

Behind the Barrel:

The Branding of Narratives of Craft and Authenticity in a Capitalist Economy

by

Katie Lynn Schwind

B.S., University of Cincinnati, 2013

M.A., University of Denver, 2017

A doctoral dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Department of Media Studies at the
University of Colorado in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Media Studies

2022

Committee Members:

Dr. Andrew Calabrese (Chair)

Dr. Arne Höcker

Dr. J. Richard Stevens

Dr. Nabil Echchaibi

Dr. Sandra Ristovska

Abstract

Craft making is defined by the pursuit of quality above all else. Narratives of authenticity revolve around that which is real or original. These two definitions are agreed on by most philosophers, scholars and citizens; however, when these words are used to define something else, especially a particular culture, countless arguments ensue. The primary goal of this dissertation study is to engage with the branding of authenticity in popular culture through the lens of critical theory. The purpose of developing this critical lens is not to define authenticity and inauthenticity but to understand the critiques of this inadequate binary. These critiques include, but are not limited to, discussions of authenticity as a value and its connection to notions of originality and origin. The motivation of this dissertation is to examine how craft cultures branded as authentic are constructed and maintained by organizations in a capitalist economy. Crafting an authentic culture and brand in a capitalist economy involves immense amounts of labor on the part of both producers and consumers. This physical and emotional labor is brought on by the need to stay relevant given that the definition of authenticity is socially constructed. Considering that what is considered to be authentic craft beer production has been debated by leaders of the industry over the past four decades through the discussions of selling out and developing a tangible definition of “craft,” the craft beer industry will serve as an empirical example for exploring this popular culture critique in this dissertation study. In conclusion, this dissertation observes that the branding of authentic craft brands is constructed through ongoing negotiations within a craft culture and influenced by mainstream political, social and economic changes. The narratives produced by these craft brands claim authenticity through their connection to history, narratives of oppositionality, taste, place, skills, knowledge and community. The overarching theme of

these narratives is a nostalgic reflection balanced with a hope for the future. Through critiques of innovation, expansion, power, gentrification and community engagement, I show that this hope for the future, no matter how progressive, is constrained by our capitalist economy in a variety of ways.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my supportive, patient and loving husband and my sweet baby boy. Thank you both for always reminding me what is most important in life. I look forward to a lifetime of writing adventures with you by my side.

Acknowledgements

Most of this research was conducted and written in gentrified areas of the United States.

Although I will reflect on this fact in further detail throughout this dissertation when discussing the connections between authenticity and place in the craft beer industry, I would like to acknowledge that through my consumption of craft beer culture and my current living situation I am very personally tied to and an agent of gentrification. Although I know that acknowledgement of a harmful and destructive history that is ongoing in our communities is a statement made more for me than those harmed, I hope that this research and craft beer research moving forward can work to recognize and encourage real political and social change and bring economic vibrancy to struggling neighborhoods across our country without uprooting the people who for generations have been physically, emotionally and culturally tied to these places.

Table of Contents

Title Page	i
Abstract	ii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vi
Introduction	1
The Significance of this Study	2
Subcultures and Countercultures	5
Connecting Selling Out and Authenticity	8
Investigating Authenticity Narratives	10
The Labor of Craft	15
The Performance of “Authentic” Culture	19
Authenticity as a Social Construct	25
Developing an “Authentic” Brand Identity	27
Methodology	35
Positionality	41
Terminology	43
Chapter 1: History and Narrative	47
A Brief History of Craft Beer in the United States	48
The Recent Craft Beer Resurgence in the United States	52
Communicating “Authentic” Craft Brand Narratives	56
Heritage	59
Innovation	65
Conclusions	67
Chapter 2: An Oppositional Market	69
Defining Narratives of Oppositionality in a Craft Context	70
Oppositional Branding in a Capitalist Economy	72
Influences of the Craft Economy	77
The Spectrum of “Authentic” Experiences	81
Power to Define the Craft Market	84
Mainstream Market Plays on Craft	87
Conclusions	92
Chapter 3: Ingredients and Taste	93

