

# Review of: "The Advertising and the Other Marketing Communications of Luxury Goods – Archetypal, Semiotic and Narrative Aspects"

Flore Di Sciullo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Université Panthéon-Assas (Paris II)

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The first lines of the paper are a bit spread out and could maybe be further blended together in one paragraph, so as to allow a more fluid reading.

Some elements could maybe be added to sharpen the viewpoint: What exactly is *aluxury good*, and what distinguishes it from *any other good*? Why is BMW considered as *luxury*, more than Renault for instance?

When the authors says "the specialists" or "some scholars", maybe some accurate example of scholars could be given (e.g. p. 3/21). This is also also true for other plural forms that are often used, such as "the admen". Some particular incarnation (an ad agency in particular) would allow the demonstration to be more accurate. Same issue p. 7/21: "the specialists". But who? I would recommend the author to consider that is important to avoid the plural form ("the scientists", "the researchers") and replace each instance with specific names of scholars / papers. Also, more than general references (Carl Jung, Mircea Eliade...) some precise quotes (with page number for the quote) could be added (not every time, but at least a few times).

More precise examples could also be given regarding specific products and/or marketing campaign: posters, TV ads, etc. The more examples will be given, the easier it will be for the reader to follow the author's train of thoughts. Also, giving examples would allow the demonstration to be *applied* more than *abstract*. Some examples are given (Dior) but maybe a little late in the paper.

I believe that the paper would benefit from a more precise introduction, that would explicitly mention the object of study: is it British marketing? Chinese? Japanese? Many examples are given, but each refer to very different context (economical, political, cultural)... Maybe focusing on one country in particular would help in making more specific observations and deepening the conclusions?

Some remarks would also deserve further explanation. P. 4/21 (bottom): "the semantic field of emotion is very important for advertising". Which advertising? And instead of mention a 1989 reference, maybe some more recent work could be quoted on that matter?

As the reader gets to p. 5, a question arises: what exactly is the topic of the article? Different archetypes are mentioned, but so far no objects (a perfume bottle, a car...) are mentioned. Maybe the author could centre his/her observations on a

group of objects/campaign ads, and therefore give a clear direction to the paper.

Also in the interest of giving more clarity to the paper, I would also recommend giving titles and subtitles, to make appear the structure of the argumentation. Some titles are given, but are often very general. For instance “the ads appeals, the customer in marketing” (p.7/21) could be transformed and phrased differently: “the customer and its appeal in advertising” for example. Most titles are short and do not really hold a key-idea; “the archetype”, “the archetypal appeals”... Ideally, titles in an academic paper are meant to give directions to the reader, and indicate a key-idea, a transition, etc.

P. 8/21: instead of bullet-point lists, maybe the ideas could be re-written in full sentences? Also, it is hard to understand what these lists are based on, and what they allow to demonstrate. Same issue p. 11/21: why quote *Éliade* as a bullet point? And what is it for in the demonstration? This is interesting of course, but puzzling at the same time... Again p. 13/21: why the bullet-point lists? What are they for?

P. 10/21: the paragraph regarding the use of light in Western painting is full of inaccuracies. Same problem with the paragraph on Versailles, Place Vendome... Those passages are way too vague and resemble a personal opinion more than a scientific analysis. Again p. 11/21: Paris and Venice are the centre of romantic love? Many couples go there for their honeymoon: Is there any data on the subject? Is it just a personal opinion? And second, what does it have to do with anything?

As the reading progresses, more issues come up, especially regarding the structure of the article. To that point, I would recommend that the author take more time to rethink its object of study, its theoretical frame and its main hypothesis. Some aspects are promising but would deserve more work and reflection to gain clarity. The topic of light could maybe be the start of a more precise topic. More could be said about the rest of the paper, and the way different “archetypes” are mentioned in just a few lines (the archetype of ‘young’, of ‘beauty’). But I believe that, more than a few cosmetics arrangement, the entire paper would gain from being re-written and enriched with specific examples. The semiotics analysis is also very modest at that point: a further analysis of signs would be welcome (but again, analysing specific objects, and preferably more recent than the Dior one).

Also, and this is a more serious issue (I apologize for the brutality of the phrasing), the paper has a lot of mistakes and inaccuracies. The author **must** verify and **quote** its sources, so as to not state things that are vague and untrue (p. 15/21, “Paris is the world centre of female beauty”... really? And why?).

Some formal aspects:

- Words from another language should be written in italics, for instance “nouveaux riches” p.3/21.
- I am not a native English-speaker myself, but maybe in the final stage of writing the paper would benefit from being reviewed from a linguistic point of view.

At last, I would like to add that I do not mean any of the above to be mean or brutal; I believe that the paper has a lot of potential, but maybe the author needs some time to deepen its point of view and mature its analysis.

