

**Understanding the trend of subcultural dissemination and appropriation into  
mainstream marketing: When Luxury plays it Geek.**

**Marine BOYAVAL**

Lecturer

IAE Lille, Laboratoire LUMEN UR 4999 - Université de Lille

[marine.boyaval@univ-lille.fr](mailto:marine.boyaval@univ-lille.fr)

**Marion GARNIER**

Professor

Grenoble Ecole de Management

[marion.garnier2@grenoble-em.com](mailto:marion.garnier2@grenoble-em.com)

**Olivier NICOLAS**

PhD

IAE Lille, Laboratoire LUMEN UR 4999 - Université de Lille

[olivier.nicolas@univ-lille.fr](mailto:olivier.nicolas@univ-lille.fr)

**Alexandre TIERCELIN**

Lecturer

Université de Reims Champagne-Ardenne, Laboratoire Regards

[alexandre.tiercelin@univ-reims.fr](mailto:alexandre.tiercelin@univ-reims.fr)

**Arnaud DELANNOY**

Assistant Professor

Ecole de Management de Normandie, Laboratoire Métis

[adelannoy@em-normandie.fr](mailto:adelannoy@em-normandie.fr)

## **Abstract**

After being mocked for decades, the geek culture is increasingly present in the media, in cultural representations, and marketing. Recently, even some luxury brands have given into the trends of using geek codes and references in ads or product design, though this may seem rather incompatible. This study then explores how members and non-members of a subculture perceive its dissemination and its appropriation, and more especially, how geeks and non-geeks perceive ads for luxury brands using geek references. Two quantitative studies on a French sample explore measurement of subcultural belonging and the evaluation of ads on the perceived congruence and attitude toward the brand dimensions by members and non-members of the subculture. Results show an interesting interplay between subcultural belonging and ambivalence toward luxury on how geeks and non-geeks adhere (or not) to the subcultural appropriation trend.

## **Key-words**

Geek culture; Luxury; Advertising; Congruence; Appropriation

## **Introduction**

In 2019, the manga “Dragon Ball Super Volume 3” was sold in more than 100,000 copies (Libération, 2019) and the movie “Avengers: Endgame”, with 6.7 million spectators, was number one at the box office (Allocine, 2019). The geek subculture is gaining in popularity and represents a considerable economic weight (e.g., \$139.9 billion in turnover for the video game industry in 2020 (AFJV, 2021)). It is increasingly present in the media, in cultural events and products, and marketing. Mostly studied in sociology, game studies, or media studies, geek culture has also been the focus of research in marketing (Kozinets, 2001; Garcia-Bardidia and Nau, 2012; Seregina and Weiyo, 2016; Tiercelin and Rémy, 2019). Originally associated with obscure activities (McCain et al., 2015) and an insult (McArthur, 2009; Robbins, 2011), the geek culture seems to be operating its symbolic revolution (Tiercelin and Garnier, 2016) to infuse popular culture.

The boundary between geek culture and mainstream culture seems more and more porous, and this is observed in consumption-related contexts: organizations and brands now use geek codes and myths in their ads or for spin-off products (Appendix 1). Recently, even some luxury brands used geek codes and references to advertise their products or to design new ones. The paradox here seems twofold. Luxury seems relatively far from geeks’ interests and geek people are not the usual target for luxury brands, at least at first sight. Indeed, geeks are defined as people who are fascinated, sometimes obsessively, by obscure or very specific areas of knowledge and imagination (Konzack, 2006), related to science fiction, fantasy, Japanese culture, role-playing, science, or technology. The stereotype of the nerdy, badly dressed geek is pervasive and does not fit with any interest in fashion or luxury. Furthermore, luxury brands' image relies on exclusivity, high range, endurance, and rarity (De Barnier et al., 2008), and other aspects surround the image of the luxury brand such as heritage, price, and product excellence (Jenni et Ava, 2020). Given geeks’ interests and stereotypes, as well as luxury’s ones, using geek symbols such as videogame characters in ads for luxury brands then seems relatively incompatible or at least weakly congruent, being questionably relevant and rather unexpected (Fleck et al., 2006; Fleck and Maille, 2010), as suggested by match-up effects in ads (Helme-Guizon, 1997). Just as Arsel and Thompson (2010) questioned the hipster culture becoming mainstream, it is then an interesting trend that has to be looked at, to clarify whether the links between geek culture and the mainstream are perceived as unexpected or irrelevant.

Our research question then relates to how members of the geek community would perceive the use of their usual codes in seemingly unrelated contexts and markets. We also wonder how references to geek culture in marketing practices are perceived by non-members. The aim of this research is then to understand better the dissemination of a subculture and how this is perceived, through the case of geek culture appropriation in mainstream advertising. We notably seek to contribute to the literature by exploring further how members and non-members of a subculture perceive its appropriation, as well as the role advertising plays in this process. We specifically tackle the case of luxury brands using geek references in their ads as a potentially incongruent case of appropriation. The first sections of our paper present the conceptual framework of our research, dealing with the geek subculture and subculture dissemination, and our research question. We then present two studies conducted recently in France. We finally detail our findings, before concluding on contributions, limits, and perspectives of this ongoing research.

