

A Note on Bazaar Consumer Collectives

Maitrayee Deka (maitrayee.deka@essex.ac.uk) is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Sociology at the University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester CO4 3SQ, United Kingdom

This article forwards bazaar consumer collective as a distinct way to view popular consumer sociality. Instead of just building social relations through a particular commodity or brand, bazaar consumer affinities emerge by 'grabbing' the moment of potentiality. This article argues that what defines bazaar consumerism is about getting onto a trend very quickly through ad-hoc and informal production networks. Unlike in previous analysis of popular consumer cultures, bazaar consumerism is no more about aspiring towards upper-class consumption—it is about encapsulating whatever is trending in their environment. A loose bazaar consumer collective gets formed by the possibilities of wearing garments that are thoroughly capturing the moment, not about wearing a specific brand. By this logic, bazaar consumerism is an act of mimesis of decentering corporate discourse at one level and introducing copies as new symbols at the other end.

Introduction

Historically, modern consumer cultures have connected to one or other forms of sociality (Pennell, 1999; Schouten and McAlexander, 1995). The rise of a consumer identity in nineteenth-century England showed that displays at shop windows, fairs, and charity shops were part of an emerging identity amongst individuals, particularly women who found the world of goods and browsing shop windows agentive (Rappaport, 2001). The charity bazaars and fairs became a place for people to experience a range of products, some imported from the 'orient', other local products, and the consumer-driven experience became a way to encounter a diverse world (Prochaska, 1977, Stallybrass and White, 1986). Consumer habits in early modern Europe was a messy terrain as lot of the time imported items were also shrouded in the cultural universe of the colonies. In fact, there was a sense of decay and amorality of these spaces to the extent that respectable bourgeoisie women found themselves in a precarious position with relation to new consumer spaces. While the daytime shopping at arcades and shops was a respectable hobby, the same place in the evenings was hostile (Dyer, 1991). Modern commodity cultures of Victorian England had aspects of finely lined consumer items and bazaar-like bizarre combinations of goods (Fanselow, 1990).

The coexistence of chaotic, second hand and bricolage of products slowly vanished from mainstream shopping experiences and the hi-streets. They got replaced by more orderly supermarkets and shopping malls, (Habibi and Pati, 2017). It is not that 'bizarre range of saleable' wholly disappeared, but their presence became marginal and came to be increasingly scrutinized by legal bodies through intellectual property laws (Sundaram, 2010). Between the eighteenth and twentieth centuries, aesthetics of consumerism changed from a messy terrain of an odd range of goods to finely lined commodities. Attached to this is the rise of brands that were able to discipline further the narrative of a commodity and the lifestyles it generates. The dominant idea of consumer collectives took off with the concept of brands (Muniz and O'Guinn, 2001; Närvänen and Goulding, 2016; Wang, et al. 2013). To a varying degree of success, brands offered a way to produce quite a strong affiliation amongst members towards a particular commodity. In other instances, commodities might not create stringent communities and may actually take the form of crowds and loose publics in a Tardian fashion (Kozinets, et al. 2008). The latter tendency gains popularity with the rise of social media and product placements via images and posts. Arvidsson and Caliandro's (2016) research on Louis Vuitton on Twitter captures the transience of brands in the age of social media. Unlike traditional brand communities grounded on the distinct feature of a product, they argue that social media-fueled collectives act more like publics—different affiliations and meaning-making processes being simultaneously in operation. In this regard, some tweets were

clearly in service of the brands, others about recording quotidian moments, and other tweets connected to instances of self-branding.

Contemporary consumer collectives are diverse, and the rise of social media has provided new ways of analyzing identities and networks through brands and commodities. Not all of these connections are enduring. They might not be as exacting and communitarian as those of the past, formulating subcultures of consumption (Hall and Jefferson, 1975). But there is still the prevalence of brands seeking some sort of vague or strong network between people and products. New middle class and upper-class consumerism have continued to use the narrative of brands to create exclusivity and specific identities (Bhandari, 2019). The exception perhaps is the physical bazaars of the world. Here a consumer collective does not get formulated around brands but is a bricolage similar to early modern consumerism of Europe. In fact I argue rather than brands, the crux of bazaar consumer collectives is mimesis. The popular classes have managed to break the shackle of branded consumerism not because of logos; insignias do not feature in any of their garments. Instead, their utter indifference to continuing the lineage of logos to an original creator or narrative that the bazaar mimetic culture takes precedence. When a wide variety of 'logos' feature in a single garment, it is not a simple act of mimicry and imitation but mimesis, 'a wider process of representation that involves the mediation between different worlds and people-in essence, between different symbolic systems' (Huggan, 1997: 94). Mimesis does not conceptualize copying as a mere act of imitation, but it shows what else is happening when someone decides to put some or other signs on their garments. It immediately transports the realm of popular consumerism as an inferior or kitschy version of upperclass consumerism. Instead, popular consumerism takes on its own meaning if the act of copying or innovation of different kinds are analyzed on its own.

