NEGOTIATING FOOD HERITAGE AUTHENTICITY IN CONSUMER CULTURE

Abstract

Purpose – Food has entered commerce as an intangible cultural heritage (ICH) because consumers want authentic food and memorable consumption experiences. Food culture and the marketplace are arenas for the creation and articulation of identities and meanings, enabling dynamic conditions that encompass multiple positions and authenticity validations in consumption experiences. This study offers insight into the authentication of gastronomic heritage from a consumer culture perspective.

Design / Methodology – A thematic review is conducted to analyse and summarise the literature on gastronomic heritage, authenticity, commercialization, and consumer behaviour in the food industry.

Approach – Literature works from databases and academic platforms were used to highlight several key thematic points and arguments related to the authentication process and consumer behaviour.

Findings – Food authenticity is socially negotiated by a variety of actors who mobilise resources and a web of interactions, creating identity and value according to their position as they respond to differences in market culture. The negotiation of authenticity mediates the assumption of legitimacy, quality, and identity that diversifies consumption patterns.

Originality of the research – The article contributes to a theoretical discourse that extends the conceptualisation of authenticity in addressing food heritage within a dynamic consumption context and commercialisation agenda.
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INTRODUCTION

Food, as part of intangible cultural heritage (ICH), has played a crucial role in cultural tourism worldwide and destination marketing due to the demand for authentic experiences (Harrington & Ottenbacher, 2010; Ab Karim & Chi, 2010; Sánchez-Cañizares & López-Guzmán, 2012; Bessiere & Tibere, 2013). Food heritage covers a broader perspective on gastronomic discourses associated with raw food materials, such as agricultural products that form part of ingredients and recipes, dishes, preparation methods, food traditions and etiquette, and material aspects such as utensils and dishware (Almansouri et al., 2021, pp. 791).

The gastronomy culture constantly evolves with the food industry’s growth, amplified by modernisation and globalisation that transform consumption, dietary patterns, and eating habits (Zainal Abidin et al., 2020). Even so, the desire to safeguard authentic gastronomic tradition is formally pursued, driven by the perpetual interest in food as a heritage identity. While it connotes the retention of cultural practices related to the past and valued as a significant ‘treasure’ or ‘legacy’, concurrently, it denotes various purposes that can run from political legitimacy (Ramshaw, 2016) to economic development of regions and communities through tourism and the commodification of tradition and society (Khanom et al., 2019). As a result, government institutions strive to develop and recognise the gastronomic tradition of communities through the heritagisation process as an authentication mechanism involving the attachment of value that transforms food, places and practices into a cultural heritage (Geyzen, 2014; Su, 2018; Zocchi et al., 2021).

Although heritagisation is intended to safeguard the tradition, it also entails appropriating such value to promote the development of food heritage for the commercial industry, especially when the global scale of commodities, media, and communities has amplified the commercial value of authentic culture (Zhu, 2015). Appadurai (1986) believed that authenticity should not be applied to gastronomy, as the idea appears timeless and historically profound, contrasted with the dynamism of food culture. In addition, when we talk about food heritage as a commodity, the cultural gap between consumer narratives, mainly the locals and tourists, could contribute to the adaptation and modification of heritage food offerings in the commercial scene (Gupta & Duggal, 2021) thus blurring the line between protecting the food heritage and commercialising its cultural identity. Producers and marketers authenticate their products using cultural resources to generate the process of otherising and traditionalising (Koontz, 2010) as a differentiation strategy in the global market that creates value to promote consumption and simultaneously cater to consumer demand for genuine products.
Literature on authenticity negotiation mostly revolves around tourism discourse since MacCannell’s (1973) “staged authenticity”. Cohen & Cohen’s (2012) work on *Authentication: Hot and Cool* illustrates the dynamics of the interaction and constitution of tourist attractions conducive to different types of personal experiences of authenticity. Authentication is a “social process through which the authenticity of the product, site, object or event—is confirmed as “original,” “genuine,” “real,” or “trustworthy” (Cohen & Cohen, 2012, pp. 1296). Within the process, not only government, multiple stakeholders, including communities, and businesses or organisations with the power, play a significant role in making authentication claims of cultural representations (Xie & Lane, 2006; Cohen & Cohen, 2012; Lugosi, 2016) that systematically directed toward their politics of interests. It presents another dichotomy based on social processes highlighting the agencies’ role in the authenticity mode.

