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Abstract
Purpose: This research aims to analyze how the productive consumer is portrayed by scientific production in the Marketing area.
Methods: A bibliographical research was carried out, and the data were extracted based
INTRODUCTION

The popularization of social media and mobile technologies converged in a change in the socio-cultural scenario (Maciaszczyk & Kocot, 2021; Ritzer & Jurgenson, 2010; Ritzer et al., 2012) that brought the participatory culture as a guideline for the way brands and organizations relate to their audiences and see the producer-consumer relationship (Daugherty et al., 2008; Delwiche & Henderson, 2013; Jenkins, 2009; Jurgenson, 2010; Wang, 2021). With the emergence of the Internet and, above all, with the advent of Web 2.0 technologies - which provided greater integration and user participation -, the change in the perspective of the consumption-production relationship has become more forceful and with greater space for consumer action, that have come into force at the heart of the process (Bartosik-Purgat, & Bednarz, 2021; Bhattacharyya et al., 2021; Ritzer & Jurgenson, 2010).

The Marketing literature has pointed to the identification of a new type of consumer, characterized by their active participation in the production of their consumption objects (Ritzer & Jurgenson, 2010; Ritzer et al., 2012; Ritzer, 2014, 2019; Ritzer & Miles, 2019). Such approximation between production and consumption has been established under the name prosumption (Cova et al., 2011; Cova & Cova, 2012; Zhang, 2017; Zajc, 2015; Büscher & Igoe, 2013; Kviat, 2021; Shah et al.,
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Although also treated by other terms, such as: do-it-yourself (Halassi et al., 2019; Watson & Shove, 2008); craft consumption (Campbell, 2005; Palmsköld, 2021); productive consumption (Laughney, 2010); or even co-creation of value (Cova et al., 2011; Cova et al., 2015; Cova & Cova, 2012; Zwick et al., 2008).

The concept of prosumer was developed by Toffler (1980), but introduced in the Marketing area by Kotler (1986) and intensified, in the last decade, by Ritzer and Jurgenson (2010). It is currently very relevant because it presents a new way of consuming that is active and that integrates the consumer into production. In this sense, the theme has attracted the attention of researchers in the field of Marketing in recent years (Shah et al., 2020), above all from the perspective of the Consumer Culture Theory, which proposes to analyze consumption practices with a postmodern and sociocultural approach (Arnould & Thompson, 2005; Gaião et al., 2012; Rokka, 2021). However, we observe that the productive consumer has been described in different ways in the literature (Alhashem et al., 2020; González Reyes, 2021; Lang et al., 2020b; Rayna & Striukova, 2021). For this reason, we seek to analyze these academic appropriations, to enable a deeper understanding of the perspectives under which productive consumption has been approached.

In order to draw a better understanding of these different perceptions about productive consumption, this research aims to analyze how the productive consumer is portrayed by scientific production in the Marketing area. Thus, the study seeks to contribute to a better understanding and definition of the productive consumer by the scientific literature, exposing the current approaches from which the theme is treated, and may serve as a basis for further studies.

**PROSUMPTION**

The term prosumption was initially introduced by Alvin Toffler (1980), as a result of his diagnosis and prediction of a growing approximation in production and consumption relations, resulting from advances in production technology and consumption practices created, above all, as a way of differentiation in the offer of products and services (Humphreys & Grayson, 2008; Kotler, 1986; Ritzer & Jurgenson, 2010; Ritzer et al., 2012). With the advent of contemporary society, it has become difficult to identify the existence of totally pure production and consumption processes, without any intersection between them, since technological advances culminated in making them increasingly interrelated processes (Humphreys & Grayson, 2008; Ritzer, 2015a, 2015b, 2019).

Ritzer (2015a) argues that we would be living in the era of prosumer capitalism, in which the instances of production and consumption in their pure conceptions no longer exist. In his theoretical elaboration, Ritzer (1993) argues that the era of prosumption began in the 1950s with the emergence of fast foods, as consumers began to place their orders at counters, take their food to the tables, throw away garbage, and take the trays to the appropriate place. In its original version, this prosumption movement aims at efficiency, predictability, calculability, and control of consumer-producers, as companies wanted to predict what the consumer should do (Kotler, 1986).