The devaluation of brands as any other ornamental design is one such way in which the mimesis happens. Another way is piecing different logos on the same garment, thereby shifting the sign system within which corporate brands exist. This is why bazaar collectives break away from a radical notion such as brandedness formulated by anthropologist Constantine Nakassis. Nakassis (1995) concentrates on the world of knock-offs and counterfeits to show how the street-level economy of consumer products are outside the aesthetics and economic universe of brands. However, his notion of brandedness remains in the universe of brands as a kind of cursory remark to that universe because his ethnographic universe had brands even if they appeared as inverted logos. Mimetic bazaar consumer collectives move away from brandedness. Although knock-offs are available in the bazaars, they have now become only a marginal part of the amount sold daily in mass marketplaces. Most of the aesthetic composition of bazaar consumerism exists outside the aspirational universe of brands. Instead, bazaar consumer collectives define their networks through the possibility of the social media-led production system. In other words, bazaar consumer collectives is a factory of redesigning powerful symbols cheap and fast. They create sociality through commodities as much as they set a unique urban voice. That middle and upperclass consumers are no longer the tastemakers of the time. They might still be in control of powerful symbols, and how they circulate in society, the bazaars have a decisive say in that. Subsequent sections develop the uniqueness of bazaar consumer collectives in more detail.

Bazaar consumerism and multiplicity

Bazaars are a bricolage where one finds T-shirts with gods' faces and sports brands alongside seasonal garments. Does this multiplicity point towards something other than their excesses and availability of cheap items? In the section, I argue that the diversity of bazaars point towards the relative indifference to brands and narratives of authenticity as important markers determining consumer choices. Instead, it becomes clear that brands promote consumers' interest amongst various others, such as features and accessories in a garment to the product's use-value. At the basis of most consumer choices in the bazaars are the utility provided by a commodity. It is rare to see a

commodity being rarefied in the bazaars just because of its symbolic value, it needs to provide concrete use-value to be worth spending certain amount of money. Secondly, bazaar multiplicity emerges from a production network that allows ordinary consumers to *grab* trends and convert them to wearable and usable commodities (Chubb, 2015). Originally used by translator Lu Xun, the word 'grabbism' captures the tension of being modern in a context outside of the west, 'borrowing from other countries with confidence, like a master who chooses freely according to his needs and not like a neurotic who fears the loss of indigenous tradition or enslavement by what is borrowed' (Xie, 2020: 129) The act of grabbism is placed in an alternative context from an elite one. When seen in the context of colonialism, it is about nations and point of translations of different cultures, when placed in a postcolonial bazaars, grabbism is about popular lives and their confidence of appropriating multiple symbols. Clothes, accessories and electronics become an easily available surface that then exhibit confident appropriations. At the level of popular consumerism, such grabbism is possible because of the advent of street level manufacturing hubs (Keene, and Zhao, 2012).

Not just in India, the popular marketplaces worldwide are known to move beyond intellectual property and legal restrictions to open up a consumer marketplace to an expansive distributive network (Pang, 2008). The emerging literature has emphasized how cheap and cheerful alternatives to branded goods and counterfeits are part of creating new markets formerly thought to be nonexistent. Gao's (2011) analysis of MediaTek in China is one such example. When the microchip first landed in China, it was not thought to be disruptive. Still, over the years, the company formed a partnership with both formal and informal actors opened up consumer items to an entirely new generation of users in small towns and villages. This is why such goods came to be associated with what Mathew et al. (2012) call 'globalization from below' because in the absence of counterfeits, and the semi-legal distributive network, there would not have been a new type of consumers. These bottom-up networks catered to people who have information about global consumer goods through movies, advertisements, and ubiquitous smartphone networks but did not have the money or propensity to buy original and branded products. Here more than the authenticity of a product, the defining feature is owning something new, being part of something going viral. Memefacturing is closest to bazaar-level commodity cultures (Wang and Wang, 2015). Pastiche of different images, practices and color schemes, etc. get attached to a garment that makes sense to the embedded universe to which popular classes in an urban metropolis like Delhi belong.