vi

Ingredients of High Quality and Cultural Value	94
Consumer Identity Formation through Brand Experiences	99
The Craft Consumer Tastes	103
The Power to Engage in and Define Craft Tastes	109
Conclusions	113
Chapter 4: Space and (Dis)Place	114
Capitalizing on Select Elements of a Place	115
Creating and Claiming “Authentic” Spaces	121
Connecting Place and Taste	124
Exclusion and Displacement	129
Conclusions	134
Chapter 5: Tools, Skills and Knowledge	135
The Craft Process	136
Tools and Machines	140
Skills and Knowledge	144
From Knowledge to Understanding	148
Branding the Craft Process	150
Conclusions	153
Chapter 6: Community and Collaboration	154
Collective Identity	156
Collective Knowledge	159
Collaboration	162
Community	163
Conclusions	167
Conclusion	168
Philosophical and Theoretical Contributions	169
The Labor of Craft Beer	173
The Performance of “Authentic” Craft Beer Culture	174
Craft Beer Authenticity as a Social Construct	175
Developing an “Authentic” Craft Beer Brand Identity	177
Coming Up Next in “Authentic” Craft Beer Brand Culture	177
Limitations of this Dissertation	179
My Next Steps	180
References	184
Appendix	202
Table 1: Breweries Included in Website Data Set	202

Table 2: Breweries Included in Facebook Data Set	208
Table 3: Breweries Included in Instagram Data Set	215
Table 4: Breweries Included in TikTok Data Set	222
Figure 1: The Brewers Association Independent Craft Brewer Seal	228
Figure 2: Soggy Bottom Brewing Logo	228

Introduction

“Authenticity is a non-objective and essentially undefinable characteristic which a stakeholder or consumer arbitrarily attributes to a product or company. However, the company can take an active and decisive role in this process, operating in such a way that a given social construct, which defines the concept of authenticity in a given context, takes on a visible and structured shape in its organization” (Cipollaro et al., 2021, p. 4).

The primary goal of this dissertation study is to engage with the concept of authenticity in popular culture through the lens of critical theory. This dissertation is structured to first review how and why the concept of authenticity has importance within critical theory, including a discussion of the reasons critical theorists find the concept both important and problematic. The goal of developing this critical lens is not to define authenticity and inauthenticity but to understand the critiques of this inadequate binary. These critiques include, but are not limited to, discussions of authenticity as a value and its connection to notions of originality and origin. These discussions are supported by Theodor Adorno’s writings on authenticity as a “jargon” and Walter Benjamin’s writings on authenticity as an “aura.” Herbert Marcuse and Hannah Arendt’s critiques of the commodification of cultural objects in capitalism lend valuable insight to the branding of authenticity, which is the empirical site of analysis throughout this dissertation. The branding of authenticity here refers to the use of socially constructed narratives to situate a product as authentic in the marketplace. These narratives are branded through a variety of ways, including but not limited to product naming and the aesthetics of the physical space where the products are purchased. Understanding the economic and cultural value that different audiences give to products and practices deemed authentic is necessary to develop a theoretical critique of

the concept of authenticity. Throughout this dissertation, I will further examine how the branding of authenticity is manifested in the craft beer industry.

I will also engage with Karl Marx's development of value theory to consider the possible implications of authenticity to forming an understanding of labor and production in a capitalist economy. Marx emphasizes that the only way to end the alienation of workers is through completely abolishing the system (1992, p. 279). Therefore, there is no revolutionary potential within capitalist systems of labor and production, as the abolition of the capitalist system is the only truly revolutionary pathway. As far as my research suggests, craft breweries in the United States are not calling for complete elimination of the capitalist system. Rather, narratives of authenticity in this context are often tied to and branded as anti-corporate efforts. Therefore, although I engage Marx's development of value theory to understand the many cultural and economic constraints that serve as barriers to a cultural producer's capacity to engage in practices of labor and production that break the mold of those typically found in capitalism, I am critical of anti-corporate narratives that suggest the revolutionary potential of the craft beer industry, or the craft economy more broadly.