The initial concept of prosumer came to reverberate preliminarily in the Marketing area from Kotler (1986), having repercussions in the present decade, with the advent of the Internet and, above all, of Web 2.0 technologies, leading to a more decisive change in the consumption-production relationship (Ritzer & Jurgenson, 2010). For Jurgenson (2010), the Internet has shaped prosumption as it is known today, causing an inversion in the growing logic of rationalization that occurred after the fast-food era. Production and consumption started to have a different relationship, especially from Web 2.0 (Jurgenson, 2010; Zajc, 2015), leading organizations themselves to insist less on direct consumer control (Zwick et al., 2008), and starting to monitor their activities more and more closely (Dujarier, 2016).

In this scenario, Cova and Cova (2012) argue that the technological advances that have permeated society in the last forty years have made it possible for consumers to have the possibility to produce content based on their interests, collaboratively and creatively. In this sense, it is understood that the consumer began to seek not only the acquisition of a product but also consumer experiences (Stuart-Menteth et al., 2006).
Thus, the prosumer has become an important social actor, given its ability to engage in the production and consumption of products and services, generating analysis materials for the corporate and social spheres (Lang et al., 2020a, 2020b). In the same way, these new and multiple possibilities of interaction with the products and services consumed led the scientific literature to approach the subject from different perspectives (Alhashem et al., 2020; González Reyes, 2021; Rayna & Striukova, 2021), analyzed in this study.

METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES

The present work is a bibliographic research, allowing the researcher to reach conclusions through the analysis of questions already determined or still little investigated (Manzo, 1971; Marconi & Lakatos, 2002). Bibliographic research contributes to the creation of knowledge and demands planning supported by various methodological mechanisms (Macedo, 1995; Salvador, 1986). Furthermore, it uses different criteria to ensure the reliability of the study (Gil, 1999).

The research used secondary sources for the assembly of the corpus, in order to allow the refinement of scientific articles already developed analytically (Gil, 1999), and adopted the desk research technique, of an exploratory-descriptive nature (Gaíaõ et al., 2012; Malhotra, 2001). In this way, the research corpus consisted of scientific articles published in journals with greater relevance in the Marketing area, according to the Scimago Journal & Country Rank portal, which has an open database and which observes the productivity and prestige of the various journals. sciences (Jacsó, 2010). Such a collection perspective is based on the criteria of location and scientific recognition of sources (Gaíaõ et al., 2012).

Data collection was carried out from the recognition of texts that represented the productive consumer in the scientific literature. The search for articles was initially carried out using keywords, a method already used in electronic content filtering (de Souza-Leão et al., 2019, 2020a, 2020b). Then, in a new stage of collection, the references of the articles already collected were observed, to expand and concentrate the collection from referenced articles that had dealt with the investigated topic (Gaíaõ et al., 2012). Finally, 84 articles were collected from 2002 to 2018. Saturation was ensured to ensure the representativeness of the corpus (Bauer & Aarts, 2000).

Data analysis used Interpretive Content Analysis procedures (ICA) (Drisko & Maschi, 2016; Nakao & Mussi, 2018), which is evidenced as a relevant method in helping researchers to understand the meanings of a given subject (Baxter, 1991). In addition, to give reliability to the observed meanings, all authors participated in the data analysis, in order to guarantee the reliability and quality of the research (Ahuvia, 2001; Drisko & Maschi, 2016). From there, data analysis took place in three main stages.

The first step took place from the understanding of the meanings given to the productive consumer by the analyzed scientific literature, resulting in the elaboration of codes for each observed meaning. Coding is, from this perspective, an instrument that portrays textual meanings from data interrelationships (Drisko & Maschi, 2016), and through it, the categories and relations that guided researchers to find the meanings of the topic are established. (Peruta & Shields, 2018). In the end, the procedure resulted in the identification of 22 codes.

The next step was carried out from the validation of links between the identified codes, recognizing the relations they established among themselves and analyzing whether such relations were sustained from a semantic point of view. The elaboration of relations is essential for the analysis of patterns or clusters (de Souza-Leão et al., 2019, 2020a, 2020b). It should be noted that some of the works dealt with only one of the codes analyzed, while others addressed several of them. Therefore, researchers need to observe which codes were semantically related, recognizing correlated meanings through the emergence of meanings. (Cavalcanti et al., 2021).