Even so, people interpret the authenticity of offerings according to their understanding (Reisinger & Steiner, 2006) and respond differently to various authenticators (Kovács et al., 2017). In the consumer culture, it demonstrates the “dynamic relationships between consumer actions, the marketplace and cultural meanings” (Arnould & Thompson, 2005, p. 868), particularly what consumers do and believe in consuming market-made commodities which closely associated with the principles of modernity, choice, individual freedom, and market relations (Slater, 1997; Arnould & Thompson, 2018). Arnould & Thompson (2005) outlined Consumer Culture Theory (CCT) as a scholarly framework that could be applied to comprehend food consumption from various perspectives that resonate with broader interdisciplinary interests and discussion in consumer research. They proposed four domains, explaining consumption as a projection of identity, examining the marketplace culture, the sociohistoric patterning of consumption and conversing on mass-mediated marketplace ideologies and consumers’ interpretive strategies at the macro level.

From the CCT perspective, consumers are recognised as active market actors who incorporate and enact various cultural resources into their identity work to negotiate a sense of self and meaningful identity narratives. In this sense, they are exposed to marketplace cultures as extended social contexts and material environments where consumption occurs, further reflecting the formation of subculture and its role in the co-creation, negotiation, and dissemination of distinct market and consumption practises and meanings. Then, at the macro level, consumption patterns and consumer identities are analysed through the lens of social structural and historical influence, resulting in value creation through socially shared practices. Mass media also contribute to consumption ideologies and cultural narratives, but consumers, as active “interpretive agents,” either make sense of and decode the narratives about their consumption or go along with media representations of consumption identity and ideals (Rokka, 2021).

Chhabra (2019) highlighted how heritage is authenticated, critically deconstructed and reconstructed according to the type of audience and context. So far, little attention has been paid to explore food heritage authentication from the CCT perspective. In particular, the question of who can be considered relevant negotiating agents and how authenticity is positioned within the consumer culture is still unclear. Given the above narrative, the study aims to:

1. highlight the role of institution agencies, businesses, and consumers as three stakeholders in the food authentication process through the literature evidence; and
2. explore the negotiation of food heritage authenticity within Arnould and Thompson’s CCT framework.

Food culture and marketplace are not just readymade markers of traditionality but also arenas for creating and articulating identities and meanings that allow dynamic conditions encompassing diverse positions and authenticity validation in consumption experiences. Moreover, many studies have examined the fundamental elements of the food heritage and its connotation, yet what constitutes its authenticity further varies between countries, cultures, and even individuals.

I. METHODOLOGY

The study presents a thematic review which integrates the literature assessment of prior studies concerning food heritage and authenticity in particular research streams with a narrative approach to offer the elaborative application of those themes in the consumer culture framework (Green et al., 2006; Pickering & Byrne, 2014; Xiao & Watson, 2017; Paul & Criado, 2020). For a start, the review attempts to articulate the dimension of the authenticity agencies as the research problem. The analysis of selected materials has framed three research themes on the negotiation of authenticity characterised by institutions, businesses, and consumers, which serves as the theoretical contribution of this review.

Accordingly, a preliminary search is performed to see the related works in the area of interest published between 2012 – 2022 for a general protocol. Only electronic academic databases such as Google Scholar, Scopus, Web of Science and ResearchGate were used to look for articles pertinent to the study. For this step, multiple keywords were used, such as *authenticity, authentication*, combining the related concepts with *food, heritage, traditional food, heritagisation, consumer culture, consumer behaviour and commercialisation.*
A total of 484 articles were identified and later sorted following the protocol to exclude non-full text documents, duplication and unrelated study contexts based on the titles. The pool is further refined in a screening process to exclude non-journals publications such as book chapters, conference papers, book reviews, editorial notes, theses and government documents such as press releases and booklets to ensure a consistent standard for analysis (Pickering et al., 2015). However, some remain in references with no determined timeframe based on their relevance to the arguments in the study. The general Google search engine was also used to access several websites for supplementary information and reference.