## **Conceptual Framework and Research Questions**

The definition of the geek culture presented previously fits the definition of any consumer subculture that is ‘a distinctive subgroup of society that self-selects on the basis of a shared commitment to a particular product class, brand, or consumption activity’ (Schouten and McAlexander, 1995, p.43). Like any other subculture, geek culture has a value system and geeks share common stylistic, cultural, literary, mythical, scientific, behavioral, and language references

(Bucholtz, 1999; Tocci, 2007; Peyron, 2012) and its members traditionally position themselves as non-conformist and uninterested in the mainstream (Peyron, 2012). Among the topics already studied regarding subcultures (Fox, 1987; Schouten and McAlexander, 1995; Thornton, 1996; Belk and Costa, 1998; Cova and Cova, 2001; Hodkinson, 2002; Kates, 2002; Belk and Tumbat, 2005; Leigh et al., 2006; Östberg, 2007; Arsel and Thompson, 2010), the porosity between a subculture and the mainstream is not a new issue (Arsel and Thompson, 2010). Both consumers' and marketers' actions make the boundary permeable (Kates, 2002) and some subculture-specific markers have already passed into mass consumption (Schouten and McAlexander, 1995; Arsel and Thompson, 2010; Tiercelin and Garnier, 2016). Research has shown that cultural movements follow a chronology (McCracken, 1986; Hodkinson and Deicke, 2007; Cléret, 2011; Bourdieu, 2013). This is described as a Symbolic Revolution (Bourdieu, 2013): what was considered transgression, scandal, and heresy by the mainstream becomes obvious, normal, and fully integrated (Tiercelin and Garnier, 2016). While geeks were insulted and mocked years ago (McArthur, 2009; Robbins, 2011), a significant part of supermarket leisure shelves is now dedicated to Marvel franchises and the Star Wars franchise extends to crisps, energy drinks, or shower gels. This permeability makes this case interesting and relevant. It seems to be more important and more durable than for other subcultures, that remained confidential or have quickly gone out of fashion.

Although Arsel and Thompson (2010) already studied the issue of the dissemination and perceived devaluation (by members) of subcultural capital, there is no study, to our knowledge, that looks at the attitudes and perceptions of a subculture's members towards the use of the symbolic elements of their subculture in mainstream advertising. Like fashion (McCracken, 1986), the advertising industry has a capacity to appropriate the salient elements of a cultural movement, such as symbols that are 'hijacked and used by companies and advertisers to update a commercial offer, and make it consistent with contemporary cultural trends' (Cléret, 2011, p.284). If the capacity of fashion to appropriate geek codes is already documented (Tocci, 2007, Quail, 2011), the question of subcultural appropriation in ads remains understudied. Research work in the area indeed mainly focused on the changing visibility of minorities (Bachollet et al., 1992; Santone, 2013) and attitudes towards the use of similar ethnic models (Koslow et al. 1994; Brumbaugh, 2002; Butt and de Run, 2010; Sierra et al. 2009, 2010). Finally, how non-members perceive the use of subcultural codes in ads is not documented.

The issue is key, especially for luxury brands, as literature in advertising has shown that the use of symbols is a determinant of brand heritage (Pécot and De Barnier, 2015). The visual branding of goods and services can be seen as a semiotic object (Floch, 1995; Bobrie, 2018): the advertising visual or the derivative product can be considered as a signifying whole (Floch, 1995). The product image elicits representations of sensory information (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982) and can increase cognitive associations (Underwood and Klein, 2002), with a mediating role in influencing iconic stimuli on consumer behavioral responses (Babin, 1992; Yoo and Kim, 2014). For brands, and specifically luxury brands using geek symbolism, questions can be raised about the semiotic dimensions and their understanding by the targets; about the imaginary that is conveyed; and about the evaluations of the product/the brand that will result from it, as iconographic elements impact on consumers' judgments (Kisielius and Sternthal, 1986; Underwood and Klein, 2002), whether or not they are members of the subculture.

We then specifically propose to study how geeks and non-geeks perceive ads using geek references, especially in the case of luxury products. Specifically, are such associations in ads perceived as congruent by geeks and non-geeks? Does this affect attitude toward the ad or the brand? We suggest that both geeks and non-geeks will perceive such an association as (1) unexpected and (2) irrelevant. We expect this perception to be stronger (more irrelevant and more unexpected) for geeks that could wish to preserve their subculture from appropriation and could then display more negative perceptions. We further hypothesize that this could in turn harm attitude toward the luxury brand appropriating geek codes. Furthermore, luxury and luxury brands are often

criticized by the general population, so that people display some ambivalence to luxury (Ladwein & Sanchez, 2018), which can be negative on the brands that make up this ecosystem and their actions. We then propose to include ambivalence to luxury as a possible covariate interacting with belonging to the geek subculture. To answer these questions, two quantitative studies were conducted.