The third stage was formed by the validation of identity groups, in order to observe the dimensions from which the productive consumer is defined. In this perspective, we tried to analyze central discursive ideas and relate them to codes, which, based on relations, made sense from a logical point of view. In this way, it is noted that the existing links between the codes and their relations guide the identification of categories, going beyond the disclosure of discourses, themes, and central
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contents of the corpus (Heinonen & Medberg, 2018; Kassarjian, 1977). Finally, three identity dimensions were identified and will be addressed in the results and discussion section of this article.

It is worth noting that all stages of the research were coordinated by the researcher with the greatest experience who performed the triangulation of the analysis performed firsthand by the other authors and carried out the validation of the final table of the results, in order to ensure the quality of the research. Still, concerning the process of obtaining quality in the research, the process of data collection and purification stands out, to obtain a representative corpus; researchers' reflexivity, who carried out reviews of the analyzes at each stage; and the rich and detailed exposition of the methodological processes used (Denzin, 2017; Hayashi et al., 2019; Paiva et al., 2011).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the analysis, 22 forms of manifestations of the productive consumer were identified, which were grouped into three dimensions according to their theoretical relations (see lines relating the categories). The numbering of the codes was defined to present a logical sequence of these relations. Figure 1 presents the map of code relations and outlines the dimensions identified. The following subsections present the survey results from each of these dimensions. It is worth mentioning that the citations presented refer to the analyzed works that support each passage and/or inference.

Source: Prepared by the authors.

**Figure 1.** Map of relations and their dimensions

**Purpose of the Act of Prosumption**

In this dimension, codes have a conceptual relation more purely aligned with the classic concept of prosumption (Toffler, 1980). In it, it is observed that individuals create their own products (C3) from what they consume, expressing their creativity (C5) and also as a form of social interaction (C6), and it is also possible to use them as a form of work or leisure (C4). Through this construction, individuals are able to develop an image of themselves (C1) contributing to the definition of their identity (C2).

Consumers use productive consumption to create their own products (C3). These productions range from media products (Ahuvia & Izberk-Bilgin, 2011; Büscher & Igoe, 2013; Chen, 2018; Dujarier, 2016; Fox, 2018; Mädler & Wallendorf, 2016; Pera & Viglia, 2015; Xie et al., 2008) to technological solutions (Moreau & Dahl, 2005; Ritzer, 2015b; Schweik et al., 2011) to technological solutions. Prosumers are extremely
innovative in their productions (Füller et al., 2007), helping to publicize the brand, based on their loyalty and devotion (Pitt et al., 2006). Such prosumer practices are driven by collective creation when consumers come together in communities to actively collaborate in the production and sharing of content (Albuquerque et al., 2012; Beer & Burrows, 2010; Campbell, 2005; Fox, 2018; Morreale, 2014; Planells, 2017; Ritzer, 2014; Ruckenstein, 2015; Sugihartati, 2017; Troye & Supphellen, 2012).

At the same time, productive consumption has been used as a work or leisure tool (C4), with which consumers create content as a way to obtain monetary gains or as a hobby to improve their well-being (Albuquerque et al., 2012; Beighton, 2017; Press & Arnould, 2011; Seraj, 2012). In this sense, while some consumers experience productive consumption as a form of work (Moisio et al., 2013), others produce content for entertainment, intended for leisure and to achieve well-being (Chen, 2018; Roberts & Cremin, 2019).

From this perspective, prosumption makes it possible for consumers to use their imagination to express creativity (C5), using the reach of Web 2.0 to share their productions with other consumers (Ahuvia & Izber-Bilgin, 2011; Albuquerque et al., 2012; Füller et al., 2007). According to Yang et al. (2011), consumers are even ‘summoned’ by brands to produce new ideas. Despite its consequences, the main motivation for creating content is the expression of creativity, from which prosumers demonstrate their ideals and interests (Goldenberg et al., 2012; Morreale, 2014).

