi: 10.1177/1367549410363197
28

29
30 Holt, D. B. (2003). What Becomes an Icon Most? *Harvard business review*, 81, 43–49.
31

32
33 Holt, D. B., & Thompson, C. J. (2004). Man-of-action heroes: The pursuit of heroic
34 masculinity in everyday consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31, 425-440. DOI:
35 10.1086/422120.
36

37
38
39 Hopkinson, G. C., & Hogarth-Scott, S. (2001). " What happened was..." broadening the
40 agenda for storied research. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 17, 27-47. Doi:
41 10.1362/0267257012571483
42

43
44
45 Humphreys, A. (2010a). Megamarketing: The creation of markets as a social process. *Journal*
46 *of Marketing*, 74, 1-19. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.74.2.1>.
47

48
49 Humphreys, A. (2010b). Semiotic structure and the legitimation of consumption practices:
50 The case of casino gambling. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37, 490-510. Doi:
51 10.1086/652464.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Humphreys, A. & Latour, K. A. (2013). Framing the game: Assessing the impact of cultural
4 representations on consumer perceptions of legitimacy. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40,
5 773-795. Doi: 10.1086/672358.
6
7

8
9 Jackson, P., Watson, M., & Piper, N. (2013). Locating anxiety in the social: The cultural
10 mediation of food fears. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 16, 24-42. Doi:
11 10.1177/1367549412457480
12
13

14
15 Johar, G. V., Holbrook, M. B., & Stern, B. B. (2001). The role of myth in creative advertising
16 design: Theory, process, and outcome., *Journal of Advertising*, 30, 1-25. Doi:
17 10.1080/00913367.2001.
18
19

20
21 John, A., & Klein, J. (2003). The boycott puzzle: consumer motivations for purchase
22 sacrifice. *Management Science*, 49, 1196-1209. ISSN 00251909.
23

24
25 Kozinets, R. V., & Handelman, J. M. (2004). Adversaries of consumption: Consumer
26 movements, activism, ideology. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31, 691-704. Doi:
27 10.1086/425104.
28
29

30
31 Lawrence, T., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2011). Institutional work: Refocusing institutional
32 studies of organization. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20, 52-58. Doi:
33 10.1177/1056492610387222.
34
35

36
37 Levy, S. (1981), "Interpreting Consumer Mythology: A Structural Approach to Consumer
38 Behavior," *Journal of Marketing*, 45, 49-61. DOI: 10.2307/1251541
39

40
41 Maguire, S., & Hardy, C. (2009). Discourse and deinstitutionalisation: The decline of DDT.
42 *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 148-178. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2009.36461993.
43

44
45 McAdam, D., & Scott, R.W. (2005). Organizations and movements. In G. Davis, D.
46 McAdam, R. Scott & M. Zald (Eds.) *Social movements and organization theory*. Cambridge:
47 Cambridge University Press.
48
49

50
51 McDonagh, P., & Prothero, A. (2014). Sustainability marketing research: past, present and
52 future. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 30, 1186-1219. Doi:
53 10.1080/0267257X.2014.943263.
54
55

56
57 Meyers, E. (2014), "Tabloids, Reality Television and the "Ordinary" Celebrity", *Flow*, 19,
58 retrieved from: <http://flowtv.org/2014/02/tabloids-reality-television-and-the-ordinary->
59
60

1
2
3 [celebrity/](#) (Accessed 10/10/2014) Muggleton, D., & Rupert, W. (2003). *The Post-Subcultures*
4 *Reader*. Oxford: Berg.

5
6
7 Parker, M. (2012). Being there, teleography and The Wire, *Journal of Organizational*
8 *Ethnography*, 1, 23-30. Doi: 10.1108/20466741211220624.

9
10
11 Perkmann, M. & Spicer, A. (2008). How are management fashions institutionalized? The role
12 of institutional work. *Human Relations*, 61, 811-844. doi: 10.1177/0018726708092406.

13
14
15 Phillips, N., Lawrence, T. B., & Hardy, C. (2004). Discourse and institutions. *Academy of*
16 *Management Review*, 29, 635-652. ISSN:0363-7425.

17
18
19 Rettie, R., Burchell, K., & Riley, D. (2012). Normalising green behaviours: A new approach
20 to sustainability marketing. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 28, 420-444. Doi:
21 10.1080/0267257X.2012.658840.