### **Study 1 – Methodology and findings**

Study 1 aimed at testing the Geek Identification Scale (GIS) developed by McCain et al. (2015) to estimate objectively and subjectively membership to this subculture, to be able to identify and distinguish members and non-members in subsequent studies. The GIS is a declarative self-identification scale (10 items) relating to the subjective feeling of belonging and involvement in geek culture. Respondents were also surveyed about their participation in geek activities as identified in French literature (Peyron, 2012), through ad hoc items. The survey was carried out with Qualtrics and transmitted via e-mail and social networks on a French convenience sample, as geeks and non-geeks can be found in any age ranges and social categories. All items were assessed on a 5-point Likert scale basis. 167 valid questionnaires were collected (which fits the criteria of having a number of respondents 5 to 10 times the number of items tested for a PCA analysis, see Appendix 2A for sample details).

Findings show that the GIS scale demonstrates good psychometric qualities (Appendix 4). From a generalization perspective, the GIS scale could easily be adapted to study other subcultures. A dynamic cluster partition (Irwin & McClelland, 2001, 2003) then allowed us to identify two easily interpretable and balanced groups: Geeks ( $M_{GIS}=3.84$ ;  $n=68$ ) and Non Geeks ( $M_{GIS}=1.87$ ;  $n=99$ ). To verify whether this score is indeed linked to so-called geek activities, we identify that the ad hoc items all significantly correlate with the GIS score, and significant differences are revealed through ANOVAs: the Geek group systematically exhibits higher scores (see Appendix 5). This study thus manages to show that the measurement of a subculture is possible, via the “geekiness” scale, that could be adapted to other contexts, and that serves to renew approaches to the identification and characterization of subcultures. This study confirms the quantifiable reality of a subculture and the possibility of measuring it.

### **Study 2 – Methodology and findings**

Study 2 then aims at assessing the reactions of geeks and non-geeks to the use of geek references in ads for luxury products. Materials include two cases of existing ads associating luxury products to videogame or manga characters (Vuitton/Final Fantasy and Gucci/One Piece) (see Appendix 3). Those geek symbols can be qualified as relatively specialized, still at different levels: if One Piece is a relatively popular manga even in the mainstream, the Final Fantasy reference requires sharper knowledge in the geek culture. A survey was conducted through a Google form transmitted via e-mail and social networks, on a convenience sample of 215 French respondents (see Appendix 2B for sample details). The respondents were presented with the two mentioned materials. They first had to state if they recognized the geek symbol evoked. We then measured the perceived congruence with its relevance and expectedness dimensions (Fleck-Dousteyssier, 2006), attitude toward the brand (Spears & Singh, 2004; Lacoste-Badie et al., 2013) and ambivalence to luxury (Ladwein & Sanchez, 2018), which is negative on the brands that make up this ecosystem and their actions, to assess a potential effect. All measurements were valid and reliable scales from literature presented in 5-point Likert format. Measurement analyses are indeed satisfactory regarding validity and reliability (explained are all above 50% and Cronbach’s Alpha for all constructs are between 0.778 and 0.95; Appendix 4B).

For Study 2, a similar partition of respondents as in Study 1 is first reproduced (Geek ( $M_{GIS}=3.42$ ;  $n=75$ ); Non Geek ( $M_{GIS}=1.42$ ;  $n=140$ ); Appendix 2). To consider also a potential effect of ambivalence to luxury, we further designed a partition of respondents combining two

classifications based on clustering techniques: (a) feeling of belonging to geek culture based on the GIS, as presented previously, and (b) ambivalence to luxury brands scores. This cluster partition allows us to identify four groups: Ambivalent Geeks (GA;  $M_{GIS}=3.43$ ;  $M_{AMB}=3.79$ ;  $n=25$ ), Non Ambivalent Geeks (GNA;  $M_{GIS}=3.39$ ;  $M_{AMB}=1.87$ ;  $n=50$ ), Ambivalent Non Geeks (NGA;  $M_{GIS}=1.41$ ;  $M_{AMB}=3.63$ ;  $n=80$ ) and Non Ambivalent Non Geeks (NGNA;  $M_{GIS}=1.43$ ;  $M_{AMB}=1.82$ ;  $n=60$ ).

Results (see Appendix 6) first show that geeks find both actions less unexpected than non-geeks (Louis Vuitton:  $M_{G-EXP}=2.14$ ,  $sd=1.05$  vs.  $M_{NG-EXP}=1.88$ ,  $sd=0.86$ , Welsh  $T^1=3,48$ ,  $p=0,064$ ; Gucci:  $M_{G-EXP}=2.43$ ,  $sd=1.16$  vs.  $M_{NG-EXP}=2.13$ ,  $sd=0.99$ , Welsh  $T=3,54$ ,  $p=0,062$ )<sup>2</sup>. Still, the effect of geekiness on expectedness perception is relatively weak ( $F<5.0$ ). Otherwise, we do not identify any significant difference between geeks and non-geeks on relevance perception and brand attitude both geeks and non-geeks. We can also notice that, in all cases, evaluations are quite low in absolute value ( $<$  or  $\sim 3$  out of 5). We further identify that ambivalent non-geeks have a more positive attitude towards Louis Vuitton than non-ambivalent non-geeks, which suggests an effect of ambivalence toward luxury rather than geekiness ( $M_{NGA}=3,63$  vs.  $M_{NGNA}=3.04$ ,  $T=4,81$ ,  $p=0,004$ ). It is then interesting to include ambivalence toward luxury in the reflection, as geekiness does not necessarily provoke the differences we might have expected.

