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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this dissertation is to understand how market rituals spread within and between distinct cultural contexts, and how this process occurs in value co-creating service ecosystems. By integrating service-dominant (S-D) logic and the markets-as-practice framework, this study traces key micro, meso, as well as macro-level market practices to explore the systemic and collaborative aspects of market creation. The research project contributes to marketing scholarship by proposing a fractal model of market co-creation, which offers an alternative way of understanding markets that shifts away from a diffusion of goods perspective to a translation of practice approach. This study contributes to early efforts to conduct empirical work inspired by the S-D logic perspective. Specifically, the study explores the contested practice of Valentine’s Day in the emerging market of Indonesia as a means to investigate the dynamic multi-level processes of practice translation and institutionalization.
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I. INTRODUCTION

During a recent transit in Seoul, Korea, –a city where all street names were foreign and indecipherable to me– I managed to find comfort in the sight of a few familiar signs and symbols, that of Coca-cola, McDonald’s and Starbucks. These were trademarks I was accustomed to seeing when growing up both in the cities of New York and Jakarta (Indonesia), as well as when studying in the small mid-western campus town of Urbana-Champaign. As part of my half-day tour in Seoul, I made a short stop at the National Folk Museum of Korea only to buy keychains and magnets at the museum gift shop. Nestled in a corner across the gift shop was a cozy coffee shop where I enjoyed a small cup of café latte. Unsurprisingly, the coffee was similarly served by a young barista, in the same type of disposable paper cup, with a flavor comparable to the lattes I normally order when taking afternoon coffee breaks with my fellow doctoral colleagues at the University of Hawaii at Manoa campus Starbucks.

This brief personal narrative depicts how commerce has facilitated the spread of brands, ideas, and practices across the globe. Not only are global brands becoming a more common sight, but citizens around the world can increasingly expect to find sightseeing tours in any tourist destination, a gift shop in most museum lobbies, as well as the ability to enjoy an afternoon cup of joe in a comfortable retail setting in any major city around the world. Market activities not only enable the spread of brands and products, but also introduce new practices (e.g., half-day sightseeing tours, museum gift-shopping, and coffee-shop drinking) that distinctly influence the way people live on a day-to-day basis.

Social and cultural critics antagonize markets as profit seeking systems sustained through the manipulation of customers. The Frankfurt School philosophy deems customers powerless as they are seduced by the pleasures of consumption (Adorno, 1975; Horkheimer and Adorno, 1993), emphasizing the market’s oppressive force and negative influence on the social, political, and cultural wellbeing of the customer (Murray and Ozanne 1991). In this case, markets are seen as an invasion to private, social, and cultural spheres of life (Maitland 1997). Global marketing is
perceived as a one-sided expansion and homogenization process which is often negatively perceived as a form of cultural imperialism, westernization, or Americanization (Kimura and Belk 2005; Ritzer 1998).

In this dissertation, I explore an alternative way for explaining the global spread of brands by reframing it in terms of an iterative process of practice translation. This explanation is developed through 1) the integration of two conceptual lenses: the service ecosystems approach, as developed in the growing perspective of service-dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch 2004a) and the markets-as-practice framework, which takes a performative approach to markets (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007), and 2) an exploration of how a foreign practice is adopted and adapted –translated– from one cultural context to another. In essence, this study focuses on how foreign ideas become embodied and embedded in new societies, given enacted markets that are situated within interconnected systems of value co-creating practices, identified as service ecosystems (Akaka et al. 2013; Lusch and Vargo 2014).

Service-dominant logic provides an explanation of markets as being driven by service-for-service exchange and emerging through human effort to integrate resources as a means to collaboratively create value for themselves and others. Taking an even broader stance, such markets are understood as being situated within a multilayered and overlapping ecosystem of service (Lusch and Vargo 2014) that is also influenced by the prevailing institutions (e.g., rules of the game, norms, values, culture). Meanwhile the markets-as-practice approach explores the opposite direction by focusing on and providing a fine-grained view of the core set of practices (i.e., representational, normative, and integrative) enacted to constitute markets. Combined, these two perspectives provide the theoretical foundations for understanding the links between disperse sets of interactions and enable a multi-layered understanding of actions and interactions.
In this case, micro-level actions are situated within larger networks of interactions, that essentially comprise of the aggregate of other micro-level actions and interactions. This approach highlights the power market practices have to influence culture on a macro (e.g., global) scale, but also underlines the degree to which markets are limited by their immediate micro (e.g., dyadic interaction) and meso-level context (e.g., family, school, organization; Chandler and Vargo 2011; Giddens 1984; Sewell 1992).

Service-dominant logic and the market-as-practice framework, thus, sets the stage for exploring how a foreign practice becomes translated in new cultural contexts. To further explore the mechanisms underlying this process, I specifically investigate how Valentine’s Day and its related rituals are enacted and reenacted in the new cultural context of Indonesia. Here, the celebration is welcomed with open arms, or at least tolerated, by the population majority. However, Valentine’s Day is also contested and rejected by a vocal minority, namely actors who align themselves with conservative cultural or religious values.

The purpose of this study is to understand how a foreign practice is picked up, interpreted, and enacted – in other words translated – given an understanding of co-creation in and of markets as service ecosystems. More specifically, the primary objective of this dissertation is 1) to develop a conceptual framework for explaining the translation of practices across distinct cultural contexts based on existing literature, and 2) conduct an empirical investigation of a specific instance of practice translation as a means to partially validate the proposed model by way of qualitative and quantitative analysis. In this process, a data-to-theory as opposed to data-to-population generalization is pursued (Lee and Baskerville 2003). Therefore, focus is on exploring how elements of the framework can inform and be informed by a real-life setting, as opposed to generalizing such elements across settings.
In the section that follows, I provide a brief explanation of the theoretical foundations that serve as the building blocks for the proposed model of practice translation, continued by a more detailed explanation of the research context. Additionally, I provide an overview of the three essays presented in this dissertation to provide a general understanding of the direction of the manuscript.

1 Theoretical Background

1.1 Markets and Value Co-creation

Value creation is at the core of every human activity. The conventional view in marketing measures value monetarily and emphasizes on activities that generate exchange potential, mainly the production and selling of goods (Vargo and Lusch 2004a). Value is embedded in products understood as exchangeable units of outputs. Exchange in this context is dyadic and transactional, and relationship is defined in terms of multiple transactions (Vargo 2009). Under this goods-dominant paradigm, value creation is a one-way process that starts from a product manufacturer, goes through other value adding entities, but ends in the hands of a customer. The market actors who produce and add value to exchangeable products (e.g. manufacturing and ‘services’ firms) are regarded as key value creators –‘producers,’ while actors who utilize or consume such products are seen as value destroyers – ‘consumers’ (Normann 2001; Vargo and Lusch 2011).

The recent emergence of service-dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch 2004a) introduces an alternative view to value creation, in which value is collaboratively created and determined. Value is not embedded in goods but manifests through all forms of practice that improve human wellbeing. In this perspective, exchange facilitates the co-creation of value. The focus of
exchange, however, is not particularly on tangible artifacts, but *service*—activities that relate to skills and knowledge; provision of operant resources that increase quality of life. Service-for-service exchange occurs through direct interaction or indirectly through goods as a distribution mechanism for any service rendered. Value is determined and realized only through the interaction of related actors, and is therefore co-created by a multitude of involved actors as opposed to being independently produced by a single actor. Additionally, the ways in which value is perceived and realized is contingent upon what individuals and society consider meaningful (Penaloza and Mish 2011), making context an important part of the value co-creation process (Chandler and Vargo 2011). The same artifact or service may be understood and valued differently in distinct cultural settings (Sewell 1992). As such, value is not only considered *in exchange* but also *in use*, and *in context* (Chandler and Vargo 2011; Vargo et al. 2008). More specifically, value is phenomenologically determined (Vargo and Lusch 2004a).

It is important to note that when customers utilize service as resources to go about their daily lives, they do not destroy value. Instead, customers continue the chain of creation as value co-creators. In this perspective, ‘consumers’ can be viewed as businesses or individual enterprises, rather than passive ‘end-consumers’ who are often perceived as targets of a firm’s action, or operand resources. By implication the producer vs. consumer perspective can be replaced with an actor-to-actor perspective, in which all parties (e.g. businesses, individual customers, households, etc.) engaged in economic exchange similarly function as resource-integrating, service-providing entities that have the common purpose of value co-creation (Vargo and Lusch 2011). As such, all parties, in principle, play comparable roles for the purpose of value co-creation (Vargo and Lusch 2011).
Importantly, value co-creation practices are embedded in a larger network of service ecosystems defined as “relatively self-contained, self-adjusting systems of resource-integrating actors connected by shared institutional logics and mutual value creation through service exchange” (Lusch and Vargo 2014). Essentially, dyadic exchanges are seen as part of a larger system of value of co-creation. Actors involved in a dynamic, reciprocal market are commonly engaged in service-for-service exchange that makes up a ‘service ecosystem.’ Service-for-service exchange reflects a greater process of resource integration (Vargo and Lusch 2004a; Vargo and Lusch 2011) in which various forms of skills and knowledge are traded, and value is co-created in exchange, use, and context through multiple stakeholders (Chandler and Vargo 2011; Vargo and Lusch 2004a; Vargo et al. 2008).

Furthermore, the exchange of service is understood as a practice that is linked to “implicit ways of understanding, saying, and doing things” (Schau et al. 2009, p. 31). More specifically, practices “comprise a temporally unfolding and spatially dispersed nexus of behaviors that include practical activities, performances, and representations or talk” (Schau et al. 2009, p. 39). Practice integrates “images, artifacts, and forms of competence” (Shove and Pantzar, 2005, p. 44) and connect behaviors, performances, and representations through understanding, rules or procedures, and engagement (Schatzki 1996; Schau et al. 2009; Warde 2005).

This study perceives markets as facilitating exchange in the process of value co-creation. While exchange is considered as a particular type of practice, exchange is also perceived to facilitate other types of practices, such as coffee drinking or museum gift shopping, as exemplified. At the same time, the particularities of the context, as defined and reflected through the values, norms, and actions defined by local institutions, contribute to shaping the meaning
and form of practices. This highlights the ability of market practices to influence culture on a global scale, but also underlines the degree to which such practices are essentially determined by the immediate context of enactment (Chandler and Vargo 2011; Giddens 1984; Sewell 1992). Understanding context as always embedded within a broader network of practice, identifies the need to explore multiple levels of context; i.e., dyadic interactions (micro-level) as subsumed under triadic (meso-level) interactions, as nested within broader (macro-level) networks of practice.

Expanding the focus from products to ‘service as practice’ is important because it leads marketers to search beyond product based solutions –product attributes, product positioning, or product category– in their effort to spread market offerings across the globe. It enables firms to think of value propositions in terms of general solutions that potentially facilitate day-to-day practices. In other words, taking the service-as-practice approach underlines the role of markets and marketing as processes that enable value co-creation in everyday life.

In general, service-dominant logic has promulgated significant shifts in marketing thought. The emphasis on value co-creation and the refocusing from goods to service open new opportunities to challenge established theories, reconstruct major concepts in marketing, and offer distinct managerial implications. In brief, this perspective offers a distinct and broader way to approach and understand the way markets work and the role of marketing in society.

Additionally, building on the markets-as-practice approach (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007) as well as borrowing from Scandinavian institutionalism (Czarniawska and Sevon 1996) enable the reconceptualization of the global diffusion of products towards a translation of practice. This study, thus, situates exchange within the integrative process of value co-creation, and identifies international marketing as a process of translation
that occurs at three levels of context: micro (individual), meso (market), and macro (societal). Focus is not on the physical diffusion of immutable products but the fluid translation of practices across distinct levels of contexts (Callon 1986; Latour 1986). By implication, the market solution does not lie only in the simple modification – adaptation vs. standardization – of a product, but in understanding how the offering and introduction of service can adapt to but also produce changes in the everyday practices of a given society.

1.2 Theoretical shifts

This dissertation rests on several contemporary views in marketing which requires a move beyond the more established goods-based theories in the field. Among the theoretical shifts undertaken include moving from an understanding of: 1) markets as exogenous to markets as endogenous, 2) context as fixed to context as a result of framing, and 3) marketing as a process of diffusion to translation.

The first foundational perspective assumed in this study is that the market is not a given or predetermined factor but a reality that is continually produced and reproduced by all involved market actors (Giddens 1984; Read et al. 2009) through the various market practices they perform (Araujo et al. 2010; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007). Following the markets-as-practice framework, markets are created through concrete practices that constitute markets – normalizing, representational and exchange practice. Service as an exchange practice is embedded within the greater practice of resource integration (Vargo and Lusch 2004a; Vargo and Lusch 2011). In this process, all actors directly or indirectly play a role as they co-create value through an interconnected process of resource integration. Markets emerge through the process of performativity, where our theories and views about the market will determine the ways in which we enact the market, and as a result, the outcome of the market (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006;
Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007). According to this view, there is no need to differentiate between the activities conducted in markets with markets themselves because markets are constantly being created through these practices (Araujo et al. 2010). In this sense, the market environment becomes an inherent part of the actor’s actions, making it controllable and within the influence of market actors (Read et al. 2009). As markets are continually performed, they consist of fluid seamless practices. Practice is understood as institutions (Lounsbury and Crumley 2007; Nicolini 2009a) and reproduced practice reflects a continual process of institutionalization (Barley and Tolbert 1997).

Understanding markets as seamless and continual brings us to the second assumption about context which functions to frame exchange (Chandler and Vargo 2011). Context plays an important role in determining how exchange takes place and how resources are understood. Context also enables actors to draw upon one another as resources (Sewell 1992). This partially relates to the notion of value being phenomenologically determined (Vargo and Lusch 2004a), in which value is always co-created in use and context (Vargo et al. 2008). Context can be understood to emerge through a process of *structuration* (Giddens 1984), in which social structure determines the actions of human agents and such actions produce and reproduce the structure within which human agents perform their actions. In brief, social structure is the medium and outcome of social action. Structure not only limits but enables action.

The importance of context can be highlighted in the following quote:

“The dynamic and living fluidity of markets is framed, or formed, because of context. Contexts frame markets as interactions or exchanges that we can “see” and “understand”. But essentially markets have no beginning or end; they are continuous. Contexts give markets form and function in time and space, whereas markets themselves transcend time and space because market exchanges simultaneously represent past and future service-for-service exchanges among different actors.” (Chandler and Vargo 2011, p. 38)
Not only does context frame exchange, but context also needs to be understood as a process of framing. Contexts do not have fixed boundaries. Although, markets can be defined in terms of a product category, cultural classification, geographic boundary, or even a combination of all of the mentioned factors, they reflect a process of arbitrary boundary-making. Contexts can either be defined by the actors involved or the observing researchers that aim to make meaning out of patterned action (Sahlin-Andersson 1996). The boundaries of context can continually be reconstructed. For example, Cayla and Eckhardt (Cayla and Eckhardt 2008; Cayla and Eckhardt 2007) highlight how some marketers are actively redefining markets by shifting the view of separate country markets in East Asia toward one of a reimagined deterritorialized community built on the identity of a modern urban Asia that spans beyond country borders.

As mentioned earlier, in this study, context is framed at three different layers: micro, meso, and macro (Chandler and Vargo 2011). While micro level context is utilized to account for direct exchange between actors, meso level accounts for indirect exchanges between dyads. Furthermore, macro level contexts are conceptualized to encompass more complex systems of exchange (Chandler and Vargo 2011). Critical to this multi-level approach of context is the understanding that interactions should be analyzed relative to each other, that is, as comprising of smaller scale exchanges as well as a component of a larger scale of interaction.

The third perspective assumes that in its spread across contexts, practices experience a process of translation as opposed to diffusion (Czarniawska 2005). In line with the Scandinavian School literature of organizational institutionalism (Boxenbaum and Pedersen 2009), this study distinguishes between translation and diffusion, in which the former involves change during travel while the latter is limited by a physical form of distribution. Overall, in this study international marketing is seen as a process that facilitates the translation of market-based
practices across fields of practices as opposed to one that merely facilitates the distribution of products across country borders. By better understanding this translation process, marketers can thus learn how best to participate and influence this practice.

Specifically, this study explores how in performing value co-creating activities, market actors draw on and contribute to existing rituals in society and how these practices contribute to the global spread of rituals, facilitating its translation across cultural categories at the individual, market, as well as societal (national) level. To provide context for this study, I analyze the interplay between market practices and the celebration of Valentine’s Day, focusing not only on how markets help to co-create the festivity, therefore establishing the rites of Valentine’s Day as a market-mediated ritual, but also on how value co-creating practices facilitate the emergence of market practices, therefore also establishing Valentine’s Day as a market-mediating ritual.

While this study builds on the travel and translation of Valentine’s Day as a globalizing practice, it is necessary to note that the objective is not to primarily provide an ethnographic description of how a holiday is celebrated in a given cultural context. Rather, the focus of the study is on how value is co-created through the travel and translation of practices, and vice versa. Therefore, any form of practice can be used as a substitute context. However, given the selected context, an explanation of its particularities is necessary, as will be elaborated in the following section.

1.3 Conceptualizing Market Rituals

Rituals are assumed to occupy a sacred space that is outside the secular sphere of the market (Belk et al. 1989). Ritual acts are normally performed as the building blocks of festival that occur in a particular time and space, highlighting a “time out of time” for the performance of a particular set of practices (Falassi 1987). Ritual acts contain meanings that transcend their
literal and explicit forms and are enacted by a particular society to be in tune with the cyclical changes on earth. The performance of rituals is rooted in the views and traditions of the people in a given locality. As Falassi (1987, p. 2) notes “the social function and symbolic meaning of the festival are closely related to a series of overt values that the community recognizes as essential to its ideology and worldview, to its social identity, its historical continuity and to its physical survival, which is ultimately what festival celebrates.”

Rituals are important because, along with shared consciousness and moral responsibility, they form the essential elements of a community (Muniz and O'Guinn 2001). Given the strong contextual bearings on the performance of rituals, it may be relatively difficult for rituals to travel across cultural contexts. However, the avid celebration of Christmas in non-Christian countries or Valentine’s Day in places where it has not been traditionally observed (Fair 2004; Kimura and Belk 2005; Miller 1993) provide evidence of successful circulation, making rituals an even more interesting phenomenon to explore.

While social critiques often antagonize market actors for co-opting the sacral spaces and meaning of ritual (Schmidt 1995), it has been noted that much of what is considered sacral have secular implications, while secular practices have sacral elements in them too (Belk et al. 1989; Miller 1993). Some rites that characterize festival, like that of conspicuous display, conspicuous consumption, and exchange (Falassi 1987) provide ample opportunity for the participation of markets. Thus, dressing fashionably becomes an integral part of churchgoing, hand-made valentines are replaced by Hallmark cards (Schmidt 1995), and canned jellied cranberry sauce becomes part of the abundant American Thanksgiving dinner.

It is difficult to separate markets from rituals and rituals from markets. Marketing practices not only impact how social rituals are performed but also influence the way marketing
is conducted as well. The post-Thanksgiving discount shopping known as Black Friday has become a ritual in and of itself for some families. As holidays approach, it has become the default for retail landscapes to be decorated according to the holiday’s norms. As St. Patrick’s Day approaches we see green colored candies, four-leaf clover cupcakes, and leprechaun hats on display. The day after St. Patrick’s Day we can expect to see chocolate Easter eggs, Easter baskets and bunnies on product packaging and on shelf display.

Markets override religious or social institutions as the primary force behind the spreading of holidays and rituals across the globe. Valentine’s Day that was primarily celebrated in the Western part of the world, for example, is becoming more popular around the world partly due to commercial forces. Although the holiday is well adopted and appropriated in Japan (Minowa et al. 2011), it is contested in areas such as Malaysia and Indonesia (Zay 2011), and banned in the Muslim countries of Saudi Arabia (CNN World 2008) and Iran (Sehgal 2011). While these examples demonstrate the widespread influence and travel of market practices, they also highlight the rich cultural meanings carried by these practices (Lofgren 2005). As indicated, some associations accelerate spread in certain contexts whereas others inhibit adoption entirely.

In this sense markets define and become defined by rituals. Rituals no longer stand alone, separate of the market. Rituals enable the emergence of markets. Conversely, their meanings, norms, and practices are mediated by actors in the market.

2 Research Context

Research context plays a significant role towards the development of theory (Arnould 2006). As a means for understanding the translation of practices, I utilize the celebration of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia as a context. Valentine’s Day is understood as a ritualized set of
practices that consists of market facing (e.g. purchase of flowers, chocolate, and gifts) and non-market facing practices (e.g. dating, family practice, religious practice). This context is especially suitable as it explores a ritual familiar to the Western world - Valentine’s Day - such that readers are able to compare how interpretation of the holiday are similar and different to the way it is commonly celebrated in the West.

I focus on the celebration of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia because the phenomenon provides a rich context for studying how a seemingly foreign idea – Western, secular yet Christian-based – is negotiated and practiced in an equally foreign setting, one that is dominated by Eastern and Muslim values. Valentine’s Day in Indonesia is a contested practice. Various practices to delegitimize the rituals take place including efforts to label Valentine’s Day as haram or forbidden under Islam by the Indonesian Ulema Councel due to accusations that the holiday was prone to religiously intolerable unrestricted expressions of love (Jakarta Post 2011b). Other narratives challenging the holiday include that it is a ‘Western’ holiday that erodes local culture or a Christian ritual that is non-Islamic.

Despite competing holidays and arguments to delegitimize the celebration, various actors take part in co-creating Valentine’s Day. Advertisers, fashion journalists, marketers and media perform various acts to promote the holiday to customers as a celebration of universal love. Various individuals react by participating in, retracting from, or actively contesting the practice of Valentine’s Day. The celebration of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia thus serves as an interesting site to study the translation of a relatively recent market practice. The main purpose is not to develop a detailed description of how the holiday is celebrated given a particular cultural context. Instead it aims to explore how practice is translated within an inter-institutional society (Friedland and Alford 1991) and how it is translated across cultural contexts. As various actors
constantly negotiate their participation in the celebration, Valentine’s Day manifests from a process of an active and ongoing translation process. Analyzing a contested and changing phenomenon better exposes the various processes that take place in the appropriation of a market practice in a given field, therefore suitable for the purposes of this study.

3 Research Contributions

This study focuses on how service-dominant logic can better develop our understanding of international marketing in relation to the travel of practices. Most empirical studies in the field of international marketing have approached the spread of practices with a rather narrow view. Guided primarily by a goods-dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch 2004a), existing studies focus on the distribution of ‘products’—goods and services—across national borders with emphasis on how to modify them in order to be acceptable in distinct country settings (Douglas and Craig 2011; Roth and Romeo 1992). Emphasis is on strategies of product standardization vs. adaptation that generate optimal performance (Cavusgil et al. 1993).

This dissertation contributes to the effort of understanding how markets work. In particular, it goes beyond the market-as-exchange paradigm (Bagozzi 1975), by identifying exchange as a process that facilitates the travel of practice, and re-contextualizes exchange as a process of value co-creation. While this research does not aim to create a general theory of the market, it attempts to offer an understanding of how practices, particularly rituals, are performed and spread in the context of markets. It shifts the research focus in international marketing from a debate between standardization vs. adaptation of products, towards understanding the travel and translation of practices within the greater process of value co-creation. More specifically, the
study comprises of three interconnected essays, which will be explained in more detail in the following section.

4 Overview of the Essays

This dissertation consists of three interrelated essays which focus on distinct sets of questions. Essay 1 is a conceptual piece that sets the stage for the following two essays by exploring the underlying concepts and perspectives necessary to develop a model of practice translation in value co-creating markets. In this essay I utilize service-dominant logic, the markets-as-practice framework, and concepts from organizational institutionalism as the foundations to develop a model on how practices travel and become institutionalized in distinct contexts given value co-creation in service ecosystems. In particular, this essay highlights the compatibilities between the service-dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch 2004a) and market-as-practice (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007), and integrates the two perspectives to explain the backdrop against which the process of practice translation takes place. Specifically, this essay emphasizes the multiple layers (e.g., micro, meso, macro) of context (Chandler and Vargo 2011) and the malleability of its borders.

Additionally, Essay 1 builds on the markets-as-practice approach to identify the key practices and processes related to practice translation. Specifically, three main practices are explained to constitute markets: normalizing, representational and exchange practices (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007). Normalizing practice is the process of establishing rules, norms and guidelines of how markets should work according to certain actors involved in the process. This includes among others formally or informally agreed upon contracts on what can be offered in the market, who can participate in the market, how exchange
takes place, as well as the responsibilities a firm has to its customers. In the context of Valentine’s Day it relates to the rules of who gives what and when, or what constitutes a proper celebration of the holiday. In Japan, example women are required to gift men on February 14th and can expect white-colored return gifts a month after on White Day (Creighton 1993). 

*Representational practice* is the practice of depicting markets and its workings. Market segments for example represent the whole set of customers in a more manageable and understandable form. With regards to Valentine’s Day, the colors red and pink symbolize affection as do chocolates, candies, and flowers. For example, gift-giving on this occasion reflects notions of romantic love. *Exchange practice* relates to actual activities that fulfill individual economic exchanges, such as presenting a product, setting a price, and terms of payment and delivery. These activities stabilize the conditions necessary for economic exchange to take place (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007). The purchase of cards or gifts as well as restaurant-going represent an exchange in the case of Valentine’s. Guided by service-dominant logic, the view that exchange practice be subsumed under integrative practices is employed instead. Exchange occurs only in the context of resource integration. Exchange serves as the means while integration is the ultimate purpose.

The study proposes a fractal model of market co-creation, in which similar patterns of action and interaction can be observed at and understood in relation to multiple levels of analysis. The key component of the fractal model is reflected in the series of translation between market practices (normalizing, representational, and integrative practices) performed by actors driven by the need to co-create value for themselves and others. Furthermore, Essay 1 investigates the distinction between translation within and between distinct cultural contexts. The
framework serves to provide a higher level abstraction to explain the links between practices, value co-creation, and institutions as embodied in distinct cultural contexts.

The second and third essays utilize an empirical context to further explore what practices are involved in the process of practice translation. These studies, which reflect early efforts to employ empirical research based on a service-dominant logic, investigate how the foreign ritual of Valentine’s Day is being adopted and adapted in the multicultural context of Indonesia.

Essay 2 focuses first and foremost on how distinct market actors utilize Valentine’s Day in their various value co-creating efforts. The study identifies three distinct ways in which Valentine’s Day is depicted, namely as a romantic holiday, a universal holiday, and an un-Islamic holiday. While the first two frames are positive the last is negative. Analysis focuses on the chain of translations that ensue as a consequence of each holiday depiction, and how these translations create multiple enactments of Valentine’s Day. How each depiction influences each other is also evaluated. The questions explored include: what practices can be identified? Who are the actors involved in practice translation, and how do their practices differ? What are the problems and opportunities that arise when multiple value co-creating actors distinctly define the focus of translation? A zooming-in-and-out-approach is employed to further investigate how the value co-creating activities of various actors are enabled and constrained by distinct actors and at different layers of context; for example how societal values at the macro level is made up of individual values at the micro level, and vice versa. Findings show that despite distinct depictions of the holiday, actors converge on the common use of Valentine’s Day as a means to co-create specific value for self and others.

Essay 3 focuses on how the competing depictions of Valentine’s Day are reconciled over time. As a means to explore translation over time, this essay utilizes Valentine’s Day articles
published in two leading national newspapers, Kompas and English-language Jakarta Post to investigate what representation becomes more prevalent as the foreign holiday is translated throughout the years. Correspondence analysis as an exploratory data analysis method is employed to construct a topographical map of how each depiction of Valentine’s Day is associated with certain types of actor categories that shape such depictions. The maps are utilized to analyze if and how frame transformation occurs over time, by graphically presenting the correspondence between holiday depiction (frame) and actor categories across four time periods. The focus is to highlight the process of frame transformation as Valentine’s Day is institutionalized in Indonesia. Findings indicate that depictions of Valentine’s Day become wider to accommodate a more social meaning and incorporate the participation of more types of actors. Yet, narrowed meanings of the holiday also polarize the view, as reflected in the recent emergence of a religious frame that rejects the holiday.

5 Conclusion

Through these three studies I expect to provide theoretical and practical contributions on the role of markets in mediating the practice of rituals. Theoretically, the framework offers a way of looking at markets as institutionalized representational, normalizing, and integrative practices—focusing on practices rather than individuals as the basic unit of analysis. Furthermore, explicating the translation process will generate ideas on how to spread ideas across context. This step will offer practical guidelines for marketers who aim to establish new practices in distinct settings.
II. ESSAY I

1 Introduction

Theorists have underlined the importance of understanding markets to develop marketing theory and practice. McInnes (1964, p. 52) once noted that “the primary observable phenomenon for any theory of marketing is the hard practical fact of the market itself…It [the market] is also the ultimate criterion for either action or theory. The market is not only the point of communication between practice and theory, it is the ultimate judge of both.” Nearly half a century has passed since this statement was made, yet researchers continue to note the lack of market theories that emanate from the marketing field (Johanson and Vahlne 2011; Venkatesh and Penaloza 2006; Venkatesh et al. 2006).

Calls have been made to bring the study of markets into the field of marketing (Araujo et al. 2010; Venkatesh and Penaloza 2006), particularly in the attempt to build positive theories of markets as foundations for establishing normative theories in marketing (Vargo 2007). “A theory of marketing explains how markets work,” (Alderson 1965, p. 23) which implies that scholars need to better explain ‘what markets are’ to provide useful guidance pertaining ‘what to do in markets.’

The primary challenge to advancing market theorization is the fact that markets are assumed as such an integral part of marketing practice that scholars and practitioners alike have taken their existence for granted (Ellis et al. 2010), leading to the overlooked need to explain them. For example, the American Marketing Association (AMA) online dictionary of basic marketing definitions comprises numerous entries of market-related terminologies but does not provide any definition for the term ‘market(s).’
Mainstream marketing, which was developed under a goods-dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch 2004a), addresses market creation as a firm-centric activity (Martin and Schouten 2014) driven primarily by the process of innovation diffusion (Mahajan et al. 1990; Rogers 2003 [1962]). In this convention, markets are frequently identified in terms of product categories (e.g. the automobile market, the coffee market; Aspers 2011; Mele et al. 2014) which grows with increased customer adoption of such offerings. Markets are perceived as self-organizing entities (Brownlie 1994) as well as part of a pre-existing external environment with static boundaries. This exogenous conceptualization of markets drive adaptation strategies (Brownlie 1994) and motivate marketers to compete for what is perceived to be a limited set of potential and opportunities (Kim and Mauborgne 2005).

More recently, marketing scholars have begun to lay the groundwork to develop a more encompassing and dynamic view of markets. To note, studies in consumer culture theory (CCT) have explored beyond firm-driven market creation to consider the contribution ‘consumers’ in the process of market emergence (Martin and Schouten 2014; Sandikci and Ger 2010; Thompson and Coskuner-Balli 2007) as well as the role of other stakeholders, primarily media and policy makers, in facilitating the legitimation of markets (Humphreys 2010). Additionally, a performative approach rooted in the sociology of science and technology (Callon 1986; Latour 1986) has been utilized to highlight the fluidity of markets by suggesting that they are constructed through concrete activities, and that theories about markets shape and affect the way markets work (Araujo 2007; Callon 1998; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007). Meanwhile, a systemic understanding of markets (Alderson 1965) is increasingly being revived through the understanding that market actors function as part of a network of networks (Hakansson and Snehota 1995; Layton 2008; Layton 2011). Along similar
The purpose of the current essay is to further explore the actions and interactions in market creation, with emphasis on developing an explanation that goes beyond a firm-centric, goods-focused, static perspective. More specifically, the objective is to develop a streamlined description of market emergence that emphasizes its collaborative, systemic (Akaka et al. 2013; Akaka et al. 2012; Vargo 2009) and performative nature (Araujo et al. 2010; Fligstein and Dauter 2007; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007) by recognizing the significance of practices over products (Shove and Araujo 2010; Shove and Pantzar 2005), the practical constitution of market actors (Vargo and Lusch 2011), along with the complexity of context (Akaka et al. 2013; Chandler and Vargo 2011; Penaloza and Mish 2011).

The proposed framework integrates service-dominant logic, particularly the actor-to-actor (A2A; Vargo and Lusch 2011) and service ecosystems perspective (Akaka et al. 2013; Akaka et al. 2012; Lusch and Vargo 2014), with the market-as-practice approach (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007) to explain a process of market co-creation that is driven by the value co-creating practices of resource integrating actors. In this perspective, not only are markets understood as institutionalized practices that emerge through the continual enactment and re-enactment of a particular set of market practices (i.e., representational, normalizing, integration practices; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007), they are also perceived to facilitate and be created out of the enactment and eventual
institutionalization of diverse value co-creating practices. Furthermore, to explain the spread of related practices, a translation approach (Callon 1986; Czarniawska and Sevon 1996; Latour 1986) is adopted, particularly as a means to acknowledge the fluidity of markets and the unique phenomenological experience in every instance of enactment.

In the following section, the key theoretical lenses underlying this research, namely service-dominant logic and markets-as-practices, are introduced. Additionally, a discussion of the interaction between practice and institutions are presented. Subsequently, a number of foundational assumptions adopted in this dissertation are elaborated, primarily the need to move beyond conventional product-focused views in marketing toward service embedded in practice, which requires a shift in how markets, contexts, and diffusion are approached. A series of research questions are proposed, before a fractal model of market co-creation is developed. Lastly, a series of research propositions are presented to guide subsequent essays.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Service-dominant logic

The emergence of service-dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch 2004a; Vargo and Lusch 2008) initiated a move beyond the deterministic, unidirectional, firm-centric approach to markets. Service-dominant logic centers around four key axioms (Akaka et al. 2013; Lusch and Vargo 2014) which emphasize the primacy of service over products in exchange (Vargo and Lusch 2004a; Vargo and Lusch 2004b), the collaborative nature of value creation (Vargo et al. 2008), the integration of resources to create new resources (Vargo and Lusch 2004a; Vargo and Lusch 2008), and the significance of context in the evaluation and determination of value (Chandler and Vargo 2011).
First, service-dominant logic highlights the importance of understanding exchange in terms of service—applied skills and knowledge—rather than goods, which has been the focus of the current prevailing logic in marketing, also labeled goods-dominant (G-D) logic by Vargo and Lusch (2004a). In goods-dominant logic, tangible goods are the fundamental units of exchange, and ‘services,’ (usually plural) reflect units of (intangible) output. Value is embedded in products, therefore created by the firms who produce them. Customers, on the other hand, who purchase and use these products, are assumed to consume or deplete value. Additionally, as intangible products, services are perceived to have their own set of inadequacies, and thus, need to be managed and studied separately (Vargo and Lusch 2004b).

The prominence of goods and manufacturing firms in present day goods-dominant logic, is assumed to stem from early developments of economic thought (Vargo and Lusch 2004a), particularly that of Adam Smith who sought to increase national wealth by underlining economic activities that contributed to export (1776). In the specific context of 18th century cross-border trade, export was confined to shippable tangible goods produced through manufacturing, whereas other activities that were difficult to export (e.g. provision of direct intangible service) were not considered productive. However, such perspective continues to be carried over to the present day; treated as taken-for-granted facts that subtly influence the current state of marketing theories and practices (Nariswari and Vargo 2015).

The service-dominant logic perspective transcends the goods vs. services distinction by defining ‘service’ (singular) as a process of doing something for and with another party. Service can either be performed directly through action, or indirectly through tangible goods, in which case, goods function as delivery mechanisms for a service (Vargo and Lusch 2004a). This view reflects a shift from thinking about value creation in terms of operand resources—tangible, static
resources that require some action to make them valuable— to operant resources— intangible, dynamic resources— that can enact upon both operand as well as other operant resources to create value (Constantin and Lusch 1994).

Second, service-dominant logic argues that value is not solely created by the firm nor embedded in a product. Rather, value manifests through exchange, in which economic actors provide mutual service for each other, therefore simultaneously functioning as providers and beneficiaries (Vargo 2009). As such, firms do not create value, but provide value propositions, and customers are always co-creators of value through their determination of value in use and context (Vargo et al. 2008). In this view, there is no distinction between “producers” who create value and “consumers” who deplete value (Vargo and Lusch, 2011), because buyers and sellers are, in principle, seen as general market actors who contribute to and benefit from market interaction. The concept of value co-creation enables a view that economic actors involved in market exchanges are inherently relational.