The review was confined to articles written in English and published only in academic journals based on comprehended abstracts. Then, 149 articles were assessed for their eligibility based on full-text reviews, and a further 30 were discarded mainly due to the irrelevant emphasis concerning food culture, authenticity, and consumption context. One hundred nineteen original and review articles were considered eligible, with six added to the lists in the final cross-check. Fig. 1 provides a flowchart of the review process based on PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) (Page et al., 2021) with some modifications to the screening and assessment process.

2. FINDINGS

2.1. The key journal disciplines and methods

The findings comprised 125 studies published in 85 journals between 2012 and 2022, as illustrated in Table 1. The greatest incidence was found in the journals of Tourism, Hospitality & Leisure fields ($n = 26$ [31%]), consisting of 43 articles, with nine published in the *International Journal Of Hospitality Management*. The Journal on food disciplines ($n = 18$ [21%]) contributes 33 articles, with seven analysed out of the *British Food Journal*. The result is most likely attributable to the prominent discussion of food heritage authenticity from the lens of gastronomic tourism, food production and the service industry. Seven articles were also found in the *Sustainability* as a multidisciplinary research journal ($n = 11$ [13%]). Decade research on authenticity, especially in food as a cultural heritage, generally shows an upward trend in recent years as the topic could draw various possible studies from diverse contexts.
Table 1: No. of Journals and articles by discipline and by years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Disciplines (No. of articles)</th>
<th>No. of Journals (%)</th>
<th>No. of articles</th>
<th>2012 – 2016</th>
<th>2017 – 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism, Hospitality &amp; Leisure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. International Journal Of Hospitality Management (9)</td>
<td>26 (31%)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tourism Management (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Journal Of Heritage Tourism (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food/Gastronomy/Food Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. British Food Journal (7)</td>
<td>18 (21%)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Food, Culture &amp; Society (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Appetite (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multidisciplinary Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sustainability (7)</td>
<td>11 (13%)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Science &amp; Cultural Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Marketing &amp; Consumer Behaviour</td>
<td>13 (15%)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Management &amp; Organisation Studies</strong></td>
<td>8 (9%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>85 (100%)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reviewed studies used a range of approaches and research designs. Most articles ($n = 55$ [44%]) applied qualitative research methods, including historical and content analyses, as well as ethnographic and phenomenological-based approaches via interviews and case studies. Quantitative research, comprising surveys and experimental designs, accounted for 33.6% ($n = 42$) of the papers. The papers used mixed designs ($n = 10$ [8%]) are relatively low in contrast to the number of conceptual paper analyses, which was 14.4.6% ($n = 18$), indicating a possible methodological contribution of this review. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the frequencies for each method.

Table 2: Methods in food heritage authentication studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>No. of articles (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>18 (14.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>55 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>42 (33.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination (Mixed Method)</td>
<td>10 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Food authenticity in consumer culture

Table 3 illustrates the frequencies of each research theme and its identified context of discourses with some examples of notable works. Then the following sections briefly describe each theme’s primary objectives and application in the CCT framework.

Table 3: Research themes and discourse contexts in food heritage authentication studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Context of discourse</th>
<th>No. of articles reviewed (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional authentication</td>
<td>• Heritagisation</td>
<td>36 (28.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trusted bodies assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quality assurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Certification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expert evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Destination branding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Theme Context of discourse No. of articles reviewed (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Context of discourse</th>
<th>Example of articles</th>
<th>No. of articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Business/ marketers authentication | • Differentiation strategy  
• projection of authenticity  
• authenticity claim  
• business branding  
| Consumers authentication | • Self-authentication act  
• Cues  
• Credible source  
• Socio-technological interaction  
• Co-created value  
• Consumer attitude | Autio et al. (2013), Sparks et al. (2013), Mellet et al. (2014), Sidiqi & Hemmerling (2014), Bryla (2015), Vásquez & Chik (2015), Luca & Zervas (2016), Lugosi (2016), Ishak et al. (2018), Burgess & Green (2018), Lim et al. (2020), Choudhary et al. (2019), Lim et al. (2020), Bentsen & Pedersen (2021), Andrade Cruz et al. (2021), Le et al. (2022) Rewtrakunphaiboon & Sawangdee (2022) | 51 (40.8%) |

Total 125 (100%)