We further notice that it is ambivalent geeks who have a more positive perception of congruence (relevance dimension:  $M_{GA}=2.94$  vs.  $M_{GNA}=2.20$ ,  $T=4,376$ ,  $p=0,006$ ; expectedness dimension:  $M_{GA}=2.30$  vs.  $M_{GNA}=1.83$ ,  $T=2,492$ ,  $p=0,066$ ). However, no significant differences are observed for the Gucci/One Piece condition (see Appendix 7). One intriguing result is that ambivalent geeks most often display the most favorable answers (in absolute value). In fact, the study shows that the geeks who are ambivalent (Group<sub>GA</sub>) toward luxury are those who seem less surprised to see those brands using geek symbols (expectedness for Louis Vuitton ad:  $M_{GA}=2.30$ ;  $M_{GNA}=1.827$ ;  $M_{NGA}=1.842$ ;  $M_{NGNA}=1.928$ ; expectedness for Gucci ad:  $M_{GA}=2.51$ ;  $M_{GNA}=2.26$ ;  $M_{NGA}=2.113$ ;  $M_{NGNA}=2.15$ ).

## Discussion

It appears that French geeks do not seem much disturbed or pained by the appropriation of geek iconic elements. They find such an association not that unexpected, not that irrelevant and their attitude toward the brand does not seem to be negatively affected. These results are not consistent with Helme-Guizon's (1997) findings. Though this has to be confirmed by further studies, we, however, suggest that it rather seems to be a lack of rejection than a clear approval. Congruence is a more challenging issue. If both relevance and expectedness are higher with ambivalent geeks, it is not the case with non-ambivalent geeks. It is then important to consider that belonging to the geek culture is not the only or main factor, and that attitude toward the luxury sector is another important antecedent to consider.

Intuitively, the ambivalent geek group should have been the most opposed to an appropriation of its symbols by luxury brands, as they are supposedly defending the *ethos* of the culture and opposed to luxury. However, it does not seem to be the case. Despite being geeks and ambivalent, they are the less "surprised." Studying more in detail this group could provide interesting insights, notably on what relevance and expectedness really mean to consumers. It could possibly be that luxury brands are expected to recycle the symbols of any subculture when it becomes a bit popular, or that luxury brands like Louis Vuitton or Gucci are consistent with the video games/Japanese mangas they used. However, this result also partly could be explained by the fact that Louis Vuitton and Gucci are known to be disruptive and avant-garde brands regarding advertisement.

---

<sup>1</sup> Due to unequal variances between groups on some of the items (Levene's Test), the Welsh T-test should be preferred to the F-test of the ANOVA.

<sup>2</sup> The p-value is borderline and can be considered acceptable at the 0,1 level. We report it as significant considering the exploratory nature of the study and the limited size of our sample.

We thus wonder about the motivation behind respondents' answers: do geeks expect disruptive brands like Vuitton and Gucci to be the first using geek symbols and trying to reach that community? Is there any pride in seeing their symbols being appropriated? Is the attitude positive or rather neutral – meaning they just do not mind or are aware they cannot prevent appropriation and have to accept this trend? Such hypotheses demand more investigation, to identify also which brands may fit more with the geek community and why. This question is even more crucial since literature (Lehu and Bressoud, 2008) showed that in-game advertising is well received if the universes of the brand and the game are consistent, and if the insertion is adequate. Such logic could also apply to advertisements using video game contents.

As for non-geeks, they appear rather unattracted to such actions and find them both irrelevant and unexpected, confirming Helme-Guizon's findings (1997). Even if unexpectedness may be a positive trait for an ad, these results may underline that dissemination of geek symbols from games and mangas is just beginning.

## Conclusion

With this work in progress, we managed to show that the measurement of a subculture is possible, via the “geekiness” scale, and that could be adapted to other contexts/subcultures. We also highlighted that the geek community is paradoxical toward the use of their symbols to advertise a product and reach them as consumers, which contributes to the literature on advertising trends as well as on subcultural dissemination. One interesting paradox relates more precisely to geeks that are ambivalent to luxury, but still seem to expect brands to actually try such initiatives of appropriating a non-conformist subculture that may be becoming popular. Further research is then much needed to understand this trend. Notably, a qualitative study about the motivation of ambivalent geeks toward luxury brands, about the congruence between those brands and their games, or even broader the *ethos* of the community, could provide interesting insights. As this research is limited to French samples, it would also be valuable to replicate the study in other countries: though the geek culture display common traits on an international level, local specificities or differences may exist between countries (Garnier et al., 2019). As advertisers and brands rely on minorities and communities to communicate, better understanding the congruence and impact of such associations entails promising research perspectives that this project is only beginning to explore.