The Significance of this Study

This dissertation study seeks to develop an understanding of the ways that authenticity is being branded by the craft beer industry to differentiate craft beer from beer being mass produced in the market. Claims to authenticity within the craft beer industry are both a way of differentiating and branding on the one hand and a way of asserting superior quality on the other. There are five main contributions of this study that are significant to the scholarly community with regards to cultural projects studied from a critical perspective at the intersection of craft and branding. The first contribution of this study is the connection of craft processes to the branding

of a mainstream understanding of craft. Craft beer could have been named artisanal beer, small batch beer or many other phrases that address these characteristics as different from the beer being produced on the mass market. However, the term that has stuck is craft beer. As I will show throughout this study, there is significant baggage that comes from using the term craft, especially to describe a product in a capitalist society. Definitions of authenticity in craft spaces are influenced by over a century of history based on efforts to reclaim craft in the face of industrialization. This study is significant to this ongoing history as many of these themes and branding techniques, including the aspects I am critical of, such as the labor of craft, are clearly still embedded in the ways we brand and expect craft processes to operate today.

The second contribution of this study is to the literature on selling out in popular culture. This literature is expansive, encompassing everything from music to celebrity. Selling out has become the moment where our capitalist culture questions the authenticity of a product and/or producer because of the economic shift toward greater emphasis on large-scale commercial success. Full creative ownership is lost when the brand sells out. In the craft beer industry, particularly in the past decade, we have seen a shift in the definition of craft beer to focus, at least on the industry side, on the amount of beer produced and the ownership structure of the brewery. This shift is one that reflects the worries that come from selling out, concerns about changes to production that occur as a result of a shift in ownership. Although “authentic” craft beer is still defined by craft breweries in many other ways outside of ownership structure, narratives of oppositionality to those that have sold out and to the mass-producers that are buying are ongoing. As I have communicated in the previous paragraph, this history of oppositionality is one that is influenced by the broader craft economy and influences the ways that craft breweries are branded today.

The third contribution of this study is to understanding power dynamics in craft beer culture. This is significant to both critical theory and cultural studies, as both are concerned with systems of power and the underlying political implications. This study explores power in many ways, including the power to define the craft market. It is clear that “authentic” craft is socially constructed; however, the power to be a part of this construction is not one marked by equality. Both craft consumers and craft producers have power to determine what is honored as “authentic” craft and then use these definitions to brand themselves as “authentic.” As authenticity has become a commodity in the market, these markers of authenticity are not simply social but also political and economical. Of extreme importance to this conversation is when place is connected to these “authentic” craft tastes and peoples and cultures are then excluded or displaced.

Therefore, the fourth contribution of this study is to the ongoing call to explore the role of craft beer in gentrification of urban areas. Although this study did not originally seek to become a part of this conversation, it became clear through the primary research material that craft breweries are regularly using the spaces and places that they are entering in order to brand their breweries as “authentic.” As I will describe throughout this dissertation, the spectrum of these representations was not universal. For example, not all breweries claimed to be restoring communities, as many were looking to renovate buildings from a perspective of sustainability. Although, a preoccupation with sustainability should not be considered as mutually exclusive of a preoccupation with community. Much more research is needed to connect craft beer and gentrification. This study largely works on the side of critique in this area; however, the digital data collected suggested that there may be more occurring behind the digital screen in on the ground work breweries are doing to actually serve a role in the success of the entire community.

As I will explore in the conclusion of this dissertation, this area of research is one I am passionately planning to pursue in the future.

Lastly, the fifth contribution of this study is to craft literature more broadly. I explore the craft process from Richard Sennett's (2008) perspective, laid out in *The Craftsman*. As I show, much of Sennett's exploration and critique of the craft process holds true in the craft beer industry. Once again, although this dissertation did not originally seek to apply a centuries long history to a relatively new phenomenon, if we consider the past five decades of craft beer in the United States as distinct from the small-batch brews that came before it, it was enlightening to see that many of Sennett's discourses surrounding tools, skills and knowledge were represented throughout the digital data collected. An industry as mainstream as craft beer carrying on these craft processes is interesting from a labor and production perspective, particularly considering that the industry has little oversight in terms of policing of "authenticity," that is outside of the Brewers Association's definition that emphasizes size and barrels of beer produced.