In my study of Delhi's electronic bazaars, Lajpat Rai Market, Palika Bazaar and Nehru Place and readymade garment market Gandhi Nagar in Delhi, the rationale of popular consumer cultures came to light. The study was part of a year-long ethnography of Lajpat Rai Market, Nehru Place and Palika Bazaar between September 2012 and 2013 when I concentrated on traders, consumers, and videogames distributors. In subsequent years, I visited the marketplaces for brief periods of time, most recently in July 2019. Throughout these visits, I extended my research to Gandhi Nagar market to have a more focused understanding of popular consumer cultures in Delhi. Its unique position as a wholesale marketplace connected to small-scale production units in the vicinity of the marketplace made it easier to track how a viral image on the smartphone became a wearable product (Deka and Arvidsson, 2021). Many of the insights came from talking to traders, distributors, and consumers coming to the marketplace. With actors in electronic bazaars, research in the four marketplaces gave me an insight into the interconnected distributive networks and how a loose consumer collective emerged in the bazaars. The study benefitted from a grounded approach to theories as interconnection became apparent through the day-to-day interactions (Mills et al, 2006). By capturing the everyday rhythms of trade, the more subtle relationship with commodities, including traders and consumers' relationship to brands, became apparent. Many of the data from the field were anecdotal in nature allowing me to gaze at the social and cultural universe that interviewees were drawing from while talking about specific topic. For instance, opinions about brands did not emerge as free flowing conversations. There were always interludes and diversions,

some of which the interviewees themselves initiated and at other times the flow of conversation were disturbed by other people in the shop. The piecing together of different information happened by formulating similar questions to different traders in the marketplaces. The result of such process was that themes started to appear in the midst of haphazard information. The word 'brand' did not come up so much in the conversations. What were more frequently mentioned was 'sticker' or 'logo' and 'label'. The use of a variety of words became legible through the context in which they were used. The ethnographic accounts of popular bazaars in Delhi provided an in-depth look into the meaning making processes behind ordinary consumer choices.

One of the most striking features of bazaar-level consumer culture is the short-term nature of popular commodities. Like a viral video or meme that enters our universe through social media soon to be replaced by something else, the stock of the marketplace particular clothing items kept evolving and changing. The quick replaceable and arrival of new supplies became possible as many vendors had their small-scale production units adjacent to the marketplace. Sewn jeans came from the marketplace with different types of accessories: buttons, zippers and 'stickers'. The quick turnover of small batches of new products made it possible for traders to capitalize on recent trends. Bazaar actors are not alone in perusing popular apps such as Vigo Videos, Facebook, and TikTok to find trends. Middle-run business-to-business (B2B) online networks such as *Indiamart* and *Udaan* connect retailers across the country by providing batches of trending items. Alongside popular apps on their phones, bazaar traders browse these B2B websites to further what ordinary consumers want. Traders, by keeping a foot in different apps on their smartphones and observing their immediate surroundings that a TikTok T-shirt and T-shirt with movie slogans found a desirable spot in shop counters apart from seasonal and enduring items such as sportswear.

Since what was trending on popular apps and their surrounding was not merely branded goods, they became part of a larger universe of exciting symbols. One popular way in which brands were known in Gandhi Nagar market was as 'stickers', playing on both the nostalgic aspect of collectibles and something that could be easily put on and pulled off. Indeed, brands in the bazaar in becoming 'stickers' fulfill both these roles. They could be amassed on a single garment to a desirable degree and when traders and consumers thought that they a particular sticker was not trendy anymore, they could also be removed from future batches. Such tinkering happened easily because traders had at their disposable smart phones and a few of them laptops to play with the aesthetic of a garment. A trader in Gandhi Nagar Market opened Adobe Photoshop and Microsoft Paint features on his laptop to redesign Ferrari symbols, Facebook and Apple logo, prototypes of which went into a 'sticker book'. The sticker book acted as an inspiration for traders and manufacturers to know what combination of brands/stickers to attach to the next pair of jeans and shirt. The wide variety and random order in which different brands came together in a single garment are similar to children collecting stickers of their favorite cricketers and superheroes. The other aspect of brands becoming stickers is, of course, its redundant nature. There is no perennial reverence to a brand and what it signifies.