## References

AFJV (2020), Les revenus des jeux et des médias interactifs ont augmenté de 12% pour atteindre 139,9 milliards de dollars en 2020 <https://www.afjv.com/news/10452-les-jeux-video-ont-rapporte-126-6-milliards-de-dollars-en-2020.htm>

Allociné (2019) Disney rachète Marvel! [http://www.allocine.fr/article/fichearticle\\_gen\\_carticle=18480869.html](http://www.allocine.fr/article/fichearticle_gen_carticle=18480869.html)

Arsel Z. and Thompson C.J. (2010) Demythologizing consumption practices: How consumers protect their field-dependent identity investments from devaluing marketplace myths. *Journal of Consumer Research* 37(5): 791-806.

Babin L.A. (1992) *Effects of imagery-eliciting strategies on imagery processing memory, beliefs, attitudes and intentions from print advertising*. PhD Dissertation, The Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.

Bachollet R., Debost J-B, Lelieur A-C and Peyriere M-C (1992) *Négripub : l'image des Noirs dans la publicité*. Paris : Somogy.

Belk R.W. and Costa J.A. (1998) The mountain man myth: A contemporary consuming fantasy. *Journal of Consumer Research* 25(3): 218-240.

- Belk R. and Tumbat G. (2005) The Cult of Macintosh. *Consumption Markets & Culture* 8(3): 205-217.
- Bobrie F. (2018) Les représentations visuelles des biens et des services par leurs marquages : les fondements sémiotiques d'un langage des marques. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing* 33(3) : 147-169.
- Bourdieu P. (2013) *Manet. Une révolution symbolique*. Paris : Seuil/Raisons d'agir Editions.
- Brumbaugh A. (2002) Source and non-source cues in advertising and their effects on the activation of cultural and sub cultural knowledge on the route to persuasion. *Journal of Consumer Research* 29(September): 258-69.
- Bucholtz M. (1999) "Why be normal?": Language and identity practices in a community of nerd girls. *Language in society* 28(2): 203-223.
- Butt M. and De Run C. (2010) Ethnic advertising: adolescents' attitudes towards target and non-target advertisements. *Young Consumers* 11(3): 189-203.
- Cléret B. (2011) *Approches contextualisées des comportements de consommation culturelle des jeunes : Regards ethnographiques sur le rap et l'Electrodance*. Thèse pour l'obtention du titre de Docteur en Sciences de Gestion, Université de Rouen.
- Cova B. and Cova V. (2001) Tribal aspects of postmodern consumption research: the case of French in-line roller skaters. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour: An International Research Review* 1(1): 67-76.
- Fleck-Dousteysier N. (2006) Effet du parrainage sur les réactions cognitives et affectives du consommateur envers la marque : le rôle de la congruence. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing* 21(4) : 104.
- Fleck-Dousteysier N., Roux, E. and Darpy, D. (2006) La congruence dans le parrainage : définition, rôle et mesure. *Actes du 21<sup>ème</sup> Congrès de l'Association Française de Marketing*, May, Nancy.
- Fleck, N. and Maille V. (2010) Trente ans de travaux contradictoires sur l'influence de la congruence perçue par le consommateur : synthèse, limites et voies de recherche. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing* 25(4) : 69-92.
- Floch J.M. (1995) *Identités visuelles*. Paris : PUF.
- Fox K.J. (1987) Real punks and pretenders: The social organization of a counterculture. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 16(3) : 344-370.
- Garcia-Bardidia R. and Nau J. P. (2012) Je suis addict mais pas no-life: stigmatisation et identités non-désirées de consommation numérique. *Actes du 28<sup>ème</sup> Congrès de l'Association Française de Marketing*, May, Brest.
- Garnier M., Tiercelin A. et Delannoy A. (2019) Quand la pub se la joue geek : Mesurer la diffusion d'une sous-culture, *Actes du 35<sup>ème</sup> Congrès de l'Association Française de Marketing*, May, Le Havre
- Hall S. and Jefferson T (1976) *Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain*. Londres: Editions Routledge.
- Helme-Guizon A. (1997) Image, imagerie et effets de la communication persuasive : application à une œuvre d'art incluse dans une annonce publicitaire. Thèse de Doctorat en Sciences de Gestion, Université de Paris IX Dauphine.
- Hodkinson P. (2002) *Goth: Identity, style and subculture, dress, body, culture*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Hodkinson P. and Deicke W. (2007) *Youth Cultures: Scenes, Subcultures and Tribes*. New-York: Routledge.
- Irwin J.R. and McClelland G.H. (2001) Misleading heuristics and moderated multiple regression models. *Journal of Marketing Research* 38(1): 100-109.
- Irwin J.R. and McClelland G.H. (2003) Negative consequences of dichotomizing continuous predictor variables. *Journal of Marketing Research* 40(3): 366-371.