Furthermore, according to service-dominant logic, exchange is embedded in the process of resource integration, in which value is collaboratively created by interacting actors who go about performing their daily tasks to sustain quality of life. This perspective highlights that all social and economic actors are essentially integrators of operand and operant resources. By implication, ‘consumers’ are viewed as comparable to businesses, or individual enterprises as opposed to ‘end-consumers,’ who are passive targets of a firm’s action or operand resources. Therefore, insights that have normally been applied to ‘consumers’ (e.g., context, language, meaning, signs, symbols, experiences, rituals), would equally apply to ‘producers.’ Similarly, concepts of business-to-business relationships, such as partnering, networks, and value, also apply to ‘consumers.’ This contributes to an A2A (actor-to-actor) perspective (Vargo and Lusch
2011) which promotes a shift towards a more general understanding of exchange, in which actors engage in service-for-service exchange by providing resources for each other’s benefits, in the form of applied skills and labor or goods, that function as indirect or materialized forms of service.

In this process, resource integrating actors are part of a network of actors that are tied together in an intricate interrelated system. When exchange occurs, value is not only created between the two interacting actors, but also indirectly through a constellation of practices (Michel et al. 2008). The A2A perspective moves away from the limited focus of value that is created through a linear, sequential, creation flow followed by its eventual destruction through use. Alternatively, the view understands economic exchange as part of a more complex and dynamic system of actors that relationally co-create value and, at the same time, jointly provide the context through which ‘value’ is individually and collectively evaluated and determined (Chandler and Vargo 2011). More generally, market interactions take place within a service ecosystem, in which actors function as part of a network of networks (e.g., firms, customers, and other stakeholders) that are governed by distinct institutions or ‘rules of the game’ (Vargo and Lusch 2011, Williamson 2000, Akaka et al. 2013).

Additionally, service-dominant logic underscores the contextual and unique nature of value realization and determination by highlighting that value is uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary. This idea is rooted in the concept of ‘value-in-context,’ which suggests that value is not only always co-created, but also contingent upon the integration of other resources and is contextually specific” (Vargo et al. 2008, p. 141).

Overall, service-dominant logic goes beyond the exploration of static markets that is driven by transactional, dyadic exchanges between ‘producers’ and ‘consumers’ to intimate a
view of fluid and dynamic markets that emerges through interactions among interrelated actors subsumed in complex networks of exchange. Such interactions are inherently collaborative and systemic, and determined by the need to integrate resources, through what is essentially a form of service-for-service exchange.

While service-dominant logic provides the fundamental perspective on how to approach markets, an explanation of how practices contribute to the continual enactment of markets is necessary. Theories of market performativity (Araujo et al. 2010), among others, the market-as-practices approach as developed by Kjellberg and Helgesson (2006; 2007), complements this discussion, and will be elaborated below.

2.2 Market-as-Practices

The adoption of practice theory in the realm of social sciences (Schatzki et al. 2001) has begun to influence research the areas of ‘consumption’ (Holt 1995; Schau et al. 2009; Warde 2005), marketing (Brodie et al. 1997; Coviello et al. 1997), as well as markets (Araujo 2007; Araujo et al. 2010). Practice theory relates to a diverse set of theories that underline the importance of shared symbolic structures of knowledge as a means to understand action and social order (Reckwitz 2002). Reckwitz (2002) identifies that the term ‘practices’ is best understood in terms of ‘praktik,’ whis is distinct from ‘praxis.’ Practice (praxis) in the singular merely represents a categorical term to describe the whole of human action (in contrast to ‘theory’ and thinking). ‘Practices’ (praktik) as understood in the theory of social practices, however, relates to “a routinised type of behaviour which consists of several elements, interconnected to one another: forms of bodily activities, forms of mental activities, ‘things’ and their use, a background knowledge in the form of understanding, know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge” (Reckwitz 2002, p. 249).
Practices involve the integration of “images, artifacts and forms of competence” (Shove and Pantzar, 2005, p. 44), which connect behaviors, performances, and representations – ‘sayings and doings’ – through three different ways: (1) understanding, that encompasses knowing what to say and do; (2) procedures, such as explicit rules, principles, precepts, and instructions; and (3) engagements or ‘teleoaffective structures,’ that include tasks, ends, purposes that are accompanied by emotions, beliefs, and moods (Schatzki 1996; Schau et al. 2009; Warde 2005).

The practice approach to markets utilizes a performative idiom which highlights that markets are constructed through practices enacted by various actors (Araujo et al. 2010; Araujo et al. 2008). Through this lens, researchers set out to identify what markets do and explain how theories as well as notions of markets are enacted, which in turn enact the reality of the market (Araujo et al. 2010; Fourcade 2007). A performative idiom sees markets as an ongoing process rather than something that is “pre-made” (Araujo et al. 2010). Conceptualizations of markets work as models that depict how markets function as well as blueprints that guide the shaping and performing of markets (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007). Essentially, markets are shaped through the simple everyday practices performed by actors in general, but those practices are influenced by the actor’s ideas about what markets are and how they work. This approach must be distinguished from the more common, representational idiom, which primarily aims to provide a depiction of what occurs in markets through identification of different types or categories of market as opposed to identifying the processes that underlie markets (Araujo et al. 2010).

2.2.1 Elements of Market Practice

Influenced by the empirical and theoretical work in the sociology of science and technology, Kjellberg and Helgesson (2006; 2007) propose a market-as-practice framework by
identifying three interrelated *market practices*—normalizing, representational and exchange—defined as “all activities that contribute to constitute markets” (p. 141). Normalizing practices relate to the establishing rules, norms and guidelines of how markets should work according to certain actors involved in the process. This includes among others formally or informally agreed upon contracts on what can be offered in the market, who can participate in the market, how exchange takes place, as well as the responsibilities a firm has to its customers. In the context of a coffee drinking culture, this normalizing practice may relate to the establishing of norms about who can drink coffee, where and what time of day coffee can be consumed, how orders should be made, the terms of payment, etc. With regards to the enactment of Valentine’s Day rituals, normative guidelines may be observed through assumptions of who can participate in the rituals, proper gifts to be presented, by whom, and when.

The second practice identified is representational practice, which relates to the practice of depicting markets and their workings. Marketers, for example, identify markets in terms of market segments to represent the whole set of customers in a more manageable and understandable form. They utilize sales statistics, market share figures as well as consumer research reports to reflect the form and current state of a market. Furthermore, conceptualizations and theories of markets (e.g., red vs. blue ocean; Kim and Mauborgne 2005), reflect and influence how markets are enacted, by implication, their shape. For example, in the case of coffee drinking, representational practice may relates to efforts in signifying *Starbucks* (e.g., good coffee, a strong corporate chain, American lifestyle, chic and modern), in other words building brand image. It also relates to an understanding about the kind of customers that go to *Starbucks* versus one that would frequent a more local, neighborhood establishment (Thompson and Arsel 2004). Similarly, in the enactment of Valentine’s Day, representational practice may
pertain to the development of meanings and views regarding the celebration. For example, due to assumptions that Valentine’s Day rituals perpetuate immoral behavior, efforts have been made in a number of countries with large Muslim populations to label the holiday *haram*, or illegal according to Muslim law.

The third practice, identified as *exchange practices*, is associated with activities that fulfill individual economic exchanges, such as presenting a product, setting a price, and terms of payment and delivery. These activities provide the conditions necessary for economic exchange to take place (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007). Examples include pricing, setting up retail establishments to facilitate coffee drinking or making sure chocolate and heart-shaped trinkets are available in retail stores before Valentine’s Day.

Building on a service ecosystems perspective there is a need to expand the market-as-practice framework (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007) by shifting the focus away from exchange towards integrative practices. This shift expands market-making beyond the limited understanding of short-term exchange between two parties. Important to note is that exchange should not be determined in terms of exchange of goods for money but rather service-for-service (Vargo and Lusch, 2004). Furthermore, while markets facilitate exchanges, the underlying notion is that exchanges are embedded in the practice of resource integration. Understanding that all economic and social actors are essentially resource integrators (Vargo and Lusch, 2008), exchange becomes a means for value co-creation that not only takes place between two involved parties, but is also situated within an intricate network of networks.

The purpose of exchange is not simply to trade one service for another, but is part of a greater objective of value co-creation which manifests through the process of resource integration. For example, integration occurs when we combine cooking skills, ingredients, and
our specific taste and meaning to construct a breakfast. The exchange of a couple of dollars for a
dozen eggs to prepare a breakfast omelet is integrated in our daily routine of getting up in the
morning, having breakfast, and going to work. The morning meal serves as a source of
nourishment supporting the energy and skills we invest at work in exchange for an annual salary
that sustains our personal needs, such as buying new clothes, paying the mortgage, or that of
buying groceries for breakfast. Our spending on clothes, housing, and groceries also sustain other
individuals who work in a chain of entities that help provide these offerings, that also make up an
industry which sustains the livelihood of other individual actors. The exchange between money
and eggs therefore is not just a simple affair, but is embedded in the process of value co-creation
through resource integration.

To summarize, exchange is not just a one-time transaction between two-parties, but
embedded in a web of other practices done for the purpose of integrating skills, artifacts, and
meanings. Exchange is part of an integrative process that market actors engage in as part of their
efforts for survival and increasing quality of life. Resource integration rather than exchange is
the process that sets the gears in motion. As such, exchange practices should be subsumed under
integrative practices (Vargo and Akaka 2012).

### 2.2.2 Value co-creation as a driver of practice

Schatzki (1996) identifies two distinct types of practices: dispersed and integrative.
Dispersed practice relates to the process of describing, following rules, explaining and
imagining. The doings and sayings in dispersed practices are primarily connected through
understanding –knowing how to do something and the ability to identify and attribute such
actions in one’s case or others’ cases (Schatzki, 1996). On the other hand, integrative practices
are ‘the more complex practices found in and constitutive of particular domains of social life’
(Schatzki, 1996: 98). Some examples of integrative practices include health-sport practices (Askegaard and Eckhardt 2012; Shove and Pantzar 2005), sport spectatorship practices (Holt 1995), cooking practices (Truninger 2011), fashion practices (Sandikci and Ger 2010), and ritual celebrations (Kimura and Belk 2005; Minowa et al. 2011; Nguyen and Belk 2013). In the tradition of marketing and consumer research, these integrative practices are often understood as consumption practices. For example, research in the CCT stream have emphasized practices to understand how veiling in Turkey shifted from a stigmatized practice towards one that is more acceptable and considered fashionable (Sandikci and Ger 2010) and the formation of the active consumer in the establishment coffee drinking practices during early Ottoman time (Karababa and Ger 2011).

However, Warde (2005, p. 137) does not identify ‘consumption’ as practice but more generally as “a moment in every practice.” ‘Consumption’ is defined as “a process whereby agents engage in appropriation and appreciation, whether for utilitarian, expressive or contemplative purposes, of goods, services, performances, information or ambience, whether purchased or not, over which the agent has some degree of discretion.”

Utilizing an service-dominant logic lens to interpret these perspectives, it is possible to reframe Schatzki’s (1996) integrative practices or Warde’s definition of ‘consumption,’ as essentially, “value co-creation practices” that manifests through a process of resource integration, in other words, the previously proposed notion of ‘integrative practices’ which subsumes exchange practices. In line with this view, Schau et al. (2009) identified brand community practices (e.g., social networking, brand use, community engagement, impression management) not –as convention in marketing and consumer research would dictate– as ‘consumption practices’ but rather as value co-creating practices.
The conceptualization of value co-creation explains a fundamental drive that underlies human practices. In the context of a ‘market society’ (Polanyi 1977; Slater and Tonkiss 2001) in which almost anything is accomplished directly or indirectly through market exchange, it is arguably possible to view all practices as relational (social; Latour 1986). This aligns with the service-dominant logic perspective that emphasizes the inherently collaborative nature of value creation. Furthermore, this view supports an understanding of (value co-creation) practice as also essentially a form of market practice (Slater and Tonkiss 2001).

Not surprisingly, there are consistencies between the anatomy of practices proposed by Schatzki (1996) and the elements of market practices identified by Kjellberg and Helgesson (2006; 2007). For example, representational practices are comparable to notions of ‘understanding,’ in that both reflect or require the conceptualization of an idea, object, or practice. Normalizing practices are closely associated with ‘procedures and related rules and principles.’ While, integrative practices are analogous to ‘engagements’ relating to the actual tasks performed. This observation emphasizes that market practices do not necessarily reflect deliberate efforts to create markets but are practices performed in the course of a more general effort to create meaning and value for the self and others.

As such, it is possible to conceptualize people going about doing their own things, for their own needs, to increase value for themselves and others, as a practice of value co-creation, in which operand and operant resources are integrated in the process. It is at the intersection of a multiplicity of disparate value co-creation practices enacted by various actors that market practices, and therefore, markets, emerge. To illustrate, the buying and selling of sport gears and equipment, home game tickets, or even flat-screen HD television sets, are driven by everyday sport practices, sport spectatorship, family-bonding moments, or collegial rituals. Reckwitz
states that, “carrying out a practice very often means using particular things in a certain way. It might sound trivial to stress that in order to play football we need a ball and goals as indispensable ‘resources.’” In line with the service-dominant logic perspective, various operand (e.g., football, safety gear, football field) and operant (e.g., football playing skills, coach, referee) resources are necessary, therefore ‘integrated,’ in the enactment of ‘playing football,’ the requirements of which might differ based on whether the game is played privately for leisure, or commercially at a collegiate or professional level. The underlying argument however is that while ‘things’ (products, resources) are important in the enactment of practices, it is practice, not products that drive market creation.

2.3 Practice as Institutions

Institutions are the more enduring elements of social life that structure and organize social action (Scott 2008). An institution is assumed to link different orders and areas of social life, including agency and structure, symbolic and material, as well as the micro-, meso-, and macro-level structures of social organization (Giddens 1984; Mohr and White 2008). Scott (2008) identifies three elements of institutions: regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive. Regulative elements highlight formal rules and laws and activities that relate to rule-setting, monitoring, and sanctioning. Normative elements relate to social rules for what is acceptable and “introduce a prescriptive, evaluative, and obligatory dimension into social life” (Scott, 2008, p. 54). Cultural-cognitive elements emphasize a shared logic or “shared conceptions that constitute the nature of social reality and the frames through which meaning is made” (Scott, 2008, p. 57). These elements provide the rationale for claiming legitimacy, which is “a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions” (Suchman 1995, p. 574).
Based on the above pluralistic understanding of institutions, Lounsbury and Crumley (2007) identify practices as a form of institution. Practice as institutions are defined as, “sets of material activities that are fundamentally interpenetrated and shaped by broader cultural frameworks such as categories, classification, frames, and other kinds of ordered belief systems” (Lounsbury and Crumley 2007, p. 996). The influence of broader social frameworks on the enactment of practices implies that practices are always social or relational (Latour 1986; Nicolini 2009a). As Nicolini (2009, p. 1405) asserts “the notion of a private or arbitrary practice is a non-sense. Practices are by definition social, because it is only at this level that morality, meaning and normativity can be sustained … it follows that all practices imply some level of durability and, in this sense, they carry traces, no matter how weak, of institutionalization.” In fact, it is possible to state that while the enactment of practices reflect a process of institutionalization, practice itself is a manifestation or form of institution. Distinguishing between the act of nail pounding and the carpentry profession, Lounsbury and Crumley (2007, p. 995) identify the former as an activity, consisting of actions that are devoid of meaning, and the latter as a practice, defined as “activity patterns across actors that are infused with broader meaning and provide tools for ordering social life and activity.”

Institutions are assumed to be durable and stable. Institutions are shaped by the individuals who sustain them and the recursive practices they perform. Institutions work in a constraining and proscriptive manner by defining opportunities and facilitating patterns of interaction. Institutions are also constitutive and prescriptive in that they provide models in how to do things. These models are reinforced through socialization or interaction or legitimation, particularly when no other scripts are available or perceived as alternatives (Clemens and Cook 1999). The above views reinforce what Giddens (1984) coins as structuration theory, which
explains the relationship between individual and society as a social phenomenon that is not just the product of structure or agency, but of both. Neither is independent of the other. Individuals draw on social structures in their actions, and at the same time these actions serve to produce and reproduce social structure (Jones and Karsten 2008). The focus is on the processes that take place and the interplay between individuals and society, in which social structure is created through every day social practice. In structuration theory, agents and structures are a duality. Structures of social systems are mediums and outcomes of practices (Giddens 1984). Structures are defined as “rules and resources, or sets of transformation relations, organized as properties of social systems,” while systems are understood as “reproduced relations between actors or collectivities organized as regular social practices” (Giddens 1984, p. 25). According to structuration theory, it is thus assumed that one’s action is determined by the social structure in which he or she is embedded. Simultaneously, one’s action contributes to continually shaping the structure in which he or she is situated.

Sewell (1992) reframes Giddens’ (1984) duality of structure by determining structure to consist not of rules and resources but of rules in the form of schemas. Resource, on the other hand, is repositioned as the effect of structure, “as media animated and shaped by structures, that is by cultural schemas” (Sewell 1992, p. 11). Resources are also the effects of schemas, “instantiations or embodiment of schemas” that “inculcate and justify schemas as well” (p. 13).

In essence, institutions are products of action. They are produced to play a purpose. Rational institutionalists argue that institutions are efficient solutions to predefined problems. However, institutions also work as frameworks for action that become taken for granted through its repeated enactment (Holm 1995). Jepperson (1991) notes that actors are carriers of institutions. Institutions are enacted through reproduced practices. Activities reproduce and
transform institutions but these practices are embedded in institutions; they constitute enactment of institutions. Acts vary in the degree to which they are institutionalized. Zucker (1977) asserts that context helps to define whether a practice is highly institutionalized or not. She notes:

“Institutionalization is both a process and a property variable. It is the process by which individual actors transmit what is socially defined as real and, at the same time, at any point in the process the meaning of an act can be defined as more or less a taken-for-granted part of this social reality. Institutionalized acts, then, must be perceived as both objective and exterior. Acts are objective when they are potentially repeatable by other actors without changing the common understanding of the act, while acts are exterior when subjective understanding of acts is reconstructed as inter-subjective understanding so that the acts are seen as part of the external world.”

Scott (2008) identifies three distinct ways institutionalization occurs: through increased returns, increased commitment, and increased objectification. The first method of institutionalization based on increasing returns is developed by institutional economists to explain that institutionalization occurs when developments in the same direction are rewarded and the cost to switch to other methods increased. When something has been invested it is difficult to reverse or use alternative approaches. At the individual level we see how difficult it is to convert a Mac user to a PC user and vice versa. Costs are embedded in the actual set up to buy a new type of computer, along with the need to learn a new system and procedure. Investment in time, money, energy will thus generate higher levels of institutionalization. Institutionalization based on increasing objectification is rooted in the work of Berger and Luckmann (1991) which relates to “processes when meanings produced in social interaction come to confront the actor as a facticity outside of himself” (Scott 2008, p. 125) This occurs when objectified beliefs become embedded in routines, forms, and artifacts. They become the taken-for-granted assumptions that are predominantly accepted and unquestioned. Institutionalization through increased commitments highlights the normative aspect of institutions or normalizing practice. It relates to
stronger commitments toward norms, values, and standard procedures by individuals and collective actors. Institutionalization in this sense is defined as “the emergence of orderly, stable, social integrating patterns out of stable, loosely organized, or narrowly technical activities. The underlying reality –the basic source of stability and integration – is the creation of social entanglements of commitments [emphasis added]. Most of what we do in everyday life is mercifully free and reversible. But when actions touch important interests and salient values or when they are embedded in networks of interdependence, options are more limited” (Selznick 1992, p. 232).

Whilst viewed as durable and stable, institutions change. Two key patterns of change include evolutionary change and punctuated change. Evolutionary change or path dependence is “a process whereby contingent events or decisions result in the establishment of institutions that persist over long periods of time and constrain the range of actors’ future options, including those that may be more efficient or effective in the long run” (Campbell 2002, p. 65). In this view, change occurs incrementally. Although existing institutional configurations may differ from prior arrangements, they will still have traces of the prior (Nelson and Winter 1982). The second change pattern is that of the punctuated equilibrium, in which a big and sudden change occurs, therefore emerging as a discontinuous pattern.

As will be explained in the proposed theoretical model, the notion of practice translation provides the foundation for understanding change and stability in markets. Given an understanding of translation through practice, markets as practices, as well as, practice as institutions, markets can thus be regarded as institutions; in other words, an institutionalized way of facilitating value co-creation.
In this view, change is viewed as natural, whereas stability is perceived as an anomaly that requires explanation (Czarniawska and Sevon 1996; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007). As markets continue to be performed, they reflect a process of institutionalization (Giddens 1984; Lounsbury and Crumley 2007; Nicolini 2009a), in which certain practices become routinized and a sense of stability takes form (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007). Yet, with each performance of practice, change occurs due to constantly evolving contexts (Czarniawska and Sevon 1996), thus reflecting translation in the performed practices, in other words, the institutionalized practices.

Building on the notion of practice as institutions (Lounsbury and Crumley 2007), it is assumed that every translation contributes to the ongoing process of institutionalization. Markets as institutions embodies three nested levels of context: the micro, the meso and the macro (Chandler and Vargo 2011). The micro-context functions at the individual level as it focuses on the service-for-service exchange across two individual actors, in which direct and reciprocal exchanges take place. The meso-context focuses on exchanges among dyads which thus include the processes of direct exchange across two actors but also indirect exchange through at least one of the actors involved. The macro-context refers to more complex forms of exchange consisting of multiple actors through simultaneous direct and indirect service-for-service exchange, thus creating a sustaining ecosystem. The layer of meta-context includes an element of time in which market practices are reproduced. In this sense contexts are understood to be heterogeneous and may either consist of two actors or more than hundreds of actors. They are complex because the link between two actors can influence other actors and other links throughout the context. These levels of context can be understood as the structure that shapes and is shaped by the exchanges and other market practices that take place.
It is important to note that these levels are nested within each other. They are not separate entities with levels ‘higher’ than the other. The actors need to be understood as interconnections situated on a flat plane. There are no such things as macro-actors (Callon and Latour 1981), “only micro-actors who associate with other micro-actors constructing networks that appear to be of a super-human size” (Czarniawska and Sevon 1996, p. 22). Similarly, it is necessary to understand the notion of ‘global’ as consisting of a network of localities. Global does not mean ‘total’ in the sense of including everybody on earth. Global is not an entity above or beyond local. This relates to the continued establishment of practices and rituals within a given context where the links between practices become stronger as it becomes embedded in a social structure.

The intersection between service-dominant logic and practice as institutions provides the general background for explaining how markets facilitate the travel and translation of practice. The purpose is to develop a framework that explains how a practice is established in one context and how this practice moves from one context to another. The notion of value co-creation developed under service-dominant logic sets the background in which market practices are translated. As actors go about fulfilling their daily needs, they integrate various resources from various sources through direct or indirect exchange of service. Service is understood as resources applied for the benefit of another. Value is thus created by multiple actors through simultaneous exchange processes (Vargo and Lusch 2004a). It is this particular mechanism of integrating resources through multiple actors that motivates the continuous performance of market practice, which thus results in value being co-created across multiple actors as well. Service-dominant logic, thus, helps situate market practices (Kjellberg and Helgesson, 2006; 2007) within a greater network of practices. Furthermore, it shifts the focus of exchange in marketing to the process of resource integration within the context of value co-creation.
The market-as-practices framework (Kjellberg and Helgesson, 2006; 2007) complements service-dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch 2004a) by offering a micro-level explanation on what it is we do in the context of value co-creation. Building on the notion that markets are created through the everyday actions of market actors, the practice approach helps us to understand that markets do not just serve as the venue of value co-creation but is a process of value co-creation. It identifies the distinct practices – namely normalizing, representational and integrative practices – that contribute to the emergence of markets.

2.4 Rituals as Practice

The notion of ritual was first introduced to marketing literature by Rook (1985) who identified ritualistic behavior in consumption and defined it as “a type of expressive, symbolic activity constructed of multiple behaviors that occur in a fixed, episodic sequence, and that tend to be repeated over time. Ritual behavior is dramatically scripted and acted out and is performed with formality, seriousness, and inner intensity” (p. 252). It was identified that consumer behavior exhibited ritualistic elements.

Tetreault and Kleine (1990) criticize this definition because it does not differentiate between the notion of ritual and ritualized behavior. Tetreault and Kleine (1990) thus further refine the definition of ritual by differentiating it from habitual and ritualized behavior. Ritual differs from habit because ritual contains a higher level of involvement, transmits more intense symbolic meanings, and is more resistant to change. Furthermore ritual should be distinguished from ritualized behavior in the sense that ritual is purposive and creates instant transitions. For example, Rook (1985) provides the example of how a baptism or sorority initiation instantaneously performs its purpose in terms of dealing with change within systems of society, knowledge, and nature. Ritualized behavior on the other hand relates to change in an individual’s
self-perception and is achieved through gradual assimilation such as that of dealing with divorce or adjusting to life as a new faculty member. Tetreault and Kleine (1990, p.33) offer a more narrowly defined notion of ritual, as follows:

“an analytical class of purposive, socially standardized activity sequences. Ritual is designed to maintain and transmit both social and 'moral' order: to reaffirm social interdependency, by evoking and communicating a network of condensed, multivocal and ambiguous affective and cognitive meanings to which members of the collectivity may jointly subscribe. Ritual's meanings are (sic) conveyed through the use of symbolic or metaphorical artifacts (objects, language, actors, and behaviors) that are orchestrated into a structured, dramatic complex (episode or script) often repeated over time. Ritual is enacted in bracketed social time and/or place, wherein time and/or place themselves have meaning.”

Prior studies on ritual have largely been generated from the field of consumer culture theory (CCT). Explorations have been made on the role of consumption in various religious or social rituals such as weddings (Otnes and Lowrey 1993), Valentine’s Day (Creighton 1993), Thanksgiving (Wallendorf and Arnould 1991), and Christmas (Kimura and Belk 2005). In this sense, there is a separation between the ritual or the holiday versus the act of consumption. However, there are certain rites that characterize festivity that are tightly connected or are reflective of consumption practices, for example rites of conspicuous display, conspicuous consumption, as well as rites of exchange (Falassi 1987).

Other researchers have explored how customers and marketers perform acts as a means to transfer meaning to and from individuals to goods. The market has been seen as a place that facilitates as well as performs varying ritual acts. “Consumption” is perceived as a form of ritual since inanimate objects are imbued with meaning and personality (Belk et al. 1989). McCracken (1988), for example, identifies four types of rituals that occur as a means to transfer meaning from goods to individuals: exchange, possession, grooming and divestment rituals. Advertising
also greatly influences how existing rituals are played out, primarily by identifying which sets of artifacts are necessary in certain rituals or by creating new rituals (Otnes and Scott 1996). Furthermore, Otnes and Scott (1996) identify advertising texts in themselves to be forms of ritual. For example, through personification the ritual type of fetish is performed in which inanimate objects are given a personality.

While current literature has enabled us to understand the role of rituals in influencing market practices and the processes through which ritual occurs, the majority of studies are guided by a goods-dominant logic. Utilizing service-dominant logic as a primary lens, this essay moves beyond the consumer-producer divide (Vargo and Lusch 2011) by shifting the focus from the exploration of consumer or consumption rituals to that of market-mediating rituals. Although service-dominant logic and consumer culture theory have been identified as ‘natural allies’ (Arnould 2006) in that both acknowledge the active role of various market actors, CCT is still steeped in the language of a goods-dominant logic. Although CCT argues for the agency of consumers in appropriating goods and brands through their day-to-day practices, the mere use of the term ‘consumer’ reflects the logic that ‘consumers’ are a distinct set of actors from that of ‘producers.’

Under service-dominant logic, rituals performed by customers are no longer seen as a separate process performed by actors who deplete value but as a set of value co-creating practices. In principle, various stakeholders are equal actors in the market. Each player is dependent upon another to co-create value, thus no one actor can create value individually. An actor can only propose value. In order for value to be realized, the proposition needs to be acknowledged. Value is co-created through the process of resource integration, a process in
which individuals gather operand and operant resources through exchange to sustain simple daily activities as a means for survival and increasing value in life.

2.5 Shifts in Perspective

Before explaining the proposed framework of market co-creation in detail, a number of theoretical shifts undertaken to develop this study is explained. The change of theoretical views required, include: 1) the move form an exogenous to endogenous view of the market, 2) a shift in understanding marketing as facilitating translation as opposed to diffusion, and 3) a redefinition of context from having fixed boundaries to a constant process of framing.

2.5.1 Moving from an exogenous to endogenous view of markets

The conventional view in marketing takes an exogenous approach to markets by identifying them as either a physical space or a “set of actual and potential buyers of a product” (Kotler and Armstrong 2010, p. 7). Markets are perceived as being external to the involved actors and narrowly understood in terms of demand for a specific product category. The static nature of markets is reflected in a number of metaphors commonly used in marketing practice. For example, under a ‘pie metaphor,’ marketers compete for a ‘slice’ of the market. Meanwhile using a ‘war metaphor’ under a condition of ‘red oceans,’ competitors ‘fight’ for market share in an industry with demarcated boundaries (Kim and Mauborgne 2005). Viewing markets as being “out there” assumes the limited role of the firm, in that they do not contribute to the creation of a priori circumstances, but can only adapt to them after the fact (Brownlie 1994).

Using the jargon of marketing management, marketers need to identify pre-existing market potential, segment and target these markets, then offer differentiated products that are uniquely positioned in the minds of the intended targets (Trout et al. 1996). Customers are then persuaded to purchase these market offerings through enticing product, pricing, distribution, and
promotional strategies (marketing mix; Borden 1964). In this view, producers play the dominant role of creating value-embedded products for customers, who provide revenue for the firm in exchange. However, customers are not assumed to generate productive value. Instead, they are seen to deplete value through the process of consumption—eating up, using, depreciating and destroying the value of market offerings. Based on this logic, it is unsurprising that marketers face the harsh criticism of dominating helpless consumers with seductive powers (Murray and Ozanne, 1991) and pacifying consumers with the pleasures of consumption (Ritzer, 2009).

Defining markets in terms of demand for a particular product category leads to a number of drawbacks. First, it leads to an understanding that markets are synonymous to consumers or masses with buying power; a narrow description that does not accurately depict the range of actors involved in exchange and market making. By implication, the field of marketing has generated abundant theory about consumers but not much about markets. The second drawback relates to an overemphasis on product categories, which does not enable flexible interpretations for a product. While products are an element of the market, they are not central to the exchange process and do not necessarily have to be used to define markets. Products change over time and as Aspers (2005, p. 13) mentions “[t]he commodity itself is to some extent a result of the market and cannot be understood as extrinsic to the market.” For example, the evolution of Arm & Hammer baking soda not only highlights the fluidity of the market but of products as well (Slater 2002). As documented, customer’s use and appropriation of Arm & Hammer baking soda resulted in the product’s shift from being solely regarded as a baking ingredient to a deodorizer and cleaning solution that is an essential ingredient in toothpaste, laundry detergent, and other products. Through repositioning efforts, the firm introduced a new set of uses for baking soda, thus creating a new market altogether. The case of Arm & Hammer describes how products can
be associated with multiple functions, thus belonging in distinct product categories. Additionally, it highlights the role of other stakeholders—in this case, customers—in contributing to the expansion of markets. More importantly, it underscores the endogenous and unlimited nature of markets which can grow exponentially with the introduction of new use or solutions; in other words, practices. Customers, marketers, and other stakeholders play a great part in determining the existence, shape, and outcome of markets. Arguably, however, the marketing field is still left oblivious to how markets come to be, how they change, and how they behave. What is thus required is an explanation of markets that captures its dynamic and systemic attributes.

A study of existing literature on markets identify a market-as-noun and market-as-verb understanding (Mele et al. 2014), which coincides with an exogenous vs. endogenous approach to markets. In this study, an endogenous approach to markets is adopted, primarily through the utilization of the markets-as-practice model developed by Kjellberg and Helgesson (2006; 2007). In this performative model, markets are constantly in the making through the continual enactment of particular sets of commercial practices, constituting of representational, normalizing and exchange-based integrative practices (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007). Although hailing from distinct research traditions, this endogenous perspective of markets overlaps to some degree with the “blue ocean” concept, in that both approaches identify markets as unbounded and uncontested (Kim and Mauborgne 2005). The endogenous perspective is also compatible with the effectual approach (Read et al. 2009) to markets, in which an economic actor is assumed as “an imaginative actor who seize contingent opportunities and exploits any and all means at hand to fulfill a plurality of current and future aspirations, many of which are shaped and created through the very process of economic
decision making and are not given a priori” (Sarasvathy 2001, p. 262) – in other words, an “effectuator.”

This study goes beyond a firm-driven perspective of market creation by recognizing that multiple actors collaboratively contribute to the creation of markets. As noted research has identified customers (Martin and Schouten 2014; Sandikci and Ger 2010; Thompson and Coskuner-Balli 2007) and other stakeholders (Humphreys 2010; Karababa and Ger 2011; Mazza and Alvarez 2000) as active participants of market making. Furthermore, taking the A2A perspective, this study rejects the dichotomization of market actors as either value producing firms or value consuming customers by adopting a generalized view of market actors by identifying them as value co-creating resource integrators. As such, this study highlights the reciprocal and interactive social views of relationships among actors and institutions that are nested within intricate social systems.

2.5.2 Redefining Marketing as Diffusion to Translation

Marketing is commonly understood as a process that facilitates exchange, of which two main types are identified: utilitarian and symbolic (Bagozzi 1975). While utilitarian exchange relates to the exchange of goods for money for the tangible or functional features and potential use of the object exchanged (Bagozzi 1975), symbolic exchange relates to interactions in which intangible features – psychological benefits or social meaning – are primarily sought (Levy 1959).

The conventional wisdom behind the marketing process is that marketers must offer ‘products’ – goods and services – that are of value to its customers. The general purpose is to produce value-embedded products that appeal to enough customers to generate profit. Reframed, marketing can be perceived to facilitate a process of diffusion where products or innovations spread through exchange mechanisms. More specifically, diffusion occurs when “an innovation
is communicated through certain channels over time among members of a social system” (Rogers 2003 [1962], p. 11).

Among the first diffusion models to appear in the marketing literature is the Bass model (1969) that identifies potential adopters of innovation to be influenced by external (e.g., mass communication) and internal (e.g., interpersonal/word-of-mouth) sources of communication. The model identifies that the diffusion process produces a bell-shaped curve in which the first half of the diffusion process is assumed to be symmetrical to the second half, and when plotted cumulatively produces an S--shaped curve. This model, noted as the most widely utilized theoretical model in present day marketing, is useful because it provides a mathematical formula to forecast the rate of adoption for a new product based on pilot launches as well as the diffusion history of similar products.

In this perspective, the perceived attributes of the innovation –ideas, product, service, or practice– is expected to greatly influence the diffusion process. The rate of innovation adoption is likely to depend, among others, on the innovation’s relative advantage over prior ideas or solutions, compatibility with existing values, experiences, and needs of potential adopters, perceived complexity of the innovation, ability to be experienced on a trial basis, as well as the degree to which the innovation and its related effects are observable by others (Rogers 2003 [1962]).

Furthermore, diffusion research has also identified distinct types of innovation adopters based that differ based on their level of innovativeness, that is, the degree to which an individual is relatively early in adopting new ideas or practices in comparison to other members of a social system. The five ideal types of adopter categories include innovators, early adopters, early...
majority, late majority, and laggards— that are explained to have distinct socioeconomic characteristics as well as personality, value, and communication behavior.

The focus on adoption rates as well as characteristics of innovation and adopter categories, fails to recognize the adaptation processes that occurs when an innovation is adopted. This emphasis on adoption rates, categories, and innovation attributes, is also observed in the context of cross-cultural diffusion, mostly studied in the field of international marketing. Studies have identified diffusion as a culture-specific phenomenon, in which high context cultures marked by homophilous communication show higher rates of adoption in comparison to low context cultures with heterophilous communication (Takada and Jain 1991), in which adoption processes are influenced by country-level factors such as cosmopolitanism, mobility, and women in labor force (Gatignon and Robertson 1989). Furthermore, a lead-lag effect is identified, which establishes that the later a product is introduced in a country, the faster the rate of adoption (Takada and Jain 1991).