Brands, just like stickers, could be removed or replaced with something else. The transience of stickers and bazaar brands points towards an irreverence, something which even a concept such as brandedness cannot capture otherwise reserved for popular consumer cultures. Nakassis's (2012) interesting work on fakes in India introduces brandedness as a cursory homage to original brands without necessarily inhabiting the same cultural universe. In his analysis, when a person wears a T-shirt with 'Columbian' written on it instead of 'Columbia', it is an instance of brandedness, being brand-like and equally rogue in opening up distributive networks outside of authorized capitalist circuits. Brands becoming 'stickers' is a step beyond brandedness. An overload of stickers does not even belong to the same semiotic universe. It is something else. This perhaps coincides with the memefication of our desires through smartphones and apps. The official figures of smartphone users in India stand at approximately 760 million in 2021. This might even be a conservative figure in a

country of 1.3 billion population. The sociality of mobile phone use where a single phone can be used amongst different members of an extended household and co-sharing a phone obscures the actual number of smartphone users. The broad reach of smartphones created a laboratory of sorts to re-imagine powerful symbols and create variations that can be connected to the existing production networks to manufacture sample pieces. It is an almost overload of signs in the bazaars. Movie stars jostles with gods and social media trends to capture consumer's attention. There is no lack of inspiration, whatsoever. In the absence of strong legal and cultural barriers passing judgment on taste, kitsch, and juxtaposition of different signs appear to be an empowering position for bazaar actors to carve out an identity through what they were.

In the last couple of years, apps such as Vigo Video, TikTok and their likes have opened up a new terrain of popular desires, passion and innovation (Deka and Arvidsson, 2021). More than a story of media determinism, it is about the possibility to inverse a Veblenian analysis of having to look vertically for inspiration. Instead, the upsurge of popular apps has initiated a desire and aspiration from their immediate world and keeping tabs of symbols and images that they can relate to and see on other people with similar economic and cultural values. What this recent change means to popular consumer cultures will be explored further in the next section.

Mimetic Bazaar Consumer Collectives

The multiplicity of bazaar consumer cultures is an aspect of different patterns co-existing on a single item. Also, the mere randomness with which images, symbols, color patterns, shapes, and sizes find their place in a commodity does not follow a defined narrative. This is what makes bazaar consumerism different from any other narratives of hybridity and multiplicity. There is no one dominant narrative that governs why an eclectic range of visual sensory—in the form of zipper, stickers, rivets, slogans, gods and human, company logos—adorn a single piece of garment.

Previous anthropological works and postcolonial studies have conceptualised popular culture's hybridity through ideas such as mimicry and mimesis. For instance, Homi Bhabha (1986) problematizes the colonial exercise of replicating and creating models in the colonized context in its image as a perverse exercise. Inversely, the colonized subject can create a much more political project by mimicking the colonizers, in which it completely subverts original intent and form. Bhabha argues that mimesis opted by colonial subjects almost veered towards *parody*, bringing in a combination of meanings that challenges and change the original. Mimesis more than mimicry, the latter being just mere imitation, is an apt way to grasp popular cultures, including bazaar consumer cultures. In fact, mimesis and grabbism are comparable concepts. Each shows the emancipatory practices of ordinary people to confidently borrow elite symbols. There is a strong emphasis in both the concepts to show ordinary people producing unique objects of culture that exists outside a bourgeoisie space of sensibility and desirability.

While using a concept like mimesis one has to be careful about its certain limitations. For instance, Huggan (1997) points out in emphasizing the powerful potential of mimesis by researchers, such eulogies can quickly turn into a patronizing discourse. He sees certain anthropological work running that danger whereby there is so much of a political and ideological emphasis on mimesis that it runs the risk of romanticizing such practices. Indeed, this is a thing that one needs to be careful about while analyzing bazaar consumer cultures. To see bazaar actors adorning a mix of different things on their bodies is not entirely a political choice. Questions like would bazaar actors still choose to buy counterfeits if they had enough money will always be there. Perhaps the simple answer is No. Even if the clothes they wore can be as disruptive and disconcerting, they may prefer to buy branded electronics. The fact that there were many stolen iPhones in the bazaars illustrates the penchant to buy original products, at least in some cases.