- Jenni R. and Ava R. (2020) Understanding consumer perceptions of luxury brands. *International Journal of Market Research* 63(5): 546-560.
- Kates S.M. (2002) The Protean Quality of Subcultural Consumption: An Ethnographic Account of Gay Consumers. *Journal of Consumer Research* 29(3): 383-399.
- Kisielius J. and Sternthal B. (1986) Examining the vividness controversy: an availability-valence interpretation. *Journal of Consumer Research* 12: 418-431.
- Konzack L (2006) Geek culture: The 3rd counter-culture. *The Inaugural Fun'n'Games Conference*, Juin, 71-78.
- Koslow S., Shamdansani N. and Touchstone E. (1994) Exploring language effects in ethnic advertising: a sociolinguistic perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research* 20(March): 575-585.
- Kozinets R.V. (2001) Utopian Enterprise: Articulating the Meanings of Star Trek's Culture of Consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28(June): 67-88.
- Lacoste-Badie S., Malek F., and Droulers O. (2013) Influence d'un contexte de programme triste sur le processus de persuasion publicitaire chez des adultes jeunes et âgés. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing* 28(1): 5-26.
- Ladwein R. and Sanchez, A. (2018) L'ambivalence dans la décision d'acheter des produits de luxe: le cas des millennials. *Management Avenir* 8: 155-178.
- Lehu J. M. and Bressoud E. (2008) L'acceptabilité du placement de marques dans les jeux vidéo: une application aux joueurs de 15 à 35 ans. *Actes du 24ème congrès international de l'Association Française du Marketing*, May, Paris.
- Leigh T.W., Peters C. and Shelton J. (2006) The consumer quest for authenticity: The multiplicity of meanings within the MG subculture of consumption. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 34(4): 481-493.
- Libération (2019), Dragon Ball, One Piece : quels sont les mangas les plus vendus en France ? [https://www.liberation.fr/checknews/2019/03/18/dragon-ball-one-piece-quels-sont-les-mangas-les-plus-vendus-en-france\\_1712197/](https://www.liberation.fr/checknews/2019/03/18/dragon-ball-one-piece-quels-sont-les-mangas-les-plus-vendus-en-france_1712197/)
- McArthur J. A. (2009) Digital subculture: A geek meaning of style. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 33(1): 58-70.
- McCain J., Gentile B. and Campbell W. K. (2015) A psychological exploration of engagement in geek culture. *PloS one* 10(11): online.
- McCracken G. (1986) Culture and Consumption: A Theoretical Account of the Structure and Movement of the Cultural Meaning of Consumer Goods. *Journal of Consumer Research* 13(1): 71-84.
- Östberg J. (2007) The linking value of subcultural capital: Constructing the Stockholm brat enclave. *Consumer tribes* 93-106.
- Pécot F. and De Barnier V. (2015) Stratégies de marques de ville basées sur le patrimoine de marque : le rôle des symboles. *Management & Avenir* 78(Juin) : 143-159.
- Peyron D. (2012) *La construction sociale d'une sous-culture: l'exemple de la culture geek*. Thèse de Doctorat en Sociologie, Université Lyon 3.
- Quail C. (2011) Nerds, geeks, and the hip/square dialectic in contemporary television. *Television & New Media* 12(5): 460-482.
- Robbins A. (2011) *The geeks shall inherit the Earth: Popularity, quirk theory, and why outsiders thrive after high school*. New York: Hyperion.
- Santone L. (2013) Publicité ethnique : enjeux commerciaux et dynamiques identitaires. *Semen* 36: online.
- Schouten J.W. and McAlexander J.H. (1995) Subcultures of Consumption: An Ethnography of the New Bikers. *Journal of Consumer Research* 22(June): 43-61.
- Seregina A. and Weijo H. (2016) Play at Any Cost: How Cosplayers Produce and Sustain Their Ludic Communal Consumption Experiences. *Journal of Consumer Research* 44(1): 139-159.

- Sierra J., Hyman M. and Heiser R. (2010) A review of ethnic identity in advertising, *Wiley International Encyclopedia of Marketing*, 4(1). Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley.
- Sierra J., Hyman M., and Torres I. (2009) Using a Model's Apparent Ethnicity to Influence Viewer Responses to Print Ads: A Social Identity Theory Perspective. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 31(2): 41-66
- Spears N. and Singh S. N. (2004) Measuring attitude toward the brand and purchase intentions. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising* 26(2): 53-66.
- Tiercelin A. et Garnier M. (2016) Geek. Une révolution symbolique, Videographie, *Actes du 32<sup>ème</sup> Congrès de l'Association Française de Marketing*, May, Lyon
- Tiercelin A. and Remy E. (2019) Le marché entre violence symbolique et émancipation: Le cas des Hardcore gameuses. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing* 34(2): 26-44.
- Thornton S. (1996) *Club cultures: Music, media, and subcultural capital*. Wesleyan University Press.
- Tocci J. (2007) The Well-Dressed Geek: Media Appropriation and Subcultural Style. *MiT5*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Avril: online.
- Underwood R.L. and Klein N.M. (2002) Packaging as brand communication: effects of product pictures on consumer responses to the package and brand. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice* 10(4): 58-68.
- Yoo J. and Kim M. (2014) The effects of online products presentation on consumer response: a mental imagery perspective. *Journal of Business Research* 67: 2464-2472.