22
23
24 Richardson-Ngwenya,, P., & Richardson, B. (2013). Documentary film and ethical
25 foodscapes: three takes on Caribbean sugar. *Cultural Geographies*, 20, 339-356. doi:
26 10.1177/1474474012469760.

27
28
29 Ryan, C., & McLoughlin, D. (1999). The apparent paradox of self: a semiological analysis of
30 the role of consumption in the life of trainspotting's Mark Renton. In B. Dubois, T. Lowrey,
31 & L. Shrum (Eds.) *Advances in Consumer Research* Vol. 4. Provo, UT : Association for
32 Consumer Research. Scaraboto, D., & Fischer, E. (2013). Frustrated fatshionistas: An
33 institutional theory perspective on consumer quests for greater choice in mainstream markets.
34 *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39, 1234-1257. doi:10.1086/668298.

35
36
37 Silvera, D. H., & Austad, B. (2003). Factors predicting the effectiveness of celebrity
38 endorsement advertisements. *European Journal of Marketing*, 38, 1509-1526. Doi:
39 10.1108/03090560410560218.

40
41
42 Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches.
43 *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 571-610. doi:10.5465/AMR.1995.9508080331.

44
45
46 Thompson, C.J., & Coskuner-Balli, G. (2007). Countervailing market responses to corporate
47 co-optation and the ideological recruitment of consumption communities. *Journal of*
48 *Consumer Research*, 34, 135-152. Doi: 10.1086/519143.

1
2
3 Thompson, C. J. (2004). Marketplace mythology and discourses of power. *Journal of*
4 *Consumer Research*, 31, 162-180. Doi: 10.1086/383432.
5
6

7 Turner, G., Bonner, F., & Marshall, P. D. (2000). *Fame games: the production of celebrity in*
8 *Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
9

10
11 Turner, G. (2004). *Understanding celebrity*. London; Sage.
12

13
14 Turner, G. (2006). The mass production of celebrity: 'Celetoids', reality TV and the 'demotic
15 turn'. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9, 153-165. doi:
16 10.1177/1367877906064028.
17
18

19
20 Veen, S. V. (1994). The consumption of heroes and the hero hierarchy of effects. In C. Allen
21 & D. Roedder (Eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research*, 21, Provo, UT: Association for
22 Consumer Research.
23
24

25
26 Wohlfeil, M., & Whelan, S. (2012). 'Saved!' by Jena Malone: An introspective study of a
27 consumer's fan relationship with a Film Actress. *Journal of Business Research*, 65, 511-519.
28 Doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.02.030.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 The Grocer (29.4.2013) A storm brewing? The experts speak on the fish and seafood
38 industry.
39

40
41 The Grocer (13.8.2011) Fish fight gets many hooked on 'new' fish
42

43
44 The Grocer (6.8.2011) Young's offers coley in fish fighting spirit
45

46
47 The Grocer (21.5.2011) Hugh's fish fight lands stunning catch.
48

49
50 The Grocer (11.3.2011) Battered mackerel hits the multiples
51

52
53 The Grocer (15.2.2011) Eat under-used species - but proceed with caution.
54

55
56 The Grocer (5.2.2011) Industry split on plan to halt fish discards
57
58
59
60

RESPONSES TO REVIEWERS

The authors wish to sincerely thank the editors and the reviewers for inviting this manuscript for revision. Based on your valuable and thought-provoking suggestions we have tightened aspects of our conceptual frame in places and have ensured that all of our interpretations are developed well enough to support the paper's overall contribution.

Reviewer 1 and 2's comments are responded to separately. Below, each reviewer's comments are presented in **bold**, followed by our direct responses in plain text.

Reviewer: 1

1.) First of all, the mechanisms of cognitive legitimation presented in table 1 are never put to any use, so what is the reason for their inclusion? They seem to have some resonance with the tripartite frame of analysis, mythologizing, personalizing the adversary, and framing the issue, but this never becomes entirely clear. Use it or lose it.

Also the paragraph that ends this part "we adopt the concepts..." is weird to the extent where it does not really make any sense. What is a "cultural understanding of celebrity"? And how does it differ from the other understandings discussed early in the paper – aren't institutional theories "cultural"?

We have deleted the table, we do not think it had much role in the paper.