The mixture of diverse symbols of the *present* has to be concurrently seen through the limits of desire. How desire exists as an unlimited possibility at an individual level and is governed by our immediate surroundings. It is in the interstices that the bazaar collective emerges as a powerful reality. The part about popular classes having an unassuming relationship to capitalist brands on one hand and their ease of appropriating different powerful symbols truly captures this in-betweenness of desire and possibilities. Popular actors do not just resign to a space of disconnect because they do not know how to engage with the intricacies of brand narratives and the economic resources to buy them. Instead, they create a space much more potent, whereby deracinating symbols from their original context, they start an optic of desire and meaning that starts from them. That is how bazaar collectives are different from brand communities, because instead of the commodity somehow guiding a mass of invested users. Bazaar consumer collective is truly about co-living the present moment bound by flashes of recurrent images on their smartphones, the mass superstar that they all adore, and the prospect of keeping warm in winter months through utility clothing. It is the unapologetic taste and aesthetic judgment that is so far removed from a bourgeoisie sensibility that a bazaar collective shines through as a different mode. In that way, 'bazaar collective' will be a nomenclature from the outside, from the eyes of a researcher who sees the recurrent theme in their consumption patterns. For the actors themselves, it is an opportunity in irreverent *grabbism*, belonging to the contemporary even though the originals were exclusionary. Bazaar consumer collective work in tandem with the lives of the actors whose relationship of the external world and global symbols are in their reaches as a signifier, it is unto them what meanings they want to attach.

Although bazaars don't highlight as much in consumer literature worldwide (because of their relative disrepute of being absorbed in semi-legal activities), just by their reach of popular consumers, such collectives are relevant. Mimetic consumer collectives have the potential of showing how popular consumer collectives of the future might look. Its radicalness shines through the relative indifference cast to capitalist aspirational model, whether brands or original products. But in another sense, there is also a type of nihilism towards collective action in this type of collectives. Unlike other consumer collectives and networks where there is a conscious adoption of an identity or a sense of belonging, a mimetic community is not set out for explicitly political and group action. Its ties become apparent only through similarities rather than associations. In many ways, bazaar consumer collectives are an anomaly to the classic idea of collectives, networks imagined through consumer items. Such a collective does not have a platform where members come together and voice their opinions. A mimetic consumer collective is visual in nature. By adorning different styles, and juxtaposition of signs, they challenge the aesthetic limit of an urban spaces. In a city like Delhi where pockets of affluent neighborhoods mimic any global shopping centers, dotted with designer brands and bespoke stores, bazaars stand out in their unique relation to what they think as desirable aesthetic. Further popular bodies wearing a mismatch of 'stickers' and trends perforate otherwise authentic branded bodies of a dominant section of middle and upper-class consumers.

Conclusion

The aesthetic world of modern-day bazaars is comparable to Victorian charity bazaars and fairs in their wide variety of products. In term of networks built through these products modern day bazaar consumers are more unruly and dispersed. After all, consumerism in early modern Europe was still about learning to buy and acquire things from the marketplaces as part of a specific lifestyle. Popular consumers of bazaars in the twenty-first century are long embedded in a market society of exchanges. The novelty of shopping experience is not anymore of being a modern consumer, it is also about how distinct commodities fit in the overall social and cultural universe of individuals. For a motley group of urban non-elites, shared consumer habits reflect the place that they find themselves in an urban environment. They assert their identity by 'grabbing' different type of

desirable symbols which became available to them through their cheap copies and assemblages. It is a distinct type of urban sensory where utility of a commodity is on one hand and aesthetic overload is on another. But in both of these respects, bazaar consumer collectives forsake quality and elitism to make an instantaneous impression. Different consumers come together because they can quickly put on their bodies whatever is making headlines at the time. There is something to be said of such an aesthetic—it is mimetic yet does not follow a herd mentality. Bazaar consumer collectives draws from logos, slogans and popular symbols. Because of a variety of choices and random order in which symbols are assembled, it is difficult to show lineage to one particular trajectory such as brands. The juxtaposition truly provides the possibility of creating consumer collectives via commodities always and already existing in a messy network of needs, desires and its limits.