This field builds on the notion of facilitating exchange in the context of cross-country boundaries that requires better understanding of a foreign nation’s culture as well as economical and socio-political legal structure. Among the key marketing strategies debated in the field of international marketing is the practice of standardization versus adaptation (Cavusgil et al. 1993; Jain 1989; Samiee and Roth 1992; Zou and Cavusgil 2002). There are three dominant perspectives identified in relation to standardization-adaptation: total standardization, total adaptation, and contingency (Zou, Andrus, and Norvell 1997). Total standardization argues for the need to use the same marketing strategy worldwide. Technological advancements that reduce cultural differences, time to market, and a global level of image consistency have been used as reasons to support this approach (Levitt 1983; Ohmae 1989; Ohmae 1995). At the other end of
the spectrum is the total adaptation perspective that highlights differences between various
country markets which demand customizing of the firm’s marketing effort (Cavusgil and Zou
1994; Cavusgil et al. 1993). The contingency perspective balances between adaptation and
standardization of marketing strategies in foreign markets. Both strategies are assumed to be
equally important. Adaptation and standardization is a matter of degree because marketing
strategies are dependent upon internal and external forces (Zou, Andrus, and Norvell 1997).

These approaches focus on the managerial role which concentrates on the normative
strategies applied by marketing managers to distribute their market offerings in various markets.
Based on this perspective, the idea, practice, object, or anything else that travels is assumed to be
constant or immutable. In other words, it highlights “the spread of institutional principles or
practices with little modification through a population of actors” (Campbell 2004, p. 77), where
practices are accepted and adopted without much question or modification, reflecting a form of
mechanical transfer (Lounsbury 2001, 29-30).

Change takes place only in the hands of marketers through modification of tangible or
intangible elements such as product features or brand meaning. This reflects a firm-centric
approach, which focuses primarily on what the firm can do to facilitate adoption of a market
offering. It is also goods-focused, concentrating mostly on how to modify a good or the
meanings attached to it. The customer is put in the background as passive receivers of such
strategies and the environment entered is seen as a fixed context. Under this logic, the actions of
the firm is perceived to work in a unidirectional rather than recursive manner, thus overlooking
the potential that action influences and changes the context in which it takes place.

However, as Strang and Soule (1993) note, “where diffusion involves the social
construction of identity, whether and when intensified relations promote homogeneity rather than
differentiation seems unclear.” In this case, Campbell (2004) asserts that diffusion does not result in isomorphic outcomes and argues for the need to investigate what occurs after a principle or practice arrives at new institution, thus providing ground for a perspective that is distinct from diffusion.

Translation, defined as “a basic social process by which something –such as a token, rule, product, technique, truth, or idea– spreads across time and space.” (Kjellberg and Helgesson, 2006), is introduced as an alternative approach to diffusion. Rooted in the study of science and technology, translation specifically relates to “the spread in time and space of anything –claims, orders, artefacts, goods – [that] is in the hands of people; each of these people may act in different ways, letting the token drop, or modifying it, or deflecting it, or betraying it, or adding to it, or appropriating it” (Latour 1986, p. 267).

The notion of translation has primarily been adopted and adapted –in other words ‘translated’– to describe how managerial practices spread across social contexts by a group of researchers working under the label of Skandinavian institutionalism (Boxenbaum and Pedersen 2009; Czarniawska and Sevon 1996). Their work has been distinct from the greater stream of organizational institutionalism literature in that they challenge the notion of isomorphic diffusion; that diffusion leads to homogenous outcomes. Instead they argue that change is an inherent concept in any form of travel or diffusion (Boxenbaum and Pedersen 2009).

Translation stems from the works of Callon (1986) and Latour (1986) in the sociology of translation and sociology of science and technology. Translation takes place as actors – individuals or organizations- imitate the practices of others, particularly those they perceive as similar or those they aspire to become similar to (Sahlin-Andersson 1996; Sevón 1996). The underlying assumption of translation is that ideas and practices change when they travel from
Skandinavian institutionalists (Czarniawska and Sevon 1996) introduce translation to substitute the diffusion approach, identifying the prior as a process of performative imitation and the latter as ostensive imitation. In ostensive imitation, the focus is on identifying a superior model to replicate, which is treated as immutable, through a mechanical form of imitation. This traditional model of diffusion assumes that the strength lies in the core idea, product, model, or practice that is being imitated, and inertia serves as the initial force that triggers and maintains the energy needed to spread it over time and place (Latour 1986). On the other hand, translation that emerges through a process of performative imitation relates to processes of adaptation, re-invention, or re-creation (Latour 1986), “in which something is created and transformed by a chain of translators,” (Sevón 1996, p. 51). In this model, ideas and practices move because of the imitators – translators – who self-identify with a particular practice, chose to pick up the practice, and fit it into his or her individual own context, thereby changing the practice in the process. Thus, actors are not just intermediaries of objects, ideas, and practices, but are simultaneously transformers. Actors who pick up these elements will shape them. In this approach, “the initial force of the first actor in the chain is no more important than the hundredths” (Sevón 1996, p. 51) because movement – and by implication, translation – only occurs when someone picks up an idea or practice and transfers it (Latour 1986). Movement is thus an effect of the energy given by the people in a chain of translation. In brief, while diffusion is perceived as a physical process, translation is viewed as a social process (Sahlin and Wedlin 2008).

The logic underlying diffusion can be aligned to the basic views of a goods dominant logic. In goods dominant logic, it is assumed that firms are the sole creators of value that embeds such value in the goods they market. Characteristics of the product are assumed as the source of
energy that triggers movement for a product. Focus has been on modifying the qualities and features of products to generate greater power for movement guaranteeing such qualities sustain the energy needed these products to be adopted in various contexts. If a product is good enough, it will inevitably be picked up. In other words, it will ‘sell’ itself. Power is in the product, not the customers.

Service-dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch 2004a) criticizes this notion by arguing that value is not inherent in a product; it is co-created. This view is in line with the translation approach, where movement only takes place when someone picks up a token. Similarly, value is realized only when customers acknowledge and utilize the value proposition offered by marketers. Value is co-created through the actions of related actors. Thus service-dominant logic endorses a focus on practice as opposed to products, which will enable marketers to provide meaningful value propositions that facilitate actors in their value co-creation efforts.

2.5.3 Context as a Process and Outcome of Framing

Understanding context is foundational to developing a model for explaining how market translation occurs between one cultural context and another. In organizational institutionalism, markets are often referred to as fields, understood as social arenas in which actors orient their actions toward each other (Fligstein 2001). This is often operationalized as organizations that operate in the same industry or deal with the same type of activity (e.g., the automobile industry consisting of various car manufacturers. A complementary notion is that of the field frame, which according to Lounsbury, et al. (2003) is endogenous to the actor rather than exogenous as in the case of institutional logic. Field frame is defined as “an intermediate concept that has the durability and stickiness of an institutional logic, but akin to strategic framing, it is endogenous to a field of actors and is subject to challenge and modification.”
While this study supports the endogenous approach to identifying the boundaries of contexts, the action net (Czarniawska 2004; Lindberg and Czarniawska 2006) is identified to be even more aligned with the translation and service ecosystem adopted in this research. Action nets (Czarniawska 2004) include all actions that contribute to a particular practice which may include actors that span beyond organizational fields (e.g., all actors involved in facilitating car driving: automakers, road infrastructure, gasoline market). In this view, actors are determined after the fact; in that they are identified through the process of tracing practices, where identities emerge through the translation processes.

In brief, the boundaries of context can be internally defined by the actors involved as well as externally delimited. Often, context is delineated by a researcher and used as a system of reference to identify actors’ structures and identities and highlight what the involved actors perceive as important (March and Olsen 1983). Context can also be determined in terms of who the involved actors refer to in their actions, and who they define as being an integral significant part of a particular practice. Although context may be identified in terms of geographic boundaries, they do not necessarily have to be geographically but can also be culturally, socially, and politically determined.

Context is significant in understanding markets because it frames exchange (Chandler and Vargo 2011). The practices that actors perform, the way they understand and act upon resources depend on the context in which they are embedded in. Sewell (1992) refers to the ‘polysemy of resources’ in which there will always be multiple interpretations with regard to the meaning of resources because resources embody cultural schemas. Sewell (1992) exemplifies that depending on the cultural schema, blankets can be seen as a resource to keep warm but also as a means to reflect power or prestige, at least in the context of the Kwakiutl potlatch performed.
by the Native Americans. As such, it supports the notion that “resources are not, they become” (Vargo and Lusch, 2004, p. 2). What is regarded as treasure in one culture can be seen as trash in another, depending on the cultural schemas of the involved actors.

Understanding markets as institutions, the role of institutional logics (Thornton and Ocasio 2008) –defined as “the socially constructed, historical patterns of material practices, assumptions, values, beliefs, and rules by which individuals produce and reproduce their material subsistence, organize time and space, and provide meaning to their social reality” (Thornton and Ocasio 1999, p. 804) –becomes relevant. Contexts are often defined as venues guided by a dominant institutional logic. However, it is being increasingly identified that most contexts comprise of overlapping institutional logics (Friedland and Alford 1991), and that competing institutional logics often drives change in context (Dunn and Jones 2010; Rao et al. 2003; Thornton and Ocasio 1999).

Furthermore, it is crucial to acknowledge that while actors are defined by context, they also define their contexts (Giddens 1984). “Each actor brings a unique quality to the context that affects other actors in the context, as well as the context as a whole. Because each actor in the context is always integrating and exchanging resources with other actors and thereby serving other actors, there is continuous change in the context” (Chandler and Vargo 2011, p. 38). Additionally, Chandler and Vargo (2011) propose to conceptualize context at three levels, each of which emphasizes a particular aspect of value co-creation: (1) micro level to highlight dyadic, direct service-for-service exchange, (2) meso level as it pertains to indirect exchange in triads, and (3) macro level as related to complex service manifesting through exchanges among triads. A meta layer that encompasses all levels emphasizes how these levels evolve over time.
Corresponding with each of the levels, Penaloza and Mish (2011) identify distinct ways the involved actors develop meaning and negotiate value. At the micro level, meanings are negotiated through individual judgements and interpretations. Societal norms and standards reflect meso-level meanings that direct action and judgment-making at the micro level. Last but not least are cosmological principles at the macro level that reflect larger social patterns and trends.

Although context is understood to frame exchange, it is important to note that defining the boundaries of context is also a practice of framing. If we see markets as fluid, simultaneous and continuous, there is thus no real rigid, objective boundary that defines a particular context. Contexts are usually defined when there is enough homogeneity within and heterogeneity between the actors. Understanding that contexts consist of a constellation of practices, Wenger (2008) identifies that these constellations can be delimited based on the following factors: sharing of historical roots, having related enterprises, serving a cause or belonging to an institution, facing similar conditions, having members in common, sharing artifacts, having geographical proximity or interaction, overlapping styles or discourses, or competition for the same resources that create continuities. Under this broad criteria, constellation of practices can be defined in terms of profession, religion, sport, language, or even nations.

In the sections above, the necessary theoretical shifts to construct a framework of market co-creation that aligns with service-dominant logic and the market-as-practice approach are outlined. In this study, service-dominant logic is employed to explain the general workings of the market, whereas the markets-as-practice approach is utilized to explain the micro-level practices that scale into meso as well as macro-level practices, and vice versa. Furthermore, practice itself is perceived as an institution (Lounsbury and Crumley 2007), and translation a process of
institutionalization (Czarniawska and Sevon 1996). Using these foundations, a framework is developed to explain how enactment of market practices contributes to the translation of a practice. The following section presents a series of research questions that will guide the development of the proposed theoretical framework.

3 Research Questions

The purpose of the current essay is to develop a framework to explain the performative (Araujo, Finch and Kjellberg 2010; Fligstein and Dauter 2007; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006, 2007) and collaborative process of market creation (Araujo et al. 2010; Fligstein and Dauter 2007; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007; Vargo et al. 2008) that is driven by efforts to integrate resources by value co-creating actors (Vargo and Lusch 2008). The systemic nature of market creation is reflected in the understanding that the practices of an individual actor is nested within an ecosystem of practice, and therefore either directly or indirectly influenced by the practices of other individuals (Akaka et al. 2013; Akaka et al. 2012; Vargo 2009; Vargo and Lusch 2011). Furthermore, the fluid nature of markets is underlined by the concept of practice translation, in which every instance of practice generates heterogeneous outcomes (Callon 1986; Czarniawska and Sevon 1996; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007; Latour 1986). Additionally, practices may be analyzed at distinct levels of analysis (Chandler and Vargo 2011; Penaloza and Mish 2011), namely micro, meso, and macro levels. At the core of these levels of interactions, however, are individual actors enacting three basic practices: representational, normalizing, and integrative practices (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007). Furthermore, every instance of practice is a translation of
prior practices, reflecting a simultaneous process of institutionalization and deinstitutionalization (Czarniawska and Sevon 1996; Lounsbury and Crumley 2007; Nicolini 2009).

Driven by these theoretical underpinnings, a number of research questions are proposed to develop a model of practice translation:

1. What core practices are enacted in the process of translation?
2. How does translation relate to value co-creation?
3. What processes contribute to the making of distinct contexts?
4. How does translation occur given multiple (micro, meso, macro) levels of context?

4 Theoretical Framework: Fractal Model of Market Co-creation

In this study, a fractal model of market co-creation is proposed. Fractal is a term coined by mathematician Mandelbrot to identify “a geometric shape that can be broken into smaller parts, each a small-scale echo of the whole” (Mandelbrot and Hudson, 2006, p. xviii). Following this analogy, service ecosystems are depicted as echoes of market practices –normalizing, representational, and integrative practices– enacted by actors who integrate resources in their mundane effort to create value for themselves as well as for, and through, others, therefore co-creating value in the process. As fractals, similar sets of market practices can thus be observed to occur at multiple levels of analysis.

The key components of this fractal model include: 1) a set of market practices consisting of normalizing, representational, and integrative practices, 2) enacted by actors driven by the need to co-create value for themselves and others 3) through a continual process of translation which involves a general process of abstraction and concretization, 4) in interaction with
multiple context framings that is situated within a complex service ecosystem, 5) which over time reflects a process of institutionalization and deinstitutionalization.

4.1 Translation of Market Practices

To explain the core practices enacted in the process of market translation, three types of practices that underlie markets are identified: normalizing, representational, and integrative practices. Incorporating a service-dominant logic perspective, it is essential to elaborate that such translations are not performed simply for the sake of creating markets, but in the context of enacting everyday life. This point addresses the issue of how translation relates to value co-creation. In particular, market translation is driven by efforts of generalized actors to create meaning and value in the day-to-day or simply by the need to survive. Markets emerge at the intersection of value co-creating practices enacted by distinct actors. As such, practices can be described as market-\textit{mediating} practices to complement the more commonly held assumptions that practices or rituals are mediated by the market, thus depicting a more iterative relationship between market and practice.

Practices are invented and re-invented through their enactment, implying heterogenous outcomes (Shove and Pantzar 2005). Translations are essentially transformations of meanings as they circulate or move from one space to another (Latour 2005). A chain of translation transforms the abstract to the concrete, wherein the “world of ideas” and the “world out there” are enacted through a series of interlinked practices (Latour 1997; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006), in which intent are transformed into artifact and artifact to intent (Martin and Schouten 2014). The chain of translation accelerates when ideas become more object-like, as exemplified in the cases where ideas turn into things (e.g., written form, framework) or ideas are enacted into action (Czarniawska and Joerges 1996). This process requires the bridging of the symbolic and
the material (Mohr and White, 2008) in which ideas manifest into concrete practices. Kjellberg and Helgesson (2006) identify this translation process of linking practices in the world of ideas to practices in the world outside as *performativity*, which involves a movement from abstraction to concretization in the form of concrete practices.

Tracing the chain of translations that link representational, normalizing, and integrative practices of the market-as-practices framework, a similar process of abstraction and concretization is identified (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006). Specifically, representational practices result in *descriptions* that influence normalizing practices, while normalizing practices provide input for representational practices by determining what is measured and the manner in which they are measured (i.e., measures and methods of measurements). Furthermore, normalizing practices generate *rules and tools* that implicate the ways in which integrative practices are performed. In addition, the interests of varying parties may influence or loop back to determine normalizing practices. Changes in integrative practices may be captured through revised *measurements* that inform subsequent representational practices. Meanwhile depictions generated through representational practices are utilized as *results* that inform integrative practices. Figure 1 depicts the adapted market-as-practices model (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006), in which exchange practices are subsumed under a more general process of resource integration; integrative practices.

In each of these links, ideas and practices are translated to become more concrete through utterances, writing, or theoretical models that are likely to facilitate their circulation among actors over time and space. In particular, Sevon (1996) highlights how ideas can travel through narratives or stories that can be carried and spread directly by people or indirectly through mass media. Similarly, Strang and Meyer (1993, p. 492) introduce theorization, “the self-conscious
development and specification of abstract categories and the formulation of patterned relationships such as chains of cause and effect,” as a circulation mechanism. Such “theoretical formulations range from simple concepts and typologies to highly abstract, complex, and rich models” (p. 493).

On the other hand, practices that have become abstracted and simplified into more theoretical forms are also likely to translate within a category of actors at a better rate as such explanations make it easier to understand and communicate the practice. However, Strang and Meyer (1993, p. 499), underline that it is not the actual practice –“a copy of some practice existing elsewhere” – but “the theoretical model that is likely to flow.” Rather than copy models to the letter, translators are expected to embellish, as these models “are neither complete nor unbiased depictions of existing practices. Instead, actual practices are interpreted as partial, flawed, or corrupt implementations of theorized ones.”

Figure 1. Markets-as-Practice Framework Adapted from Kjellberg and Helgesson (2006)
In essence, theorization of ideas and practice (Strang and Meyer 1993), among others, through narratives (Sevon 1996) or strategic framing (Boxenbaum 2006; Boxenbaum and Battilana 2005; Goffman 1974; Lounsbury and Crumley 2007) are manifestations of representational practices. This perspective, thus, emphasizes the significance of representational practices in facilitating the travel of ideas. Not only do representational practices increase the pace in which an idea or practice spreads within a given population, they also reduce the need for direct contact or structured social relations across adopters, which enables ideas and practices to spread across weakly related actors (Strang and Meyer 1993).

4.2 Drivers of Translation: Perceived Homogeneity and Self-identification

As discussed, translation takes place as actors co-create value for themselves and others. However, the motivation that drives actors to translate a particular idea over others has not been fully explained. What drives an actor to translate an idea that is foreign to them? Conventionally, a logic of consequence is assumed, wherein self-interested, rational actors make decisions based on fixed identities and preferences, and behavior is based on efforts to optimize expected returns. However, studies in organizational institutionalism suggest that mimetic behavior (DiMaggio and Powell 1983) is often driven by a logic of appropriateness, defined by Olsen and March (2006, p. 689) as “a perspective that sees human action as driven by rules of appropriate or exemplary behavior, organized into institutions. Rules are followed because they are seen as natural, rightful, expected, and legitimate. Actors seek to fulfill the obligations encapsulated in a role, an identity, a membership in a political community or group, and the ethos, practices and expectations of its institutions. Embedded in a social collectivity, they do what they see as appropriate for themselves in a specific type of situation.” In other words, practices are adopted not necessarily because they provide the most optimum solution, but because they mostly align
with existing norms and what is considered legitimate in a given context—behaviors likely to be encountered during a times of uncertainty (DiMaggio and Powell 1983; Suchman 1995).

Studies in asocial diffusion, as in the case of the spread of communicable diseases, explain transmission in terms of direct contact or interaction between two or more actors. However, in processes that involve the social construction of identity, other explanatory factors are necessary (Strang and Meyer 1993). While interaction may generate solidarity and feelings of similarity that result in imitation, it has also been identified to create conflict, invoke differentiation and boundary making efforts that eventually result in cultural division or polarization (Flache and Macy 2011; Strang and Meyer 1993). As such, rather than interaction, social researchers point towards perceived similarity or homogeneity as the drivers of mimetic behavior. Perceived similarity influences imitation because an actor will most likely imitate other actors to whom one relates or identifies with (Sahlin and Wedlin 2008). Considering translation practices as a form of performative imitation, Sevon (1996, p. 52) depicts imitation as a process of acting “like someone else with the more or less conscious intent to achieve the same, or similar consequences.” In the context of organizational studies, it is established that firms will imitate organizations that have a good desirable reputation, or those that are similar to the firm’s current condition or similar to what they aspire to become. Imitation is thus driven by self-identification, “the impetus for imitation must come from the imitators themselves, from their conception of the situation, self-identity and others’ identity, as well as from the analogical reasoning by which these conceptions are combined” (Sevon 1996, p. 51). Actors compare organizations they consider similar in one way or another, or those perceived to be successful to which they aspire to become.
Strang and Meyer (1993) refer to group homogeneity in terms of cultural linkages, which relates to “the cultural understanding that social entities belong to a common social category constructs a tie between them.” (p. 490), and stresses that “where actors are seen as falling into the same category, diffusion should be rapid.” (Strang and Meyer 1993). They assert that conceptualizing a category as similar, homogenous, or belonging to the same cultural category, increases the likelihood that actors who identify with the category will adopt similar practices.

However it is important to highlight identities as fluid and identification as a continual process. Actors are determined through a process of inter-definition, and attain their characteristics in interaction with others (Latour 1996, p. 162-164). “The identity of a subject – a person or an organization- is defined in relation to others; it is derived from its reference to and relationships with other” (Sahlin-Andersson 1996). Identities are outcomes of action and interaction with other situated actors.

Identities are derived from their reference to, or relationships with, others and are therefore institutionally constructed. However, they become internalized and function to structure an individual’s consciousness and actions (Berger and Luckmann 1991; Sevón 1996). Meyer (1996) identifies the soft actor who is embedded in culture. This type of actor is one “with interests, resources, identities and abilities, but at the same time the analysis acknowledges that these interests, resources, identities and abilities are neither stable nor intrinsic to individuals or organizations” (Sahlin and Wedlin 2008). Imitation shapes identity because the process allows actors to construct new relationships and identities as well as create new opportunities for comparison and establishing new identities. “Identity is not seen as a stable, essential feature but rather as a conception of a feature that develops in an ongoing and never-completed accomplishment: The identity of an organization is a description of an individual entity emerging
form interactions between actors rather than existing as a form of an essence that is consequently exhibited” (Sevon 1996 in Czarniawska-Jörges 1996, p. 2000).

4.3 Translation as Institutionalization

To understand translation of practice, it is important to acknowledge practices as institutions (Lounsbury and Crumley 2007). Individuals who enact practices are embedded in institutions and carry attitudes, norms, and construct meaning based on existing rules and resources. However, heterogeneous outcomes are likely because actors are embedded in multiple structures and are therefore influenced by varying factors in their enactment of practices.

Translation may be understood not only as a mechanism that drives change but, paradoxically, one that also promotes stability. In other words, translation reflects a simultaneous process of institutionalization and deinstitutionalization (Czarniawska and Sevon 1996). Among the many ideas and practices – new and old – that abound, some are picked up, enacted, and re-enacted while others are overlooked, left behind, or replaced. Due to the overlapping dominant institutional logics (Thornton and Ocasio 2008) that guide different actors, one or a number of actors will be more inclined to utilize some ideas or practices over others. This highlights the strength of existing institutional arrangements to influence which ideas and practices are maintained, and which are rejected. The ideas and practices that survive this filtering process – those that continue to leave their traces despite multiple iterations of translations – are the ideas and practices that eventually become institutionalized. As Czarniawska and Jörges (1996) explain, “a time-and-space collective constantly selects and de-selects among a common repertoire of idea plans for action, and the ideas repetitively selected acquire institutional status…Generally, one might say that what remains unaffected, after one fashion has changed into another, acquires the status of institutionalized action, the more so the longer it survives.”
The process, however, is not uni-dimensional. Given multiple actors, and individual actors that are embedded in multiple institutions, questions of how ideas and practices survive the filtering process over time arises. How do multiple actors with overlapping, and sometimes competing logics, negotiate and stabilize meaning and practice over time?

4.4 Types of Translation

To address the research question of what processes contribute to the making of distinct contexts, this proposed model identifies two types of translation: within context and between context. Context in this case refers to a market that consists of actors that converge due to resource integrating (integrative) practices or similar ideas, norms, and values (representational and normalizing practices). These actors are drawn and translate with similar others, thus collaboratively creating a relatively homogenous cultural context. The common understanding is that actors are guided by a dominant institutional logic (Thornton and Ocasio 2008), but it is important to acknowledge that through the reproduction and embodiments of such logics, actors contribute to the shaping of logics and cultural context, in general. In this proposed model, such processes are understood as translation within context. Meanwhile, translation between contexts is marked by translations that occur between social groups surrounding distinct sets of ideas, norms, and values. As such, these groups diverge in their translation of some core idea or practice, but converge on the need to share or draw upon common resources for diverging needs. In this model, such processes are identified as translation between contexts.

4.4.1 Translation within context

Translation within context relates to the spread of ideas and practices among actors that are guided by and contribute to the shaping of a similar set of rules or cultural frames, in other words a dominant institutional logic. This process aligns with Strang and Meyer’s (1993, p. 490)
notion that diffusion occurs through cultural linkages, or the culturally-derived conceptualization that certain actors or entities belong to a common category. Homogenous cultural categories increase the probability that actors who identify with the category will adopt similar practices. However, it is important to note that these boundary making practices – determining what comprises a relatively homogenous cultural category – is an arbitrary process (Sahlin-Andersson 1996; Sahlin and Wedlin 2008), influenced by changes in the perceptions of the involved actors or observer involved in their analysis. To illustrate, Anderson (2006) identified the Indonesian nation as an ‘imagined community,’ through which peoples of diverse ethnic groups, mutually defined by the experiences of Dutch colonialism, identify themselves as a united entity bounded by a common nationality. As reflected, the determination of distinct cultural categories is therefore a manifestation of the process of framing (Chandler and Vargo 2011; Goffman 1974). Moreover, utilizing the markets-as-practice perspective (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007), the conceptualization of a group of actors as similar, homogenous, or belonging to the same cultural category – in other words, their perception about a particular cultural category – also reflects a representational practice. What is depicted as well as how groups and practices are delimited and described, are guided by norms, rules, and/or logics that have been developed by dominant actors in the context; normalizing practices. For example, despite assimilation efforts, historically rooted tensions between Indonesian ‘natives’ and immigrants populations, result in the continued ‘othering’ of ethnic Chinese Indonesians to the present day (Nanjing 2006). Strang and Meyer (1993, p. 496) state that “[t]heories actively motivate certain groupings as meaningful and consequential,” thus highlighting how representational practice is influenced by normalizing practices, which will also influence and be influenced by exchange as subsumed under integrative practices in general.
Enactment of practice is determined by the context in which an actor is embedded (Giddens 1984; Sewell 1992). Exchange of practice and ideas most frequently occurs between similar or homophilous individuals; those that share attributes like beliefs, education, or socioeconomic status (Rogers 2003 [1962]). “The more communication there is between individuals in a dyad, the more likely they are to become homophilous. The more homophilous that two individuals are, the more likely that their communication will be effective” (Rogers 2003 [1962], p. 306). This may be explained by the fact that actors within a particular context are exposed to a similar set of overlapping institutions, therefore exposed and having access to similar resources as well as guided by comparable rules and tools of action, including the handling of resources (Thornton and Ocasio 2008; Thornton and Ocasio 1999). In other words, imitating actors have access to a common set of resources and draw from a similar set of cultural schemas to generate meaning from and utilize their institutional surroundings. By implication, it is expected that actors will draw on and translate from similar representational practices, producing less variance in outcome. As such, it can be expected that translation within context will be characterized by a convergence of ideas and practice.

Indeed, while homophily can facilitate the spread of similar ideas, it can also impede the spread of new, foreign, or innovative ideas due to redundant information. As Granovetter’s (1973) strength-of-weak-ties theory dictates, strong relational (dyadic level) ties between individuals are structurally weak (at the population level) because they fail to “facilitate diffusion, cohesion, and integration of a social network by linking otherwise distant nodes” (Centola and Macy 2007). Contrastingly, weak relational ties are structurally strong because it provides access to new types of information, which increases the rate of its distribution, cutting across the social topology (Granovetter 1973). Therefore, differences in translation outcome is
still possible because actors are embedded in multiple structures (Friedland and Alford 1991) which may influence the translation processes of distinct actors in different ways. The section below presents an argument that translation between-context is likely to generate more distinct outcomes primarily because translators are drawing on distinct logics and re-enacting practices in a different institutional environment.

4.4.2 Translation between context

Translation between-context occurs when abstractions of what is assumed to occur in one context is concretized in another context. Distinct from within-context translation, which is driven by perceived or self-identified similarity with other actors, the proposed driver of between-context translation is the aspiration to become similar to an identified actor. This process often implies the need to modify the representation of cultural categories that belong to a particular group (representational practice). For example, the spread of a managerial model across national borders became much easier when Japanese and US organizations were re-framed as economic organizations (Ouchi 1981). Another study, for instance, identifies that marketers in Asia position their brands based on an imagined regional identity (Cayla and Eckhardt 2008; Cayla and Eckhardt 2007). This positioning strategy highlights East Asia’s connectedness as a modern, urban culture, and establishes the presence of a distinct regional culture that extends beyond any particular national identity. The notion of imagined communities draws on Anderson’s (1983) seminal study on nationalism, which states that a nation is a socially constructed community imagined by the people who perceive themselves as belonging to that group. This concept parallels Simmel’s (1903 in Cayla and Eckhardt 2008, p. 218) perception that “a border is not a geographical fact that has sociological consequences; instead boundaries are sociological facts that take geographical and political form.” As such, by re-imagining Asian
identity, marketers deemphasize the apparent differences between Asian nations by centering on the similarities in a deterritorialized space in the minds of the consumers.

In addition to modifying the representation of homogenized actors, translation between-context also requires a redefinition of the traveling idea or practice. Adjustments are made by way of narrowing, expanding, or modifying the depictions being transported through representational practice. Actors from one context identify and interpret the representational practices of another and represent it in a way adaptable in its own context. This process can also be understood as *frame transformation*, which relates to “redefining activities, events, and biographies that are already meaningful from the standpoint of some primary framework, in terms of another framework, such that they are now ‘seen by the participants to be something quite else’” (Goffman, 1974, p. 45). In essence, distinct contexts can be characterized by divergent ways in which ideas and practices are being translated, namely marked by a frame transformation. In other words, two distinct contexts can be expected to diverge in the ways an issue is framed.

As noted, when translations generate and are guided by a comparable—though not necessarily identical—set of logic, practices might be performed in more similar manners. Conversely, when imitators draw on distinct cultural schemas and translations are guided by distinct sets of institutional logics, the translation outcome can be expected to be significantly different from their enactments in the original setting. Additionally, outcome variation may also be further exacerbated by the fact that the institutional configurations of the new context are distinct (Shove and Pantzar 2005). Distinct contexts are marked by existence of different types, roles, and powers of involved stakeholders. Rules or institutions readily taken for granted in one context may not be available in another. Therefore translation always requires the reinvention of
a practice. To illustrate, in a study on the spread of Nordic walking from its original Finnish context to the UK, Shove and Pantzar (2005, p. 61) identify that “innovations in practice are not simply determined by the generation of new products, images or skills. What really matters is the way in which constituent elements fit together.” They further state that, “practices like Nordic walking are always ‘homegrown,’ woven together, maybe with new ingredients, but always against the backdrop of previous, related and associated ways of ‘doing’ – in this case, ways of ‘doing walking’” (Shove and Pantzar 2005, p. 62). Therefore, the enactments of Nordic walking depend on the schemas and resources available in a particular locality. Nordic walking moved across transnational boundaries not as a practice, but a fluid concept. Facing the competition of trekking poles, a lack of governmental support unlike that experienced in Finland, as well as cultural barriers in terms of lower tolerance of UK citizens to ‘look extremely silly’ when exercising, Nordic walking was reinvented with a new set of meanings. As opposed to being identified as a type of leisure or ‘fun’ activity like that in its native origin, Nordic walking became translated to a form of serious exercise to promote health and well-being in the UK (Shove and Pantzar 2005). Similarly, in their effort to import the practice of diversity management – an American managerial practice – to Denmark, Danish managers (i.e., translators) reframed the practice from one that relates to workforce integration and professional development of marginalized groups toward a financially sound managerial practice that is in line with principles of democracy and human development (Boxenbaum 2006). Shove and Pantzar (2005, p. 57) succinctly describe the process of between-context translation by emphasizing that upon translation “the resulting practice will be significantly marked by a specific configuration of images, institutions and practitioners…Although the symbolic ingredients are similar [health, outdoor life, nature] they are not identical, nor do they knit
together in quite the same way. It is, therefore, possible that the necessary links will not be made on any scale and that the elements [of Nordic walking] will never quite cohere.”

Wilk’s (1995) conceptualization of structures of common differences can potentially be utilized to explain the outcome patterns of within-context and between-context translation. Wilk (1995) explains the process in which global culture appears to be homogenizing, but notes that the global cultural system structures difference. At the macro level, these structures identify the dimensions of difference in ways that are commonly understandable by people across the world. However the content of culture itself will be always be distinct because they are subject to local translation. Local enactments thus reflect a process of within-context translation, and the spread of similar enactments to other social groupings is a process of between-context translation.

This conceptualization may be used to explain the global spread or acceptance of Valentine’s Day as a globalizing holiday, yet also explains the multiplicity of translation – including rejection by certain groups- at the micro level. Driven by aspirations to belong to an imagined global community of practice, Valentine’s Day rituals are performed by the urban and middle-upper classes of Japan (Minowa et al. 2011), Ghana (Fair 2004), and Indonesia. However, the associations and micro-level practices relating to the holiday are distinct. Such patterns can also be expected to echo at lower levels (e.g., within country) of analysis, in which distinct groups (e.g., marketers, urban celebrants, religious conservatives) may also perform Valentine’s Day in distinct manners, thus highlighting the scalability of practices and usefulness of analyzing practices at different levels of contexts as well as the interactions between distinct levels of context.
4.5 Micro-meso-macro levels of analysis

In this section, the issue of how translation occurs given multiple (micro, meso, macro) levels of context is addressed. Corresponding to different levels of contexts, Penaloza and Mish (2011) identify three levels through which multiple actors in markets develop meaning and negotiate value. At the micro level are meanings that are made and negotiated through individual judgments and interpretations, such as an individual’s set of values. Here, value refers to the result of personal evaluation or summary judgment and relates to terms such as affect, attitude, evaluation, predisposition, and opinions (Holbrook 1999). At the meso-level are societal norms and standards that guide action and judgment-making at the micro level, which parallels values that relate to standards from which judgment is drawn and relates to terms such as rules, norms, goals, and ideals. Functioning at the macro level are cosmological principles that reflect larger social patterns and trends. Subsequently, norms and standards of the meso level are assumed to derive from and inform cosmological principles at the macro level.

These levels do not consist of distinct sets of actors, in which a macro level actor is bigger or at a higher level than micro level actor. Instead, meso and macro level actors are aggregate framings of individual actors performing value creating practices. Borrowing Wenger’s (2008) terminology, these levels reflect different constellation of practices that emerge from different ways of framing (Chandler and Vargo 2011). In reality, they consist of seamless webs of individual or micro level practices.

4.5.1 Interaction at distinct levels of analysis

The proposed model enables market practices to be analyzed at distinct levels of analysis. Zooming in to the micro-level, markets are enacted as individuals perform normalizing, representational, and integrative practices in their respective value co-creation processes. The
outcome of one type of practice is translated to enact another practice, generating a continuous
link of translation. This series of translation is the essence of the fractal model, as this is the
process that is echoed at the other levels. In Figure 2, micro-level enactments are depicted by
micro level actors (individuals; A, B, C) performing their respective market (normalizing,
representational, and integration) practices. A micro-level analysis thus relates to the study of
interactions between distinct individuals that contribute to a particular link of translation, marked
by overlap on a particular idea, meaning, or way of doing [interactions within the confines of the
blue dotted circles]. This reflects a process of frame convergence, in which various actors –that
may otherwise diverge in other aspects- contribute to the shaping (translation) of a particular
representation (representational practice) and the inherent links of translations to other types of
practices). Such convergence enables these distinct actors to be perceived as a relatively cohesive
(homogenous) unit (e.g., group 1, group 2, group 3, etc.) as their interactions lead to the
collaboratively creation of a distinct cultural context.