We have amended the paragraph. Specifically we have sought to highlight the cultural role of celebrity to counter more individualistic readings that would give rise to hyper-masculine agency'.

"We adopt the concepts of legitimisation and institutional work. Specifically we shall be looking at institutional entrepreneurship in the celebrity campaign. We shall argue that the celebrity campaign operates through use of myth and discourse to produce moral and symbolic frames and is thus socially located (Colomy, 1998) rather than hyper-muscular individual agency (Clegg, 2010). Accordingly, we outline a cultural understanding of celebrity."

2.) Secondly, it also is not too obviously why the processes described in the first of the three abovementioned processes is necessarily a mythologizing process. We are presented with no clear definition of what is a myth, and therefore the process remains opaque. We are told that we know from Thompson's 2004 paper that myth can be constructed through the marketplace – so far so good – but what is it precisely in the described process that makes it deserve the qualifier "mythologizing"? The modes of

1
2
3 **representation described definitely construct and add to a particular narrative about**
4 **our celebrity entrepreneur and as such may be decisive for his efficiency as a mobilizer**
5 **of mainstream malcontent, but where does the mythological come in?**
6
7

8 *Thank you for making this point and we are delighted to take the opportunity to make*
9 *ourselves cleaner. We believe the mythologizing aspects of the celebrity entrepreneur's*
10 *portrayal stem from their grounding to two archetypal and long perpetuated plotlines used to*
11 *explain and aggrandise behaviour (i.e. Colomy 1998's 'sole hero' and 'the journey to*
12 *enlightenment') which are characterised as mythic. We recognise however that our argument*
13 *loses clarity without first explaining what a myth is, so we have returned to this theme to*
14 *rewrite its opening paragraph with our own definition and an explication based on Levy*
15 *(1981): (see below)*
16
17
18

19 "The formation of a story capable of providing – and enchanting – the average
20 consumer with meanings and metaphors has the potential to serve multiple ideological
21 agendas (Thompson, 2004). Such stories are often made possible by drawing on
22 mythic archetypes and plotlines. Myths are commonly recognised and easily
23 understood characters (e.g., the saviour, the villain, the fighter) and narratives (e.g.,
24 heroic journeys, struggles between good and bad) (Hopkinson and Hogarth-Scott,
25 2001) that structure texts, stories and actions while charging them with emotion: "In
26 reading fairy tales, as a first example, the reader (consumer) reacts directly with ideas
27 and feelings" (Levy, 1981, p.50). Advertising, brand management, PR and the media
28 have historically borrowed liberally from these elements to produce compelling
29 images, characters, and promotional appeals (Holt, 2003; Johar, Holbrook, and Stern,
30 2001). This recipe, we argue, is no different to the institutional efforts of the celebrity
31 campaigner...."
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **3.) My third and possibly most significant point is the lack of any reflexivity of the**
39 **particularities of this case that might render it somewhat special in terms of its ability to**
40 **say anything about mainstream malcontent and celebrity entrepreneurs in general and**
41 **in particular within sustainability issues. For one thing, the consumers in this particular**
42 **case do not suffer any particular loss spare possibly a small increase in price. There is**
43 **nothing that they can no longer consume as they used to – as it is clearly stated both in**
44 **the paper and by Hugh himself during the program. We know from former analyses of**
45 **for example wine boycotts that it is relatively easy to mobilize mainstream malcontent**
46 **when there are equally good alternatives available. The tuna consumer does not suffer a**
47 **loss from consuming an outcome of a more sustainable production (in this case fishing)**
48 **process. But try to make Hugh the mythmaker mobilize and convince the same crowd**
49 **about the sustainability outcome of having next year's vacation in Mansfield rather**
50 **than the Maldives (especially after having seen Hugh's trip there.), and the result might**
51 **be slightly more disappointing.**
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

This is an important point and we thank the reviewer for highlighting this. We have returned to the paper to flesh out our discussion of the subtleties of the campaign's call to action in the section (slightly renamed) "Post-script – Changes in the Institutional Field" section as well as in the discussion.

The tuna issue is of particular interest since here Hugh did not request that consumers change their personal consumption never, for example, suggesting an alternative to the nation's 'favourite fishey sandwich filler'. Rather, viewers were to become activists demanding change and making someone else responsible to bring that about – the effectiveness of this demonstrated by the speed of announcements regarding pole-and-line tuna throughout the industry as shown in Table 1.