Subcultures and Countercultures

Although much of this discussion can be found in the conclusion of this dissertation, supporting details are given throughout each chapter. I am exploring how craft breweries establish a subculture, which oftentimes more closely resembles a counterculture, of beer production through their engagement with political, economic and social aspirations that set them apart from mass-producers¹ of beer in the United States. Overall, the subculture of craft

¹ "Mass-producers" will be used throughout this dissertation study to refer to any beer organization that does not fall within the Brewers Association's current definition of craft beer producers. As of 2022, this definition is as follows: "An American craft brewer is a small and independent brewer. Small: Annual production of 6 million barrels of beer or less (approximately 3 percent of U.S. annual sales). Beer production is attributed to a brewer according to rules of alternating proprietorships. Independent: Less than 25 percent of the craft brewery is owned or controlled (or equivalent economic interest) by a beverage alcohol industry member that is not itself a craft brewer. Brewer: Has a TTB Brewer's Notice and makes beer" (Brewers Association, n.d.).

brewing is defined by the sector of the market that identifies as small² and independent³, a definition managed by the Brewers Association. The counterculture of craft brewing is that which is influenced by overarching craft narratives, which are tied to anti-corporate sentiments and a craft maker's connection to the product in ways mass-production prevents from occurring. The characteristics that distinguish the subculture from the counterculture of craft beer production in the United States will be explained in further detail in the paragraphs that follow, although there are extensive overlaps. Critical theory will inform my analysis of the branding of authentic craft beer cultures from a value and labor perspective. This includes a discussion of the barriers that exist for craft beer production branded as authentic in the United States, such as the difficulties with distribution. Engaging with the study of craft and craftspeople, the study of production described as "authentic" and its branding in popular culture more broadly will support the results and discussion of this empirical study of the craft beer industry.

As a part of this analysis, I will interrogate the difference between claiming the tag of *craft* for a brewery in the economic sense versus attempting to make progressive changes to society through the pursuit of artisanal practices over industrial ones, which is supported by my engagement with philosophical texts discussing the barriers faced in capitalist systems of labor and production. This range of artisanal practices can be categorized by being a part of the subculture or the counterculture of craft brewing. The subculture is defined by economic independence and relatively small-scale production. This definition is provided by the Brewers Association and has been accepted and used nationwide for many years. The branding of this

² "Small: Annual production of 6 million barrels of beer or less (approximately 3 percent of U.S. annual sales). Beer production is attributed to a brewer according to rules of alternating proprietorships" (Brewers Association, n.d.).

³ "Independent: Less than 25 percent of the craft brewery is owned or controlled (or equivalent economic interest) by a beverage alcohol industry member that is not itself a craft brewer. Brewer: Has a TTB Brewer's Notice and makes beer" (Brewers Association, n.d.).

subculture revolves around a primary objective of distinguishing one's brewery from mass-produced beer. On the other hand is the counterculture of craft beer. These breweries are those that are branding themselves as the politically, economically and socially progressive sector of the beer industry. Theodore Roszak in his often-cited book *The Making of a Counter Culture* examines the ways the political and economic situation in the United States post-Great Depression in the mid-twentieth century gave rise to countercultures:

What I have called "the counter culture" took shape between these two points in time as a protest that was grounded paradoxically not in the failure, but in the success of a high industrial economy. It arose not out of misery but out of plenty; its role was to explore a new range of issues raised by an unprecedented increase in the standard of living (Roszak, 1995, p. xii).

As illustrated in this quote, the existence of countercultures was made possible by the increase in disposable income that Americans were experiencing after a time when many had little to spend on food, let alone goods or experiences deemed cultural. Roszak uses the term *paradoxically* here to critique the revolutionary potential of countercultures due to their deep ties to existing as a result of industrialization, even if many stood opposed to these processes of production.

One way that corporate food brands balance the appeals of countercultures without adopting the political mission often tied to them is through the use of language historically tied to representing a counterculture. For example, although in the 1980s *natural* and *healthy* were avoided in the mainstream marketing of food brands, these words are used on branding materials across organizations today (p. 3). This history of food countercultures, referred to as *countercuisines* by Warren Belasco (2007), was marked by guiding principles outlined by debates in the 1960s:

A coherent set of dietary beliefs and practices, the countercuisine had three major elements. A consumerist component offered survivalist advice and suggested what to avoid, especially processed “plastic” food. While radical consumerism was largely negative, the second, therapeutic component suggested ways to make food more fun — e.g., through a delight in improvisation, craftsmanship, ethnic and regional cooking. Addressing issues of food production and distribution, the third element was the organic paradigm, which posited a radically decentralized infrastructure consisting of communal farms, cooperative groceries, and hip restaurants (p. 4).

