

Review of: "Ethical and political consumption: an integrated typology of practices"

Anders Rhiger Hansen¹

¹ Aalborg University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an interesting paper with a solid review of literature on political and ethical consumption. Understanding the conceptual nuances of political and ethical aspects of consumption processes is indeed important, and the paper provides a contribution to this, primarily by emphasizing the legal versus illegal consumption.

My main critique of the is that it is unclear about the distinction of practices and consumption (practices). Although Warde (2005) is referenced in the beginning along with the perspective of practices, Warde's work on consumption and practices are missing in the paper. I think the introduction gives the impression that consumption as practices is a perspective throughout the paper, but it misses a few points from Warde's perspective.

First, my interpretation of Warde's perspective is that consumption is practices. This could be interpreted in other ways, but if consumption occurs in the course of accomplishing practices, then consumption practices as a term might mislead what is the specific case here. Also, it is not clear to me what a practice is, and I think the concepts presented in Warde's work could help making this clearer. For example, on page 13 'sharing' is discussed as a practice, but the distinction between as dispersed practice (as 'sharing') and integrated practice might be useful (mentioned in Warde, 2005). Also, Warde (2010, 2014, 2017) distinguish between three processes of consumption: acquisition, appropriation, and appreciation. As this paper addresses some of this, a reference to Warde's work could be in place, also to further understand this as processes of consumption. This especially concerns the introduction (page 1) and discussion, where 'green', 'sustainable' etc. could be view as teleo-affective aims or meanings of practices. Second, building on the three processes of consumption, the definition of consumption as something more than (just) acquisition (or economic exchange) is not new as it appears to some places in the paper. This is for example presented by Warde in his book 'Consumption – A sociological analysis' and several other papers. His (broad) definition of consumption might contribute to the perspective presented in this paper. Third, a closer reading of Warde (2005) might reveal. Fourth, the use of 'ordinary' as normal on page 3 conflates with Warde's distinction between 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary' consumption, where 'ordinary' refers to the mundane rather than the mainstream as it is done in this paper. Fifth, Warde (and others) focus on habits and practice career is also somehow missing. For example on page 8, it could be useful with a reference to Warde (2005) about social differences based on practice careers.

In addition, Kirsten Gram-Hanssen published the paper 'Conceptualising ethical consumption within theories of practice' in 2022. As the reviewed paper addresses something similar, it could be beneficial to reference this, for example on page 2 of the introduction, a reference to Gram-Hanssen would be suitable in relation to what 'ethical' means.

On page 2, it says that the article intends to present a new analytical tool. However, I would like to clearly state, in connection to this, what literature this new analytical tool builds on. In other words, what is the need for a new analytical tool? Are there, for example, someone asking for such a new tool or is it a critique of previous tools?

On page 3, it says 'organizing of society', but it probably should be 'organization of society'. Below this, '(e.g., to explain motivation)' could be removed. A practice theoretical understanding, based on Warde's work, on consumption would also address motivation in a different way.

Table 1 on page 6 could benefit from a description by the author, where Jonas's descriptions are put in own formulations.

I like the summary on page 6 (last paragraph), which I think is clearer than the review itself. However, 'dominant' is referred several places and remind of Bourdieusian theory on how dominant positions drives (consumption) practices by dominating the dominated. Without using Bourdieu's framework, a clearer description of the use of 'dominant' and the mechanism related to this could be useful, for example on page 10 this is related to "mainstream".

On page 9, it says 'consumer practices than' which should be 'consumer practices that'.

On page 12, the 'note' does not need to be written as a note.

On page 13, 'potentiality' should maybe be 'potential'.

Finally, the conclusion starts by referring to a 'we', but who are 'we'? Warde provide a potential explanation of the focus on purchasing resting on the semantic origins of consumption. This would be better to refer to that. See Warde, 2017, or other papers.