Zooming out to a meso level, market practices are observed to be enacted by an aggregate
of actors that function or can be identified as a single or relatively homogenous entity, such as a
group, an organization, a community of practice, a cultural grouping, a nation. In Figure 2, meso-
level actors are those exemplified by the blue dotted-circles that reflect a relatively homogenous
group of actors (e.g., group 1, group 2, group 3, etc.) enacting market practices as a synchronized
entity. The boundaries of a meso-level actor are arbitrarily defined, namely by the involved
actors that overlap in terms of how they frame an issue or practice, or as identified by a
researcher or observer in which different clusters of actors optimally diverge on how they frame
an issue or practice. Thus, as noted in Figure 2, distinct contexts are marked by frame
divergence, whilst converging on the utilization of such issue or practice in their value co-creating practices, labeled as a process of resource convergence.

Zooming out even further, market practices can be analyzed at a macro level, where practices take place between distinct meso level entities. A macro-level analysis studies the interrelationships taking place between meso-levels; aggregates of actors [see Figure 2: within the dotted blue circles], and therefore focuses on the interactions within broader systems of practice [ see Figure 2: within the red dotted circles]. The following section describes in brief how translation between and across distinct levels of contexts takes place.

Micro-to-micro level translation
Translation at the micro-level occurs when transformation of practice is enacted at the individual level. This most likely occurs through direct person-to-person interaction, otherwise regarded as interpersonal channels of communication (Mahajan et al. 1990; Rogers 2003 [1962]). For example, Ghanaians who had relatives living abroad were the first to learn about the celebration of Valentine’s Day, referred to in short by locals as Val Day (Fair 2004). Additionally, the first customers to purchase Valentine’s Day greeting cards in Ghana were those who had returned from living abroad.

Meso-to-meso level translation
Translation at the meso level refers to translation that occurs at an organizational level, or between relatively homogenous groups of actors. The translating actors themselves might comprise of individuals or a set of individuals, but their association to a given position or role in a particular organization define their acts as a meso level practice. Cultural brokers working in television, music, publishing industries, trading companies, advertising agencies and department stores (Tobin 1992) are some of the examples. For example, when Nintendo of America
attempted to market Pokemon to the Western market, they altered the cartoon’s storyline to have unquestionable battles between good and bad which was a translation from the more morally ambiguous story developed by Nintendo Japan (Allison 2004). The spread of management theories or practices, like the employment of ISO 9000 quality certificates (Guler et al. 2002), diversity management (Boxenbaum 2006), or human resources management (Mazza and Alvarez 2000), although possibly spearheaded by an individual or group of actors, reflect a meso-to-meso level translation.

**Macro-to-macro level translation**

In theory macro-to-macro levels of translation occurs across complex systems. The implementation of a market mechanism or notions of a global consumer culture (Alden et al. 1999) are examples of these macro level practices. For example, although market mechanisms appear to be the natural solution in resource allocation, it only reflects one of many ways of economic ordering (Slater and Tonkiss 2001). Other forms of economic orders exist, like that of sharing (Belk 2010) or centralized distribution. Depending on how the researcher frames an interaction, macro-to-macro levels of interaction may include translation between countries, or between regional organizations such as, the European Union and the United Nations, or ASEAN and the African Union. However, the question of whether macro-to-macro level interactions can be observed becomes a debatable issue, as in practice, these interactions can essentially be analyzed as exchanges between meso-level organizations.

Regardless, the main purpose of this multilevel understanding of context is to raise an awareness of the embeddedness of individual level practices in a broader set of practices and the interactivity between higher and lower order contexts of practice. Not only does interaction take
place between contexts of comparable levels, translation can also occur between distinct levels, as will be discussed below.

4.5.2 Interaction across distinct levels of contexts

Understanding that there are distinct levels of contexts, market practices can be translated between individuals in one context and another context at the micro level, or at the meso or macro level. Translations can also take place across-levels through interactions between micro-meso level contexts, meso-macro, or micro-macro contexts, therefore highlighting the significance of multi-level perspectives and analysis. In a study exploring the marketing and popularity of Hello Kitty as a means to understand ‘pink globalization,’ which is “the transnational spread of goods and images labeled as *kawaii* [English: cute] from Japan to other parts of the industrial world,” sociologist Yano (2013, p. 19) argues that “Hello Kitty gains meaning as well as creates conditions for large-scale processes of which it is a part.” More specifically, Yano (2013, p. 9) states that “this macroperspective embraces the complex factors that frame the phenomenon of both production and reception: nation-cultures, political interrelationships, and global economies. At the same time *Pink Globalization* seeks to intertwine these with the microperspective of everyday lives –of girl tweens and their badges of belonging, of housewives and their all-pink kitchenware, of punk rockers and their in-your-face co-optations, of Asian Americans and their icons of ethnic identity, of media mavens an their newly black pink.” This quote reflects the interactive multi-level processes at play that can only be observed by zooming in and out of micro, meso, and macro level practice.
Cross-level-context translations

Meso-macro level translations may occur when organizations draw on what is perceived to be global ideas or conventions. Meso-level enactments could then potentially filter down to influence micro-meso level translations that occur when individuals learn of new or foreign practices through organizations or cultural brokers in their home or foreign contexts. Most often this occurs when individuals have access to media or broadcasting material that convey foreign ideas and practices. For example, individual actors may learn of foreign brands, slang, or conventions through exposure of foreign-content advertising, television, or movies, or through their interactions with professional organizations or media that introduce them to new ideas. Communication through mass media channels, thus, reflects a micro-meso level of translation.

Micro-macro translations may manifest through the aspirations of individuals to belong to a global culture, which symbolizes notions of modernity, freedom, and individuality, through acquisition of global brands (Batra et al. 2000; Hannerz 1992). Such purchases, as Yano (2013, p. 9) states, “signifies membership in a sorority of modern global consumers who have access to these goods through formal and informal distribution systems, disposable income, knowledge, and taste.”

4.6 Translation over Time

In addition to multiple levels of context framing, Chandler and Vargo (2011) identify a meta-layer of context that accounts for the time dimension. The translation process of translation drives change and stability, thus reflecting a simultaneous and continual process of institutionalization and deinstitutionalization. This process can only be observed over time and is depicted in Figure 3.
5 Research Propositions

The proposed fractal model of market translation provides a conceptual explanation for how practices are translated from one cultural context to another given an understanding of markets as service ecosystems. Essentially, translation is marked by a tension between converging and diverging forces. Disparate actors guided by distinct institutions converge by way of value co-creation and resource integration, in that their value creating efforts interweave, directly or indirectly, as they serve as resources for one another.

The model points towards the translation between three key market practices as the fractal element that can be observed at any level of framing. The model highlights representational practice as a critical element in the exploration of the process of practice translation. This is because among the outcome of representational practices –depictions, descriptions– are relatively abstract, malleable, and relatively easier to shape and carry across contexts. As proposed, translation between and within context are marked by a convergence or divergence in these depictions. More specifically, this study operationalizes depictions as frames, and identifies a tendency for frames to converge within context, and for frames to diverge across distinct contexts. Given distinct contexts and socialization experiences, actors guided by and contributing to a particular logic may converge in terms of their representational practice, but diverge from the representational practices of groups that comprise other contexts; they differ in terms of how they interpret or imbue meaning unto a particular practice.

Actors may strategically transform the depiction of a practice to encourage adoption of a practice, making representational practice an effective and strategic tool in the effort to either facilitate or hamper the translation processes. Furthermore, given the chain of translation between the three market practices, a focus on one practice element (representational practice)
automatically implies an effect on the other two practices (normalizing and integrative). Specifically, by abstracting and defining the meaning of a practice (i.e., representational practice), actors activate the links of translation, by subsequently drawing rules of action that align with the representation (i.e., normalizing practice), thereby influencing the more concrete or behavioral aspects of a practice (i.e., integrative practice). By moderating meaning, value co-creating actors contribute to the molding of concrete practice. Actors with distinct value co-creation goals will gear translation in one direction versus another, manifesting in a competition in the meaning-making process, as reflected in the push-and-pull of distinct representational practices.

Given this understanding, a number of questions are brought to the front fold, which will be explored in the subsequent essays. Recognizing the benefit of utilizing representational practice as a starting point to explore the translation process, the questions focus on this practice as a foundational building block:

1) How are representations –outcomes of representational practices– translated through normalizing and integrative practices?

2) How are the competing representations reconciled, and what value co-creation opportunities arise from this process?

3) What practices contribute to the stabilizing of markets over time? In particular, what type of representation becomes increasingly prominent over time?
Figure 2. Fractal Model of Market Translation
Essay 2 will explore the first two questions in the context of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia. In this case, I identify how actors with their respective value co-creation goals (outcome of normalizing practices) contribute to the effort of defining Valentine’s Day as an emerging practice in the nation (representational practices), by implication influencing enactment, in this case acceptance or rejection, towards the holiday (integrative practices). The study will explore how distinct representations of the holiday –narrowed or widened reinterpretations of the celebration– are reconciled. Essay 2 will identify distinct representations of Valentine’s Day and zoom in to trace the respective chains of translations that follow. The study also zooms out to explore the interaction between the distinct practices surrounding the
different representations to provide a detailed picture of the reconciliation of meaning taking place.

Essay 3 addresses the third question by incorporating a longitudinal analysis to explore how the contestation of meaning develops over time. The assumption is that wider more encompassing representations of the holiday will be proposed to accommodate for the varied perspectives. The purpose is to explore whether meanings persist, become wider, narrower or even polarized over time, as a reflection of the reconciliation process.

6 Conclusion

This essay integrates service-dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch 2004) and the markets-as-practice framework (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006) to present a fractal model of market co-creation as a means to explore how practices are translated when it moves from one cultural context to another. This model relies on a shift in perspective regarding some fundamental marketing perspectives, namely: 1) from an exogenous to endogenous approach to markets (Araujo et al. 2010; Mele et al. 2014), 2) from an understanding of marketing as facilitating diffusion to one of translation (Czarniawska and Sevon 1996), and 3) from perceiving context as having fixed boundaries to context being determined through a process of framing (Chandler and Vargo 2011). These theoretical shifts imply a focus on practice over products, in which market actors are expected to shift away from an overemphasis on the physical characteristics of goods, toward an understanding of resource integrating practices collaboratively performed to create markets. The role of the marketer is not necessarily to modify a product but to find ways to translate value propositions that offer value co-creating opportunities in a given context.
The fractal model of market co-creation hinges on the notion that idea and practices travel as markets are enacted through the translation between three key market practices: representational, normalizing, and integrative. Markets are perceived to emerge through the enactment and institutionalization of links between these three market practices (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007). Additionally, practice is perceived as institutions (Lounsbury and Crumley 2007) and translation as a process of institutionalization (Czarniawska and Sevon 1996).

A fractal is a geometric concept in which smaller parts of a figure are echoes of the larger figure (Mandelbrot and Hudson 2006). In this model, the underlying fractal element is the chain of translations between representational, normalizing, and integrative practices. These practices are enacted at the individual level by respective market actors, but each actor is connected within a web of exchange and interaction with other market enacting actors. Depending on the level of framing, market translation thus can be observed at the micro, meso, and macro level, in which each level of observation is a fractal element of the other. While micro level practices are influenced by meso level practices, meso level practices are essentially an aggregation of micro level practices. This perspective highlights the need to understand that value creation does not occur in isolation. Actors do not stand alone but are subsumed and connected to broader processes. Thus an understanding of micro level enactments requires an understanding of broader (meso, macro) level enactments, and vice versa.

The value of this model lies in the possibility to study parts of a market ecosystem but still be able to see its connections relative to the broader context as well as in relation to the lower level practices it comprises.
III. ESSAY 2

1 Introduction

In Essay 1, a fractal model of market co-creation was proposed through the integration of the service-dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch 2004), service ecosystems perspective (Vargo and Lusch 2011) and the market-as-practices framework (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007). The model establishes the translation of practices as foundational to value co-creation, which necessitates and facilitates a process of resource integration by way of exchange (Bagozzi 1975), sharing (Belk 2010), or other resource allocation mechanisms (Mauss 1990; Sherry et al. 1993). At the core of these value co-creation practices, are individual level enactments of market (i.e., representational, normalizing, and integrative) practices (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007). Analyzed at different levels of aggregation, these practices can be observed as fractals scalable to reflect micro, meso, or macro levels of practices (Chandler and Vargo 2011; Penaloza and Mish 2011). Furthermore, the model highlights that practices change as they are translated from one cultural context to another or adopted by one social group from another, and proposes that markets emerge as a consequence of and at the intersection of disparate value co-creation practices (Callon 1986; Latour 1986). This fractal model, thus, presents a collaborative process of market creation that emerges through the interweaving of distinct individual and collective value creation efforts, which drives and is driven by the circulation as well as the change and eventual stabilization of practices.

To note, context plays a critical role in the process of resource integration and value co-creation because it influences how actors understand and determine value (Vargo et al. 2008) as well as act upon existing resources (Sewell 1992). Actors also draw upon each other as resources, which enables each individual to uniquely affect other actors at a micro level and
contribute directly or indirectly to the broader meso, macro context as well (Chandler and Vargo 2011). Iteratively, how actors draw upon objects and one another as operand or operant resources is also contingent upon the cultural toolkit that is determined by the contexts in which they are embedded (Swidler 1986). In essence, context frames the ways in which exchanges takes place (Chandler and Vargo 2011), therefore influencing the process of market co-creation.

As distinct actors are continually integrating resources with different sets of actors, context is ever changing and fluid. Context is often guided by a dominant institutional logic (Thornton and Ocasio 2008; Thornton and Ocasio 1999). However, a more detailed look at any institutional arena will reveal the interplay of multiple institutional spheres, which thus becomes the venue for the interaction between multiple institutional logics (Thornton and Ocasio 1999). Friedland and Alford (1991) for example, identify a number of key institutions (e.g., the market, bureaucratic state, democracy, nuclear family, Christian religion) that co-exist to shape the individual preferences and organizational interests of the contemporary capitalist West. Important to note that they do not reflect institutions narrowly defined as organizations, but in a broader sense in terms of taken-for-granted rules that come guiding principles for action. In some cases, the logics are well aligned, as is the case between Protestantism and capitalism in the early 20th century (Weber et al. 2002). In other cases, however, the guiding principles of these distinct institutions may contradict or compete against each other, as reflected in the conflicting values of Puritanism and agrarian tradition which, among others, supported post-harvest behavior which was marked by celebratory excess (Nissenbaum 1996). Competing institutional logics can also be observed at the industry level, as exemplified in the tension between science and care logic in the field of medical education (Dunn and Jones 2010) as well as the strain between editorial versus market logic in the area of higher education publishing (Thornton and
Ocasio 1999). Practice translation and market co-creation thus, takes place amidst the complexities of context that is reflected through the co-existence of multiple institutional spheres and micro level interactions that inform and are informed by meso, macro levels of interactions (Akaka et al. 2013).

The purpose of Essay 2 is to explore how translation occurs in the context of inter-institutional spheres that are guided by distinct institutional logics. The celebration of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia is selected as an empirical context to explore how a foreign, Western, secular practice is translated locally among a multiethnic, Eastern, and predominantly Muslim population.

The theoretical section that follows highlights the significant role of culture and interpretive processes as a means to better understand the mechanisms of practice translation within and between distinct cultural contexts. Diffusion research in two bodies of literature – social movement as well as organizational studies – are drawn. The social movement literature is relevant because the key focus of any social movement is the ability to generate support and mobilize action among interested as well as indifferent actors (McAdam et al. 1996; McAdam and Rucht 1993). Interestingly, research in both fields has identified the significance of interpretive frames and the need to approach framing as a strategic practice to facilitate translation (Benford and Snow 2000; Boxenbaum 2006; Snow and Benford 1988). At its core, frame alignment is identified as a key process in generating collective action in relation to social movements (Snow et al. 1986). Similarly, an organizational study regarding the importation of foreign managerial practices into new cultural contexts has also underlined the importance of strategic reframing to ensure success in translation success (Boxenbaum 2006). The insights...
provided from these disparate fields of study will serve this current study by providing the foundation to better understand translation in the context of inter-institutional spheres.

2 Theoretical Background

The spread of ideas and practices within and between contexts have been explained through at least two pathways (Snow et al. 2008). Hierarchical models assume that circulation of an idea or practice takes place in a top-down manner, in which the practices of high status members are emulated by lower status members (Wejnert 2002). On the other hand, the proximal approach assumes that actors will imitate others they perceive as spatially or culturally relevant (Soule 1997). Ideas and practices can circulate through direct contact by way of network ties, or indirectly through media as well as identification with a shared social or cultural category (McAdam and Rucht 1993). Practices diffuse if they are regarded as salient, familiar and compelling (Strang and Soule 1998). Aligning with the notion of homophily, actors seek the familiar and interact more intensively with others they perceive more similar to themselves (McPherson et al. 2001). This implies that the ideas and practices likely to be translated will reinforce preexisting views and attitudes (McPherson et al. 2001), particularly given shared value co-creation goals.

If an actor’s interest, identity, value, and assumptions are embedded within a given institutional logic (Thornton and Ocasio, 2008), this begs the question of how novel ideas and practices come to be adopted and adapted in a foreign context? Studies on the importation of foreign managerial practices point toward several critical factors and micro-level processes of translation between contexts (Boxenbaum 2006; Boxenbaum and Battilana 2005). Boxenbaum and Battilana (2005) note that a key facilitating factor in the selection to transport a managerial
practice across distinct contexts or national boundaries is the existence of a meso (field) level problem that requires a novel solution and the presence of actors who are motivated and able to import such practice. Actors usually assert individual preference when deciding on a particular practice that is worthy of importation. These preferences often reflect their personal and professional trajectories (Boxenbaum 2006). Such actors often have exposure to these unique practices due to their multiple embeddedness, i.e. socialization in different groups, thus enabling them to introduce new ideas to a given context.

In order to increase the success rate of a translation process, a new idea or practice needs to fit with the local context (Hargadon and Douglas 2001), therefore requiring some degrees of retrofitting. “Practices are always adapted when implemented in other social or organizational settings, no matter how different these practices. The creation of new forms and innovative elements are part of the imitation process since there are no ready-made models which remain unchanged as they spread” (Boxenbaum and Battilana 2005, p. 375). Ansari et al. (2010, p. 68) focus on the critical role of establishing _fit_, defined as “the degree to which characteristics of a practice are consistent with the (perceived) needs, objectives, and structure of an adopting organization…which should be assessed as an issue of dynamic fit between practices and adopter and that this fit is influenced by technical, cultural, and political factors.” This assertion also aligns with the concepts of “strategic selection” and “strategic fitting” (Benford and Snow 2000) in which, respectively, either the importer or the exporter of the foreign idea plays an active role in strategically selecting and adapting or borrowing or accommodating the new idea or practice to fit into a new cultural context.

Building on a cultural understanding of the translation process, research has identified the importance of frames and framing in facilitating the spread of ideas and practices across distinct
cultural contexts. Adapting Goffman’s seminal work on frame analysis (Goffman 1974) for the study of social movements, Snow and Benford (1992, p. 137) define frame(s) as “interpretive schema that simplifies and condenses the ‘world out there’ by punctuating and encoding objects, situations, events, experiences, and sequences of action.” Frames are “schemata of interpretation’ that enable individuals ‘to locate, perceive, identify, and label’ occurrences within their life space and the world at large. By rendering events or occurrences meaningful, frames function to organize experience and guide action, whether individual or collective” (Snow et al. 1986, p. 464).

Framing is “an active, processual phenomenon that implies agency and contention at the level of reality construction” (Benford and Snow 2000, p. 614). Framing occurs in context, but within a greater system of practice that is determined by existing contradictions as well as past trajectories (Zald 1996). As values, identity and action are embedded within a pre-existing institutional arrangement and related logic (Thornton and Ocasio 2008), it is necessary to discuss the relationship between institutional logics and frames. In explaining this connection, Boxenbaum (2006) states that, “institutional logics inform field frames and assign power to them. A field frame is most powerful when its underlying logic implicitly sets the agenda, that is, when it invisibly determines which goals, actions, arguments, and actors are positioned as most desirable and legitimate.” A field frame serves as the foundation for institutionalized practices in a certain practice domain that corresponds to the application of a dominant institutional logic in a particular field of practice (Boxenbaum 2006). Whereas institutional logics are more general and can be employed in many different organizational fields or areas of practice, a field frame is more specific in that it guides behavior in a specific area of practice. According to Lounsbury, et al. (2003, p. 72) field frame is “an intermediate concept that has the durability and stickiness of
an institutional logic, but akin to strategic framing, it is endogenous to a field of actors and is subject to challenge and modification.”

Framing is a dynamic, strategic, competitive process (Zald 1996) that takes place within complex system of practices that involves multiple organizations and multiple institutional arenas (McAdam et al. 1996). Framing works in the middle of and contributes to the creation of contested spaces. Thus translators essentially take part in a framing contest to develop frames that align with current world events, can be perceived as credible, and resonates best with the cultural narratives of a specific locality (Snow and Benford 1988). Additionally, Snow and Benford (1988) assert that for a frame to be appealing, it must be consistent with the internal structure of the greater belief system, among others by having hierarchical salience in relation to other elements in the greater belief system (centrality), as well as a relatively high degree of range (i.e., can be linked to more than one core belief value) and interrelatedness with other ideas within the greater belief system.

In their research, Snow et al. (1986) highlight the importance of frame alignment in generating support for social movement organizations (SMOs). They define frame alignment as, “the linkage of individual and SMO interpretive orientations, such that some set of individual interests, values and beliefs and SMO activities, goals, and ideology are congruent and complementary” (Snow et al. 1986, p. 464). Frame alignment can be achieved through a number of processes, among others frame bridging (connecting two or more frames that are ideologically congruent but structurally unconnected regarding a particular issue), frame amplification (embellishment or clarification of existing values or beliefs), frame extension (depicting a problem beyond primary interests to include issues perceived to be important to potential
Similarly, in the field of organizational studies, Boxenbaum (2006) identifies strategic reframing as a key process that can optimally support the mobilization of resources for, and the implementation and spread of a new idea or practice. Strategic framing is an approach to achieving fit which more specifically refers to the process of making strategic considerations about how to (re)frame an idea or practice in such a manner so that it becomes appealing to key players in the local context (Boxenbaum 2006). Strategic reframing is often characterized by a process of frame transformation, “redefining activities, events, and biographies that are already meaningful from the standpoint of some primary framework, in terms of another framework, such that they are now ‘seen by the participants to be something quite else’” (Goffman 1974, p. 45). For example, in the case of diversity management in Denmark, managers who imported the practice were personally intrigued by the human development aspect of the management practice, but agreed that framing the practice in terms financial performance would gain more supporters (Boxenbaum 2006).

Boxenbaum (2006) also identifies how translators engage in local grounding subsequent to employing a process of strategic reframing. Local grounding relates to the merging of foreign practice elements with elements of local practices. In this case, translators attached diversity management with the pre-existing practice of corporate social responsibility (CSR). They identified elements of CSR that were compatible with diversity management and integrated them to the frame of diversity management.

In essence, the above explanation signifies the role of frames and framing in the translation process. Drawing from the proposed fractal framework of market co-creation, the
process of framing is very much aligned with representational practice. More specifically, ideas and practices can be represented through distinct frames that align well with potential followers and can be adjusted to meet the specific objective of the translator (accept vs. reject). As such, I operationalize the research question of this study by incorporating frames as a key concept.

3 Research Question

As noted in the introduction, the purpose of this study is to understand the process of translation given overlapping institutional spheres and related logics. The observed context of the enactment of Valentine’s Day is thus approached as a contested practice, in which distinct actors take part in a framing contest. In other words, various actors engage in active processes of framing to create and control the meaning of the holiday. Analysis will thus focus on identifying the distinct frames and the proponents of these framings as well as how different players contribute to the reinforcement of a specific or number of different framings. Furthermore, analysis will try to explore how such representational practices contribute to the greater process of market co-creation. This study thus aims to investigate framing contests that occur within complex, multi-institutional arenas (McAdam et al. 1996; Meyer 1995) by addressing the following research questions:

1. What are the different ways in which Valentine’s Day in Indonesia is framed? Who frames in this way?
2. How do distinct framing attempts undertaken by distinct actors influence each other?
3. How do these framing processes influence the circulation and translation of such practices?
4 Research Context

Research context plays a significant role towards the development of theory (Arnould 2006). As a means for understanding translation in the process of market co-creation, I utilize the celebration of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia as a research context. I focus on the celebration of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia because the phenomenon provides a rich context for studying how a seemingly foreign idea – Western, secular yet Christian-based – is negotiated and performed in an equally foreign setting, one that is dominated by Eastern and Muslim values.

Valentine’s Day is a holiday built around the idea that romantic love needs to be expressed, materialized, or celebrated through the enactment of a number of rituals, which includes, but is not limited to, gift-giving. Celebrated across the globe every February 14, the holiday may involve market facing (e.g. purchase of flowers, chocolate, and gifts) and non-market facing practices (e.g. dating, family practice, religious practice). Unlike Christmas, Easter, Hanukkah or Kwanzaa, Valentine’s Day is a secular celebration that is not currently tied to any cultural, ethnic, or religious associations and thus, more aligned with other inclusive rather than exclusive practices. The celebration is often attributed to Saint Valentine, widely known today as the patron of romantic love. However, as will be explained in more detail below, the true origins of the holiday in general and its association to Saint Valentine in particular is still debated. In brief, the holiday is mostly built on myth rather than fact. It is precisely because of these vague origins and associations that Valentine’s Day is selected as the context of study of this dissertation. The elusiveness of the holiday exposes Valentine’s Day to multiple interpretations, which provides opportunity for contestation and molding. It is this negotiation, among various actors, to create and control meaning of the holiday that allows for a meaningful observation of the translation process. Similarly, Nissenbaum (1996, p. 5) asserts in reference to
studying the celebration of Christmas, “it isn’t very useful, finally, to try to pin down… the precise rituals of some ‘traditional’ holiday season. Those boundaries and rituals changed over time and varied from one place to another. What is more useful, in any setting, is to look for the dynamics of an ongoing context, a push and a pull—sometimes a real battle—between those who wished to expand the season and those who wished to contract and restrict it.” The strategic reframing efforts expended by various actors to contribute to the shaping and molding of the perception and practice of Valentine’s Day provides a relatively more visible translation process, thus providing a better opportunity to study the translation process.

Indeed, in many parts of the world, particularly in countries greatly influenced by conservative national or religious culture, the practice of Valentine’s Day is being actively framed as a foreign, Western, or Christian holiday, and has thus increasingly become a subject of contestation (Flock 2012; Mellman 2011). For example, in India, Valentine’s Day is equally rejected by Indian intellectuals and leftists who condemn it as a form of Western imperialism as well as by Hindu extremists who cite public display of affection as going against cultural norms and values. In Kyrgistan, the city officials of Osh prohibited students from celebrating the holiday, citing it as bad influence on children’s morality (Ghosh 2014). Likewise, officials of Belgorod, Russia called off any Valentine’s Day celebrations because they did not find the holiday to contribute to the growth of spiritual and moral values of the city’s youth.

In Indonesia, particularly, the celebration of Valentine’s Day is mostly welcomed with open arms by moderate-minded middle class urbanites. Couples, children, teenagers, housewives and husbands participate in the holiday rituals to varying degrees. Mainstream advertisers, fashion journalists, marketers and media promote the holiday as a secular celebration of universal love. However, the holiday is disputed by conservative Muslims who cite potential
cultural and religious erosion ("Muslim organizations warn of ‘dark world’ of Valentine’s Day" 2014b). Various practices to delegitimize the rituals take place, including efforts by some chapters of the Indonesian Ulema Council to label Valentine’s Day as *haram* or forbidden under Islam, particularly because of accusations that the holiday was prone to religiously intolerable unrestricted expressions of love (Jakarta Post 2011). Other narratives challenging the holiday include that it is a ‘Western’ holiday that erodes local culture or a Christian ritual that is non-Islamic.

Despite arguments to delegitimize the celebration, various actors take part in co-creating Valentine’s Day. Various individuals react by participating in, retracting from, or actively contesting the practice of Valentine’s Day. It is this particular tension that makes Valentine’s Day in Indonesia an interesting context to study. The study of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia reflects the translation of a globalizing idea in a local context, which provides a strategic means to understand how value co-creating practices are translated from one cultural context to another and how their enactment enables the emergence of markets.

The main purpose is not primarily to develop a detailed description of how the holiday is celebrated given a particular cultural context. Instead it aims to explore how practice is translated within an inter-institutional society (Friedland and Alford 1991) and how it is translated across cultural contexts. As a relatively recent introduction to the Indonesian society, the rituals and meanings associated with Valentine’s Day are continually being negotiated, offering ample opportunity to explore a process of ‘markets in the making’ – an essential component to understanding markets-as-practice (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007). As various actors constantly negotiate participation in the celebration, Valentine’s Day manifests from a process of an active and ongoing process of translation. Analyzing a contested
and changing phenomenon better exposes the various processes that take place in the appropriation of a market practice in a given field, therefore suitable for the purposes of this study.

In the following section, to provide a greater understanding of the research context, I conduct a more thorough exploration about holiday rituals and provide a deeper contextualization of the history of Valentine’s Day in particular, and its current practice in other parts of the world, which sets up the background for this research.

4.1 Holidays and Rituals

Holidays are a specific set of days that are distinguished from everyday life. They are designated for the celebration of social transitions or the commemoration of historical and religious events and/or people (Etzioni and Bloom 2004). On these days, it is customary for people to defer from work and business-related activities to set aside “time out of time” for the enactment of particular sets of practices (Falassi 1987), namely rituals assumed to occupy a sacred space outside the more secular sphere of the market (Belk et al. 1989). As noted, rituals and holidays are celebrated as a means “to separate and protect the sacred from the profane, the social and spiritual from labor and commerce” (Etzioni 2004, p. 4). Some rituals are performed cyclically to align with changing seasons of the year (Caplow 2004), while others are enacted to mark liminal stages, such as graduation, birth, wedding, or death (Turner 1969). In addition to religious holidays (Christmas, Passover, Eid), there are holidays created to build nationalistic morale (Independence Day), signify historical events (Memorial Day, Veterans Day), or commemorate important figures (Martin Luther King Day, Washington Day; Hobswam and Ranger 2008). Meanwhile, other celebrations, despite their respectable motivations, are often
perceived to be created predominantly for commercial gain (Mother's Day, Father's Day, Administrative Professional's Day; Santino 1995; Santino 1996).

The term ‘holiday’ and ‘ritual’ are often used interchangeably, namely because the celebration of holidays are characterized by numerous rituals like that of gift exchange, flag raising, Turkey carving, Christmas tree decorating, Easter egg hunting, or participation in religious services. Holiday celebrations are often symbolic because the connection between the purpose and the essential elements of the holiday (e.g., food, activities, or rules of enactment) are arbitrary (Etzioni and Bloom 2004). In other words, the elements of ritual, including the objects involved, worshiped, or celebrated do not necessarily have any inherent relation to the actual purpose of the holiday. Instead, these objects are imbued with specific meaning that transcend their literal and explicit forms (Otnes and Scott 1996), which may explain why lighting a candle during a baptism ceremony carries more meaning than doing so during a blackout and why presenting a box of chocolate for a loved one on Valentine’s Day is perceived as distinct from purchasing them at a discount the following day. To further illustrate, the artifacts commonly associated with Christmas (e.g., Yule log, candles, holly, mistletoe, the Christmas tree) are in fact part of pagan tradition that have no association with the birth of Jesus (Nissenbaum 1996).

When holidays are celebrated over time in a similar manner, their rituals eventually become tradition (Etzioni 2004). Inversely, the performance of rituals is also rooted in the views and traditions of people in a given locality. As Falassi (1987, p. 2) notes “the social function and symbolic meaning of the festival are closely related to a series of overt values that the community recognizes as essential to its ideology and worldview, to its social identity, its historical continuity and to its physical survival, which is ultimately what festival celebrates.”
The carrying out of tradition through repeated enactment of rituals can therefore be understood as a specific form of institutionalized practice.

Rituals are important because they function to maintain social order, create community by uniting people through shared consciousness and moral responsibility, as well as facilitate change or transformation (Driver 1991; Otnes and Scott 1996). They are cultural products that signify the values and beliefs of a particular group (Etzioni 2004). Changes in their practices may be used to reflect more general changes in society (Nissenbaum 1996). Iteratively, as venues for symbolizing and embodying notions of social relations, holidays also serve as opportunities for change. In his historic analysis of the changing practices related to American Christmas celebrations up until the end of the 19th century, Nissenbaum (1996, p. vii) states that “those changes were expressions of the same forces that were transforming American culture as a whole… Christmas as one of these very forces – as a cause as well as an effect, an active instrument of change as well as an indicator and mirror of change.”

A study of holidays, thus, provides a ‘refractory reading of societies’ beliefs and other attributes’ (Etzioni 2004) like that of advertising that has been noted as a ‘distorted mirror’ into the values and aspirations of a society (Pollay 1990; Pollay 1986). Exploring which holidays a society selects to observe as well as how they perceive and celebrate them (e.g., public vs. private, nationalistic vs. religious vs. militaristic, dominated by merchandising) offers an opportunity to understand transformation in the society that enact them.
4.2 Valentine’s Day: Historical Roots

In the present day, Valentine’s Day is predominantly dedicated for couples in romantic or committed relationships as a means for them to celebrate their love for each other (Close and Zinkhan 2006). Celebrants exchange appreciative gestures on this designated day, among others through the presentation of gifts as well as wine-and-dine and other intimate rituals. Perceived as a commercially geared holiday, store-bought greeting cards, chocolate, roses, or jewelry serve as the common tools to express love. The scope of the celebration, however, has also expanded to include participation by children (Close and Zinkhan 2006) who engage in baking or crafting rituals as well as exchanges of chocolate, cookies, candies, and valentines with family members at home, teachers and classmates at school, or friends in their community. Additionally, other adults in non-romantic relationships may also enjoy the festivities through similar exchanges of greetings and gifts or gathering rituals with friends and family on top of the possible practice of self-gifting (Mick and DeMoss 1990).

Tracing the origin of Valentine’s Day is an elaborate process as there are overlapping narratives that surround the history of the holiday. Religious, folk as well as aristocratic customs and traditions have blended and evolved to influence the practice of modern Valentine’s Day (Schmidt 1995). Popular press assumes that the current practice of Valentine’s Day stems from the ancient Roman festival of Lupercalia, which was celebrated every February 15th to honor the pastoral God, Lupercus. The ritual which was performed to ward off wolves was marked by men wearing strips of animal hide and also involved dancing, drinking, and frolicking (Tobin 2011). Celebrated in mixed company, the practice was assumed to evolve to a fertility ritual which required men to draw the name of a young woman in a lottery, which would designate them as
partners for –depending on sources– the duration of the celebration (Seipel 2011) or for the entire year (americancatholic.org).

The common perception is that, in the 5th century (496 AD), in an effort to expel pagan rituals, Pope Gelasius I muddled the celebrations by replacing Lupercalia with Saint Valentine's Day (Santino 1995). It was said that Gelasius changed the lottery games to have both young men and women draw the names of saints whom they would then emulate for the year. Additionally, instead of Lupercus, the patron of the feast became Valentine (Americancatholic.org). Medieval historians, however, have not found any solid evidence to support the connection between Valentine’s Day and Lupercalia (Schmidt 1995).

Furthermore, it remains unclear which Saint Valentine was celebrated as the Christian patron as there were multiple Christian saints named Valentine. In particular, two 3rd century martyrs named Valentine were emphasized in early medieval hagiography: a bishop in Terni and a priest in Rome. Both saints were noted for their untiring faith in God, prayers for divine healing, and the ability to convert pagans. Incidentally, both were supposedly decapitated on February 14th. The similarity of their stories has led a number of historians to assume that the separate narratives reflect one figure (Schmidt 1995). Despite much uncertainty, the fact remains that a saint by the name of Valentine did exist, as evidenced by a cult following. However, it was also evident that early hagiography honored the Valentine saints for their martyrdom and perseverance in the Christian faith, not for defending romantic love (Schmidt 1995).