### 3. DISCUSSION

#### 3.1. Institutional authentication

The first theme contemplates the legitimisation of food heritage and various discourses of institutionalised formation of authenticity in consumer culture, constituting 28.8% (n = 36) of the reviewed articles. The study synthesises institutional authentication as a dimension concerning authorities’ and experts’ validation, in which the power vested in them could declare the authenticity of an object, site, event, custom, role, or person to be original, genuine, or real (Cohen & Cohen, 2012). In this context, food authenticity is validated from an objectivist perspective that is associated with genuine, true and original as a result of a specific craft process (Pratt, 2007) or quality attributed to a range of foods and cuisines specific to a location, region or country (Guerrero et al., 2009; Vanhonacker et al., 2010; Omar & Omar, 2018; de Almeida Costa et al., 2021) and originally manufactured or locally produced by ethnic communities (Chhabra, 2010; Almansouri et al., 2022).

The legitimacy of authentication is structured in an explicit and formal performative act through established mechanisms such as certification and recognition for quality assurance to encourage confident consumption. The authentication comes with several purposes, such as protecting producer and consumer interest (Antonelli & Viganò, 2018), increasing the commercial value of the products (Mohd Noor & Abd. Aziz, 2010; Aziza et al., 2020), providing an advantage for local and traditional food to remain competitive in the economic sector (Parasecoli, 2017; Reinders et al., 2019; Latiff et al., 2020, Bardone & Spalvēna, 2019; Marie-Vivien, 2020) and conveying the significant quality cues to conclude in corroborating consumption ideologies and identity (Chousou & Mattas, 2021; Othman et al., 2019). It also comprises expert evaluation and standardised rating systems to enhance the authenticity and quality of food and service (Liu et al., 2014).

In another facet, institutional authentication is also linked with cultural heritage protection. Many countries experience external pressures on their culture and tradition, including losing their food heritage and identity. As a safeguarding measurement, gastronomic resources that convey genuineness attributed to their geographical origin and local culture are heritagised (Bessière, 2013; Brulotte & Di Giovine, 2016; Csergo, 2018; Zocchi et al., 2021). Such recognition is expected to empower cultural identity, preserve tradition and local knowledge, and improve socio-economic conditions (Matta, 2016; Raji et al., 2018; Dai et al., 2018; Guan et al., 2019). However, it also provides an opportunity for the recontextualisation of food heritage through a legitimate process within political and cultural domains for commercialisation (Klein, 2018). In such cases, traditional foodways are presented through cultural staging and standardised commodities (Pétursson & Hafstein, 2022), initiating globalised food localism (Stazio, 2021) whereby food heritagisation matches the business strategy (Pfeilstetter, 2015; Littaye, 2016; Barrionuevo et al., 2019), destination branding and tourism product (see Leng & Badarulzaman, 2014; Gyimothy, 2017; Rinaldi, 2017; Pearson & Pearson, 2017; Luncharprasith & Macleod, 2018; Lai et al., 2018, Lai et al., 2019).
Although issues such as cultural propertisation and economic marginalisation (Lixinski, 2018) have subtly imposed a cultural and communication gap between the heritage preservation agenda and the redefinition of heritage value for economic development, heritagisation remains a persuasive branding pursued in consumer culture. It denotes its significant positioning among market-made commodities that convey the credibility of food heritage for experiential consumption for contemporary societies while cultivating identity, pride, and self-assurance, enriching the tourism sector through the way culinary tradition is reignited as socio-cultural enjoyment.

3.2. Business authentication

The second theme, which accounted for 30.4% \((n = 38)\), is focused on the negotiation of authenticity in the commercial scene and business patterning of authenticity as a differentiation strategy in the marketplace as a competitive advantage. The study denotes business authentication as the claim and manifestation of authenticity in the marketplace to delineate, qualify, and evaluate experiential products and services.