References

- Arvidsson, A., & Caliandro, A. (2016). Brand Public. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42(5), 727–748.
- Bhabha, H. (1984). Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse. *October*, 28, 125–133.
- Bhandari, P. (2019). *Money, Culture, Class: Elite Women as Modern Subjects*. Routledge.
- Chubb, A. (2015). China's Shanzhai culture: Grabism and the Politics of Hybridity. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 24(92), 260–279.
- Deka, M and Arvidsson, A (2021) 'Names Doing Rounds': On Brands in the Bazaar Economy. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, available online: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1469540521989396>
- Dyer, G. (1991). The "Vanity Fair" of nineteenth-century England: Commerce, women, and the east in the ladies' bazaar. *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, 46(2), 196–222.
- Fanselow, F. S. (1990). The Bazaar Economy or How Bizarre is the Bazaar Really? *Man*, 25(2), 250–265.
- Gao, B.(2011). The Informal economy in the era of information revolution and globalization: The *Shanzhai* cell phone industry in China. *Chinese Journal of Sociology*. 31(2):1-41.
- Habibi, L., & Pati, F. M. (2017). From Bazaar to Shopping Centers: Analysis of the Evolution of Modern Commercial Spaces in Tehran. *Bagh-e Nazar*, 14(49), 45–56.
- Hall, S., & Jefferson, T. (1975). *Resistance through Rituals*. London: Hutchinson.
- Huggan, G. (1997). (Post)Colonialism, Anthropology and the Magic of Mimesis. *Cultural Critique*, 38, 91–106.

- Keene, M. & Zhao, E. J. (2012). Renegades on the frontier of Innovation: The Shanzhai grassroots communities of Shenzhen in China's creative economy. *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, 53(2), 216–230.
- Kozinets, R. V., Hemetsberger, A., & Schau, H. J. (2008). The Wisdom of Consumer Crowds Collective Innovation in the Age of Networked Marketing. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 28(4), 339–354.
- Mathews, G., Ribeiro, G. L., & Vega, C. A. (Eds.). (2012). *Globalization from Below: The World's Other Economy*. Routledge.
- Mills, J., Bonner, A., & Francis, K. (2006) The Development of Constructivist Grounded Theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 25-35.
- Muniz, A. M., & O' Guinn, T. (2001). Brand Community. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27(4), 412–432.
- Nakassis, C. V. (2012). Counterfeiting What? Aesthetics of Brandedness and Brand in Tamil Nadu, India. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 85(3), 701–721.
- Nakassis, C. V. (2016). *Doing style: Youth and Mass Mediation in South India*. Chicago University Press.
- Närvänen, E., & Goulding, C. (2016). Sociocultural brand revitalization: The role of consumer collectives in bringing brands back to life. *European Journal of Marketing*, 50(7/8), 1521–1546.
- Pang, L. (2008). "China who Makes and Fakes": A Semiotics of the Counterfeit. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 25(6), 117–140.
- Pennell, S. (1999). Consumption and Consumerism in Early Modern England. *The Historical Journal*, 42(2), 549–564.
- Prochaska, F. K. (1977). Charity bazaars in nineteenth-century England: *Journal of British Studies*, 16(2), 62–84.
- Rappaport, E. D. (2001). *Shopping for pleasure: Women in the making of London's West End*. New Jersey, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Schouten, J. W. & McAlexander J. H. (1995) Subcultures of Consumption: An Ethnography of the New Bikers. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 22(1), 43-61.

Stallybrass, P., & White, A. (1986). *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Sundaram, R (2010). *Pirate Modernity: Delhi's Media Urbanism*: New Delhi: Routledge.

Wang, J. J., Zhao, X., & Li, JJ. (2013). Group Buying: A Strategic Form of Consume Collective. *Journal of Retailing*, 89(3): 338-351.

Wang, J., & Wang, H. (2015). From a Marketplace to a Cultural Space: Online Meme as an Operational Unit of Cultural Transmission. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 45(3), 261–274.

Xie, H. (2020). 'Grabbism' and Untranslatability: Reinterpreting Lu Xun's Position as a Translator. *Comparative Literature Studies*, 57(1), 126-147.