As the craft industry is marked by ties to the history of craft movements globally, so is the counterculture of food. In the craft beer industry specifically, we see many of these themes at play, particularly the counterculture phenomenon’s association with revolutionary potential that was more aspirational than realized. Through this dissertation, I seek to better understand how craft breweries are branding themselves as a counter to mass-producers of beer in the United States. This branding is of course established and maintained by the breweries themselves, but also by their distribution networks, beer writers, national media and consumers. As such, digital texts produced by craft breweries for these many audiences are analyzed as a part of this study. Therefore, the main focus of this dissertation is on how craft beer producers define and maintain the socially constructed characteristics that distinguish craft beer production from mass-production of beer in the United States. Authenticity narratives are central to defining and maintaining craft beer culture as opposed to mass-produced beer.

Connecting Selling Out and Authenticity

This critical lens supports my engagement with the scholarship surrounding the study of authenticity in popular culture. This study includes, but is not limited to, the study of craft and

craftspeople, the study of claims of authentic production, the branding of “authentic” production and the narratives surrounding “selling out,” which refers to the phenomenon of people and/or organizations selling rights of their product and/or company to a large organization or conglomeration rather than maintaining their financially independent status, and presumably their commitment to high standards of craft making. The phenomenon of selling out is connected to authenticity because narratives surrounding those organizations that have sold out question the sell out’s authentic character. Considering that craft beer production branded as authentic has been debated by leaders of the industry over the past four decades through the discussions of selling out and developing a tangible definition of “craft,” the craft beer industry is an applicable empirical example for exploring this popular culture critique in this dissertation study.

Selling out and authenticity are directly related according to the current standards set for craft beer production in the United States, as has been referenced in the Brewers Association for craft beer production in the previous paragraphs. This relationship though, where the definition of authentic craft production is tied to organization size has been in flux over the past forty years. Although I will explain this in much greater detail in the following chapters, it is important to acknowledge here that much of the history of craft beer production, and craft making more broadly, has been tied to the desire to brand these markets as oppositional to mass-production. This history is emphasized and centered in the current definition of craft beer production in the United States, in large part due to the recent history of craft breweries selling their businesses to corporate beverage producers. In order to maintain and police claims of craft beer production, the definition has been narrowed to exclude those that sell out. What is problematic here is that moments after selling a craft brewery to a mass-producer the brews produced by that organization are no longer considered to be “authentic” craft products. Clearly, this is a major

disconnect, as at least in those days that follow the products being produced are the exact same. Therefore, the authenticity of a brand being tied to its status as being a sell out or not is also socially constructed, and in this case influenced by the Brewers Association. As I will articulate in the conclusion, there is not clear evidence if consumers consider a brand less authentic over time after they have sold out.

Investigating Authenticity Narratives

An overarching goal of authenticity narratives centers around locating the *real* or *original*. The motivation behind this goal is the overwhelming homogenization and standardization of cultural products in modern society (Thurnell-Read, 2019, p. 1449). Rather than rejecting the binary claims of what is authentic versus what is inauthentic, we should explore these categories to reveal the inherent ambiguities (Theodossopoulos, 2013, p. 344). Critical theorists' critiques of mass culture have given substance and relevance to the investigation and analysis of these goals and overall value of authenticity as a concept (Thurnell-Read, 2019, p. 1450). Products are not innately authentic but are branded as authentic using narratives of authenticity (Hartmann and Ostberg, 2013, p. 885). Critiques of authenticity have contended that authenticity is a tag or descriptor that is achieved or earned, rather than innate. Therefore, we cannot depend on looking at where and when it is claimed. Rather, we must examine the processes of production, distribution and consumption that exist behind the products that have claimed to be authentic (Thurnell-Read, 2019, p. 1450).

When investigating cultural products valued as authentic, the overwhelmingly common characteristic attributed to this value is that the products are of high quality or are devoted to quality in some way (Frake, 2017, p. 3931). The value of interrogating claims of authenticity, at

least in an academic sense, comes from overwhelming branding of authenticity in culture on a broad scale, as Dimitrios Theodossopoulos (2013) argues:

The development of analytical conceptualization of authenticity with qualifying adjectives or nouns is not a sign of academic verbalis, but an academic response to authenticity's multiple vernacular uses: in many evaluations of objects, performances, or cultural practices, more than one conceptualization or criteria of authenticity is debated at any given moment (p. 340).