Date	Organisation	Action
11 th Jan	Channel 4	First Fish Fight episode airs
11 th Jan	Tesco	Pledged to move all tuna to pole-and-line by the end of 2012
10 th March	Princes	Announced all tuna to be from pole-and-line and FAD-free sources by end 2012
10 th March	Asda	Announced elimination of use of FADs for tuna by end 2014
12 th April	Morrison's	Announces movement towards pole-and-line or FAD-free sources for own-brand tuna and products including tuna
20 th April	SSC	Sustainable Seafood Coalition formed
14 th May	Princes	Announced first branded range of pole-and-line caught tuna

Table 1: Chronology of institutional changes with particular reference to Tuna (Source: adapted from The Grocer May 21st 2011).

Notably, two new institutions have been introduced to the field, trade associations (as noted also by Thompson 2010a) amongst competitors at retail and supplier levels. In April 2011 the Sustainable Seafood Coalition (SSC) was also formed to operate under the secretariat of Client Earth with involvement from Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall. By October 2014 the SSC had released voluntary guidelines on the precise definitions to be used where sustainability claims are made with respect to fish (www.sustainableseafoodcoalition.org), thus responding to the problems Hugh identified at Tesco. In 2012, the International Pole-and-Line Federation, a UK charity, was established to collate research, provide support and stimulate pole-and-line fisheries internationally, in an attempt to meet demand with supply (www.ipnlf.org). In these ways, the institutional field coalesces around standards and practices in response to mainstream, temporary activism.

1
2
3 The important point emerging from a review of changes is that the viewer and
4 consumer are implicated in different ways. Expanded markets for lesser used fish
5 depend upon long term commitment to more sustainable consumption and presuppose
6 that the consumer continues to be aware and consumed. New approaches to fish
7 labelling enable such a consumer to make appropriate choices. Tuna initiatives,
8 however, alter the institutional environment to the extent that, once implemented, the
9 consumer is called on to do nothing other than continue consuming, since there will
10 be little availability of less sustainable variants. This has been brought about through
11 mobilisation of the mainstream consumer as temporary activist.
12

13
14 *We return in the discussion to consider how it is the changed institutional field that means*
15 *consumer activism need not be permanent:*
16

17
18 The viewer at home, the average mainstream consumer, is rallied to feel malcontent
19 towards current institutions and through the prospect of joining high-legitimacy
20 figures like the ‘ordinary’ celebrity in his/her heroism, there is a desire to shape new
21 institutions. As a caveat it is worth reflecting on this non-invasive particularity of the
22 Fish Fight campaign. Mainstream malcontent in this case was arguably galvanized to
23 such an incredible extent partly from the lack of burden or obligation it required from
24 its primetime television audience. These individuals were simply encouraged to voice
25 their outrage from the comfort of their sofas through popular social media
26 applications and were expected not to incur any real losses spare possibly a small
27 increase in the price they pay for their fish. Unlike other activist efforts like boycotts,
28 which are typically ongoing and require “individuals to forgo a preferred product on a
29 repeated basis” (see John and Klein, 2003, p.1197), there is nothing that ‘Fish
30 Fighters’ could no longer consume as they used to. This is suggestive that beyond the
31 legitimacy hard-won through mythologizing the celebrity institutional entrepreneur,
32 the attribution of personhood to his adversaries and the selective framing of issues,
33 rallying mainstream malcontent is largely dependent on carefully avoiding
34 interference with immediate and experienced day-to-day schemas. Therefore shaping
35 consumers’ institutional expectations of production to improve sustainability efforts is
36 contingent on maintaining their expectations of consumption.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 **4.) Askegaard with no e at the end, p.5; Thompson 2010b not in reference list; p. 6 A**
45 **number of typos and misspellings (missing plural s’s etc.)**
46

47 *Thank you for highlighting these errors. We have combed through the document and attended*
48 *to all typographical, grammatical and spelling mistakes throughout.*
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Reviewer: 2**
4

5 **Comments to the Author(s)**
6

7 **This is a quality piece of work and very impressive in the form of cultural analysis that**
8 **it delivers. My changes are minor and offered in a spirit to improve rather than detract**
9 **from the paper as it stands:**
10