Also, productive consumption is a tool for social interaction (C6), in a constantly changing environment (Chen, 2018; Fox, 2018). Prosumers, in the digital age, use multimedia tools to express themselves and share their productions with other individuals (Planells, 2017), through social networks and new technologies, creating new forms of socialization (Eden, 2017; Pera & Viglia, 2015; Planells, 2017).

In addition, productive consumption contributes to the construction of the identity (C2) of consumers as individuals (Andrews & Ritzer, 2018; Chen, 2018; Eden, 2017; Keinan & Kivetz, 2011; Moisio et al., 2013; Reynolds, 2016; Roberts & Cremin, 2019; Sugihartati, 2017; Zhang, 2017). This stems from the fact that prosumers are in a constant process of changing their needs and desires (Bonsu et al., 2010), which can translate into the construction of multiple identities over time (Caldwell et al., 2007; Press & Arnould, 2011; Sugihartati, 2017). For this, individuals use a range of resources, both offline and online (Akaka et al., 2012; Arnould & Thompson, 2005; Schau & Gilly, 2003; Smith et al., 2012).

Still, through productive consumption, the individual develops his image (C1), in order to be able to understand his “I” (Firat et al., 1995). This fact can be evidenced in the prosumption, as consumers seek a way to reflect and build personalities based on co-creation and the contribution they receive from others (Roberts & Cremin, 2019; Toubia & Stephen, 2013; Xie et al., 2008).

Interaction Between Consumers

In the current dimension, it appears that prosumers use the online environment to communicate (C7) and interact (C6), to share and produce experiences (C11) while producing knowledge (C12) and influencing (C14) other users, from the sharing of evaluations of the object of consumption (C17). From these practices, prosumers promote the community (C8) in which they are inserted and contribute to the establishment of beliefs and culture (C13), by co-creating values (C15) that are passed on spontaneously, producing shared value (C10) and creating symbols and meanings (C16) for the community. At the same time, as a way to facilitate access to their acts of prosumption by other consumers, they create keywords (C9) that translate their productions in a summarized way.

Through productive consumption, consumers can communicate (C7), exchange ideas, information, debate common issues in the community in which they are inserted, and dialogue with the companies that offer the products and services they consume (Büncher & Igoe, 2013; Chen, 2018; Cova & Cova, 2012; Sugihartati, 2017). The online medium has become an essential communication tool among prosumers, establishing itself as a space for exchanging experiences and information, socialization, and promoting creativity (Chevalier & Mayzlin, 2006; Hennig-Thurau et al., 2004; Morreale, 2014; Nam et al., 2017; Pan & Zhang, 2011; Seraj, 2012; Smith et al., 2012; Sun et al., 2017).
In this sense, Web 2.0 made it possible to increase the co-creation of value (C15), based on the dynamics and reach of virtual spaces (Arvidsson, 2005; Beighton, 2017; Dellaert, 2018; Figueiredo & Scaraboto, 2016; Grönroos & Voima, 2013; Troye & Supphellen, 2012; Sugihartati, 2017; Zhang, 2017), and through the possibility of creating content (Eden, 2017; Morreale, 2014; Roberts & Cremin, 2019). Brands take advantage of this scenario to integrate the prosumer into their business strategies (Bonsu et al., 2010; Ritzer & Jurgenson, 2010; Schau et al., 2009). Thus, consumers become essential parts of the value creation process, because they share experiences with other consumers (Cova & Cova, 2012; Grönroos & Voima, 2013; Hatch & Schultz, 2010; Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004; Rieder & Voß, 2010; Sugihartati, 2017; Zhang et al., 2012), and cooperate directly with the brand (Zwick et al., 2008).

At the same time, consumers are invited and encouraged to become brand evaluators (C17), using the digital environment to express their opinions and consumption experiences (Chen & Xie, 2008; Netzer et al., 2012; Pitt et al., 2006; Seraj, 2012). The analyzes that productive consumers make in the online environment have become a source of relevant information for other consumers and brands, leading to the replacement or complementation of other forms of communication between brand and consumer (Chevalier & Mayzlin, 2006; Pan & Zhang, 2011). In this perspective, Tang et al. (2014) expose the need to build a knowledge structure that allows consumers to properly understand, interpret and evaluate the knowledge around products.