## Appendix 1. Examples of the use of geek symbols and references in advertising and example of spin-off products



## Appendix 2. Study samples

### Appendix 2A. Study 1 - Sample and Geek/Non-Geek groups

Group	n	M/F repartition	Age	GIS score
Total	167	M: 38,3% (n=64) / F: 61,7% (n=103)	75,4% btw 18 and 44 y.o.	2,44
Geek (G)	68	M: 48,5% (n=33) / F: 51,5% (n=35)	82,3% btw 18 and 44 y.o.	3,84
Non Geek (NG)	99	M: 38,3% (n=31) / F: 61,7% (n=68)	70,7% btw 18 and 44 y.o.	1,47

### Appendix 2B. Study 2 – Sample and Geek/Non-Geek groups

Group	n	M/F repartition	Age	GIS score
Total	215	M: 50.7% (n=109) / F: 48.4% (n=104) / Non binary : 0.9% (n=2)	90.7% btw 15 and 39 y.o.	2.12
Geek (G)	75	M: 68.0% (n=51) / F: 30.7% (n=23) / Non binary : 1.3% (n=1)	95.9% btw 15 and 39 y.o.	3.42
Non Geek (NG)	140	M: 41.4% (n=58) / F: 57.9% (n=81) / Non binary : 0.7% (n=1)	87.9% btw 15 and 39 y.o.	1.42

### Appendix 3. Luxury advertising and initiatives using Geek codes and references

Videogame character used to promote luxury products	
Character / game : FF13 lightning / Final Fantasy Luxury brand : Louis Vuitton	Character / Game : Luffy / One Piece Luxury brand : Gucci
	

### Appendix 4. Geek Identification Scale validation (French translation used in the study)

Items	STUDY 1			STUDY 2		
	Loadings	Explained Variance	Cronbach's Alpha	Loadings	Explained Variance	Cronbach's Alpha
GI1. Je considère que je suis un(e) "geek".	0,920	79,05%	0,97	0,879	75,47%	0,96
GI2. Être geek est central dans mon identité.	0,921			0,887		
GI3. Être geek est important pour moi dans ma vie.	0,900			0,920		
GI4. Être geek est une partie importante de ce que je suis.	0,952			0,917		
GI5. Je me décrirais à d'autres personnes comme étant un(e) geek.	0,907			0,853		
GI6. Je suis fier(e) d'être un(e) geek.	0,893			0,866		
GI7. Si j'arrêtais de participer à des activités geek, je ne serais plus la même personne.	0,822			0,838		
GI8. Je ne peux pas imaginer la vie sans mes centres d'intérêt et mes activités geek.	0,857			0,827		
GI9. Je considère que je fais partie de la culture geek.	0,886			0,878		
GI10. Je valorise le fait d'être geek.	0,825			0,817		

#### Appendix 4B. Psychometric values of scales used in study 2

		% explained variance	Cronbach's Alpha
<b>Ambivalence to luxury</b>		71,2	0,865
<i>Louis Vuitton - Final Fantasy</i>	<b>Brand image</b>	83,2	0,898
	<b>Relevance</b>	74,95	0,833
	<b>Expectedness</b>	69,84	0,778
<i>Gucci - One Piece</i>	<b>Brand image</b>	90,95	0,95
	<b>Relevance</b>	74,41	0,828
	<b>Expectedness</b>	72,34	0,871

#### Appendix 5. Study 1 findings – Geeks vs Non-Geeks comparisons

Ad hoc Items on geek activities	Pearson Correlat. with GIS score	Sig.	Levene Stat.	Sig.	Gp	Mean	sd	Err. Std	F or Welsh T *	Sig.
Playing videogames	0,517**	0,000	2,696	0,103	<b>G</b>	<b>3,68</b>	1,099	0,133	<b>44,806</b>	<b>0,000</b>
					<b>NG</b>	<b>2,44</b>	1,214	0,122		
Downloading on platforms	0,380**	0,000	2,054	0,154	<b>G</b>	<b>2,51</b>	1,086	0,132	<b>16,427</b>	<b>0,000</b>
					<b>NG</b>	<b>1,85</b>	1,014	0,102		
Member of a game, sci-fi, fantasy club or association (Quidditch or laser saber club, scientific association, game or Magic club...)	0,377**	0,000	35,787	0,000	<b>G</b>	<b>1,75</b>	1,138	0,138	<b>13,485</b>	<b>0,000</b>
					<b>NG</b>	<b>1,19</b>	,634	0,064		
Reading (mainly books)	0,368**	0,000	1,036	0,310	<b>G</b>	<b>3,65</b>	,927	0,112	<b>21,575</b>	<b>0,000</b>
					<b>NG</b>	<b>2,90</b>	1,083	0,109		
Tabletop traditional board games playing	0,365**	0,000	0,006	0,938	<b>G</b>	<b>2,76</b>	,948	0,115	<b>19,741</b>	<b>0,000</b>
					<b>NG</b>	<b>2,08</b>	,997	0,100		
Collections (LEGO, Magic...)	0,351**	0,000	0,839	0,361	<b>G</b>	<b>2,04</b>	1,028	0,125	<b>12,397</b>	<b>0,001</b>
					<b>NG</b>	<b>1,55</b>	,799	0,080		
Watching TV series (science-fiction, fantasy...)	0,325**	0,000	9,332	0,003	<b>G</b>	<b>3,85</b>	,868	0,105	<b>14,501</b>	<b>0,000</b>
					<b>NG</b>	<b>3,27</b>	1,096	0,110		
Watching programs in streaming	0,205**	0,008	0,511	0,476	<b>G</b>	<b>3,49</b>	1,203	0,146	<b>4,851</b>	<b>0,029</b>
					<b>NG</b>	<b>3,08</b>	1,140	0,115		