On the one hand, food producers and businesses strategically project authenticity through the organisation’s type (Kovács et al., 2014) by committing to the quality of products and services, maintenance of stylistic consistency, instrumental use of history and place as a positive reference and sources of market value (Beverland, 2005; Angelopoulos et al., 2019; Mardatillah et al., 2019), and persistent company tradition and production (Gilmore & Pine, 2016) to represent prestigious market offering. Aaltosen et al. (2015) coined the Enterprise Cultural Heritage (ECH) concept that appropriated history and unique heritage knowledge or hereditary practices of small-medium enterprises (SMEs), mainly the local craft and food industries resulting from decades of trading into a source of authentication and innovation assets (see Mardatillah, 2020, Abd Aziz et al., 2021). Intuitively, as cultural identity influences food consumption (Fernández-Ferrín et al., 2018; Huang et al., 2019) food industry appropriates ethnic values and cultural markers embedded in food tradition, local ingredients, traditional recipes, and commensality habits to be marketed as authentic performative and experiential attributes in culinary setting (e.g. Mkono, 2012; Chhabra et al., 2013a; Chhabra et al., 2013b; Lu et al., 2015; Wang & Mattila, 2015; Kim & Baker, 2017; Liu et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2020; Guiné et al., 2021; Chiu & Huang, 2022; Skinner et al., 2020; Grubor et al., 2022).

On the other hand, businesses also claim the impression of authenticity through a sincere narrative and a creative blend of industrial and rhetorical attributes (Beverland, 2005). Some food producers explore linguistic and material links that allow them to achieve authenticity, traceable reflecting the olden days yet viable for modern economies and palettes (Cavanaugh & Shankar, 2014). However, consumers typically regard business self-claim authenticity as self-promotional activity (Beverland & Farrelly, 2010), sometimes driven by an emotional reaction instead of a cognitive reassessment organisation’s authenticity (Kovács et al., 2017; Lehman et al., 2018). Nevertheless, when claims are seen as informational disclosure, consumers will be more aware of specific qualities that connote authenticity and resulting in positive assessments (Beverland, 2005).

The marketplace represents a rich source of symbolic resources and choices through which people seek to build identity narratives conforming to social structures such as class, community, gender and ethnicity (Arnould & Thompson, 2005; Fonseca, 2008) while epitomises assumptions, beliefs, and what producers and marketers expect consumers to value that shape consumption patterns. Authenticity rhetoric in product marketing is typical (Peterson, 2005). Thus producers’ and marketers’ efforts to create and maintain authenticity with the understanding of how consumers develop notions of authenticity would be the source of business imperative and competitive advantage (Gilmore & Pine, 2016), which can impact product success in the marketplace (Koontz, 2010).

3.3. Consumer authentication

The third theme accounted for the largest 40.8% \((n = 51)\) of the reviewed articles, which focused on the consumers’ attitude and perspective on authenticity and their interpretive strategy, resulting from communicative cues, credible sources, and socio-technological facilitation that influences the co-creation of references and consumption. Consumer authentication serves two purposes in CCT; self-authentication of consumption identity and authentication as interpretive strategies.

The first purpose relates to consumption as an act that pursues specific ideals (Steenkamp & de Jong, 2010) and encapsulates a process of projecting a consumer’s personality (Sidali & Hemmerling, 2014). Consumers are conceived of as identity seekers and makers; thus, self-authentication exhibits unique individual traits, perceptions, and consumption attitudes congruent with personal identities. In other words, consumers make consumption decisions personally as they reflect their true selves. Beverland & Farrelly’s (2010) asserted that consumers self-authenticate their consumption based on three goals, i.e. the control or practicality of their choice, connection feeling, and the virtue or morality of their choice. For example, consumers decide to consume local foods as they feel connected to the nostalgia, natural and social environment that supports the ideals of sustainable livelihoods and traditions in their regions and provinces (Autio et al., 2013; Renko & Bucar, 2014; Bryla, 2015).
Accordingly, mass media also provide a unique consumer acculturation source, authenticating images and values of various consumption activities, consumption-related norms, and the desirability of consumption ownership. They could signify numerous ideas and product intentions in the mass consumption system (Zukin & Maguire, 2004) that sometimes could be falsified and disguised as genuine messages (Luca & Zervas, 2016; Andrade Cruz et al., 2021). Based on CCT, consumers could submissively embrace the prevalent representations of identity and lifestyle aspirations depicted in advertising and mass media (Rokka, 2021) or consciously break from these ideological prescriptions with interpretative strategies that construe and respond to marketers’ messages about consumption.