Online communities, in turn, allow consumers to produce and share experiences with each other (C11), through productive communication (Arvidsson, 2005; Pitt et al., 2006; Sugihartati, 2017). Seraj (2012) states that the virtual environment has become a relevant tool for sharing experiences since individuals are actively engaged and producing content for the entire community in which they are inserted. This allowed consumers to move from mere passive information hunters to agents who share their consumption experiences (Füller et al., 2007; Hennig-Thurau et al., 2004; Holt, 1995; Netzer et al., 2012; Pan & Zhang, 2011; Reynolds, 2016; Tang et al., 2014; Tirunillai & Tellis, 2012). In this sense, online communities become a decisive factor in the purchase decision of other consumers (Ahv & Chang, 2009; Liu-Thompkins & Rogerson, 2012; Ransbotham et al., 2012; Yoganarasimhan, 2012; Zhang et al., 2012; Zwik et al., 2017). They also have a strong impact on the decisions of a company’s investors, as well as on the performance of the stock market (Tirunillai & Tellis, 2012).

This process led productive consumers to play the role of influencers (C14), becoming relevant in building brand value to other individuals (Dellaert, 2018; Kumar et al., 2010; Smith et al., 2012; Zwik et al., 2017) and influencing their buying attitudes and behaviors (Dujarier, 2016; Tang et al., 2014). Bird (2011) states that this influence transcends consumers and even affects cultural production industries.

From this perspective, productive consumers produce shared value (C10) through the production of content. To Pitt et al. (2006), the creation of shared value depends not only on the efforts of companies but also on consumers, who share values with each other. This is due to the mutual influence existing between community members (Akaka et al., 2012; Bagozzi & Dholakia, 2002).

Virtual communities also provide the production of symbols and meanings (C16) in which, through an interpretive and dynamic process, new meanings are developed around a particular brand (Ahuvia & Izberk-Bilgin, 2011; Akaka et al., 2012; Arvidsson, 2005; Eden, 2017; Pitt et al., 2006). Consumers interpret and produce content around the products and services consumed, generating new meanings and modifying existing ones (Andrews & Ritzer, 2018; Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2017; Sugihartati, 2017).

In a complementary way, productive consumers create keywords for their content (C9), both to classify them and to briefly describe them (Nam et al., 2017). In this sense, it is observed that the creation of keywords by productive consumers uses as a reference both the main characteristics of the created content and its contextual characteristics (Nam et al., 2017).

Also, through productive consumption, consumers promote the community in which they are inserted (C8). According to Fox (2018), when individuals feel involved and trust the community, they feel motivated and engaged in their promotions. Part of this involves creating rites and artifacts based on culture and beliefs (C13). Consumers understand that their acts of prosumption must be aligned
with the decisions and perspectives of the community, resulting in the establishment of beliefs and culture (Ahn et al., 2016; Collins, 2010).

Finally, consumers are considered producers of knowledge (C12), when creating, disseminating, and sharing consumption practices (Beighton, 2017; Büscher & Igoe, 2013; Cova & Cova, 2012; Netzer et al., 2012; Schweik et al., 2011; Seraj, 2012). Through their consumption experiences, consumers can produce knowledge for other individuals (Netzer et al., 2012; Reynolds, 2016; Zwick et al., 2008).

**Relationship of Consumers with Companies**

In the third dimension, consumers play a collaborative role with companies (C22) participating in the design of products (C19) and evaluating them (C17). They also play the role of brand advocates (C18) when exposing their opinions to other consumers, influencing them (C14), and co-creating value (C15) about the brand. Ultimately, consumers actively participate in the market (C21) and become true producers of supply (C20).

Consumers began to actively participate in the market (C21), sometimes becoming sellers and distributors (Dellaert, 2018). This active position has been taken advantage of by companies, which use the engagement of prosumers to make them ‘market partners’ (Cova & Cova, 2012).

From another perspective, productive consumers create, transform and modify market offers (C20), acting as co-creators of products for companies (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2017; Berthon et al., 2007; Dujarier, 2016; Xie et al., 2008). Companies use the online interaction of consumers as a tool to attract prosumers, who will start to produce content according to the brands’ interests (Cova & Cova, 2012; Pan & Zhang, 2011; Pitt et al., 2006; Xie et al., 2008). Such contents even have the potential to affect a company’s stock market performance (Tirunillai & Tellis, 2012).