Yet, narratives that attribute Saint Valentine to love and romance continue to evolve. Legend has it that Valentine lived under the time of rule of Claudius II, who is reported to have banned marriage because it was believed that single men made better soldiers. One legend states that Valentine secretly performed the sacrament of marriage, and when discovered, was
imprisoned for treason, while another stated that Valentine baptized some family members (Tobin 2011). Additionally, there is a story of Valentine sending his jailer’s daughter (love) letters signed, “Your Valentine” which is believed to have inspired the custom of sending love notes or cards on Valentines’ Day (Tobin 2011).

The true facts about Saint Valentine may never be recovered as his story was carried over the years mostly through oral tradition. Furthermore, factuality in early hagiography was not critical as the priority was for the church to create a story that reinforced “the mythic paradigm of Christian saintliness as well as to the interpretative understanding of the communities for which the myths were 'adapted'” (Schmidt 1995). Therefore, there is a possibility that the stories about Saint Valentine’s commitment to God was rehashed to make portray him as the defender of romantic love. Interestingly, because not enough facts are known about St. Valentine, the feast of St. Valentine was removed when the Roman the calendar was revised by Pope Paul VI. For that reason, Valentine’s Day is no longer part of the Catholic liturgy, hence, technically no longer a religious celebration.

Historian Henry Ansgar Kelly and Oscar argue that the foundations that connect Valentine and romance is more recent, namely the work of 14th century English-French poet Chaucer and his successors who attributed Valentine’s Day as a time for bird couplings and lovers mating (Schmidt 1995). Schmidt (1995) highlights how Valentine’s Day traditions were carried forward from the era of Chaucer, through three interrelated paths: religious, folk culture, and aristocratic. The Church of England was known for criticizing the development of stories that co-opted life of martyrdom for self-indulgence. However, folk traditions like drawing lots, which was considered youthful entertainment and part of a wider practice of pairing games and foretelling, persisted not only on Valentine’s Day but also performed on other special days, like
St. Agnes’s Eve. Furthermore, in the courts or among aristocrats holidays were a time for extending compliments through poetry and gift giving, which possibly created the blueprint for the current practice of sending of holiday greetings, poetic compliments, and gift exchanges. As Schmidt (1995, p. 47) explains, “from a youthful fold gathering with ample carousing and local variety, St. Valentine’s Day would emerge as an occasion for the exchange of mass-produced greetings. The new ceremonies would be intimate, personal transactions of relatively autonomous couples, not a community activity; the great themes of the new rituals would be fashion and romance rather than fate or tradition; the sovereign choices of consumers would replace the blind luck of village fortunes.”

Today, in the United States, Valentine’s Day is often referred to as a Hallmark Holiday, in other words, a holiday constructed for the sole purpose of commercialism. As Santino (1996, p. 4-5) states, “the contemporary American calendar of seasonal changes and official holidays is very much a function of industrial commerce rather than agrarian time. Our holidays both reflect and support consumer industries within a capitalist political system, and as a result, we often see that these celebrations have become too commercialized. However, one must reconcile one’s feelings about holiday commercialization with one’s attitude toward contemporary American society in general. We cannot live in a money-based, profit-driven society and expect our major ritual occasions not to reflect that society.” Indeed, since the mid 19th century, Valentine’s Day which was once a forgotten saint’s day of the Old World became reinvented primarily by printers, booksellers, lithographers to a modern American holiday (Schmidt 1995). Today, it is an $18.6 billion dollar industry (Reynoso 2013). Santino (1996, p. 7) continues, by underlining that “it is the very popularity of these holidays that forms the basis for the ever-expanding
commercialism that surrounds them.” This suggests an iterative process in which rituals mediate and are mediated by the market, which is the interplay that is of primary interest in this study.

4.3 Valentine’s Day around the Globe

The celebration of Valentine’s Day is becoming increasingly popular around the world. The holiday is well adopted and appropriated in Japan, leading to the establishment of follow-up gift-giving occasions like White Day (Creighton 1993; Minowa et al. 2011). Contrastingly, Valentine’s Day is contested in Malaysia and Indonesia (Zay 2011) and outright banned in the Muslim countries of Saudi Arabia and Iran (Ahmed 2008; Sehgal 2011). These examples illustrate the globalizing adoption of Valentine’s Day, and how its translations are distinct in various national contexts. They highlight the multiple meanings carried by a set of rituals that may inhibit or accelerate their appropriation in distinct contexts (Lofgren 2005).

Much of the study on Valentine’s Day has focused on tracing its history and development in the United States (Schmidt 1995). Valentine’s Day has also been studied in the context of gift-giving and gender-roles (Otne et al. 1994). The adoption of Valentine’s Day in non-western worlds has also been explored, specifically in Ghana (Fair 2004) and Japan (Creighton 1993; Minowa et al. 2011). These studies focus on how Valentine’s Day has been adapted in these localities, highlighting its role in changing as well as reflecting the dominant values in society.

Valentine’s Day in Japan is understood as a symbol of liberation for women. The holiday provides Japanese women the opportunity to express their feelings and affection to men, which on other occasions would otherwise be unacceptable. While Valentine’s Day appears to promote gender equality, Creighton (1993) argues that Valentine’s Day in Japan serves as a ‘ritual of reversal,’ a temporary comic relief, that actually maintains the existing order in which women have a subordinate position against men. For example, the choco giri (chocolate gift) tradition
emphasizes women’s obligation to express their gratitude to their male superiors and office mates during Valentine’s Day. However, there is no obligation for men to return these gifts. In fact, given potential romantic implications with officemates, it is considered inappropriate to provide a return gift. This ritual thus positions the female on the inferior side, having the obligation to give without expectation to receive.

A more recent study of Valentine’s Day in Japan was conducted through a visual analysis of the holiday’s advertisements over the past 50 years (Minowa et al. 2011). By emphasizing on gendered gift-giving, the study traces the transformation in the meanings of Valentine’s Day, understanding them as reflection of changes in social values, consumer ideology and the economy. The study finds that in recent years Valentine’s Day does not necessarily reaffirm the traditional gender ideals that women are inferior to men but instead becomes a rite to reconfirm gender identity. During the period of economic growth in Japan (post 2002) advertisements highlighted fancy self-gifts for women signaling “a gender shift in power in Japanese society, involving a feminization and strengthening of the animus in the society” (Minowa et al. 2011).

The study of the development of Valentine’s Day in Ghana (Fair 2004) highlights a process of collaborative translation of the holiday, underscoring how enactment of Valentine’s Day is a process of value co-creation. As Fair (2004, p. 44) states, Valentine’s Day “is not a story of Western media or outside business interests imposing the holiday and its meaning on another culture. Ghanaian media have marketed Val Day, possibility even created the modern celebration, but people have had choices. They did not accept wholesale what the Ghanaian media initially offered.” Instead, the holiday is made relevant to the context, serving ideological interests in the process. Valentine’s Day has become a means for Ghana urbanites to connect with global modernity. The celebration has provided an opportunity for local economies to
develop a commercial culture. It also serves as a venue to approach sensitive issues such as new notions of love, romance, marriage, sexuality, and diseases (HIV/AIDS) – that would normally be inappropriate to discuss at other times of the year.

The above studies highlight how changing values are reflected in the changing meaning and practices of Valentine’s Day. However, it assumes that Valentine’s Day reflects the permeating logic of a society at a given point in time. However, as we have identified, contexts constitute inter-institutional spheres, each with a distinct set of logic. This study thus contributes to existing literature by exploring how Valentine’s Day is continuously redefined in the context of competing value systems.

5 Methodology

5.1 Action Nets

This study takes a performative view of markets by building on the premise that markets are continuously enacted and unfolding (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006), and therefore, requires a research methodology that is consistent with the perspective. To guide the study of the translation of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia, I integrate the action net approach (Czarniawska 2004; Lindberg and Czarniawska 2006) and the ‘zooming-in-and-zooming-out’ methodology of studying practice (Nicolini 2009a; Nicolini 2009b).

The notion of action nets was developed through the integration of new institutional theory and sociology of translation, and specifically designed for the field of organization study to highlight organizations as temporary reifications that are part of an ongoing process of organizing (Czarniawska 2004). The action-nets approach is a method for looking at things as they unfold. The starting point is the awareness that an action net exists, and the objective is to
identify how actions are connected to other actions, in other words, *knotting* (Lindberg and Czarniawska 2006). The main question to ask in an action net analysis is “*what is being done, and how does this connect with other things that are being done in the same context?*”

Adoption of an action net approach implies a focus on tracing how something arrived to a particular state rather than an analysis of the end product (Czarniawska 2004). Thus rather than study an organization as a fixed state, an action net analysis focuses on the process of organizing instead. This approach runs counter to the taken for granted practice of identifying actors at the beginning of an analysis. In contrast, in an action net analysis actors are traced through practices as identities are assumed to emerge through the translation processes; that is, by and in an action net, and not vice versa. As such, action nets can be understood as a connection of actions rather than of actors (Czarniawska 2004). The assumption that actors are products rather than sources of organizing is similar to an underlying principle of actor-network theory (ANT; Latour 2005). This overlap is not surprising since both approaches share the theoretical roots of practice translation (Callon 1986; Latour 1986). However, Czarniawska (2004) asserts that action nets and ANT differ in terms of time focus. Action nets are best observed when they are being established, whereas “ANT studies begin when translations and connections between actions in an action net have already begun to stabilize. In order to present themselves as macro-actors, different actants try to stabilize their own identities and the actions in the network to which they belong. The emergence of an action net may lead to a subsequent creation of networks and macro actors, but does not necessarily do so” (Lindberg and Czarniawska 2006, p. 294-5).

Action net is also distinct from an organizational field (DiMaggio and Powell 1983), which often serves as the frame of reference for organizations dealing with the same type of activity that may include virtual contacts as well as actors with no direct contact (e.g., actors in
the car rental business: Alamo, Avis, Enterprise, Hertz, Zipcar, etc.). Action nets, on the other hand, encompass all actions that contribute to a particular practice which may include actors that span beyond organizational fields (e.g., car rental provider, car manufacturers, cleaning service, security, advertising and communication specialists, social media consultants, media corporations, etc.; Czarniawska 2004).

Guided by this approach, Valentine’s Day in Indonesia will be analyzed as an ongoing practice that is continually shaped by the changing actions of involved parties. The boundaries of the holidays are not pre-determined in terms of holiday participants or the competing firms and businesses that target these celebrants. Instead, a study of Valentine’s Day encompasses all the related activities that contribute to the creation of meaning and shape of the holiday. These may include a focus on the actions of celebrants and supporting marketing firms, but may also expand to include the actions of non-participants, as well as other entities, such as journalists or the media, religious leaders, government officials, cultural experts, as well as NGOs or social activists, who find use in associating themselves on way or another with the holiday.

5.2 Zooming in and Zooming Out

Along similar lines to the action net approach, Nicolini (2009a; 2009b) introduces a specific method of analysis that involves an iterative process of zooming in and zooming out on data as well as between data and theory. In fact, this method switches between a number of theoretical lenses, as a means to highlight some aspects of practice while bracketing the others. Among the research traditions foundational to this approach are the Wittgensteinian and Heideggerian understanding of social practices (Schatzki 1996), ethnomethodology (Garfinkel 1967), ANT (Latour 2005) as well as other semiotic-oriented social ontologies, which include
concepts and methods developed by Czarniawska and colleagues (Czarniawska 2004; Lindberg and Czarniawska 2006).

This process first requires zooming in on the details of a specific practice in a specific place to generate an understanding of the local outcomes of a practice. This notion parallels the first component of the action net approach, which is to focus on “what is being done.” The next step involves zooming out by expanding the analysis to follow trails of connections between practices and their outcomes, which falls along the same lines to the second component of the action net approach that emphasizes how an action connects with other things that are being done in the same context. Nicolini (2009b, p. 121) suggests the recursive process “stops when we can provide a convincing and defensible account of both the practice and its effects on the dynamics of organizing, showing how that which is local contributes to the generation of broader effects.”

In the zooming in process, there are four aspects to highlight in the analysis of practice (Nicolini 2009b): (1) the actual sayings and doings and their temporal flow, (2) the interactional order between human (and non-human) participants, (3) concerns, expectations, and a sense of what is the appropriate course of action, and (4) the influence of artefacts and other practices on the outcome of a particular practice. Table 1 presents each aspect along with its corresponding method of data collection as well as a list of questions that need to be addressed in order to orient the researcher in zooming in on each aspect.

On the other hand, the process of zooming out is achieved by: (1) tracing various intermediaries of a practice (e.g., people, artefacts) that enable a practice to appear in different places (2) following the connection between practices and the effects of these relationships, which can be material (e.g., the outcome of a practice used in another context) as well as social (e.g., how a practice may generate conflict or maintain the existing arrangement), and (3)
comparing how the same practices are enacted in different places under different conditions, which may reflect the influence of historical trajectories and local power dynamics.

The zooming-in-and-zooming-out approach was primarily developed as a ‘package’ for studying work practices to ensure the compatibility between the ontological assumptions of performativity (i.e., processual ontology) and the chosen methodological approaches (Nicolini 2009a). As a means to explore the unfolding nature of practices, a multi-sited ethnographic method is highly advocated, as well as some more specific data collection methods such as participant observation, shadowing (Czarniawska 2007), and projective interviewing methods like that of ‘instruction to the double’ in which interviewees are asked to explain a work practice to someone who will be replacing him/her the following day (Nicolini 2009b). Considering the primary purpose of developing guidelines for the study of work practices and the fact that this approach was developed based on a study on the practice of telemedicine and, the proposed data collection methods are probable and manageable. Under these conditions, a researcher is able to immerse himself in an organizational work context, observe a variety of work processes, follow (i.e., shadow) various actors in distinct organizational positions, for a number of hours, every day for a designated period of time.

However, with regards to developing a study on the enactment of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia, such efforts are not as feasible. First, Valentine’s Day occurs only once every year, and its overall performance emerges through the interweaving of a number of disparate practices. To engage in a multi-sited ethnography through participant observation, for example, would require simultaneous involvement of a great number of researchers (observers) who would zoom in on the different practices of distinct actors on the days leading up to and on the day of the celebration. This practice not only requires immense coordination but is also costly in terms of
manpower. Since it is virtually impossible for a single principle investigator to trace different practices that are simultaneously occurring in a short period of time, the use of multiple observers also faces issues of reliability. The second issue with employment of ethnographic methods relate to the underlying nature of Valentine’s Day as a celebration of romantic love. This premise makes it difficult for a researcher to observe or shadow, as surely most lovebirds would not appreciate having a third person taking notes during their candlelight dinner. Given the limited resources and restrictions imposed by the research context itself, this study relied on a more achievable and less obstructive methods of data collection.

Table 1. Zooming-in Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zooming in</th>
<th>Types of questions or analysis to consider</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Market practice equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sayings and doings</td>
<td>What are people doing and saying? What are they trying to do when they speak? What is said and done? How do the patterns of doing and saying flow in time? What temporal sequences do they conjure? With what effects? Through which moves, strategies, methods and discursive practical devices do practitioners accomplish their work? What practical concerns move practitioners? How are the constant micro changes of the practice coped with? How are the different elements realigned?</td>
<td>Writing style of ethno-methodological approaches that emphasize routines and practical activities; relies on participant observation efforts and thorough description of conduct</td>
<td>What are people saying? Representational practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interactional order between human (and at times non-human) participants.</td>
<td>What sort of interactional order is performed by this specific practice How do they differ from similar practices performed elsewhere? What positions does this specific practice make available? How are these positions negotiated or resisted? What type of collective interests are sustained and perpetuated by the specific practice? How is the practice transmitted? How are asymmetries and inequalities produced or reproduced in the process?</td>
<td>Emphasize the activity of novices, apprentices, and learners, using the ethnographic method of shadowing</td>
<td>What are the integrative practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. (Cont.) Zooming-In Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zooming in</th>
<th>Types of questions or analysis to consider</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Market practice equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The horizon of sense, intelligibility, and concern associated with a specific practice. (Lived concerns, expectations, and a sense of what is appropriate to do next)</td>
<td>How do norms and goals manifest themselves in practice? What local forms of intelligibility are available to the practitioners? How do they become normatively binding? How are they acquired and sustained? What is the role of discourse in all this?</td>
<td>Instruction to the double; projective technique which requires interviewees to imagine that they have a double who will replace them in their job the next day</td>
<td>Normalizing practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneous and material multiple ‘entities’ which will play an active part in the accomplishment of practice. Investigate the active contribution of artefacts in the practice as well as the ways in which these artefacts establish relationships between practices.</td>
<td>How is practice accomplished through the body? What is the material and symbolic landscape in which the practice is carried out? What active effects are produced by different artefacts (for example how do the material and symbolic tool influence the performance of a practice)? How are the artefacts used in practice? How do they contribute to giving sense to the practice? What visible and invisible work do the artefacts perform? What connection do they establish with other practices? What type of practical concerns or sense do artefacts convey to the actual practicing? What is the intermediation work they perform? Are the tools and the practice aligned or are there conflicts and tensions between them? What resources are required for the practice to be performed?</td>
<td>Focus on how operand and operant resources are being used in the process of value co-creation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Data Collection

The study relied on a number of distinct data sources: archival resources in the form of newspaper articles, advertisements, and in-depth interviews with celebrants and non-celebrants of the holiday. The publication selected as the primary source of archival data is Kompas, an established national newspaper with a trusted reputation for independent and balanced reporting, that aims to be politically and religiously unbiased. With a national circulation of 500,000 (600,000 Sunday edition) and a readership level of 1,850,000 per day, Kompas is the leading and most established newspaper of the nation. Their readers are considered well educated (61% with at least a diploma/associate’s degree), of productive age (64% between 20-40 years old), and categorized as having middle-upper economic status (54% of AB SES).

Kompas newspaper articles were purchased through Pusat Informasi Kompas (PIK), the newspaper’s information center, which provided digitized versions of their print publications. A request was made for all articles pertaining to Valentine’s Day that was published since the newspaper was founded in 1965 to 2012. The key words used for the article search were: Valentine’s Day, Valentine, Hari Cinta, and Hari Kasih Sayang (the last two are Indonesian translations for the holiday; respectively meaning Love Day and Day for Caring). To note, at the time of data request, PIK had converted only articles published after 1990 into digital text format, while the remaining articles were still in the form of article scans. This discrepancy in technology may influence the ability to guarantee complete search of the 1965-1990 articles based on the given key terms. The database search located 55 articles published between 1965-1990 and 379 articles from 1991-2012. Upon sorting the articles for duplicates (e.g., one article being associated to multiple key terms), or irrelevance (e.g., Valentine referring to someone’s
name, Hari Cinta to express a completely distinct activity or entity, etc.), a total of 30 articles published between 1965-1990 remained for analysis, as did 302 articles published after 1990.

Additional articles on Valentine’s Day were gathered from of the Jakarta Post, the leading English language newspaper in Indonesia. Online searches using the key word Valentine’s Day generated 134 articles, including advertorials, printed between 2001 and 2014.

Treated as retrospectives –accounts of developments, events, and situations that are made up after the fact– the newspaper articles were utilized to indicate not only how media, but also other distinct groups reported in these articles, were contributing to the creation of the holiday by way of framing, reproducing and establishing norms surrounding the practice and integrating practices.

Valentine’s Day advertisements were also collected from Kompas, specifically those that were published between 2007 and 2012. A total of 222 advertisements were compiled and analyzed as remnants, which are objects (e.g. documents, tools, photos) that were part of the event being studied, used as reference to indicate the practices of marketers contributed to the creation of the holiday. More specifically, advertisements are utilized to explore what marketers do to represent and normalize Valentine’s Day in the context of exchange. In other words, advertisements are analyzed along the key dimensions of market practice (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007).

All advertisements collected were examined individually and in a pool to identify common patterns of the visual text. A sample was selected based on judgment for in depth analysis, as was conducted by Minowa et al. (2011) in their analysis of Japanese Valentine’s Day advertisements. These advertisements were chosen based on how conceptually significant each text is in representing co-creation of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia (Mick 1986; Rose 2006; Zhao
and Belk 2008). The archival resources (e.g., newspaper articles and advertisements) collected spanned longitudinally over a period of years, and therefore are to some degree in keeping with a practice approach that would enable the researcher to trace the unfolding nature of market co-creation.

Additionally, two rounds of interviews were conducted with participants and non-participants of Valentine’s Day. First, in the summer of 2011, a focus group discussion consisting of five young adults was conducted, followed by semi-structured in-depth interviews with 14 University of Indonesia students of different academic disciplines. University of Indonesia was selected primarily because its flagship status. Informants were economically, ethnically, as well as religiously diverse, consisting of students from various provinces across the country. Informants were selected to ensure a comparable number between males and females as well as an equal representation of views coming from those who were Muslim and non-Muslim. Among the Muslim respondents were those who, based on their organizational affiliations, way of dressing, and views of the holiday, can be considered as either more religiously conservative or liberal. Additional interviews were administered in the city of Semarang, Central Java with 3 adults and two pairs of spouses. Questions focused on when and how they first learned about Valentine’s Day, and their perceptions toward the holiday. Additional questions focused on whether they considered Valentine’s Day a secular, as well as whether they considered the holiday a form of commercialization or Westernization, and a Christianization effort and should be forbidden in Islam. This first set of interviews provided a basic understanding of the differing perspectives and opinions about Valentine’s Day.

To supplement, I conducted phenomenological interviews with participants and non-participants of Valentine’s Day, which is a specific form of interviewing that focuses on issues of
experience (what, where, when, how questions) rather than rationalization (why questions; Thompson et al. 1989). The second round of interviews was conducted in February 2012, shortly after the celebration of Valentine’s Day. Interviews were conducted with students of various universities, which included University of Indonesia, Atmadjaja University (private Catholic university), University of Pelita Harapan (private university), and Bina Nusantara University (dual-degree program in collaboration with a number of foreign universities; private university). This sample provided an even wider net of students that included upper class students as well as the ethnic Chinese community. However, the basic difference during this round of interviews was the use of the phenomenological method which focused on revealing the lived experience of the interviewees. The primary objective of the interview was to draw out a first-person description of a specified domain of experience, in this case, Valentine’s Day. As noted, the first phase of interviews focused mostly on why questions, which risks being interpreted as a request for a rationalization and can generate defensive responses. In contrast, guided by the phenomenological method, the second phase interviews concentrated more on questions like “Can you tell me about how you spent last Valentine’s Day?” “How did you feel when you learned that Valentine’s Day was forbidden according to Islam?” “Can you describe a time when decided not to do anything special on Valentine’s Day?” “Can you tell me what was going on/what you were thinking when you made that decision?”

In using the above methods, particularly the collection of longitudinal archival data as well as the utilization of phenomenological interviews, this study aims to present itself as a study of performativity by focusing on the unfolding aspect of the data.
5.4 Data Analysis

To guide the exploration of the translation of Valentine’s Day, the zooming-in-and-zooming-out method (Nicolini 2009a; Nicolini 2009b) is employed in approaching the proposed fractal model of market co-creation. Additionally, guided by the action net (Czarniawska 2004) approach, focus is on unfolding practices and how they link to one another.

The study begins by zooming in on the foundational micro-level market practices (representational, normalizing, and integrative). To address the first research question regarding the different ways in which Valentine’s Day in Indonesia is framed, a specific focus is on identifying the distinct depictions used to represent Valentine’s Day, including an exploration of the different actor categories that shape and reproduce such depictions. As such, the discussions more specifically highlight the different representations of Valentine’s Day, followed by an effort to trace how they link to normalizing and integrative efforts in the translation of the holiday.

The representations are operationalized through the identification of frames, conducted primarily through a manual, in-depth, values coding process of all the collected newspaper articles on Valentine’s Day. Values coding is “the application of codes onto qualitative data that reflects a participant’s values, attitudes and beliefs, representing his or her perspectives or worldview” (Saldaña 2013, p. 110). Unit of analysis is at the statement level. As such, any statement that expressed attitudes and beliefs about Valentine’s Day was coded. A second cycle of coding was conducted to categorize the coded statements into more manageable themes. This process generated 1456 statements, and produced five general themes of statements about Valentine’s Day, each of which is regarded as a separate frame regarding Valentine’s Day. While a thorough explanation of the coding process is provided in Essay 3, for the purposes of Essay 2,
a brief identification of the frames are provided. The respective frames resulting from the coding process include: romantic (13.5%; e.g., a celebration of love for couples in romantic relationships), social (27.3%; e.g., an occasion for all who want to celebrate universal love, by expressing love to family, friends, marginalized others, and an opportunity to raise awareness for important causes or social issues), trade (27.6%; e.g., the commercial opportunities afforded by the holiday), religious (13.7%; e.g., the holiday’s assumed association with Christianity, Western culture, immoral behavior, which makes the holiday un-Islamic and unsuitable for Indonesians to celebrate), global (17.9%; e.g., the holidays global spread, it’s reflection of and appeal to the middle class, urban, and young global lifestyle and population).

The type of actors associated with the expressed statements was also coded, resulting in the identification of five actor categories: media, public, businesses, social organization, and religious authority. It must be acknowledged that this process sits somewhat uneasily with the action net approach, which suggests against a priori determination of actors, as the approach is also a tool for identifying how actors emerge. However, coding of actor categories was based on the roles played by the statement makers, with the careful understanding that roles are not fixed, and that one individual can play multiple roles at a time (Akaka and Chandler 2011). For example, when an actor is coded as a business(man), it is with the understanding that this label is attributed due to the role played in buying and selling of a particular value proposition (e.g., rose, chocolate), and that on a different occasion the same actor can also (theoretically) be labeled as a ‘general public’ stating his/her stand for/against Valentine’s Day. As such, the fluidity of identities and the understanding that acting entities emerge as a result of action and translation is acknowledged throughout the coding process.
Furthermore, to enrich explanations on the enactment of Valentine’s Day, data from in-depth interviews were also analyzed. The interviews with a diverse set of university students who either participated in or rejected the celebration of Valentine’s Day revolved around the discussion of three distinct framing efforts, namely as a romantic or social holiday, as well as a forbidden holiday in the context of Islam. Meanwhile, a discussion around the celebration of Valentine’s Day as a global holiday hardly emerged in the interviews. Through the integration of findings from the aforementioned coding process and the general patterns emerging from the series of in-depth interviews, only the most dominant recurring frames are included in the analysis of Essay 2, namely: 1) the romantic framing, which is closely defined and enacted through market-based resources, 2) the social frame, and 3) the religious frame.

In particular, this essay will further discuss each frame, identify the type of actors who invest themselves in these respective frames, and explore how various actors contribute to refining these frames. Furthermore, the analysis will also trace how these different actors continue the translation of the respective frames through normalizing efforts and other integrative practices.

A second analysis zooms out of the data to address the research questions of how distinct framings influence each other and how this process influences the circulation of such ideas and practice. Of specific interest is to understand how distinct actions interweave to shape the holiday. This will be achieved by presenting an analysis of how the meanings and roles of roses (flowers), a key artifact in Valentine’s Day, changes as it transfers across different actors, or how they are expected to function differently in the hands of distinct actors. Furthermore, analysis will focus on how the framing efforts by one group may influence the framing and actions of
another group, to depict the seamless web of practices that construct the current shape of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia.

6 Results

6.1 Translation within Context

6.1.1 Romantic Frame: Valentine’s Day as a commercialized celebration of romance

Representational, normalizing, integrative practices

Valentine’s Day is most commonly understood as a day to celebrate love, particularly by ‘romantic dyads’ of varying levels of commitment (i.e., dating, seriously dating, engaged, married; Stafford and Canary 1991). A contributor to the Jakarta Post (Tannason 2011), emphasizes the romantic framing of the holiday, by stating:

Valentine’s Day is never my favorite day. Why? I’m single. Consequently, when my friends, relatives and even strangers I meet on the streets flock to florists to buy roses and Valentine’s gifts for their girlfriends, I sit in front of television watching the latest episodes of Glee. And when the day comes, I will probably be reading a stack of Time or Newsweek magazines when they are dining out with their girlfriends. Perhaps, I should’ve listened to Oppie Andaresta’s [singer, songwriter] ‘Single Happy’ to cheer me up.

This statement implies that Valentine’s Day is not a celebration for singles, and outlines what the contributor assumes singles would normally do on this day – stay home, watch TV, read magazines, or listen to empowering pop songs. The statement also highlights what the newspaper contributor assumes are enacted by couples on this particular day – flock florists to buy roses and gifts, as well as dine out with their romantic partners.

Similarly, approaching Valentine’s Day, other journalists in various media outlets also report on the many activities surrounding the holiday. Newspaper articles predominantly report on increased business activity, particularly by focusing on the growing supply and sales of roses,
chocolate, and gifts, along with the emergence of seasonal peddlers offering fresh or imitation roses, as well as the increasing number of shops that begin to sell other Valentine’s Day trinkets (Rohmah and Ayuingtyas 2013). The media also reports on the changing retail atmosphere, in which shopping malls and plazas become crowded by Valentine’s Day symbols (e.g., hearts, cupid, etc.) and are decorated in red, pink, and white; the holiday’s colors (Santoso 2004). They additionally report on the Valentine’s Day sales, discounts, and entertainment programs offered by various shopping establishments (Kompas 2007). Feature pieces highlight the grand romantic gestures people perform on the holiday, such as how a California wife saved her husband’s life by donating him her kidney (Kompas 1996) or how a former Italian convict was caught by airport authorities in Rome for using a fake ID in his attempt to visit a lover in London (Kompas 1998b). Other feature pieces highlight the various events taking place around the globe in the name of Valentine’s Day which ranges from mass dating events in Singapore (Kompas 2008b) to mass weddings in the Philippines (Kompas 1998a), Taiwan, Thailand (Kompas 1998b), Thailand, and the United States (Kompas 2002a). Interview pieces explore how various national and international public figures perceive of or celebrate the holiday (Kompas 1999; 2012a). Other articles report on upcoming Valentine’s Day concerts (Kompas 2012b) and how the public have secured tickets to attend such events (Setiawati 2012).

In these various articles, the media depicts the many activities surrounding Valentine’s Day. By outlining the distinct actors that participate in the holiday (e.g., couples, entertainers, florists, shopkeepers, restaurants, hotels) and their respective roles (e.g., purchase and exchange gifts, go out to dinner, hold Valentine’s Day performances, sell roses, chocolate, and other Valentine’s Day gifts, offer candlelight dinners, and romantic accommodation packages) the media is enacting a process of market translation.
By explaining who normally celebrates the holiday (i.e., couples, businesses, etc.) and how, the media builds on the romantic framing of the holiday (i.e., a representational practice) and reinforces performs a representational practice by reinforcing the romantic framing of the holiday. Through their reporting, the media contributes to shaping the public’s understanding of what constitutes as normal, acceptable, or expected behavior on this particular day. In other words, in their efforts to describe the holiday, particularly by reporting what people do during the celebration (i.e., integrative practices) and how they think about the practice, journalists not only contribute to strengthening the romantic framing of the holiday (i.e., a representational practice), but also participate in establishing the rules and norms about how the holiday should be celebrated (i.e., a normalizing practice). In brief, as journalists or media companies aim to conduct business as usual by providing the public with timely information of various current events, they continually participate in forming the perception of and shaping the outcome of Valentine’s Day.

Similarly, peddlers, street vendors, florists, shopkeepers, restaurant owners, hotels, and even multinational corporations, in their respective efforts to run profitable businesses, also contribute to the shaping of Valentine’s Day. They build on and strengthen the romantic notion of the holiday, by supplying the resources necessary for the public –primarily couples- to celebrate the day. By promoting their market offerings, they reinforce the holiday norms of gift-giving and other activities through the use of commercial solutions.

Valentine’s Day celebrations in Indonesia are often contained within the retail domains of hotels and shopping centers, including the restaurants and movie theatres inside the malls. Advertisements not only promote Valentine-themed shows that are being screened on TV and movie theatres, but also highlight restaurant menus, events, and promos, as well as feature
romantic hotel packages. Grand Hyatt Jakarta, for example, offers an accommodation package available from US$488++, which includes a one-night's stay in the hotel’s Grand Room, a romantic dinner for two at C’s or Fountain Lounge, strawberries in guests’ rooms and Tiffany gift vouchers valued at Rp 1,500,000 (US$ 120) (Kompas 2008a).

Most brands boast themselves as the perfect gift solution. For example, Felice Jewelry promotes their diamond rings by reminding lovers “Don’t go for small gift, if you can go for bigger one.” Air France advertises “Fly to Europe or beyond with your loved one,” and Motorola promotes a pair of cellphones that could “Make a perfect pair for Valentine’s Day.” Korean electronics company, LG in their Electronic City LG promo simply offers “something for your Valentine from LG Appliances.” Other brands highlight how their can be used to facilitate Valentine’s Day. For example Canon offers celebrants to “celebrate your Valentine’s moment with Canon” by offering its whole range of cameras and printer to the capture special moments and print it.

Most importantly, Valentine’s Day participants also enforce the romantic framing of the holiday by enacting precisely just that, celebrating the romantic relationship with their partners. Although each couple may have their unique way of celebrating the relationship on this particular day, most participating couples are likely to follow the given script that have been outlined, depicted, and reinforced by the media, various business entities, other celebrants, as well as prior experiences.

This depiction above highlights two basic points. The first relates to the co-creative nature of the holiday in which different actors contribute to the creation of Valentine’s Day. Valentine’s Day takes shape because of the various value co-creating practices different actors are performing based on an implicit understanding of their respective roles in relation to the
holiday; couples trying to celebrate their romantic relationships, media trying to provide information to the public, and business entities trying to thrive and survive through commercial exchange. Vice versa, Valentine’s Day serves as an occasion – a venue – that enables actors to perform such practices (e.g., couples have a specific time to celebrate their relationships, media have something interesting to report about, businesses have another reason to promote their market offerings). Resources are exchanged and markets emerge (i.e., are enacted) as actors draw on each other’s resources to complete their distinct value co-creation process. Valentine’s Day emerges out of the intersection of value co-creation practices, while at the same time enables such intersections to occur. As such, Valentine’s Day mediates and is mediated by value co-creation practices. More specifically, the way these particular actors enact the holiday primarily hinges on the idea that Valentine’s Day is a romantic couples holiday, drawing from and contributing to the reinforcement of the romantic associations of the holiday.

The second point pertains to the seamless translation process. For most people who are familiar with the holiday, the romantic framing of Valentine’s Day has become so taken for granted that the rituals related to the holiday have almost become tacit knowledge. The roles different actors are required to play as well as the props necessary to successfully perform Valentine’s Day have somewhat been established and are well understood. As such, no questions or explanations are necessary. This emphasizes how dominant the romantic framing has become to the extent that it is regarded as the first reference point when speaking about the holiday. Furthermore, the romantic framing has become well accepted that its behavioral implications no longer require any explanation nor raises any questions. The meaning and enactment of Valentine’s Day has become common knowledge and second nature for the actors involved. For example, when February 14th approaches, couples can expect to perform some of the related
rituals: prepare gifts as a token of love, assume that a romantic dinner will be scheduled, and perform other activities that reinforce the bond between the loving couple. A US-based study on Valentine’s Day indicated that while most men have negative perceptions towards the holiday, they feel obligated to participate in the rituals by following the commonly prescribed set of actions (i.e., gift-exchange; Otnes et al. 1994). Based on this romantic framing it becomes clear who needs to celebrate, and how (see Figure 4).