\* Due to unequal variances between groups on some of the items (Levene's Test), the Welsh T-test should be preferred to the F-test of the ANOVA. This column shows either the Welsh F or T test, depending on the Levene statistic.

## Appendix 6. Study 2 findings for geeks and non geeks

Dependant variable	Levene Stat.	Sig.	Gp	Mean	Sd	Err. Std	Welsh T *	Sig.
<b>Condition A : Final Fantasy – ad &amp; product based on Final Fantasy universe - Louis Vuitton</b>								
Attitude towards brand	1,202	0,274	G	3,151	1,163	0,134	1,984	0,161
			NG	3,379	1,062	0,090		
Congruence – relevance	0,01	0,921	G	2,653	1,019	0,118	2,641	0,106
			NG	2,462	0,949	0,080		
Congruence - expectedness	6,316	0,013	G	<b>2,142</b>	1,047	0,121	<b>3,481</b>	<b>0,064</b>
			NG	<b>1,879</b>	0,865	0,073		
<b>Condition B : One Piece – ad based on One Piece universe – Gucci</b>								
Attitude towards brand	0,452	0,502	G	2,920	1,280	0,148	0,948	0,332
			NG	3,093	1,164	0,098		
Congruence – relevance	2,338	0,128	G	2,658	1,220	0,141	0,659	0,418
			NG	2,521	1,083	0,092		
Congruence - expectedness	3, 674	0,057	G	<b>2,427</b>	1,164	0,134	<b>3,542</b>	<b>0,062</b>
			NG	<b>2,129</b>	0,992	0,839		

\* Due to unequal variances between groups on some of the items (Levene's Test), the Welsh T-test should be preferred to the F-test of the ANOVA.

## Appendix 7. Study 2 findings – Geek Identification and Ambivalence to Luxury

Dependant variable	Levene Stat.	Sig.	Gp	Mean	Sd	Err. Std	Welsh T *	Sig.
<b>Condition A : Final Fantasy – ad &amp; product based on Final Fantasy universe - Louis Vuitton</b>								
Attitude towards brand	4,005	0,008	GA	3,153	1,184	0,167	<b>4,812</b>	<b>0,004</b>
			GNA	3,147	1,143	0,229		
			NGA	3,633	0,850	0,095		
			NGNA	3,039	1,218	0,157		
Congruence – relevance	1,740	0,160	GA	2,940	0,989	0,140	<b>4,376</b>	<b>0,006</b>
			GNA	2,200	0,908	0,182		
			NGA	2,396	1,008	0,113		
			NGNA	2,550	0,865	0,112		
Congruence - expectedness	1,134	0,336	GA	2,300	1,004	0,142	<b>2,492</b>	<b>0,066</b>
			GNA	1,827	1,081	0,216		
			NGA	1,842	0,897	0,100		
			NGNA	1,928	0,826	0,107		

Condition B : One Piece – ad based on One Piece universe - Gucci								
<b>Attitude towards brand</b>	0,471	0,703	<b>GA</b>	3,007	1,237	0,175	1,394	0,251
			<b>GNA</b>	2,747	1,372	0,274		
			<b>NGA</b>	3,233	1,143	0,128		
			<b>NGNA</b>	2,906	1,174	0,152		
<b>Congruence - relevance</b>	2,735	0,045	<b>GA</b>	2,760	1,197	0,169	1,321	0,273
			<b>GNA</b>	2,453	1,265	0,253		
			<b>NGA</b>	2,629	1,168	0,131		
			<b>NGNA</b>	2,378	0,948	0,122		
<b>Congruence – expectedness</b>	1,906	0,130	<b>GA</b>	2,510	1,046	0,148	1,662	0,182
			<b>GNA</b>	2,260	1,378	0,276		
			<b>NGA</b>	2,113	1,019	0,114		
			<b>NGNA</b>	2,150	0,964	0,124		

\* Due to unequal variances between groups on some of the items (Levene's Test), the Welsh T-test should be preferred to the F-test of the ANOVA.