11 *Thank you. We are delighted with your positive appraisal of our manuscript and would be*
12 *happy to attend to your comments and suggestions.*
13
14

15
16
17
18 **p. 1 Focus on ‘mainstream consumer’, does this need tightening up to pin down ‘who’ of**
19 **change.**
20

21
22 *Thank you for raising this, we agree that it is problematic – and has been in previous*
23 *literatures. In having to address this rather we believe that we have strengthened our*
24 *contribution. We believe that the mainstream remains a usefully ambiguous term – what is*
25 *important, for people to take action and for organisations to respond, is that they experience*
26 *themselves as mainstream and are perceived as such. Accordingly we have placed more*
27 *emphasis on ‘mainstreaming’ as process (this ties in with later comments on class and*
28 *therefore the full section that addresses both points):*
29
30

31
32 “Importantly, up to now, we have left unquestioned who the ‘mainstream’ is, treating
33 them as other than the committed fringe. Our analysis reveals the institutional agency
34 of an amorphous mainstream rallied to temporary actions. This temporality allows us
35 to suggest that a focus on process might provide a powerful means to think about ‘the
36 mainstream’ and sustainability change. Accordingly we might look at mainstreaming
37 malcontent rather than at mainstream malcontent as a stable category.
38

39
40 Firstly, we note that Fish Fight called on viewers and consumers with a carefully
41 crafted and non-invasive particularity and with an inclusivity that evades questions of
42 class and different interests. The heroic journey permits a singular focus on an
43 identified problem and allows neglect of debate about alternative views or the means
44 through which a solution might be realised. Issues such as economic effects for
45 fishing communities or the price of tuna on the supermarket shelf are excluded. Fish
46 Fight, we believe, mainstreams malcontent by allowing the audience (however
47 inaccurately they might represent the population) to see themselves as a collective
48 mainstream acting for a generalised and non-partisan cause. Non-invasive
49 participation is facilitated. Outrage can be voiced immediately from the comfort of the
50 sofa through popular media applications. Fish fighters carry light burdens and
51 obligations. Extant consumption of ‘the nation’s favourite fishy sandwich filler’ can
52 be continued if institutions change. Fish Fighters are introduced to lesser known and
53 cheaper species, evidence perhaps that the call was embraced, but perhaps not to the
54 intended detriment of cod and haddock sales.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Therefore, it is fruitful to think of celebrity campaign as a process that galvanises an
4 audience to relatively non-invasive action precisely because it allows them to see and
5 experience themselves as mainstreamed malcontent. Mainstreaming is largely
6 dependent on limited interference with immediate and day to day schemas. It can be
7 back to life as normal if temporary actions provoke changes in the institutional field
8 that embed greater sustainability in normal consumption.”
9
10

11
12
13
14
15
16 **p.3. The focus on ‘legitimacy’ looks useful, but is charismatic authority also at work?**
17 **Why no mention of work on celebrity activism would this lend further support to your**
18 **focus on the institutional celebrity entrepreneur?**
19

20
21 *We did not want to look too broadly at celebrity activism in total – which would take us into*
22 *Live Aid etc. However, we have expanded the paper by noting previous work on celebrity in*
23 *food campaigns – this also addresses your later point about class and the mainstream:*
24

25
26 “Studies of the kitchen celebrity in marketing have attended to printed visuals and
27 texts. Elsewhere, food documentary (eg Richardson-Ngwenya and Richardson, 2013)
28 and celebrity campaigns (Jackson, Watson and Piper 2013; Bell and Hollows 2011;
29 Hollows and Jones, 2010) have been analysed. These studies, focusing especially on
30 Jamie Oliver’s child nutrition campaigns, provide a compelling view of the genre as
31 one of heroic narrative. However, filmic devices are deployed to distance a food
32 savvy audience from the feckless or incompetent subjects of the campaign to offer a
33 form of voyeurism underpinned by class difference (Jackson, Watson & Piper 2013;
34 Hollows and Jones, 2010). The case we will study, Fish Fight, differs in that the
35 campaign operates through film rather than being documented on film and focuses on
36 what the audience are assumed to eat and to value. We shall return to questions of
37 class which we do see as relevant, but we believe that the film operates by largely
38 erasing questions of class in addressing the audience as the mainstream. We believe
39 that the study therefore provides insight into the process of mainstreaming
40 malcontent. Command over legitimation through ordinariness at high-status level
41 makes the “ordinary celebrity” a powerful resource in mainstreaming malcontent
42 around unsustainable behaviours and in making sustainability efforts actionable at
43 mass-audience level.”
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51
52 **p.5 You need to explain rhetorical actions?**
53