From this perspective, brand advocates (C18) emerge, who are prosumers who share their positive opinions about products and services with other network users (Liu-Thompkins & Rogerson, 2012). At the same time, productive consumers play a collaborative role with the company, suggesting ideas (Berthon et al., 2007; Muñiz & Schau, 2007); collaborating on products and services (Cova & Cova, 2012); getting involved in the creation of product design (Katona, 2015); participating in decision making (Planells, 2017); generating new content to promote the brand (Pitt et al., 2006; Roberts & Cremin, 2019); experimenting and giving opinions on new products (Dujarier, 2016; Zukin et al., 2017); co-creating brand equity (Muniz & O’guinn, 2001; Press & Arnould, 2011; Ritzer & Jurgenson, 2010; Ritzer, 2014; Schau et al., 2009; Sugihartati, 2017; Zwick et al., 2008); and co-creating competitive strategies (Schau et al., 2009).

This allows us to observe that companies started to invite prosumers to participate in the product design process (C19), involving them to collaborate with ideas, opinions, and experiences that allow the improvement of products already marketed, as well as the creation of new products. and services, or even advertisements (Andrews & Ritzer, 2018; Beighton, 2017; Chen, 2018; Dujarier, 2016; Katona, 2015; Pitt et al., 2006; Seraj, 2012; Thompson & Malaviya, 2013).

**CONCLUSION**

The productive consumer is important for studies in the field of Marketing, as it is a peculiar type of consumer that increasingly impacts social and economic scenarios, and that manifests itself in various ways, making investigations in the academic literature quite broad. Thus, this work analyzed the different definitions about the productive consumer presented by the scientific literature in the area of Marketing, indicated in periods of high relevance, according to the ranking provided by the Scimago Journal & Country Rank.

The research identified three conceptual dimensions regarding how productive consumers are discussed in the literature. The first dimension deals with the purpose of the act of prosumption, which is categorized as the most reliable form of the purely said concept, as it understands that consumers develop productions based on what they consume and that they can, through this, express themselves and build themselves. The second dimension shows the interaction that productive consumers have with each other, creating a culture and a community, sharing experiences, and
creating evaluations that influence others, culminating in the production of knowledge and the creation of value around a certain object. The last dimension exposes the relationship between companies and the productive consumer, who become strong marketing allies when they collaborate in the design of a product or when they create value for other individuals.

In this way, the research contributes to the Marketing area by providing an in-depth investigation of studies around the productive consumer and the different ways in which they are perceived, especially from the perspective of Culture Consumer Theory, a field that investigates the social and cultural aspects of consumption. The study outlined a theoretical framework on academic approaches given to the subject, thus enabling a conceptual portrait of the figure of the prosumer in the area.

However, as it is a qualitative study, from an interpretive perspective, it is worth noting that it has limitations, since the researcher, as an element and object of research, can make the study partial. To overcome this limitation, the study was designed with all the methodological accuracy necessary for data analysis and validation. It is also noted that the work was based only on international publications written in English and published in highly relevant journals, with no geographic delimitation of the corpus.

With this, it is observed that future research can be carried out by analyzing other bibliographies on the subject, mainly from a geographical perspective, making it possible to draw a comparative relationship between national and global productions. Still, it is possible the emergence of investigations that analyze new types of prosumers and new ways of acting, enabling the development of the theme and the creation of new conceptual relationships about the phenomenon.

References


Ahuvia, A. (2001). Traditional, interpretive, and reception based content analyses: Improving the ability of content analysis to address issues of pragmatic and theoretical concern. *Social indicators research, 54*(2), 139-172. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011087813505


The Prosumer Faces: The representation of the productive consumer in the marketing literature


González Reyes, R. (2021). The other faces of the prosumer: a review of the foundational concepts of pro-am (professional amateur) and maker. *Comunicación y sociedad, 18*, http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0142-9522


Seraj, M. (2012). We create, we connect, we respect, therefore we are: intellectual, social, and cultural value in online communities. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 26(4), 209-222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2012.03.002