As noted above, the different types of market practices overlap to some degree as the same practice can be interpreted as either a normalizing, representational, or integrative practice depending on the interpretation of the context (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007). Translation from one market practice to another seems to flow seamlessly and be implicitly agreed upon reflecting a relatively high level of institutionalization. For example, when asked what first comes to mind upon hearing the word ‘Valentine’ or ‘Valentine’s Day,’ my informants automatically respond love, chocolate, romance, and roses. Valentine’s Day is associated with love and gift-exchange. Roses and chocolate, particularly, can be assumed as staples to the holiday as they have become the standard expression of love on Valentine’s Day.
Depiction of Valentine’s Day as a romantic holiday

Couples exchange greetings, gifts (cards, roses, chocolate, jewelry), wine and dine, offer marriage proposals, celebrate weddings

Implies that holiday is celebrated by couples in romantic relationships (courting, dating, married)
Love between couples is expressed through romantic gestures
Reliance on market facing resources is acceptable, even encouraged and expected

Figure 4. Translation of the Romantic Frame: Valentine’s Day as a Commercialized Celebration of Romance
Furthermore, the fact that couples in romantic relationships need to celebrate this holiday is also often unquestionable. Most male partners know the default option is to prepare something special for the day, even if he experiences personal resistance (Otnes et al. 1994). Surya, an undergraduate student at the University of Indonesia majoring in Business, explains:

When I was in 9th grade, even since the first of February I would already be thinking, ‘oh no, only two weeks left, need to find time to go... look for.. prepare for everything, what to do on the 14th. I would have to empty my schedule, make sure not to go anywhere. So back then, Valentine’s Day was very important, so much so, that I would prepare well in advance. Nowadays, it’s no longer like that. It’s not that important, not too important. It’s okay not to celebrate it. But if the girlfriend is a bit...hmmm... if she thinks that it’s important, then celebrating it is a reflection of how we care about our partner. That’s enough indication that Valentine’s Day needs to be celebrated. For example, maybe hints are dropped. ‘Where are we going on the 14th?’ So, I at least have to be prepared. If I don’t have anything prepared, there will be a disaster. Even up to one week after (Valentine’s Day) there’s still potential for “communication issues” [code for fighting].

Actually, even back then I didn’t really care [about Valentine’s Day]. It was more out of obligation [laugh], obligation because my girlfriend paid attention to every little detail, so I just followed the flow. Rather than create problems, that would be disastrous. So I just follow the flow. (Surya, male, Balinese, Hindu, university student)

On the other hand, there is the case of Teresa’s boyfriend who had completed all the necessary elements of Valentine’s Day –beautiful flowers, chocolate, and dinner– but did not have the mood nor attitude suitable to carry out a romantic date. Therefore, his demeanor did not meet his girlfriend’s expectations for how Valentine’s Day should be celebrated. Teresa claimed that she and her boyfriend did not celebrate Valentine’s Day despite the fact that he had bought her flowers and took her out to dinner –all commonly accepted rituals for celebrating Valentine’s Day. She explains:
Unfortunately my boyfriend and I do not celebrate (Valentine’s Day). Maybe if he were romantic, I can tell you a lot, all the details. But he’s not. Last Valentine he only gave me three things: flowers, a kilogram of (Silverqueen) chocolate, and Ferrero Rocher (a brand of chocolate). But really, he’s the one that eats all the chocolate. When he gets hungry, that’s what he nibbles on, chocolate. So, it doesn’t count. He will eat the gift. He knows his girlfriend doesn’t like Silverqueen.

So, can you imagine? He put the flowers in the trash bin. There is a small trash bin in his car. He put the flowers in there so they wouldn’t fall over. And when I entered the car he didn’t present them to me. Usually, you would pick it up and say ‘Happy Valentine’s Day,’ or something like that. But no, when I entered the car the flowers were already there. But he didn’t say, ‘Happy Valentine’s,’ no. That’s it. They were just there. Oh well, I knew they were for me.

The flowers were actually pretty nice. Orange-colored roses and orchids. My sister took some for herself. I mean, after it was unwrapped, and put in a vase. My sister took some home. She said, ‘Oooh, the roses are so beautiful.’ That was the first time. Usually when he gives me flowers my sister doesn’t react that way, [she would say] “Oh, just roses.” But this time she said, “Hey, what nice colors!” And they smelled nice. So that day, I thought at least the roses made up for it [his behavior; lack of enthusiasm]. It’s ok that he hurt my feelings, what’s important is - at least I can smell the sweet scent. (Teresa, female, Indonesian Chinese, Christian, office manager)

Teresa’s Valentine’s Day experience makes explicit some of the tacit elements necessary to perform the celebration. Technically, her boyfriend did celebrate Valentine’s Day with her. After all, he did take her out to dinner, as well as give her flowers and chocolate. In fact, he presented her with two types of flowers (i.e., orange-colored roses and orchids) as well as two types of chocolate (i.e., 1 kg of Silverqueen chocolate bars and a heart-shaped box of Ferrero Rocher chocolate). Yet, Teresa claims that “my boyfriend and I do not celebrate” Valentine’s Day. She was disappointed in her boyfriend’s behavior, as highlighted in her words “it’s ok that he hurt my feelings,” which stems from the inconsistencies of sayings and doings on the part of the boyfriend with regards to expected enactments of Valentine’s Day.
On the other hand, Fina explains how her boyfriend created a memorable Valentine’s Day for her, which involved an elaborate surprise dinner:

We had dinner at Kemang, at (The) Edge (Bistro) Kemang, in a private room that my boyfriend had reserved. First, my boyfriend took me to the restaurant with eyes blindfolded. Sorry, this is a bit corny [giggle]. I have always really liked that place, but never had the chance to dine there. When we got there, all the glass walls in the room were covered by drapes, so I didn’t know where we were. Then we ate. After eating, I opened the first set of drapes, I could see what looked like an empty building on the outside, then the second drape, also an empty building. When I opened the third drape in the middle, apparently there were many people outside the room that saw us, because the divider was transparent. ‘What is this?’ I thought. I was surprised because many people were looking at us. Then my boyfriend told me we were at my favorite place, Edge, Kemang.

I was surprised. At that time the lights were a dim yellow, and we sat in the middle of the room, there was a table, two chairs, also some wine. The table was surrounded by flowers, they were supposed to be roses, but because he didn’t have time to buy roses, there were only flower petals, the ones you would bring to a graveyard [giggle], the red ones. Also, we had music playing in the background, from an iPod. I was enchanted. (Fina, female, Indonesian, Muslim, student)

The interviews with Surya, Teresa, and Fina highlight that there is an agreed upon tacit understanding of what actions, sayings and doings are required to perform Valentine’s Day. As has been outlined, there are three elements of practice (1) general procedural understandings and rules (explicit knowledge); (2) skills, abilities, and culturally appropriate action (tacit, embedded knowledge or how-to); and (3) emotional commitments expressed through actions and representations (Schatzki 1996; Schau et al. 2009). These interviews emphasize the significance of all three elements. For example, Teresa’s boyfriend followed the general rules of the holiday by presenting her all the right gifts, yet failed to convey the culturally appropriate action and emotional enthusiasm that was expected by Teresa based on a set of implicit rules. Therefore, despite presenting the necessary artefacts to celebrate the holiday, Teresa’s boyfriend did not show the proper emotions nor perform the necessary doings or sayings for Teresa to feel as if she
had celebrated Valentine’s Day with him. On the other hand, despite purchasing the wrong kind of flowers, Fina’s boyfriend managed to enchant her by enacting the proper actions and emotions on Valentine’s Day.

It is interesting to note that much of these enactments seem to work based on implicit rules and assumptions that has become second nature. The links between the distinct types of practices are seamless that the translation process seems non-existent. Importantly, the interplay between celebrants and commercial entities have also become unspoken or unquestioned. Surya knew to prepare something special for his girlfriend for the special day. Teresa received a bouquet of flowers and specific brands of chocolate which her boyfriend had purchased. He also took her out to dinner at a mall restaurant. Similarly Fina’s boyfriend took her to dinner at a fancy restaurant. As such, turning to market exchange has become expected—much like a reflex response— as opposed to any form of rule or obligation.

In this case, the ritual of buying roses at a florist or from a seasonal street peddler, stopping by at a shop or department store to pick up chocolate, as well as treating a date out dinner, is also understood as customary Valentine’s Day practice. Celebrants know that they can rely on local florists, shops, and restaurants to provide the necessary service needed to successfully perform Valentine’s Day rituals. Vice versa, the florists, shops, and restaurants also know to increase supply of roses, chocolate, and prepare special dishes or offer couple’s meals as they know to expect an increase in demand of their market offering. This highlights the integral role that commercial entities play in shaping and facilitating the holiday, thus supporting Valentine’s Day as a romantic commercial holiday. It also emphasizes the crucial role of Valentine’s Day in facilitating the distinct value co-creation practices of disparate actors.
6.1.2 Religious Frame: Valentine’s Day as a foreign, immoral, and un-Islamic celebration

Representational practice

The growing popularity of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia has become a source of anxiety and incentive for contestation, particularly among those who see the holiday as a threat to Islamic morality as well as societal well-being. Among the most vocal in their stance against the holiday are religious leaders, activists of religious (Islamic) organizations, and local politicians, particularly those governing areas that are predominantly Muslim. In addition, teachers as well as students who are more faithful to studying Islam feel the need to spread their knowledge of Valentine’s Day to peers and mentees.

To limit its appeal, Valentine’s Day is often framed as a foreign practice. Furthermore, the romantic associations of the holiday are narrowly interpreted to connote immoral behavior, which is not condoned in Islam. Often these two separate framings are conflated to argue against public participation in the holiday. For example, Muhammad Zamzami, the chairman of the Aceh chapter of the United Action of Indonesian Islamic Students (KAPMI), states that “Valentine's Day, which is celebrated every February 14, is not part of Indonesian culture and is against Islamic teachings” (Jakarta Post 2011a) Roza‘i Akbar, chairman of the Dumai chapter of Majelis Ulama Indonesia, more specifically states, “(f)rom its origins, it is recognized that the Valentine’s Day is a holiday of non-Muslims in Rome, Italy. Therefore, Valentine’s Day celebrations are forbidden for Muslims” (Jakarta Post 2011b)

Some find the holiday problematic because they perceive Valentine’s Day as a Western construct, citing it as “typical Western cultural pollution,” “part of a liberal culture,” where participation in the holiday reflects “mindless aping of Western/Anglo-Saxon culture.” Others more specifically argue that it is inappropriate for Muslims to participate in Valentine’s Day. As a Jakarta Post reader comments, “the pro (of Valentine’s Day) is that it disseminates love
messages. The con is that it is not Islamic culture, but Christian” (Jakarta Post 2014a). Other religious conservatives point to the holiday’s roots to pagan practices and associate it with idolatry.

Another common strategy used to vilify Valentine’s Day is the argument that the holiday’s romantic associations lead to premarital sex, as well as drug and alcohol use; vices according to Islam. For example, Deputy Mayor of Bukittingi, West Sumatra, Ismet Amzis stated that “(t)he Valentine's Day celebration is not our culture as it usually relates closely to immoral acts where, during the celebration, young couples tend to hug and even kiss each other. This is an immoral act, right?” (Bachyul Jb 2008). Others, such as Ilyas Husti, chairman of Indonesian Ulema Council (MUI) in Pekanbaru notes that these celebrations “have led to the channeling of lust between unmarried couples” and that such promiscuous behavior could result in pregnancies out of wedlock which will impact the entire community (Ayuningtyas 2013). A prominent cleric of the Aceh Ulema Council, Teungku Faisal Ali, says that Valentine’s Day, “does not reflect love in accordance with Islamic teachings ... it's the same as promoting faiths other than Islam” (CBS News 2013).

Evidently, logical flaws are inherent in most of these statements. First, is the notion that any foreign practice is non-Islamic or against Indonesian tradition, or that anything foreign is immoral. This is ironic given that Islam, which is rooted in Arabic culture, was once a foreign practice in Indonesia. Additionally, the identification of Valentine’s Day to motivate immoral practice or the argument that participation in the holiday is indicative of claiming religious faith outside of Islam both reflect oversimplifications in the deduction process. To note, Valentine’s Day celebrations do not necessarily imply sexual intercourse. Furthermore, nowadays, Valentine’s Day is considered more of a commercial rather than a religious holiday, especially
since the commemoration of St. Valentine’s Day on February 14th has been removed from the liturgical calendar of the Catholic church. Thus, the worry of promoting or practicing other religions is technically unsubstantiated.

In general, most Indonesian Muslims do not agree with the narrow framing of Valentine’s Day as an immoral, un-Islamic activity. In fact, these arguments are not necessarily shared by the Muslim majority, as most are aware of the conflation between fact and fiction and could not care less. For example, responding to the statement made by the Bukittinggi deputy mayor cited above, Desi Anwar, a well-respected senior female journalist states, “it looks as if our deputy mayor in Bukittinggi is precisely trying to do that, stand in the way of people showing their affection just because his head is stuck up his own backside and thinks everybody else shares his own filthy view of the world…. Let the world be rid of the likes of Ismet Amzis, rather than being allowed to poison our young people with his brand of morality” (Anwar 2008).

In summary, Valentine’s Day is framed in a number of ways that emphasize its incompatibility with Islamic belief and values. Despite the logical flaws in the framings proposed, as will be discussed in the following section, this particular representation of Valentine’s Day is successful namely due to the normalizing practices enacted through the issuing of edicts (Islamic religious decree) by respected ulema council members and the spread of supporting verses in Islamic texts by teachers, student mentors, as well as in social media.

Normalizing practices

As part of a normalizing practice, concerned actors at all levels take part in the effort of educating others about the perils of the holiday. Religious leaders and actors cite words from the Al Qur’an, the holy book of Islam, as a foundation for their arguments. By labeling Valentine’s Day as a Christian holiday, taking part in the celebrations would signify participation in a religious Christian ritual. This implies that one takes on the belief of another religion, which is
assumed to have after-life consequences. This belief was explained in an interview with a number of university student informants who are involved with the campus’ Islamic organizations. For example, Rina, an undergraduate student of sociology at the University of Indonesia, recalled how she had become a mentor for an after-school religious activity during her high school years. As a 12\textsuperscript{th} grade senior, she and other student mentors were responsible for holding mentoring sessions as a means to transfer religious knowledge to their 10\textsuperscript{th} and 11\textsuperscript{th} grade juniors. Rina mentioned that every year when Valentine’s Day neared, they made sure to hold a session that discusses the Islamic view of Valentine’s Day. The excerpt below describes the explanation most often used to describe Valentine’s Day:

Interviewer: Can you describe to me what happened during the mentoring session regarding Valentine’s Day?

Interviewee: We held our discussion about Valentine a couple of days prior to the day of the celebration. Valentine fell on a Monday, and our mentoring session was the Friday before. Mentoring always falls on a Friday. At first we ask questions, ‘do any of you know what Valentine is?’ then we ask, ‘do (you) celebrate or not?’ and then we talk about (Valentine’s Day) from a religious perspective.

Interviewer: What did your explanation sound like?

Interviewee: Do I need to elaborate?

Interviewer: Yes, if possible. You can imagine that I am one of your mentoring students. What would you have told me?

Interviewee: Yes, so [I would say] something like, we cannot make a celebration or event out of it. Hmm, I don’t mean event. What I am referring to are activities that are not within the scope of our (religious) teachings. Because that can be categorized as bid’ah. Bid’ah, like I mentioned before, is to do something without proper guidance, the teaching of the Rasul. And that is considered a sin. And there is also a hadist for bid’ah, for example, if we perform bid’ah, our rightdoings will not be accepted. Hmm, let’s see…what else (is there)? I forgot. That was the first explanation. Also, actually I do not know who this celebration is for, but there is another explanation. If we follow the celebration or doings of a
different group, then we will be considered as one of them. That’s it, short and simple.

The first argument made against Valentine’s Day is that it is considered *bid’ah*. According to Islam, *bid’ah* is a religious innovation; a new way of worshiping God that was not revealed by the Prophet Mohammad. *Bid’ah* does not carry positive connotation and is perceived more as an opposition to established forms and knowledge. It is often noted in online resources that Valentine’s Day is categorized as an innovated festival with no basis in Islam and therefore not permitted to celebrate. Islamic caliph Ali ibn Abu Talib is quoted, “(he) who innovates or gives protection to an innovator, there is a curse of Allah and that of His angels and that of the whole humanity upon him” (Islamic Terminology, 2011). Abd Allah ibn Umar, a prominent authority in hadith and law, also noted that “every innovation is misguidance, even if the people see it as something good.” According to Rina, by categorizing Valentine’s Day as *bid’ah*, no further questions need to be asked regarding its related practices, as any form of participation would be considered a sin.

The second argument builds on the holiday’s perceived ties to paganism and/or Christianity. A common verse cited is “O you who believe! (Do) not take the Jews and the Christians (as) allies. Some of them (are) allies (to) others. And whoever takes them as allies among you, then indeed, he (is) of them. Indeed, Allah (does) not guide the wrongdoing people.” (Al Ma’idah 5:51) and the Sunnah of Abu Daawood, who quotes the Prophet as having said “Whoever imitates a people is one of them.” Simply interpreted, by doing what the Christians do, one becomes a Christian. By doing what the pagans do, one becomes a pagan. Imitating the worship as well as customs and behavior of non-Muslims, whether they be idol worshippers
(pagans) or People of the Book (Christians, Jews), is considered *haram*; forbidden based on Islamic law.

Based on the labeling of Valentine’s Day as *haram*, there are additional stipulations, which include restrictions for Muslims to congratulate non-Muslims on their holiday celebrations or festivals. Ibn al-Qayyim in *Ahkam Ahl al-Dhimma* (vol. 1, p. 205) is often cited:

Giving congratulations on the special events that are specific to the disbelievers, such as congratulating them on their holidays by saying, "Blessed holiday for you" or other similar greetings, is considered forbidden by the agreement of the scholars. … In fact, that is one of the greatest sins in Allah's sight. That is a greater sin than congratulating them for drinking wine, having illegal sexual intercourse and so on. Many of them who are not very religious do such things and they do not know how evil what they are doing really is. Whoever congratulates another human for any sin, heresy, or act of apostasy has exposed himself to the punishment and anger of Allah.

It must be noted that such restrictions are not limited to Valentine’s Day activities. For decades, in Indonesia, every Christmas season there is a public debate about whether it is appropriate for Muslims to wish their Christian neighbors a Merry Christmas, as some interpret such greetings to imply recognition of the birth of Jesus as the son of God. This is problematic for Muslims because the Qur’an depicts Jesus, or Isa, as a prophet, not God.

In an effort to boost religious tolerance in a diverse nation, chairman of the Indonesian Ulema Council (MUI) Din Syamsuddin, made an official statement this past Christmas of 2014, indicating it was acceptable for Muslims to convey Christmas greetings, because the act had nothing to do with faith but was a means of courtesy to community members living in a diverse society. On separate occasions, public officials, including the Minister of Religious Affairs, the Minister of Internal Affairs, Vice President and President, publicly expressed Christmas greetings to Indonesian Christians in the nation. For example, Religious Affairs Minister Lukman Hakim Saifuddin tweeted and posted on the ministry’s website “For joyful Christians,
Merry Christmas. May peace be on Earth. May it fill your hearts with peace. May we continue to live in harmony and love.” This greeting was retweeted nearly 1000 times along with praise for his words of tolerance. However, seven hours after the tweet, he apologized for causing discomfort to fellow Muslims who had criticized him for sending the wish, and asked Indonesian Christians to be understanding in the case that their Muslim neighbors refused to greet them with a “Merry Christmas” on the religious occasion (Parlina 2014). Similarly, on Valentine’s Day, the exchange of chocolate, with the expression “Happy Valentine’s Day” (Selamat Hari Valentine) is considered improper.

Additionally, there are restrictions around activities that may facilitate a non-Muslim holiday. The simple premise is that Muslim’s should not support a celebration that is considered haram. By implication, Muslims should not sell flowers, chocolate or profit from any other businesses that may stem from the celebration. Such restrictions however, are largely ignored, by the entrepreneurs, firms, and corporations who see the holiday as a business opportunity.

To note, although some local chapters of the ulema counsel as well as other hardline Islamic organizations define Valentine’s Day as haram, at the national level, the Ulema Counsel has not issued any official edict to declare Valentine’s Day as haram. Much of the restrictions, therefore, are based on personal or unofficial interpretations which are enacted through a number of integrative practices explained in the following section.

Integrative practice

Concerned actors who support the religious framing of the holiday aim to communicate their perspective to a wider net of people. The most basic method of information distribution is through venues of formal and informal education. After school mentoring programs brief mentees on the hazards of participating in Valentine’s Day. Islamic school organizations mostly in public or Islamic schools are known for printing black-and-white bulletins, otherwise
identified as loose leafs or booklets containing photo-copied material distributed to students in
the school. Hari recalled his involvement in these activities:

Back then, there was a trend to make cohort-based groups on Facebook. In the end, I searched for various articles on Valentine, I compiled them, and posted it in the notes section of the cohort groups, so that my cohort and the previous cohort could read. Also, during high school, there is something called the Black and White bulletin. So, during the time of Valentine we created a Black and White special edition on Valentine. So people would be interested right? That’s it. There we created various content about Valentine. Obviously, because it was an Islamic bulletin the opinion leaned towards forbidding the celebration of Valentine to our high school friends. It was more about distribution of information. But we did not directly confront our friends who celebrate. The fear is that there they will resist, reject, or complain. (Hari, male, Indonesian, Muslim, student)

Additionally, as briefly mentioned above, teachers emphasize restrictions in relation to performing the holiday rituals at school. Some interviewees, for example, recall their grade school or junior high school teachers forbidding them to bring chocolate or candy on Valentine’s Day, particularly if the intention is to share or give as a Valentine’s Day gift to others. Some headmasters or teachers even perform unannounced inspection of student belongings on Valentine’s Day, to ensure that students do not have chocolate or candy in their schoolbags ready for exchange. Shirley remembers her grade school days, stating “My elementary school was an Islamic school. So when my friends brought chocolate on Valentine’s Day, my teacher reprimanded, saying it is the celebration of another religion.” Oki, recalled a similar experience in high school:

Interviewee: My school was an Islamic school. Most of the teachers had a rigid view of religion. I personally have no problem. If my friends want to celebrate or if I celebrate it. But during Friday preach, the khotib (preacher) displayed resistance. That was in high school. He said it [Valentine’s Day] did not align with Islamic values. There were also teachers that socialized this idea in class, before class started, like an opening lecture.

Interviewer: How did your friends react to this socialization effort?
Interviewee: My friends were somewhat indifferent, why make such a big deal? My teachers used to tell me that this is an Islamic school, but from what I observed, the students were not religious. Maybe because my school targeted students of middle-upper class, so the tuition was quite expensive. It’s different from the people who enroll in madrasah, whose students truly do want to study religion. But this school, it’s a secular school with a breath of Islam, it’s unclear, a.k.a grey. Is this school secular or Islamic? Most of the students do not study religion. In fact, many break religious rules, they don’t care.

In other cases, schools involved their students in protest efforts. For example, about 500 first to sixth graders of Al Fattah Islamic elementary school in Surakarta, Central Java were accompanied by 30 teachers to march to the Manahan Stadium to protest against the participation of Muslim youths in Valentine’s Day celebrations (Ayuningtyas 2013). Similarly about 500 senior high school students in Pekanbaru, Riau, took to the streets to rally against the holiday (Fardah 2012). Pan-Islamic movement Hizbut Tahrir Indonesia (HTI) are also involved in similar activities, staging protests against Valentine’s Day in Sukabumi, West Java in 2012 and Kediri, East Java in 2014. In 2013, in Malang, East Java, dozens of girls in headscarves not only protested against Valentine’s Day but offered an alternative celebration, declaring February 14 as ‘Headscarf Day’ ("Indonesia conservatives protest Valentine's Day" 2013). They distributed pamphlets depicting modest dress for men and women.

Appeals are made by government officials or religious leaders for parents to supervise their children around this holiday. As Faisal Ali, chariman of the Aceh Branch of Nahdatul Ulama (NU) stated, “We must prevent the younger Muslim generation in Aceh from being poisoned by a culture that contradicts our Muslim values. Therefore, everybody, parents in particular, should give our youth the proper guidance” (Fardah 2012). Similarly, the Deputy Mayor in Depok, West Java also advised parents to prevent children from celebrating the
holiday. However, some government officials choose to take more concrete action by limiting student access to the holiday’s activities. For example, the Mataram Education, Youth and Sport Agency issued a restraining order prohibiting students from participation in any sort of Valentine’s Day celebrations in school (Jakarta Post 2014b). Similarly, in Pekanbaru, Riau Islands, Mayor Ayat Cahyadi instructed all schools under his jurisdiction to ban their students from celebrating Valentine’s Day.

As a means to fend off immoral activity on Valentine’s Day, in 2008, the Bukittinggi, West Sumatra municipal administration under Mayor Djufri decided to ban residents from celebrating Valentine's Day and encouraged parents to forbid their children from going out on the night of the holiday. The administration shut down cafes and tourist sites that would attract visitors on the holiday, including the famous Jam Gadang (clock tower). Additionally, permits already issued for Valentine's Day activities had been revoked and threats were made about bringing firms who insisted on celebrating to court (Bachyul Jb 2008). In Aceh, which is the only province in Indonesia where Syariah (Islamic) law is imposed, a new rule banning the purchasing of Valentine’s Day gifts has recently been enforced (Gade 2013).

More extreme measures are reflected in the raiding of parks, hotel rooms and cemeteries (often used by locals as dating ground) on the night before Valentine’s Day. For example Pekanbaru, Riau Islands, Mayor Ayat Cahyadi asked the city’s public order officers (Satpol PP) to cooperate with local police to monitor hotels in Pekanbaru on the eve of Valentine’s Day (Ayuningtyas 2013). Meanwhile authorities in Balikpapan, Borneo also ordered monitoring of cheap hotels to conduct raids on unmarried young couples. In these efforts, some teenagers were arrested and released to their parents (France-Presse 2013).
Figure 5. Translation of the Religious Frame: Valentine’s Day as Un-Islamic
The overall depiction and analysis presented above reflects the chain of translation that stems from the religious framing of Valentine’s Day as foreign, immoral, and therefore, un-Islamic. In this effort, a process of frame transformation is identified, in which the notion of romance is replaced with immorality. The holiday conceptualized as foreign, Western, and part of Christian tradition, further supports its un-Islamic framing (i.e., representational practice). Islamic texts and religious interpretations of respected scholars are cited to insinuate that holiday participation implies religious sin (i.e., normalizing practice). Communication campaigns as well as banning and policing efforts are performed by supporters of the religious frame (i.e., integrative practice) to ensure that all related parties are aware and enact in the proper manner by rejecting participation. Seen as a threat to Islamic culture in particular and local tradition in general, various actors feel compelled to continue the translation of Valentine’s Day as un-Islamic. Student mentors, teachers, parents, religious leaders, and government officials take part in constructing a new meaning for the holiday and its related practices. The celebration of romance becomes narrowly redefined in terms of a festival of lust that is translated into action, among others through education, contestation, rejection, banning, issuing of edicts, and even policing by relying on guidelines noted in religious texts as foundation to continue and spread this perspective and practice.

It is critical to understand that the deliberate efforts made by various actors to reject the holiday are part of a larger scheme of actions. In other words, anti-Valentine’s Day efforts to some extent are related to other disparate efforts to co-create value. For example, student mentors create anti-Valentine’s Day mentoring sessions as part of their general effort to improve the overall religious knowledge of student mentees. Valentine’s Day is only one topic among a list of existing material prepared for the mentoring sessions. Parents and teachers forbid their
children or students from participating in the holiday primarily out of concern for their overall wellbeing and a sense of responsibility to protect vulnerable children from engaging in immoral practice or actions that may tarnish not only their religiosity but also standing in society. Interestingly, the ulema council chapters and government officials that take active measures to curb or ban Valentine’s Day activity are of regions that have a predominantly strong religious (Islamic) constituent. It may thus be the case that holiday restrictions are enforced solely to gain favor of potential political and/or financial backers. On the other hand, it may also be the case that these policies truly reflect the sentiment in society.

As an action net approach would underline, it is through the performance of these chain of translated practices that an actor may be deemed a conservative or liberal Muslim, as a liberal would not buy into a narrow framing of the holiday, cite text verses to support rejection, as well as participate in active efforts to ban, boycott or curb the holiday using this particular framing. One’s opinion and approach towards Valentine’s Day is only one such determining elements. Their position and action regarding clothing, alcohol and pork consumption, polygamy, fasting are among other issues that may further define the labeling of one as conservative or liberal. This example reinforces the idea that, it is practices that determine actor’s identity and not vice versa.

To underline, the concerted effort to reject the holiday serves as a means for a particular social group to reinforce their identity as a certain type of religious actor. In this case, actors can strengthen their identity as (conservative) Muslims by not participating in Valentine’s Day and taking active action to prevent the spread of the celebration. This translation process guides and pressures other to follow suit if they want to identify as such or belong to this cultural category.
6.1.3 Social Frame: Valentine’s Day as a celebration of wholesome, universal love

Representational practice

Valentine’s Day has also been framed as more than just a day for couples. Instead, some have reconstructed it as a special day to express love to anybody who deserves care and recognition, like that of friends, mothers, fathers, and children. The basic framing is summarized by Tika Bisono, a well-known Jakarta-based psychologist, who says that “Valentine's Day is not just for lovers and couples. It is also for parents and children, bosses and employees and between friends” (Asrianti 2008). Similarly, Astri, a college student, explained in her interview how she no longer regards Valentine’s Day as a couple’s celebration:

Maybe when I was still in junior high school, I thought it was just a moment to exchange chocolate, without really knowing what the purpose of Valentine is. Maybe now, I already know what the underlying principle is. So it’s not just for couples. Back then, maybe we can see that the majority who celebrate are couples. But that is no longer the case now. It can be for family, for friends, to show that we care about them.

Overall, in this view, another form of frame transformation occurs, in which Valentine’s Day is redefined to be more inclusive, accommodating the needs for all actors, not just romantic couples, to express their love and care for one another. In this context, Valentine’s Day is interpreted as a wholesome holiday for children, friends, and family to participate in. It can even be more broadly interpreted as a means to express a more universal love, by taking a stand to care for crucial issues relating to poverty, social injustices, climate change, and other causes that support humanity and their well-being.

Normalizing and Integrative Practices

Interviews with university students indicate that most of their first encounters with Valentine’s Day occurred doing their early school years. While some learned about the holiday in grade school, others learned later in junior high or high school. Most remembered their first
encounter or earlier experiences with the holiday as an enjoyable occasion that is mostly marked by the exchange of chocolate among friends.

I first learned about Valentine’s Day in elementary school because my friends exchanged chocolate, just for fun. I wasn’t too excited because I don’t like chocolate. So when I received chocolate, I was happy, because ‘ooh, I’m given a chocolate (gift),’ but not too excited about eating it. I only know that it’s Valentine’s Day, but I don’t know the meaning behind it. All I know is that gifts are exchanged. (Crystal)

In junior high and high school we made chocolate. Some friends made their own chocolate. I’m lazy so I buy the chocolate for teachers, friends, anybody I know. I would just give them out not really as a gift or in hopes for anything in return, but as a thank you, (to express) I love you to a friend, to a teacher. (Beta)

Additionally, people have come to adopt Valentine’s Day as part of a family ritual, enacted through the exchange of greetings and gifts among family members. Astri, for example, recalls how she and her sister began giving flowers to her mother every Valentine’s Day:

Suddenly my sister and I came up with the idea, Valentine’s Day. Maybe (it was because) at that time neither of us had a boyfriend. So on Valentine’s Day, (we thought) ‘who said it was just for couples?’ Our parents are much more dedicated (to us). So that’s what happened, we wanted to express it, because maybe we seldom say, ‘I love mom.” But on Valentine’s Day, it’s a good time to say it, ‘Mom, you know I love you, right, Mom?” (Astrid)

The rituals of Ofani’s family are somewhat different. Lead by their mother, they take the occasion to focus attention on their father:

Usually, in our family we focus our (Valentine) greetings to our father. We make something, give flowers to father, and in return he takes us out to dinner… My mother was the one who initiated this. (Ofani)

Among some, Valentine’s Day has become a family affair, used to increase the bond between family members:

In the last couple of year, we celebrate (Valentine’s Day). I mean, my brother, the oldest, would buy chocolate. For all his siblings, also for his wife, and his children. So even though I am not part of his immediate family, I also got something, affection, then we celebrate. We talk. For us, there is a long chat at the
dinner table. So when he gets home from work, then we have dinner, then he
gives chocolate, and we chat. That’s how we celebrate. (Crista)

In 9th grade I was given chocolate as a gift by a (girl who was my) junior. I told
my mom what had happened, and I gave her the chocolate I received. My mom
said we should eat the chocolate together. I also asked her to give me a chocolate
gift in return, and (instead) she offered to make me a meal. After that we watched
a movie together. .... I think Valentine’s Day is a day to express our love to
others, not just our girlfriends, but also our parents. Since 10th grade, every
Valentine’s Day, I always give my mom and dad a Valentine greeting. (Beri)

By acknowledging Valentine’s Day as more than just a day for romance and couples,
marketers seem to also support such frame extension, Bank Danamon, for example, uses the
holiday to express their love and gratitude towards their customers, through the tag line “For us,
the biggest win is winning your heart.” Other brands, like Pasar Raya, a modern middle-upper
scale department store promote Valentine’s Day as a wholesome family celebration. Their
Valentine’s Day advertisement, for example, featured a close up picture of a family, where mom
and two kids huddle together to give dad a kiss. The tagline states, “Give a loving gift to the
most special people. Father, mother, older sibling and younger sibling” (Berikan kado penuh
kasih pada orang teristimewa. Ayah, ibu, kakak & adik).

Other sets of actors also contribute to widening the definition of Valentine’s Day.
University organizations and companies often hold blood drives on Valentine’s Day as a means
of expressing care to those in need. Catholic school students in Yogyakarta distribute basic food
needs among less fortunate others. And students in Bali collected donations to send to Jakarta
students who had experienced flooding. Valentine’s Day thus becomes reframed as a day to do
good—to give to charity, or donate to those who are in need. For example, animal rescue
communities like Animal Defenders and Jakarta Fauna Welfare held pet adoption events
enabling people to express their love for animals in need of homes.
NGO activists, use the popularity of the holiday to bring awareness on crucial social issues. For example, One Billion Rising Indonesia organized a flash-mob dance, as part of a global effort to raise awareness about and violence against women. Hundreds of people danced at the National Monument (Monas) in Jakarta to show their solidarity with female victims of violence (Agusta 2013). GAYa Dewata, a Bali-based organization working to empower gay and transgender community participated in a public forum at the Bali Museum in Denpasar to show support for other LGBT communities in Indonesia who still face discrimination (Sertori 2011).

Public figures use the holiday to send messages of peace and tolerance. Before executing his blindfolded driving stunt on Valentine’s Day, well-known local magician, Deddy Cobuzier, noted that his show is call to ensure that love and peace does not become polluted in the nation (Messwati 2001). Nidji, Indonesian alternative pop band, used their Valentine’s Day concert to call upon religious tolerance, particularly in relation to recent cases in which members of the Ahmadiyah sect in West Java had been assaulted by Muslim extremists in West Java and a mob or enraged Muslims rampaged through the streets of Temanggung, Central Java burning two churches. Lead vocalist Giring Ganesha represented the band during their Nidji Live in Valentine’s Concert in saying, “I love all religions. In my opinion, everyone should feel that way, love each other and try to be a blessing for this world.” In addition, the band performed a number of songs that depicted the spirit of love for life, family, and work (Kompas 2011c).

Other entities not only used the occasion to call attention to certain issues, but also used common Valentine’s Day symbols and rituals as a means to better convey their message. For example, the police of Boyolali, Central Java stopped hundreds of motorcyclists on the road on Valentine’s Day. Rather than fine for violations, police rewarded motorcyclists who properly wore helmets, carried complete registration, and had working lights with a flower and a heart-
shaped paper. Motorcyclists were given the choice of three gifts: cellphone credit, a helm or gas coupon. In this case, the Boyolali police adapted the gift-giving rituals of Valentine’s Day to raise awareness for traffic safety and at the same time reward motorcyclists for abiding traffic rules and regulations ("Berbagi "Cinta" di Tepi Jalan 2009).

In an effort to criticize the dwindling performance of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), media reporters sent KPK a Valentine’s Day gift that consisted of a board filled with ‘valentines’ to the commission, a bouquet of withered flowers, a jar of stale kerupuk (chips), as well news clippings about the commission. This play on the conventional set of Valentine’s Day gifts –greeting card and fresh roses– is an attempt to mock KPK for their slow performance. This gesture was to remind KPK that they are continually being evaluated by the media and reflect the reporters’ hope for KPK to strengthen their effort in eradicating corruption.