The innovative and productive consumer interpretive strategy sometimes goes against entrenched corporate meanings that yield authentication of consumption experience to advocate social interests. Further, internet technology has facilitated the accessibility, reproduction, and augmentation of media narratives and platforms for information sharing on gastronomic culture through user-generated content (Ishak et al., 2018; Burgess & Green, 2018; Lim et al., 2020). Consumers articulated the experiential value through writings and images in socio-technical performative arrangements (Lugosi, 2016) that could be valuable validation for food products, brands, and services (Choudhary et al., 2019; Rewtrakunphaiboon & Sawangdee, 2022).

In this context, value co-creation allows the interpretive strategy to represent increased consumer active performance and dissemination in appraisal systems (Mellet et al., 2014; Baka, 2015; Bentsen & Pedersen, 2021). It does not simply apply to consumers attributing qualities to a place, person, event, or product but also involves offering credible information, cues and suggestion that deliver more detailed and informative experience-related advice for prospective consumers (Sparks et al., 2013; Vásquez & Chik, 2015; Lim et al., 2020; Le et al., 2022). Correspondingly, value co-creation signifies marketplace culture in which consumers can experience strong emotional bonds through common passions, experiences, and identities, thus seeking to jointly recognise and participate in solidarity rituals of collective authentication processes amid socio-cultural differences that could significantly influence consumption.

Consumers’ sense of togetherness and shared value in products and services are exhibited through interpretative strategies as they compare their expectations with marketers’ creations (Koontz, 2010). At the same time, the interpretive strategy offers rich co-creative ideas, practices, and solutions that predict consumers’ behaviour, refining products and business practices to drive market improvement (Lugosi, 2014; Marine-Roig & Clavé, 2015; Orlikowski & Scott, 2015). In such a way, consumers may present commodities in various ways, altering their original significance; thus, consumption could be considered a sort of production, transforming the act of appropriation into a reinterpretation of commodities and innovation of sorts to suit their identity projection and interests.

CONCLUSION

The article contributes to a theoretical discourse that extends the conceptualisation of authenticity in addressing food heritage within a dynamic consumption context and commercialisation agenda. In a reflective sense, the negotiation of authenticity associated with the consumption experience is an integrated part of consumer culture (Arnould & Thompson, 2005; Jensen et al., 2015). In the consumption cycle, the business’s overall marketing mix seeks to authenticate offerings to distinguish them from mainstream everyday mass products, while consumers may interpret an object’s authenticity differently based on their social beliefs, expectations, or perceptions. At the same time, institutions are interested in utilising authentication schemes to establish certain values that mediate consumer decision-making. Hence, the review argued that food authenticity is socially negotiated by the diversity of stakeholders mobilising resources and the web of interactions, conforming to identity and values creation according to their position while responsive to differences in the marketplace culture. The negotiation of authenticity is represented as values, ideologies, manifestations and interpretive strategies that mediate the assumption of legitimacy, quality, identity and diversity of consumption patterns.

This review offers an understanding of food heritage positioning in the consumer culture that kindles the exploration of opportunities and negotiation of its authenticity as a commodity. Further, in contemporary times, the decline of traditional food identity and the increased commercial taste are inevitable due to cultural homogenisation prompted by globalisation and international socio-economic integration. Therefore, authenticity is recommended as a collective reputation and quality for food heritage businesses and marketers to instil consumer trust and confidence in the face of commercial value. More empirical studies should be done in this area, notably addressing policymakers’ efforts and challenges in sustaining authentic heritage consumption and the implication underlying the authentication and heritagisation of gastronomy on business growth from market perspectives, especially in the digitalised marketing era.

In sum, the review has several limitations in its findings. First, it may be lacking in methodology as the review is drawn from literature sources and could be prone to bias in scoping and criteria selection according to the author’s framework of understanding. Then, the discourse was approached from a socio-cultural context. Other microscopic details of food, such as technology, safety, substance and nutritional perspective, are omitted from the discussion, suggesting its limitation. Also, it is worth mentioning that this review does not conclude the entire breadth of articles on food heritage from social structure perspectives or negotiation of food politics, for instance, the policy and legal instrumentation or branding associated with intellectual property rights. However, it may help highlight certain gaps for potential future research, possibly in dissecting the connotation of food heritage from the lens of iconic authenticity as an innovative and creative culinary interpretation.
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