54 *We have returned to this section and given brief but equal explanation of the two types of*
55 *actions:*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 “Material actions resemble those highlighted by Greenwood and Suddaby (2006) such
4 as the building of networks and establishment of (trade) associations to influence
5 regulative and normative legitimacy. Rhetorical actions, which might also be termed
6 cultural work (Perkmann and Spicer, 2008), operate through an effect on discourse or
7 by generating credibility for alternative narratives (Phillips et al, 2004) to disrupt
8 taken-for-granted understandings.”
9
10

11
12
13
14
15
16 **Table 1 do you need to explain these in text?**

17
18 **p.6 you mention ‘hyper-masculine agency’, why the caution, Hugh doesn’t seem to fit**
19 **this notion or does he, perhaps offer another term for the forms of agency he brings?**

20
21
22 *We have clarified this, in the extract provided above.*

23
24
25 **p.7 final sentence, this makes me think of shift to practice theory does this need to be**
26 **acknowledged, fleshed out?**

27
28
29 *We have reworked the conclusion and do not think this necessarily applies any longer*

30
31 **Methods, would be good to hear more on discourse/narrative analysis to firm up this**
32 **section and what was conducted, achieved.**

33
34
35 **p.14 ‘realising newsworthiness in a mainstream’?**

36 **Analysis does class and distinction need to be acknowledged here, who watches Hugh?**

37
38
39 *Many thanks for this making this interesting point and we agree that Eton educated Hugh*
40 *does not attract a representative audience. We think it is an interesting point that the*
41 *campaign operates without drawing overt class differences and argue (in sections cited*
42 *above) that that which is omitted from the campaign (especially the economic) works to erase*
43 *questions of class and to allow for the formation of what might be experienced as the*
44 *mainstream because possible differences of interest are obscured. We believe that this*
45 *strengthens our work – especially because food campaigns have been seen as very much*
46 *class and distinction based.*
47
48

49
50
51
52
53 **p.17 mobilisation of mainstream consumer? Is it a mainstream consumer or a classed**
54 **identity that is at work in such representations of taste and distinction? Notion of**
55 **temporary activist also needs firming up and fleshing out, what forms of activism/levels**
56 **of participation are at work?**
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Conclusion, as above is this the squeezed middle who would most entertain such ideas
4 and behavioural change. Is class at work, if so how and in what ways? Tastes also as
5 political and consumption as a moral dilemma is my thinking, perhaps cite work on
6 morality and consumption (see work of Daniel Miller 'The Poverty of Morality' and
7 Richard Wilk on 'Consuming Morality').
8
9

10 *We hope to have addressed these points in extracts already given above.*

11
12
13 Your paper needs a good proof-read!

14
15
16 Please check out work of Bell and Hollows in Celebrity Studies journal for more on
17 links to ethical consumption, moral entrepreneurs and taste cultures with specific
18 reference to Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall.
19

20
21 *Thank you, we have now included literature from this field.*

22
23
24 This is an enjoyable read and one which in my view offers much for our understanding
25 of celebrity, media consumption and issues of sustainability.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Dear Professors McDonagh and Martin

Ref: 'When people take action' Mainstreaming Malcontent and the Role of the Celebrity
Institutional Entrepreneur

Thank you for your continued help with this manuscript. We have made very limited changes prior to publication – and thank the reviewers for their helpful comments.

The references provided by reviewer 1 (of which we have used 2) have helped us to locate the work within JMM.

We concur with reviewer two that the background of neoliberalism underpins the campaign that we have analysed and is deeply implicated in any notions of responsibility (who should act and on what) in contemporary society. It is very much in this direction that we see our future research directions. That said, we did not feel it was possible or necessarily desirable to incorporate this very hefty political thought into the current paper. We did not wish to attempt to cover it since we know we can not do justice to it here. Therefore, we introduce the neoliberal background in what is now the concluding paragraph – highlighting merely that it is highly relevant and should be further studied.

I trust this is in order,

Yours sincerely,

Gillian Hopkinson