Similarly, the United Front of Law Students (Kesatuan Aksi Mahasiswa Hukum; KMH) performed a unique gift-giving ritual layered with symbolism as a means to criticize the District Prosecutor Office for their performance. On Valentine’s Day, KMH held demonstrations in front of the High Court and Prosecutor Office in Denpasar, Bali. They presented a packet of condoms to Prosecutor Santoso, to symbolize their hopes that the prosecution office not be contaminated by elements of the New Order, which they liken to the HIV virus. They also presented paper flowers to signify their love on Valentine’s Day (Kompas 2001).

Overall, in this chain of translation (see Figure 6), the definition of Valentine’s Day became widened to not only include romantic love, but used to define a more universal love that not only encompasses expression of affection for children, family, and friends but to refer to any case, issue, instance or problem that may demand attention or consideration, starting from
Figure 6. Translation of the Social Frame: Valentine’s Day as a Day to Enact Universal Love
abandoned pets, refugees, the poor, as well as issues like domestic violence, LGBT, religious tolerance, traffic compliance, and corruption.

Again, in this case Valentine’s Day, along with its attached meanings, popularity and controversy, and therefore, newsworthiness is used as a resource by various actors and entities (children, parents, adults, police, NGOs, student organizations, marketers) to enact their respective value co-creation practices. The child’s play of chocolate exchange, expression of kinship among adults, police efforts to improve traffic compliance, and efforts to raise awareness for important causes and issues all become connected through their reliance on Valentine’s Day as the enabler or facilitator of action. The notion of love and caring is positive and universal enough that any project or social effort can latch on. Additionally, the general appeal of the holiday also generates attention to efforts that would otherwise go unnoticed. For example, it would be difficult for pet adoption or blood drive efforts to receive media coverage if it did not leverage the love celebration.

Overall, the three identified framing of Valentine’s Day reflects efforts to maintain, narrow, as well as widen the ‘original’ meaning of the holiday. Each frame is not necessarily supported by a single entity or actor, but reflects a co-creative interweaving among disparate actors who can hinge or build their respective value co-creating efforts based on the particular framing.

In this section, I performed a ‘zooming-in’ analysis by highlighting the sayings and doings (i.e., representational) practices of various actors to construct three distinct framings of Valentine’s Day: 1) the commercialized celebration of romantic love (romantic), 2) an un-Islamic practice (religious), and 3) the celebration of universal love (social). I have explored how different actors have built on the respective framings, and continued the chain of translation by
citing supporting texts, issuing rules, establishing norms and guidelines, as well as generating normative pressure to support each frame (i.e., normalizing practices), and by performing integrative practices that reflect the different perspectives. Each frame is enacted by individuals who are informed by their greater peer group, and vice versa. The greater peer group also draws its ideas and ideals from a wider network of action, as their actions also contribute to this broader network. Analysis however, has primarily been developed in the confines of each respective framing.

In the section that follows, I will perform a ‘zooming-out’ analysis to explore how these distinct frames, as enacted by their respective communities of practice, interact and influence the actions of the others, to provide a better understanding of how translation occurs amidst competing frameworks driven by the presence of inter-institutional spheres.

6.2 Translation between Contexts

In the following section, I conduct a zooming-out analysis first by trailing the movement of the Valentine’s Day rose as it changes hands from grower to vendor to lover, concerned religious actors, or social activists. I explore the role the roses play for each actor and the shift in meanings observed each time the artefact shifts between actors, as a means to explore how framing influences action, and explore how different actors that support different frames converge and diverge. A second analysis focuses on how different framings interact with each other, particularly by focusing on how the actions of those supporting one frames can enable and constrain the actions of those supporting another frame. Additionally, analysis is done by zooming out further more by exploring how enactments in other broader social and global context influence the enactment of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia.
6.2.1 Following the trajectory of Valentine’s Day roses

Red roses, are among the key artefacts used in the celebration of Valentine’s Day. In this analysis, I trace the movement of roses, as a means to explore the action nets built around Valentine’s Day. Following the trajectory of roses, enables us to highlight how distinct frames of thoughts that are empowered by higher level institutional logics contribute to distinct use and interpretations of a particular artefact. In this case, distinct framings of Valentine’s Day influence how roses are interpreted and utilized as a resource in various value co-creating practices. Vice versa, the identification of how roses are signified and treated in different practice enactments, provide a concrete micro-level reflection of the various interpretive frames that drive the performance of Valentine’s Day.

In the context of Valentine’s Day, roses are widely accepted as the symbol of love and have become somewhat of a staple in the gift-giving aspect of the holiday’s rituals. Roses are namely presented by a man to his female partner, as a sole gift or a supplement to other gifts (e.g., chocolate, jewelry, etc.), as a means to express his affection. However, prior to this particular gift exchange, the same exact roses have already been exchanged through a number of hands, namely among rose growers, flower wholesalers, small florist shops, and seasonal street vendors who focus on ensuring its sufficient supply for the holiday. Treated as a commodity to be bought and sold in the open market, the roses played a different role and carried a distinct meaning among prior handlers.

While Valentine’s Day celebrants utilize the rose to signify love, those involved in the process of supplying roses for the holiday, identify them as business opportunity with profit potential. While roses are grown and marketed throughout the year, demand is expected to increase during certain holiday seasons, including Valentine’s Day. Proper calculations need to
be made so that a sufficient number of seeds are planted at the right time so that roses can be harvested by Valentine’s Day. A 2002 newspaper report ("Perdagangan bunga hias masih lesu" 2002b) highlights the details of the Valentine’s Day rose trade at the Kayun flower market in East Java. It is noted that to optimize Valentine’s Day related sales, rose shipments to Kayun flower traders begin to decrease in early February; the normal shipments of 1000 roses every 2-3 times a week are cut by 50% as supply was reserved for Valentine’s Day. As early as four days before Valentine’s Day, rose farmers can increase their charges by up to fifteen-fold. Half-bloomed roses that are usually sold for Rp. 500 (4 cents; 1USD=Rp. 12,000,-) a stem, begin to be sold at prices that range between Rp. 2,500 and Rp. 7,500. Meanwhile, imported rose varieties that are cultivated in Cipanas, East Java begin to be sold at Rp. 30,000 a stem by rose growers, which is four times above its normal price. Retailers also charge at a higher base, selling domestic roses for Rp. 3,500 to 15,000 a stem and imported roses starting from Rp. 35,000 a stem to hundred thousands of rupiah.

Meanwhile Islamic conservatives insist that Valentine’s Day goes against Islamic values, and therefore encourage the public to avoid participation in the holiday. Government officials in Aceh, the only Indonesian province that imposes Islamic law, have gone to the extremes of outlawing Valentine’s Day celebrations and in 2013 issued a new rule banning the public from buying gifts for the holiday (Gade 2013). Under this rule, the meaning of roses is again reinterpreted, not as a symbol of affection or a profitable trade commodity, but a forbidden artefact that signifies immorality. Performed for the purpose of Valentine’s Day, the cultivation, shipment, distribution, marketing, and purchase of roses shift from a simple transaction to the facilitation of sinful behavior, which by implication, is also considered sinful.
Interestingly, social activists creatively borrow the rituals and artefacts of Valentine’s Day to create value and meaning for themselves and others. For example, as noted, in their effort to critique the performance of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), journalist visited the agency on Valentine’s Day bearing gifts, which included a large poster of hand-written valentines, bouquets of withered flowers and stale *kerupuk* (chips), as well as news clippings about the commission (Gade 2013). The protest coordinator, Okky Puspa Madasar made the following statement as she handed the gifts to KPK head Antasari Azhar and deputy chair Chandra M. Hamzah, “this is a symbol of our love for the KPK. We criticize because we love this commission and we support its efforts to eradicate corruption.” Thus in the hands of concerned journalists, the rituals of Valentine’s Day, particularly the gifting of flowers, was used to convey a social critique reflected hope and a call for better performance of a public agency.

Overall, roses in the context of Valentine’s Day, can be attributed to a number of meanings depending on the framing of the holiday employed and the motivation behind the actors involved in the translation process. Traders seek profit, couples express love, religious conservatives assert their identity, and activists raise public awareness as they incorporate roses in their respective performances. Furthermore, each interpretation of the rose exists because of the other. For example, only because celebrants use roses to signify love, can traders sell them for a good profit on Valentine’s Day. Likewise, because of the romantic associations of the rose do religious leaders ban its purchase. This analysis identifies the linkages between distinct the groups of practices. Analyzing the tangible, all parties utilize the rose, but at a more conceptual level they make use of the concept of Valentine’s Day as a resource in the meaning-making efforts. What they diverge on are the interpretive frames used to inform use of the rose and the holiday as well as the framings produced. As such, while distinct grouping converge on the
utilization of roses and Valentine’s Day as a common resource, they diverge in the meanings attributed and reinforced.

6.2.2 Tracing the relationship among distinct Valentine’s Day frames

In the zooming-in analysis, three distinct framings of Valentine’s Day are identified: romantic, religious, and social. Each frame is reinforced by distinct sets of actors who find significance in supporting this particular frame. In other words, the frame aligns with their respective needs to co-create value for themselves and others. In this zooming-out analysis, we explore the interaction between these competing frames by identifying how presence of each respective frame influences the actions of proponents of other frames.

As noted, the romantic framing of Valentine’s Day hinges on the idea that love needs to be expressed and celebrated at least once a year, namely on Valentine’s Day. This celebration is primarily reserved for those who are in a romantic or committed relationship, namely dating teenagers, courting couples, or married spouses and enacted through the performance of implicitly agreed upon rituals, which include among others the exchanges of gifts, commonly in the form of chocolate and roses with an accompanying greeting card as well as a romantic dinner and quality bonding time.

This romantic framing not only attracts modern day couples, but also appeals to the various commercial entities that see facilitation of this celebration as a profit opportunity. Similar to greeting card companies as well as chocolate makers and manufacturers, rose growers, wholesalers, shops, and street vendors anticipate greater demand during this occasion, and respond by timely ensuring optimal levels of supply, usually at an increased price. Restaurants offer romantic dining packages, hotels prepare romantic accommodation, film producers and
theaters release romantic movies, performers serenade love songs, and brands position themselves as the best Valentine’s Day gifts.

The increasing commercialization of the Valentine’s Day contributes to its growing popularity. Those who have never heard of Valentine’s Day before are confronted with the holiday as retail arenas are decorated with the holiday colors and symbols, and various media promote the upcoming holiday. The marketing hype also serves as inevitable reminders to potential celebrants that Valentine’s Day is around the corner. The assertiveness of commercial entities in their efforts to facilitate the holiday has helped to establish Valentine’s Day as a mainstream commercial holiday. Holiday rituals and commercial practices increasingly overlap, as Valentine’s Day becomes gradually defined, driven, and dependent upon commercial activity. Valentine’s Day is no longer a private affair between couples. Instead the holiday not only mediates but is mediated by commercial activity.

For the most part, the customers openly welcome commercial facilitation of the holiday. Holiday participants use magazine articles and advertisements as reference to guide them in performing the proper rituals or choosing the best Valentine gift. Celebrants utilize the available resources by buying chocolate, flowers, and greeting cards from various vendors, making reservations at restaurants, and booking other potential supporting services.

The increasing popularity of Valentine’s Day, however, has generated concern among religious conservatives who perceive the celebration as a threat to local tradition and society in general. Perceiving the holiday as infiltration of a foreign culture, a practice that for the most part is commercial and secular either becomes labeled as a Christian holiday or associated with immoral behavior. Given these associations, taking an active stance against Valentine’s Day becomes the expected course of action and helps to assert one’s identity as a ‘true’ Muslim.
However, as this stance is peculiar to the moderate majority, it draws attention and gains coverage in local as well as international media. Such publicity, not only helps to broadcast such views about Valentine’s Day, but also brings the religious framing to the level of global discourse. This increases the legitimacy of the religious framing of Valentine’s Day and validates the significance of the group of actors that support such framing. The anti-Valentine’s Day movement, therefore, becomes a way to assert religious identity.

Arguably, it is the increasing popularity and appeal of Valentine’s Day as well as the ambiguity and controversy surrounding the holiday that warrants concerted action against it. As Valentine’s Day is deemed newsworthy by the media, actions to reject Valentine’s Day become worth the effort, as such actions also become newsworthy. Interestingly, other imported and potentially controversial holidays, like that of Halloween or April Fool’s Day, have not received as much attention or been put under comparable scrutiny by religious authorities or the more faithful followers of Islam. While both holidays are celebrated in Indonesia, its popularity and scope is still limited. Night clubs hold costume parties on Halloween night and radio jockeys play pranks on the first of April. The sexual innuendos of these costume parties and the mischievous actions of the pranks can easily be linked to digression from religious values. Nevertheless, the celebration of these holidays have not generated much protest, perhaps because their level of popularity and degree of commercialization is not alarming enough to reach the radar of or raise concern for conservative Muslims.

The widespread awareness of the religious framing and the increasing number of customers that support the anti-Valentine’s Day stance also influences they ways in which firms and other business establishments approach the holiday. While firms may see profit opportunity
by jumping on the Valentine’s Day bandwagon, doing so may also run the risk of alienating a pre-existing customer base who may find the firm’s association with the holiday off-putting.

While marketers still predominantly frame Valentine’s Day as a romantic event, there are an increasing number of firms who are beginning to shift or broaden the associations of the holiday. Instead of highlighting the romantic relationship between couples, the first set of advertisers emphasizes the relationship between the customer and the brand. For example, companies like Ace Hardware and Selular Shop use the holiday as an occasion for customers to reinforce their attachment towards the brand through discounted purchase. Meanwhile CIMB Niaga (bank), utilizes the event to express love to their customers by holding a ‘point sale’ in which customers can redeem their rewards with only half the number of points than commonly required. As mentioned, Pasar Raya also widened the holiday’s romantic frame by promoting Valentine’s Day as a wholesome family celebration. Aside from catering to a broader audience this widened framing may also better align with the ideals of those that agree with the religious framing of the holiday.

Another interesting observation is the shifting advertising themes that Matahari (department store) has employed over the course of about 8 years in relation to Valentine’s Day. As displayed in the figure below, Matahari’s 2003 advertisement simply promotes a 5-day Valentine’s Day sale in which an additional 30% discount is offered and pre-discounted products can reach up to 70% off. The department store’s 2008 ad displays various female fashion accessories on sale. The headline states, “Express love with your best gift. Celebrate Valentine, Discount (up to) 50%”. If addressed to a female audience, this may imply a self-gift or presenting oneself as the best gift to one’s partner by purchasing new accessories to be worn on Valentine’s Day. If addressed to a male audience, this may give hints on what the best gifts are to
present a girlfriend on Valentine’s Day. In brief, this ad builds more on the romantic interpretation of Valentine’s Day. Meanwhile, their 2010 advertisement, however, portrays a young family of four consisting of a father, mother, older sister, and younger brother standing around a large red circle displaying the statement, “Enjoy 1 day of saving 50%.” An additional headline at the bottom states: Special Offer Just (for) Today, and in smaller font, “Shop economically earlier with the family on a Day Full of Love.” In this advertisement, the department store builds on an extended view of Valentine’s Day, framing it as a family occasion rather than a couple’s event. One of Matahari’s 2012 advertisements displays a young female model in red and white clothes standing under a red circle stating “Enjoy 1 day of saving 50%.” In the background are two blocks of pink and a block of all white roses. Interestingly, there is no mention of the holiday whatsoever, only application of the holidays’ colors (red, white, and pink) as well as their symbols (roses). The advertising strategies of Matahari is particularly interesting because their core target market consists of Indonesia’s lower-middle and middle class, which may be more inclined to agree with the religious framing of the holiday. As such, Matahari’s involvement in the holiday, particularly by employing a romantic frame of Valentine’s Day may offend an existing customer base. However, withdrawal from the holiday may also result in lost profit opportunity for the department store. As such, over time, we observe a shift away from the romantic framing, towards a more wholesome family oriented definition of the holiday, to implicit association with the holiday. This implies that some firms are beginning to orient their strategies to accommodate and align with the changing views and values of customers in general.

Additionally, the popularity of Valentine’s Day along with the controversy that surrounds it makes the holiday very appealing for social activists, as many have used this day to draw attention to their respective causes, such as violence against women, LGBT issues, AIDS, and
corruption, government efficiency. Schools and social organizations also latch on to the holiday to perform charity, blood drives, and pet adoption. Others also choose to hold protests to stand for their cause. One interesting demonstration was one that stood against FPI (Islamic Defender Front). FPI is a hardline Islamic group that has often resorted to acts of violence in the name of religion. Not surprisingly, they take a stance against Valentine’s Day and act as vigilantes by policing low-end motels to expose those who engage in immoral activity on this holiday. On Valentine’s Day of 2012, these anti-Valentine protesters were protested, as a rainbow coalition stood in unity for an “Indonesia Withou FPI.” They requested that FPI be prosecuted for their violent acts as they perceive the government has been too lenient towards their delinquent acts.

The coalition mocked FPI’s strong stance against Valentine’s Day, by holding a banner stating “Valentine Gift for Habib Riziek” who is the head of Front Pembela Islam (Jakarta Post 2012). Amusingly, one most likely sold in gift shops as a cute Valentine’s Day gift. However, as it is widely known that pork (and therefore the pig) is considered haram in Islam and that contact with a live pig would be considered najis, or ritually unclean, in the context of this protest the stuffed animal was meant as an insult.

Overall, this analysis highlights how actions guided by a particular frame influences and is influenced by actions guided by other framings. The interaction is highlighted by points of convergences and points of divergences. As shown in the contextualized framework (see Figure 8), each action net diverge on their respective framing. Different sets of actors support different types of framing. While couples and marketers maintain the romantic frame of the holiday, other participants, marketers, as well as social activists prefer a broader framing of the holiday that defines Valentine’s Day as a more universal celebration of love. Furthermore, concerned parents, religious leaders, conservatives, as well as provincial government officials support religious
Figure 7. Frame Transformation Reflected in Matahari Valentine’s Day Ads
Figure 8. Fractal Model of Translation: Valentine’s Day Context (Meso-level analysis)
framing of the holiday. As such we see divergence in terms of the framing of Valentine’s Day. However, convergence is identified as these distinct groups similarly employ the idea of Valentine’s Day as a resource for their respective value co-creation practices.

6.2.3 Zooming out

Zooming out even further, we come to see the enactment and rejection of Valentine’s Day as further embedded in a larger network of action (Figure 9). Much of the factors that contribute to the enactment and controversy around Valentine’s Day is made possible by the shifting values of the Indonesian nation as situated in a global context.

With a population of nearly 250 million, Indonesia is the fourth most populous country and home to the largest Muslim population in the world, most of whom are moderate followers of the religion. The people of Indonesia comprises of a handful of dominant ethnic groups of about a thousand diverse ethnic/subethnic groups (Suryadinata, Arifin, and Ananta 2003). Altogether they speak an estimate of 550-700 languages and dialects (Sneddon, 2004), but are connected by the national language, Bahasa Indonesia. Furthermore, the diverse peoples of Indonesia function as an imagined community that is united through a strong sense of national identity (Anderson 2006).

In 1998, President Soeharto stepped down from power after 32 years of authoritarian rule. Since then the people of Indonesia entered the Reformasi (reform) era, which prompted a series of new policies that encouraged a move toward a more democratic and tolerant society. Among these changes included direct presidential election as well as efforts to redistribute power from the highly centralized state structures of the Soeharto era (Carnegie 2008). Decentralization has increased the number of municipalities (kota) and districts (kabupaten) by almost 50% from 292 to 434 in 2003 (Fitrani et al. 2005). Direct election of provincial leaders has been
established, and 75% of the 3.9 million civil servants are now under regional control, which contributes to 40% of government spending (World Bank 2003). Freedom of the press is better guaranteed as a press operating license (SIUPP) is no longer required for print publication. In 1999, only one year after reform, the Indonesian Press Publishers Association (SPS) reported a significant leap in the number of publications, increasing from 289 to 1398 (Sen and Hill 2010).

Along with increasing democratization, is a shift towards stronger adherence towards Islam, which is consistent with the practice in other parts of the Muslim world (Burhanudin and van Dijk 2014). Indonesian Muslims have become more religious in their attitudes and
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practices, and are increasingly observing the religious tenets, such as fulfilling the hajj and the wearing of headscarves by women (Burhanudin and van Dijk 2014). While liberal Islamic views, like those embodied by JIL (Jaringan Islam Liberal) exist (Ali 2005), there is also an increase in Islamic fundamentalism as signified through the emergence of radical or militant groups like Front Pembela Islam (FPI), MMI, and Laskar Jihad (Burhanudin and van Dijk 2014). A secular Indonesia, that is dominated by moderate Muslims, now face hardline groups that carry the agenda of establishing a more purified practice of Islam and implementation of Islamic law. The face of Islam is increasingly fragmented, as Aspinall (2013, p. 45-6) explains:

Indonesian Islam has moved away from a model defined by the contest between traditionalist and modernist aliran, their chief organizations, NU and Muhammadiyah, and the cluster of smaller bodies that used to orbit around them. Instead, we see a much more plural field populated by mass organizations, celebrity preachers, Sufi sects, NGOs, and a plethora of other actors, many of whom it is impossible to define in light of the old modernist–traditionalist dichotomy. The transnationally oriented Islamist groups themselves are fractious, with groups such as PKS and Hizbut Tahrir (to say nothing of the jihadi grouplets) fiercely divided on issues of doctrine and strategy and orienting themselves to different international models and centers.

Democratization in Indonesia moves alongside marketization. Indonesia is currently the 16th largest economy (Oberman et al. 2012) in the world and can boast stable economic growth at around 5.8 percent for the last ten years (Rachmat 2014). Its economic success can be attributed to government policy, increasing industrialization and trade openness, as well as endowment of natural resources and a young growing labor force (Elias and Noone 2011). Additionally, there are also efforts to improve governance and transparency to slowly eradicate corruption. Indonesia’s economic growth is driven more by domestic consumption rather than exports, as well as services rather than manufacturing of resources (Oberman et al. 2012).

The translation of Valentine’s Day is thus situated, within these macro-level enactments of Indonesia’s participation in the global economy, the nation’s strive to achieve legitimacy as a
The enactment of Valentine’s Day equally contributes the enforcement of the nation as being part of a global economy and democratic state. Meso level practices thus need to be explained in light of and as contributing to shape these macro level practices.

The increasing popularity of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia goes hand-in-hand with a more open trade, increased access to media, rising middle class, as well as increased democracy. The marketization of the any holiday is a reflection of how business actors see value co-creation opportunities, and the increased acceptance among the general public may reflect efforts to assert middle class, and urban global identity. Meanwhile, religious conservatives who reject the celebration are enacting their role to translate what it means for them to become a ‘good’ Muslim in the context of a modernizing and globalizing culture. While the nation aims to establish a unique identity that not only stays true to local values and traditions, it may also refer to other nations as legitimate role models. For example, while Indonesia may lean towards Western models of democracy and economic development, it may lean towards the (Middle) East in establishing its Islamic identity. Regardless, the areas of religion, economy, and democracy also overlap. As Aspinall (2013) notes, the “pluralization of religious expression is itself one sign of the wider social and cultural changes associated with an emerging neoliberal social pattern and allied transformations: globalization, commercialization, digitalization, new communication technologies.” Thus the rapid adoption and recently increasing rejection of the holiday contributes to and is reflective of the open economy and democratic environment, as well as turn towards religious conservatism.

Therefore, adoption of foreign (Western) rituals and practices like that of Valentine’s Day may reflect efforts of a growing middle class, to participate in the global consumer culture
and attain membership to an imagined modern global society. On the other hand, rejection of Valentine’s Day also does not occur in isolation. It is not surprising that as religious leaders in Indonesia ban the holiday, as clerics in other Islamic countries do so too. Malaysian authorities similarly warn the public about the celebration, and Islamic countries like Iran and Saudi Arabia have banned Valentine’s Day (Mellman 2011). Furthermore, countries such as Russia and India reject Valentine’s Day as a means to symbolize the rejection of foreign culture. Thus, the rejection of Valentine’s Day buy religious and cultural leaders may reflect efforts to align with the values and actions with likeminded actors and countries that serve as role models or benchmark for emulation. As Lee and Chandler (2010) note, cultural convergence may occur via imagined communities (Cayla and Eckhardt 2008; Cayla and Eckhardt 2007) as a means to connect with transnational forces.

7 Discussion

Based on the above analysis, distinct patterns of convergence and divergence are identified in the process of translation within and between contexts. In translation within context, practice converges in the representations being created. In other words, distinct actors align themselves along the lines of a common frame. Meanwhile groups of actors diverge because the representations are used for their respective value co-creation practices. As noted, couples enact the romantic frame as a means to strengthen their relationship while marketers contribute to shaping the romantic frame for profit potential. With regards to the religious framing of Valentine’s Day, parents, educators, and student mentors perpetuate the narrowed frame out in an effort to become better practitioners of Islam and out of concern for the moral and spiritual well-being of the children under their guidance. Government authorities, may also have similar
concerns, or arguably depict Valentine’s Day in a negative light as a means to win constituents. Rejection of Valentine’s Day becomes a means to establish identity as a ‘good’ Muslim. Meanwhile, other actors enact the frame of Valentine’s Day as a celebration of universal love, but differ in the meaning and benefits derived out of their participation. Children, family, and friends celebrate to have fun and express love to friends and family. Social activists build on similar meanings to generate attention and create appeal to their respective causes. As such, distinct actors converge through the building of a particular frame but diverge in the motivation to use enact such frames as they relate to distinct value co-creation practices.

In analyzing the translation process between contexts, a process of frame transformation between contexts is observed, either in the form of narrowing or widening of meaning. Enactments of Valentine’s Day thus diverge by the enacted frames –romantic, social, or religious. However, these enactments converge because the actions of distinct actors in different contexts become a resource for the actions of others, and the fact that all utilize the notion of Valentine’s Day as a resource to perform their respective value co-creation activities.

In this study, there is a surprising lack of creativity and responsiveness among business actors in their contribution to the shaping of Valentine’s Day. In particular, business actors have been focused on maintaining the original meanings of the holiday and catering to a limited set of customers. Marketing efforts have largely been focused on making available Valentine’s Day related products (rose, chocolate, red-colored items) and ‘services’ (restaurant and hotel holiday offers). The customer of focus have largely been romantic couples, and now increasingly, encompassing children, family, and friends. Interestingly, it appears that social organizations and even conservative Muslims have been more creative and resourceful in utilizing Valentine’s Day to ‘market’ their interests, causes, or ideologies. While business actors rely on existing and taken
for granted links of translation, social organizations and religious conservatives are vigorously creating new links of translation by making use of the versatility of meanings through efforts to conduct frame transformation.

This finding further suggests the significance of this fractal model of translation in enabling analysts to observe the various framing processes –market-making efforts– that are simultaneously occurring, which allows the identification of new market opportunities. At the moment, the majority of business actors seem to be content on building markets through the maintenance of existing meaning systems, whereas other actor categories are assertively attributing new meanings and uses towards the practice. If business actors are more sensitive to these efforts, changes in marketing strategy during Valentine’s Day should be more apparent. For example, the current primary holiday business players are florists, chocolate shops, restaurants, hotels and malls. However, with the awareness of Valentine’s Day as a day to celebrate universal love, more types of market actors with more distinct market offerings can also be involved in facilitating the holiday. Additionally, current marketers seem content with catering primarily to romantic couples, consequently alienating themselves to serving the purposes of a niche holiday. Meanwhile, social organizations are making the holiday a platform for launching multiple causes. This indicates somewhat a lack of creativity on the part of marketers to develop market opportunities based on new meanings. This may either be due to careful calculations on the part of Indonesian marketers, but more likely caused by their inability to see beyond product defined market opportunities. The fractal model of translation can thus become a useful tool in enabling marketers to observe ongoing changes and opportunities in markets.
IV. ESSAY 3

1 Introduction

Essay 2 explored the multi-level dynamics involved in the translation of a foreign practice to a new cultural context. The study identified a number of frames used to define the translated practice and explored processes of frame transformation in which actors employed strategic interpretive efforts by narrowing or widening the ‘original’ meanings associated with the imported practice. Additionally, the study points toward the value co-creating needs of each respective actor category, as the underlying driver of these frame transformation efforts. Utilizing the introduction of the foreign celebration of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia as an empirical context, the study analyzed individual (micro-level) representational practices employed by various actors to define the holiday, and explains its direct implication –translation links– to the seemingly more concrete normalizing and integrative practices. The study also emphasized the influence of meso and macro level practices in determining the enactment of Valentine’s Day in particular, and other value co-creation practices in general by highlighting how one translation effort may influence or be influenced by the translation efforts of others.

Essay 3 builds on the particular finding that the enactment and contestation towards Valentine’s Day is influenced by the shifting values of the nation, as situated within a globalizing world. As such, Essay 3 aims to better depict and explore the negotiation of meaning as an institutionalization process by taking a longitudinal account of the frame transformation process. The purpose is to highlight the influence of broader systems of practices as enabling and constraining the translation process.

When new “concepts spread beyond national and cultural boundaries, they must pass through powerful filters of local cultural and structural opportunities and constraints in order to
mobilize legitimacy. Struggles over their meaning are intensified if they challenge prevailing order” (Meyer and Höllerer 2010, p. 1241). This study considers the negotiation of meanings as a representational practice, and therefore focuses on identifying which representations become more established, as new practices become more common and widespread over time. Not surprisingly, the institutionalization of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia reflects such process. Despite for the most part being seen as a harmless celebration, Valentine’s Day is recently increasingly being contested by a vocal minority.

The objective of this study is to explore how a contested practice is negotiated by all involved actors, namely by depicting how the dominant frames about a practice shift over time as well as by identifying the actors and factors that contribute to such shifts. Additionally, the study will investigate the direction of frame transformation, particularly whether continual negotiation of meaning result in the convergence of ideas, increase in the multiplicity of meanings, or produce a polarization of opposing views.

2 Theoretical Background

In institutional studies, there has been increasing attention towards how institutions are constructed, sustained, and change through the struggle to determine social meaning based on the interpretive efforts of involved actors (Lawrence and Suddaby 2006; Rao et al. 2003). Schneiberg and Soule (2005, p. 122) specifically identify institutionalization “as the product of constitutional struggles –conflicts evoked by social movements over the fundamental character of social, political, and industrial order.” Given this particular understanding of institutionalization, in the context of translation in value co-creating markets, institutionalization may thus reflect the contention between, and negotiation of, competing representational practices by various actors involved in their respective value co-creating efforts.
In studying institutional change, Schneiberg and Clemens (2006, p. 2018) identify the value of “tracking the changing cast of competing actors and recovering the shifting repertoire of alternative models or practices, an ‘archeology of schemas.’” Similarly, Meyer and Hollerer (2010) underline the importance of identifying the repertoire of interpretations offered to frame a new practice as well as naming all the relevant actors (DiMaggio and Powell 1983) taking part in the framing process, otherwise referred to as the politics of signification (Benford and Snow 2000).

While an unlimited collection of framings is available in the broader cultural context, how an actor frames a practice or issue is often dependent upon social standing, that is, his or her position and identity in a given context. More importantly, Meyer and Hollerer (2010) argue that the differences found in the framing of a particular issue is a manifestation of the structure of the cultural context, because “although rhetorical strategies leave room to maneuver, social actors are not free to strategically choose from the entire menu or tool kit.” In essence, representational practices are enabled and constrained by the current context, that is characterized by a multiplicity of varied and competing principles and logics (Friedland and Alford 1991). Most of the time, representational practices are local translations of global theorizations.

Studying translation as a mechanism that explains the spread of a new idea or practice into a new context, it is possible to draw from studies of cultural diffusion to project the trajectory of a stream of translations. When direct or indirect cultural contact occurs between people located in disperse geographical locations or disparate social environments, studies have suggested three possible outcomes (Axelrod 1997; Flache and Macy 2011). First, diffusion of culture is often assumed to result in the homogenization of cultures across the globe. In this case,
widespread assimilation is expected to occur, where differences between contexts cease to exist, and a monoculture becomes increasingly evident (Levitt 1983). For example, “the strength of weak ties” theory (Granovetter 1973) implies that that bridges which connect disparate clusters in a social network essentially promote integration (Flache and Macy 2011).

The second proposed outcome of cultural spread in an increasingly connected world is the maintenance, or even heightening, of diversity (Axelrod 1997). Axelrod (1997) identifies that social influence is associated with the likelihood for someone to alter their opinions, beliefs, or customs to imitate that of a similar or respected other, including among others, the cultural majority, a high-status minority, or a next door neighbor. Selection, on the other hand, relates to the ability to change interaction partners (Axelrod 1997), which is namely guided by the concept of homophily—that similarity breeds attraction (McPherson et al. 2001). It is argued that “homophily can preserve diversity despite the convergent tendencies created by cultural influence” because “preference for interaction with those who are similar can preclude influence once the differences between cultural groups become too large” (Flache and Macy 2011, p. 149).

The third possible outcome of cultural diffusion is polarization, in which “a population divides into a small number of factions with high internal consensus and sharp disagreement between them” (Flache and Macy 2011, p. 149) In this scenario, cultural diversity is reduced while cultural divisions continue to deepen (Flache and Macy 2011).

These alternative outcomes contribute to determining the potential temporary equilibrium generated in the process of institutionalization emerging from the struggle between interpretive frames. In examining the introduction and institutionalization of the American business concept of shareholder value in Austria, Meyer and Hollerer (2010) observe increasing commitment published in the corporate reports of Austrian companies, possibly indicating increased
convergence and establishment of a new practice in a new context. However, an earlier translation study of shareholder value in Germany, identified rejection towards the practice, as reflected in backlash, non-adoption, and efforts towards a more balanced framing (Fiss and Zajac 2004; Fiss and Zajac 2006). Similarly, Meyer and Hollerer (2010) observed polarization vs. neutralization efforts among involved actors in Austria. Neutralization is operationalized as statements that shy away from controversy, and are characterized by its technical and emotionally neutral nature. On the other hand, polarization relates to counter-positions that are critical, carry normative weight, and invite controversy. This leads to the conclusion that “rather than a hybridization of logics or the victory of one over the other, we are observing a ceasefire, a suspended contestation ready to erupt again with critical events” (Meyer and Höllerer 2010, p. 1259).

The purpose of this study is to depict the translation process over time, particularly through an observation of shifting framing strategies by distinct actors, to reflect an ongoing institutionalization process. Specifically, the study continues the exploration of the enactment – institutionalization- of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia to depict the holiday’s revolving status in the society. By doing so, the study may provide support for one of the competing outcomes – convergence, diversity, or polarization– or offer other potential narratives of institutionalization.

3  Methodology and Data

As a means to depict the shifting interpretations of Valentine’s Day and their involved actors, this study utilizes correspondence analysis to present topographic maps that depict the institutional arrangement of meanings and actors at four distinct time periods. Correspondence analysis is an exploratory data analysis method that results in the graphical display of
contingency tables. This method is particularly useful in analyzing the results of a chi-square test, particularly in cases when it is difficult to detect which parts of the table is responsible for the association (Greenacre 2007). Correspondence analysis deals particularly with qualitative variables (nominal scales). It is similar to Principal Component Analysis for quantitative variables. Essentially, this analysis “scales the rows and columns of a rectangular data matrix in corresponding units so that each can be graphically displayed in the same low-dimensional space” (Hoffman and Franke 1986, p. 213).

To identify the various frames different actor categories assigned to the holiday, a content analysis of newspaper articles about Valentine’s Day was employed. By producing a correspondence map for each distinct time period, this study thus presents a longitudinal account to observe how framing towards, in other words depictions of, Valentine’s Day shifted over time to reflect translation as a continual process of institutionalization.

In this analysis, the media (i.e., newspaper) is used to reflect the general context of Indonesia as a social space with particular logics and characteristics, particularly to represent the multitude of meanings that the Indonesian society has attributed to Valentine’s Day. However, it must be noted that media is not necessarily a neutral vessel of the many interpretive efforts. Media is often, concurrently, a critical player that is involved in the meaning making process, among others through agenda setting, and filtering which ideas are channeled or not. The direction in which a conversation is steered often depends on the ideology of the media owners, editors, advertisers, and most likely reflective of the audience served. Media is thus venue and actor in the construction of meaning; it influences and reflects the range and frequency of framings about a particular issue (Meyer and Höllerer 2010).
The same newspaper dataset employed in Essay 2 is utilized in this essay. Particularly, articles that have direct mention of Valentine’s Day were collected from two leading Indonesian newspapers Kompas and Jakarta Post. A total of 332 articles from Kompas were included, covering a range of reports published between 1972 and 2012. Meanwhile, 134 articles on Valentine’s Day from 2001 to 2014 were collected from Jakarta Post. The articles were coded, with specific actor statements related to Valentine’s Day as the unit of analysis. The process generated a total of 1456 codes, 1075 from Kompas and 381 from Jakarta Post.

Five Valentine’s Day frames were identified in the coding process, and labeled as: romance, social, trade, religious, and global frame. The coding process also identified five actor categories that were involved in the meaning contestation of Valentine’s Day: the general public, businesses, social organizations, religious authority, and media.

The articles were also categorized into four different time periods based on relevant events: Period I (before 1991), Period II (1991-1998), Period III (1999-2004), Period IV (2004). The first period characterizes all articles on Valentine’s Day before the introduction of private television in Indonesia. From 1962, the Indonesian television audience was served only by TVRI (Televisi Republik Indonesia), the nation’s government sponsored television station. The country’s first private television channel, RCTI, was established in November 1988, but only catered to the Jakarta area as paid TV (Sen and Hill 2000). It was not until August 1990 that RCTI was permitted to air as free TV, thus significantly broadening its audience base. Since then, the number of private television stations continues to increase, amounting to four stations in 1995 and seven in 2002 (Sen and Hill 2000). Private television stations became a significant source of foreign content, introducing the Indonesian society to cultures, rituals, traditions, and global pop culture in general (Sen and Hill 2010). Coincidentally, 1991 also marks the year of
the highly successful opening of the first McDonald’s outlet in Jakarta, Indonesia (Hamdani 2011). Long known to the world as the symbol of America, the western world, modernity and a global culture, the entry of McDonalds in Indonesia not only reflected presence of Western culture in the East, but also facilitated the participation of local customers to be part of the global consumer culture.

The second period identified was between 1991-1998, which marks the time between introduction of private television and the fall of President Soeharto. President Soeharto, the second president of the nation, had been the country’s authoritarian leader for 32 years (1966-1998). Under his leadership, the nation achieved great political stability and economic progress, but in a system where collusion, corruption, and nepotism was rampant and democracy stunted.

The period after 1998, thus marked the beginning of the Reform era in Indonesia, in which a culture of democracy began to be cultivated. Deregulation of the press and freedom of speech began to take heed, direct election mechanisms were installed, and political parties proliferated (Ananta et al. 2005). Increased democracy, also allowed cultural and religious expression to prosper, among others facilitating a conservative turn in the practice and understanding of Islamic religion.

The year 2004 was selected to mark this religious turning point, as it coincided with the success of Partai Keadilan Sejahtera (PKS; Prosperous Justice Party) to gain 7.3% of popular votes in the 2004 parliament elections, a significant jump from 1.36% in 1999 elections (Platzdasch 2009). PKS has Muslim constituents and denotes Islam as its party ideology (Ananta et al. 2005), with associations to the Muslim Brotherhood, a regio-political Islamist organization in Egypt (Hilmy 2010). As such, the third period identified is between 1998-2004 to reflect an era of democracy prior to the conservative religious turn, and the fourth after 2004.
The coding process produced 1456 actor statements about Valentine’s Day, in which 2.9% stem from period I, 2.3% from period II, 18.3% from period III and 76.6% from period IV. To note, the majority (95.8%) of Jakarta Post articles consists of articles from period IV, with only 16 statements (4.2%) originating from period III.

4 Analysis

4.1 Framing of the Holiday

Five frames in relation to Valentine’s Day were identified: romance (13.5%), social (27.3%), trade (27%), global (17.9%), and religious (13.7%). The first frame identified is the romantic frame, which defines Valentine’s Day as a holiday dedicated for the celebration of love between involved couples, those dating, engaged, or married. The table below depicts the different statement coded under the romantic frame.

Table 2. Examples of Statements Coded under Romantic Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Romantic Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For those who already have a significant other, Valentine(‘s Day) is no doubt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the perfect moment to express love in a more romantic way. This can be done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through a romantic dinner, roses, or chocolate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Valentine’s Day is a day where I can be romantic for a day. At least in a year,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I become romantic twice, on our anniversary and on Valentine’s Day,” says</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teddy who recalls his love story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not surprising for those who have partners to prepare a romantic event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well before February 14th. “I will have a candlelight dinner for two. Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before that we will watch an exciting movie. In my opinion, Valentine should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not be celebrated among a crowd. We won’t be able to feel the Valentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atmosphere,” says another respondent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I still remember one sweet and memorable moment in Bali with my girlfriend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I flew directly from Jakarta and we had a beautiful and romantic dinner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One buyer, Marc Eric, said that flower giving is an expression of love towards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a loved one. Because of that, he routinely buys flowers every month to give to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his wife. “We buy flowers every 15th of the month to commemorate our wedding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day. Because this month coincides with Valentine(‘s Day), the greeting this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time says Happy Valentine,” says Eric, who bought flowers with his daughter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another set of statements were labeled under the social frame, which widened the meaning of Valentine’s Day by defining it not only as a celebration dedicated for romantic couples, but to also include the expression of love between friends, family members, children and parents or teachers. Valentine’s Day is defined as an opportunity to care or share love about wider things, like a realization to care about the earth, nature, animals. Additionally, the holiday is used to express love for unfortunate others through charity, almsgiving, as reflected in efforts to service marginal community members through the visiting orphanages, blood drives, or efforts to help victims of flooding. Furthermore, Valentine’s Day becomes an occasion to discuss critical social issues or draw attention to important causes. For example, many cultural experts use the occasion of Valentine’s Day to raise awareness towards and criticize the increasing consumeristic trends and capitalization in general. Others use the occasion to create a discourse surrounding respectful relationships to propagate an awareness of the repercussions of love, sex, and relationships. For example, many seminars and talk shows are held around Valentine’s Day to create awareness of domestic violence and promote respectful, loving, relationships. Others discuss the dangers of sex, alcohol, and AIDS among teenage audience. Moreover, Valentine’s Day becomes an opportunity to draw attention to other causes, for example to raise awareness about the LGBT community, protest the unhealthy habits of smoking, to fight against corruption in the government, as well as contest Islamic violence in the nation. Below are some statements exemplifying the social framing of Valentine’s Day:
Table 3. Examples of Statements Coded under Social Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saint Valentine’s Day is a celebration of love in its truest forms — whether you’re yearning to show your love toward your parents and siblings or to show your gratitude toward your best friends. But it’s a day to celebrate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event manager, Benny Setiawan, says the event coincides with Valentine’s Day because the objective is to motivate inmates who are not often tended to. The event included a love-letter writing and reading contest, which was attended by 79 of 118 inmates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella Duce I Junior High School Yogyakarta share their love on Valentine’s Day, Thursday (2/14) by handing out 200 packages of <em>sembako</em> (basic needs) and providing free health check-ups for neighboring citizens, such as pedicab operators and foot peddlers on Dagen Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tika Bisono said Indonesians should use Valentine's Day to show their sensitive side as people tended to hide their innermost feelings in daily life. &quot;Valentine's Day celebrations have a good effect on people because they are reminded that people care for them and they are not alone,&quot; Tika told The Jakarta Post on Tuesday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“And IWAMA has had legal status since its establishment in 1991. But in the past few days IWAMA members are often chased by police. Because of that, on this Valentine’s Day, we would like to knock on the hearts of our legislative members to pay more attention to the transgender community,” says Merlyn Sopjan, Head of Ikatan Waria Malang (Iwama; Transgender Association of Malang).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those are the issues raised during the talk show carrying the theme “Violence in Dating” that was organized by Koalisi Perempuan Indonesia Semarang (Indonesian Female Coalition) at Fashion Café, Semarang, Monday (2/14). Present as speaker, was public figure and female activist Nurul Arifin, Coordinator of KPI Central Java, Ida Budiati, dan psychologist as well as Head of Ketua Lembaga Perlindungan Anak Jateng Wike Dyah Anjaryani.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Often closely intertwined with the romantic and universal framing is the commercial aspect of the celebration. The focus in these statements is the business opportunities emerging from the celebration of Valentine’s Day, regardless of whether it is perceived as a romantic or more social holiday. Examples of statements categorized as part of trade framing include:
Table 4. Examples of Statements Coded under Trade Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As Valentine's Day is right around the corner, sales of chocolate and red roses have seen a significant increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During every celebration of Hari Kasih Sayang, or what is commonly known as Valentine’s Day, the demand for roses can increase by tenfold. On a regular day, sellers only supply 3,000 flower stems, whereas at this time it can reach 30,000 roses. The sale price for 20 stems of roses is Rp. 70,000 to Rp. 80,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The moments leading to the celebration of Valentine’s Day is seized by sellers of Valentine trinkets to find seasonal gain, as observed in Jalan Mayjen Sungkono, Surabaya, Friday (2/13). The trinkets are sold for Rp. 10,000 to Rp 150,000 per item. The seasonal sellers only operate for three to four days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Manager of Hotel Ciputra Semarang, Julia SKB, arranges for a romantic dinner experience themed Eternity of Silk and Orchid, at the Resto Gallery accompanied with live music by Trio Jazz Band with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“As an expression of our love towards our shoppers, in this program we offer gifts of many forms,” he says. Visitors who shop above a certain value is entitled to one direct voucher and a chance to take a red envelope (angpau) from the tree of luck in the mall lobby. The angpao is filled with various vouchers, including discounts on products, free parking pass, and cell phone credit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, statements were made about Valentine’s Day as a global phenomenon and part of more general process of globalization. The statements in this category also include interpretations of Valentine’s Day as primarily a youthful holiday, and one that is distinctive of a middle class, urban, and diverse lifestyle and culture. Examples include:
Table 5. Examples of Statements Coded under Global Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Framing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The need to express love on Feb. 14 every year sweeps almost every part of the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In rituals of consumption an event is needed. The event of Valentine is a form of an urban lifestyle, after all is provided for, such as luxury, beauty, and infrastructures in the form of malls, and entertainment venues such as five star hotels, cafés, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Feb. 14 of this year was Saturday - a perfect day for Valentine's Day celebrations. Young Indonesians out there who live in big cities like Jakarta and Bandung know exactly what this means: It's love time!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I've learned from our experience here last year is that Valentine's is really 'in' for the younger generation, it's so popular,&quot;&quot; said Uraini Umarjadi, director of public relations at the Kempinski Hotel in Central Jakarta. &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropologist Bambang Rudito says, the symbols of Valentine’s Day) that emerges in the current societal space is none other than a sign of globalization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last but not least are more narrowed depictions of Valentine’s Day antagonized as foreign, un-Islamic, and uncharacteristic of Indonesian culture, particularly as a country that is predominantly inhabited by followers of Islam. The holiday is often associated with the Christian religion as well as immoral extra-marital activities.

Table 6. Examples of Statements Coded under Religious Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Framing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Valentine's Day celebration is not our culture as it usuallyrelates closely to immoral acts where, during the celebration, young couples tend to hug and even kiss each other. This is an immoral act, right?&quot; Bukittinggi Deputy Mayor Iset Amzis told The Jakarta Post on Wednesday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentine’s Day) originates from the day to observe St. Valentine, a Catholic priest from Rome that lived in the 3rd century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ban is also meant to prevent extra-marital sex among young people as Valentine’s day is identical to all other things that deviate from religious norms,&quot; he said.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“On that day, many people celebrate it by having casual sex or drinking alcohol,” said Dadun.

Deputy Prime Minister Muhyiddin Yassin said late on Saturday that the government was not trying to demean Valentine’s Day, but stressed that it was “not suitable” for Muslims.

As the relationship between Muslim women and men is really strict in Islam, I don’t think that celebrating Valentine’s Day is in line with Islamic values.

Indonesian Islamic clerics have long condemned Valentine’s Day, claiming that this celebration comes from Christian culture and therefore should not be celebrated.

### 4.2 Actors involved in Framing of the Holiday

The analysis identified five actor categories that were involved in the efforts to frame Valentine’s Day. Most of the statements were made by the media (44.6%), as reflected in various statements made by the reporters and contributors in their articles about Valentine’s Day. Additionally, direct quotes or references are included about statements made other actors. Among the most cited include public officials as well as representatives of any social organization, including schools, university officials, activists, and leaders or members of any non-governmental organizations (20.9%). Opinions of the general public (18.3%), reflected in the opinions of adults and teenagers interviewed and featured as well as statements made in specific articles in the form of opinion forums are also accounted for as a separate category. The articles also included the voices of commercial actors, particularly representatives of large scale companies, hotels, restaurants, shopkeepers, as well as simple street vendors, including the seasonal street peddler (13.4%). The last category identified comprises of religious leaders (2.9%).

### 4.3 Identifying Frame Transformation over Time

To identify whether there was a shift in the ways Valentine’s Day has been represented throughout the years, a test of association between the different frame categories and the four
time periods was employed. The chi-square analysis revealed a significant relationship between the identified frames and the four time periods ($\chi^2=38.62; N=1456, p=.00$), indicating that the dominant frames used to describe Valentine’s Day did change over time. Depicted in Figure 10, are the proportions of the five distinct framings relative to all statements made about Valentine’s Day during in each time period.

![Shifting Representations of Valentine's Day](image)

**Figure 10. Shifting Representations of Valentine’s Day**

Important to note however are the significant differences in the framings proposed by the two media outlets ($\chi^2=121.27; N=1115, p=.00$) during period IV, as depicted in Figure 11. In *Kompas*, the predominant frames were related to the holiday’s commercial opportunities (33.7%) as well as the broadened universal nature of the holiday (30.9%). Meanwhile, the religious discussion of the holiday was limited at 8%. Contrastingly, *Jakarta Post* articles highlighted the religious (29.3%) and social (24.4%) aspects of the holiday. As a newspaper that stands behind the nation’s more pluralistic stance, such findings may indicate the deliberate effort of *Kompas*
to suppress the religious discussion. Meanwhile, as an English language newspaper that caters not only to a local but international audience, the emphasis on religious controversy in the *Jakarta Post* may reflect the newspaper’s effort to serve news that piques the interest of their audience.
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**Figure 11. Comparison of Valentine’s Day Framing by Newspaper (after 2004)**

### 4.4 Mapping the Terrain

To further explore the representational practices that contribute to the institutionalization of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia, a correspondence analysis is employed for each period to create a topographical map depicting the various depictions of Valentine’s Day and actors involved in shaping such type of depictions. This map reflects the multiple representations of the practice as well as the complex relation of the actors in relation to the context within which meaning is created. This method is useful in providing an account of the spatial arrangements of the frames and actors, to depict how the different frames are positioned relative to each other in a particular context (Mohr 1998).
The analysis begins with the analysis of a contingency table that intersect all frames utilized to construct the meaning of Valentine’s Day (frame category; rows) and all actors that participate in the meaning-making effort (actor category; columns). From these contingency tables, presence of association between the two variables is tested. The data is also used to generate a correspondence map that visualizes the categorical dataset on a two-dimensional plane. The particular focus of this analysis is to identify, for each frame, which actor category contributes most to the meaning construction of the frame. In other words, what actor categories are most frequently associated in relation to a particular depiction of the holiday?

Given the structure of the contingency tables, in which ‘frame categories’ are presented as rows, and ‘actor categories’ are presented in the columns, as well as ‘frame categories’ as the variable of focus in the study, all maps presented are in the form of asymmetric row principal maps. This map is characterized by rows that are scaled in principal coordinates, and columns scaled in standard coordinates (Greenacre 2007). This map presentation format is most suitable for the purposes of displaying, for each frame category, what percentage of the statements in the frame category are driven (made by) each actor category. The following section provides the analysis for each identified time period.

4.4.1 Period I (Before 1991)

A total of 42 statements were identified to reflect the holiday meaning-making terrain for period I. During the introductory phase of Valentine’s Day (before 1991), the holiday was mostly discussed in terms of a universal celebration of love (33.3%) and a romantic celebration (23.8%). Religious framing about the holiday was also present (19%). Tracing of the coded statements indicate that the statements categorized under the religious frame were generally positive/neutral in tone, and namely comprised of statements explaining Valentine’s Day as a day celebrated by
Westerners (the term WASPs was utilized; White Anglo-Saxon, Protestants) or relaying the holiday’s legend in relation to the Catholic Saint Valentine. Statements related to the commercial associations of the holiday were still limited at 14.3%. Analyzing the general scope of the discussions, 35.7% of the statements related to occurrences or made references to Valentine’s Day celebrations outside Indonesia. In essence, this phase reflected efforts to merely introduce the Indonesia public to a foreign practice.

To further explore the actor categories associated with each frame, a correspondence map is presented in Figure 12. This map depicts the various framing of Valentine’s Day along with the different actor categories that contribute to the framing from all articles printed prior to 1991. A chi-square analysis testing for presence of association between frame category and actor category during this time period did not reveal a significant relationship, \( \chi^2(12, N = 42) = 13.3, p = .35 \).

The map explains 84.18% of the inertia, which is a measure of how much variation there is in the cross-tabulation \( \chi^2/n \). This first dimension (x-axis) is highly explanatory, accounting for 60.47% of the inertia. Meanwhile the second dimension (y-axis) contributes to an additional 23.71% of the inertia. With regard to the quality or the model, all categories are well explained by the two dimensions, except the category ‘global.’ This implies that ‘global’ might not be accurately positioned on the map.
Figure 12. Correspondence Analysis (Period I: Before 1991)

In the map above, we observe the trade frame to be furthest away from all other frames, notably the romantic and social frame. Romantic and social frames are, respectively, more closely associated with the ‘public’ and ‘social organization’ actor categories, while the religious, global, and trade frames are relatively more closely associated with the media. The trade-related framing of the holiday is also associated with business actors. With the exception of ‘businesses’ all categories are clustered around the center of the map, indicating small deviations from the average profile. This map indicates that each frame is shaped by distinct types of actors: the media is strongly associated with the religious and global frame; business actors, as drivers of the trade frame; and the public as well as social organizations respectively driving the romantic and social frames.
4.4.2 Period II (1991-1998)

Between 1991 and 1998, the representations of Valentine’s Day become more balanced around the romantic (24.2%), commercial (24.2%) and global (21.2%) framing, followed by the social (15.2%) and religious framing (15.2%). To note, all statements coded under the religious frame were also still positive in tone. The international scope of the reports decreased from 35.7% to 27.3% in this time period, which may indicate an increase in localized enactments the holiday. These proportions reflect diversity in representational practices in the meaning-making terrain, where all issues are somewhat evenly spread.

This correspondence map plots the frame and actor categories that emerged between the years 1991-1998. The map depicted in Figure 13 explains 89.08% of the total inertia. The first dimension (x-axis) explains 44.85% of the inertia, while the second dimension (y-axis) contributes another 44.24%. With regard to the quality of the model, all categories are well explained by the two dimensions (except ‘businesses’). Looking at the profiles’ positions, we see that the furthest frame categories are romantic and social, deviating to the right-hand side. Thus, we can conclude that these frames have the greatest difference in terms of the actor categories they are associated with, as indicated by the general public contributing to the romantic framing of Valentine’s Day and social organizations contributing to the social framing of the holiday. Meanwhile, the other frame categories -religion, global, and trade- are clustered together on the left-hand side of the map, closely associated with the media and business actors.
4.4.3 Period III (1998-2004)

The third period (1999-2004) reflects the first phase of the Reform era. Findings indicate that the predominant discussion during this phase centers around the holiday’s commercial association (30.8%), followed by the holiday’s global (22.2%), social (21.8%), and romantic associations (18%). Religious framing was low at 7.1% with only 4 (21.1%) of the religiously framed statements being negative in tone. Interestingly, the scope of the discussion took an overwhelming turn towards local (97.7%) enactment as opposed to reporting of celebrations taking place overseas (2.3%), indicating a possible increase in local participation in the holiday.
The correspondence map below (Figure 14) depicts the meaning-making struggle surrounding Valentine’s Day that occurred since the beginning of the Reform era. The map explains 86.5% of the total inertia. The first dimension contributes 52.22% to the inertia, and is strongly explained by social and social organization on and religious framing and religious authority on the other end. The second dimension contributes and additional 34.28% of inertia, and is strongly contributed by religion on one end and trade and business actors on the end.

As visually depicted on the correspondence map, social frame is mostly constructed by social organizations and global and romantic frame by the public. Meanwhile, trade frame is driven by business actors and religious frame is more heavily shaped by the media and religious authority. Here, however, tracing back to the contingency table, the number of religious authorities are very low, but all make statements to build the religious frame.

4.4.4 Period IV (After 2004)

The fourth period (after 2004) shows predominant discussion of the holiday as a practice to express universal rather than romantic (11.7%) love as reflected in the social framing majority (28%), followed closely by the holiday as a commercial celebration (27.4%). A total of 15% of the frames had religious connotations, 48.5% of which were negative in tone. Additionally, the scope of reporting was still predominantly local (93.4%). It is during this time period that the negative sentiment of the religiously framed statements began to increase, indicating polarization in the understanding and attitudes toward Valentine’s Day.
Figure 14. Correspondence Map (Period III: 1998-2004)

Figure 15. Correspondence Map (Period IV: After 2005)
The correspondence map (Figure 15) explains 90.22% of the total inertia. The first dimension contributes 60.85% to the total inertia, while the second dimension adds 29.37%. This map shows the most difference between the commercial and religious frame in terms of the associated actors. Specifically, while the commercial frame is associated with statements made by business actors, the religious frame is associated with statements made by religious authorities. Romantic, social, and global framing of the holiday are centered around the average profile. While social and global framing share associations with the public and social organizations, the romantic and trade frame is closely associated with statements made by the media. It is during this period that a large number of religious authorities as an actor category start to emerge, whereas they were non-existent in the first two periods, and scarce during period III.

5 Discussion

In this study the process of institutionalization is further explored by analyzing outcomes of the translation process, particularly representational practice, over time. Through the period mapping of various framings about Valentine’s Day and identification of actors that contribute to shaping each type of framing, distinct ways in which Valentine’s Day has been depicted over time is observed.

An understanding of the contextual environment better explains the observed patterns. For example, for the most part, the meaning-making process has largely been determined by the media, with business actors shaping the trade frame, and social organizations shaping the social frame. Between period I-II, although democratic life was suppressed, Indonesia was experiencing rapid economic growth and enjoying the benefits of foreign investment with entry
of many global brands. Valentine’s Day thus was seen in positive light and openly embraced. Similarly, the attitude towards Valentine’s Day remained predominantly positive in period III, and was characterized by a significant jump in local vs. international scope reporting. This is indicative of increased first-hand participation in the holiday, as noted in increased reports of personal, social, as well as local business activity in relation to Valentine’s Day. The voice of religious authorities is seen for the first time, but remained low and predominantly positive. However, after 2004, coinciding with the conservative turn, efforts to reject Valentine’s Day emerged, as reflected in the increased voice of religious actors using the religious frame in a negative light.

As the analysis indicates, rejection and contestation towards Valentine’s Day is a recent phenomenon only occurring in the past decade. For the most part, translation towards the foreign holiday was smooth and well accepted, indicating that the values proposed by Valentine’s Day were in line with the values of a society that was eager to participate in a global consumer culture. The counterforces only appeared later, after the cultivation of democracy, which among others also enabled the conservative turn in the practice of Islam. Only then did distinct translation efforts to practice conservative Islam clash with the translation efforts of Valentine’s Day, which generated the contestation of the holiday’s meaning.

However, the competition is not necessarily between the romantic and the religious frame. Other frames, were also developed shaping the positive meaning of the holiday, among others by underlining the business opportunities afforded (i.e., trade frame) and the opportunities to raise awareness for important causes (i.e., social frame). Generally, over the four periods studied, there was an increase in complementary positive framings that widened the meaning and depiction of Valentine’s Day. This development establishes Valentine’s Day as a value co-
creating activity for a broader set of actors. Only in the last period, did polarization of opinions ensue, through the protests of Muslim conservatives. Yet, such protest, also functions to facilitate the value co-creating efforts of, serving as a means for actors to establish their identity. Also similar to social activists that use Valentine’s Day to draw attention to their cause, religious actors also aim to draw attention to the particular cause of returning to the ‘true version’ of the religion.

What is essentially observed is not only a process of frame transformation between contexts as noted in Essay 3, but also frame transformation over time. Between period III and IV, there is a decrease in the romantic frame and increase in social frame. During the same period however, an increase in the religious frame is observed. Thus while meanings are becoming more generalized as indicated through the shift from romantic to social frame, there is also increased polarization in the emergence of a negative depiction as currently shaped by religious actors. The current depiction of Valentine’s Day is therefore characterized by a predominantly positive view towards the holiday but also a small fraction of opponents. It will be interesting to explore how the depictions are further reconciled as time evolves. Will the views become further polarized or widened to accommodating multiple views? How will these depictions be translated into rules and action?

This study makes evident the interaction between macro (global) level systems of practice (like capitalism, democracy, religious conservatism) and meso level efforts of institutionalization (establishment of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia). It also highlights that translation is not uni-dimensional and does not occur in isolation. Instead, it often clashes with other institutions and their respective efforts to translate. This study reflects the importance of understanding context in the translation process, thus the benefit of conducting multi-level
analysis of contexts. Valentine’s Day is a globalizing ritual, currently adopted in many distinct parts of the globe. Yet, the holiday’s local translations remain distinct, not only between countries (or other spatial groupings), but also within countries over time.
V. EPILOGUE

1 Conclusion

This dissertation set out to uncover how a non-conventional marketing perspective, namely the service-dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch 2004a), can be utilized to contribute to a better understanding of marketing. This study, thus, explored the simple phenomenon of ‘what happens when a new idea or practice is introduced in a new market.’ In marketing, the process of introducing new products to new markets is not an uncommon activity. In fact, continual success in new product launches is crucial to the survival of any marketing firm.

In this context, the conventional marketing approach would dictate the need to identify and manufacture a product of value, and by way of market segmentation and targeting, identify a pre-existing customer base (i.e., ‘market’) to which this product can be sold. Given assumed stable characteristics of the market, a marketing mix strategy is employed by tweaking or modifying the physical elements of the product, its brand name, price, distribution, and promotional elements in order to increase the appeal of the product offered. This approach, while useful as a practical tool, is increasingly criticized by marketing scholars when used as foundational concept for understanding markets (Christensen et al. 2007; Grönroos 1994).

Overall, under this goods-centered, firm-centric, manufacturing logic, the firm is assumed to create products of value to be offered to a given market, and the firm receives in money exchange for the products and ‘services’ rendered. Here, the physical characteristics of the products become of central issue, as is the ability of the firm to modify, distribute, and promote the product. The buyers, customers, more commonly labeled as consumers, purchase these products and in so doing, deplete the value offered. Thus, research in marketing is guided by a
unidirectional model of value creation that underlines the role of value producing firms and value consuming customers.

In the context of global diffusion, a manufacturing logic will likely highlight the more physical elements in the distribution of goods across national boundaries. In this view, the focus is on how to modify products to be acceptable in distinct country settings (Douglas & Craig, 2011; Roth & Romeo, 1992) and emphasis is on strategies of product standardization vs. adaptation that generate greater levels of exchange (Cavusgil, Zou, & Naidu, 1993).

However, as presented in this dissertation, the utilization of a service-dominant perspective (Vargo and Lusch 2004a) enables the depiction of a more complex, iterative, and dynamic view of the market, leading to a distinct explanation about of what happens when a new idea or practice is introduced in a new market. In this study, focus is shifted away from product characteristics to practices (Shove and Pantzar 2005), and markets are perceived as endogenous as opposed to exogenous (Mele et al. 2014). More specifically, markets are understood as performative –emerging through the enactment of practices– (Araujo et al. 2010; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006; Kjellberg and Helgesson 2007) and occurring in the context of service ecosystems (Lusch and Vargo 2014; Vargo and Lusch 2011). Furthermore, product diffusion is reinterpreted as a process of practice translation (Callon 1986; Czarniawska and Sevon 1996; Latour 1986), which needs not only be evaluated at micro (individual) levels of interaction, but observed as nested within meso and macro levels of interaction (Chandler and Vargo 2011), to acknowledge how contexts –the specificities of local institutional arrangements– determines the rules and resources drawn to perform such practice translation (Akaka et al. 2013).

Based on these assumptions, a fractal model of market co-creation is proposed to explain the spread of practices within and between distinct cultural contexts as process of translation. At
its core is the abstraction of an idea of a practice (i.e., a representational practice) that is translated through a process of frame transformation to be enacted (i.e., integrative practice) in a given locality based on existing rules of action (i.e., normalizing practice). When an idea/practice aligns with the preexisting context, translation is smooth and seamless. But when the idea/practice does not fit the contours of the new context, contestation may occur and negotiation needs to take place through strategic efforts of frame transformation.

As practice translation is driven by the disparate value co-creation efforts of various actors, distinct translation practices may clash and compete, resulting in a process of meaning (representational) contestation. Understanding practices as institutions, and practice translation as a process of institutionalization, institutionalization is thus observed through an account of translation occurring over time, particularly through the shifting representations identified as a process of meaning-making market co-creation.

2 Research Contribution

Given the novel attempt explain the spread of new ideas and practices across distinct cultural contexts, this dissertation contributes to the theoretical effort to better understand how markets work. The study expands the market-as-exchange paradigm (Bagozzi 1975), by identifying exchange as a process that facilitates the travel of practice and re-conceptualizes exchange as a resource integrating mechanisms that underlies the process of value co-creation. While this research does not aim to create a general theory of the market, it attempts to offer an understanding of how practices, particularly rituals, are performed and spread in the context of markets.

Overall, this research project contributes to marketing scholarship by presenting a theoretical integration of service-dominant logic and the market-as-practices framework as well as by offering an
alternative way of understanding the diffusion of goods in terms of practice translation. Specific to research in the field of international marketing, this focus shifts away from the debate between standardization vs. adaptation of products, towards understanding the travel and translation of practices within the greater process of value co-creation.

Additionally, this reflects one of the early efforts to conduct empirical study inspired by the service-dominant logic perspective. While studies have identified market creation as a process of legitimation (normalizing practice; Humphreys 2010) and research on Valentine’s Day in Japan has focused on how gift-giving rituals (exchange practices) are reflective of changes in the nation’s values and economy, this project studies Valentine’s Day in the context of practice institutionalization given markets as value co-creating service ecosystems. Methodologically, this study is also unique in its attempt to employ the action-net (Czarniawska 2004; Lindberg and Czarniawska 2006) and zooming-in-and-zooming-out analysis (Nicolini 2009a; Nicolini 2009b) developed in organizational studies to the field of marketing.

3 Marketing Implications

The conceptual developments derived from this study have significant practical and managerial implications. First, the study underlines the need for marketing managers to move their focus away from products to practice. All market offerings should be understood as service (direct or indirect; Vargo and Lusch 2004a; Vargo and Lusch 2004b), defined as embedded knowledge and skills that facilitate practice, “implicit ways of understanding, saying, and doing things” (Schau et al. 2009, p. 31). In this view, despite standardization efforts, the value of any market offering is evaluated and determined in their use (i.e., contribution to a practice). Furthermore, the meaning and functionality of the market offering is also dependent upon the cultural schemes or logics used in the assessment process. Accordingly, the same market offering
may serve different roles and purposes for different people in distinct contexts. Consequently, rather than introduce a new product, marketing managers should be more concerned about identifying value co-creating practices that can make use of the underlying market offer, or introduce new practices to accommodate existing market offerings.

The findings from this study also alert managers of the need to reframe their role from distributors or marketers of products to translators of practice. The translation approach proposes that energy is not embedded in the core idea, product, model, or practice that is being circulated. Instead, energy is inherent in the actors—translators—who self-identify with a particular practice, chose to pick up the practice, and fit it into his or her individual own context, thereby changing the practice in the process (Latour 1986). As such, for marketing managers, the issue is not about whether to standardize or adapt a new market offering, but a question of what representational practices (i.e., framing strategy) to employ that will best facilitate a process of translation in a given context.

Moreover, this study enables marketers to more appropriately assess their influence in the market. The uni-directional model of value creation, in which firms are defined as value producers, and consumers understood as destroyer consumer of value, lead managers to overestimate their role in their market. Understanding that the manager is only a co-creator as opposed to sole creator of value, reminds managers that they can contribute to the meaning making process, but have limited control over the process. The process of co-creation means that outcomes are co-determined.

On the other hand, conceptual models that assume markets as exogenous, pre-determined and fixed, underestimate the role of the firm and their managers. This view assumes all market factors, except the market offering, to be constant. Therefore, managers face the challenging
demand of developing a market offerings that will fit a given need or situation in the market. In reality, markets are fluid and malleable, and highly sensitive to the changes introduced by the firm and their managers. In this view, markets, and other cultural institutions influenced by markets, change and are changed, among others by and though the actions of managers. Market creation, too, is a co-created iterative process. This understanding awakens managers to the notion that their actions do generate consequences for society in general, thus demanding ethical and responsible actions on their part.

4 Future Studies

Despite the strengths and contributions of this dissertation, it also has its limitations. First, this study is based on a single case study observing the enactment of Valentine’s Day in Indonesia. While this research approach affords data-to-theory generalizability (Lee and Baskerville 2003), it cannot necessarily be used to establish population generalizability. As such, similar studies in different value co-creation contexts – a distinct service category (e.g., brands, goods, or service offerings) or different setting (e.g., target market, state, country) – are encouraged.

Additionally, while this dissertation is inspired by practice theory (Schatzki et al. 2001), because the study methodology does not involve direct observation or ethnographic approaches that ‘follow’ the practice of interest (Czarniawska 2007; Nicolini 2009b), it may not be considered a study of practice in the purest sense of the word. Thus, a similar study can be developed using observational methods that are more aligned with conventional practice research (Czarniawska 2007; Czarniawska 2014). This study largely relied on media reports and in-depth interviews which are based on respondent accounts. Using observational methods will truly
allow the tracing of events as they unfold, and enable the researcher to pick up on bodily actions, and observe subtle cues and gestures that an actor may not be conscious of or remember to report.

The study uncovered some surprising but explainable findings. First, as noted in Essay 2, is the lack creativity and ‘entrepreneurial’ logic of the business actors in relation to identifying abundant opportunities during Valentine’s Day. For the most part, business actors relied a narrow depiction of Valentine’s Day as a romantic event. Florists, chocolate shops, jewelry makers as well as restaurants and hotels are the active shapers of the holiday. Other companies frame their product as the proper gift for a romantic partner. Not many business actors dare go beyond the romantic frame, only a limited entities position their brand in relation to the social frame involving family love. However, both social organizations and religious presented better entrepreneurial sensibilities, as reflected in their more creative efforts in linking their causes and efforts to the holiday.

This finding reflects the myopic vision of the business actors and highlights the usefulness of a fractal model of market co-creation in enabling marketers to identify multiple market translations occurring concurrently and the value co-creating efforts each group is pursuing. Emphasizing on the practice rather than the product will provide an understanding of what is truly happening in markets and how to better cater to these processes.

Another surprising finding is how relatively recent the negative view towards Valentine’s Day emerged and how successful this translation has been in among certain groups in Indonesia. This indicates the fast past change in the Indonesian society which hints toward an interesting study of how translations in one area of practice precipitates translations in other areas of practice. For example, the increased rejection towards Valentine’s Day parallels the increased
translation of hijab wearing, Islamic movies and popular literature, Islamic banks, and real estate. This brings to the forefront the issue of how marketers contribute to and perpetuate social change by serving the shifting needs and trends.

Overall, this study observed translation as it applies to the introduction of a foreign practice in a foreign context. Another potential idea for the study of practice translation is to explore how a new version of an existing practice is introduced to a particular locality. For example, coffee drinking is a long tradition in Indonesia. Yet, the emergence of Starbucks in Indonesia still managed to change not only the retail landscape of the nation, but also translated the practice of coffee drinking in general. How the old and new traditions are integrated to create innovative practices or reinvigorate the traditional practices is an interesting venue to explore in the general area of translation.

Furthermore, however, this study points towards the general benefit of studying practices and institutions through a co-creation lens, primarily focusing on multiple levels of interaction to accommodate for the complexity of context.
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