Although academically, we have seen an increase in studies of authenticity, the same is true for media outlets more generally. Looking at national newspapers over the last century, Carroll and Wheaton (2009) found an exponential increase in the number of mentions of authenticity when discussing topics specifically related to food (Carroll and Wheaton, 2009, p. 258). The value of authenticity, and everyday products claimed to be authentic, has become central to the ways products are branded. This branding of authenticity by organizations is not a one-time venture but a commitment to become a part of the ongoing social negotiations of what can be claimed and branded as authentic in a popular culture context. These negotiations involve much labor by producers and consumers to maintain the value attributed to claims of authenticity, as these claims allow both producers and consumers to brand themselves as "authentic." This ongoing labor is explored throughout this dissertation study to develop a critique of the limited transformative potential of the craft beer industry as a counterculture within a capitalist society.

Part of the challenge of branding a product, organization or industry as "authentic" comes from the many types of value that we as consumers attribute to our experiences with these products, organizations and industries branded as "authentic". Authenticity has both economic and cultural value. "All work of culture industries, in some way or the other is preoccupied with

claims to authenticity” (Jones et al., 2005, p. 893). The product branded as authentic is that which has significance beyond monetary value, that which exists because of its affective⁴ dimensions (Banet-Weiser, 2012, p. 5). The desire for authenticity in the modern world “is a cultural construct coincident with the rise of possessive individualism, the development of late capitalism, and the appearance of nationalism, among other factors” (Lindholm, 2013, p. 390). This desire for authenticity creates economic and cultural relevance for both consumers and producers. As such, cultural products that can be bought and sold contain two independent use values, that as a symbolically valued object and that as a commercially valued object (Bourdieu, 1985, p. 15-16). “Besides being a commodity that has a commercial value, any cultural object is also a symbolic good, having a specifically cultural value” (p. 13). Further, the economic value of the cultural product has the ability to reinforce its value as a cultural, symbolic object (p. 15-16). Therefore, brands claiming authenticity must balance symbolic value with commercial value in order to maintain relevance in the marketplace of authenticity.

Because narratives of authenticity are based on an overall goal to escape homogenization and standardization, the value of a product or brand that is socially deemed “authentic” fades if that product becomes too popular or mainstream. “The authenticity paradox, then, is that even as the appeal of authentic offerings increases, their popularity and iconicity diminish the returns to authenticity” (Verhaal and Dobrev, 2020, p. 1). The goal of marketers is not to claim authenticity, as these direct claims are typically read as “inauthentic” by consumers, but rather to mediate authenticity (Hartmann and Ostberg, 2013, p. 884). The product or brand becomes a

⁴ This dissertation study is not equipped to philosophically explore the affective dimensions of “authentic” craft beer cultural experiences. Therefore, affective will loosely be defined as the emotions or feelings that a producer and/or consumer, depending on the context, experiences as a result of engaging in the culture. The call for research on the affective dimensions of “authentic” cultural experiences is expanded upon in the conclusion of this dissertation study.

medium of authentic experience for the consumer. This appeal of products that are branded using narratives of authenticity attracts consumers that are seeking to differentiate themselves and define their personal identities, which is a factor considered by organizations when determining whether or not to brand their products as “authentic.” Producers typically brand their products using narratives of authenticity in relation to connection to a specific category, or in opposition to a particular category, and/or in relation to the moral meanings or values that can be claimed from engaging with that product (Carroll and Wheaton, 2009, p. 261). Consumers typically pursue products they consider authentic to contribute to both their self-identity and their locational identity (Hoskins et al., 2021, p. 570). Therefore, brands utilizing claims of authenticity adopt localism as a characteristic of their authenticity.

As previously discussed, a major expectation of engaging in a consumptive experience considered authentic by consumers exists the desire for the arousal of specific emotions or feelings. From the consumer perspective, experiences of authenticity also have the capacity to trigger affects, allowing cultural objects to invoke feelings of authenticity long after the original experience is over. “Auras are afterlives contained in objects’ abilities to exist outside their moments yet perform as channels to distant spaces and times...Auras of authenticity trigger affects” (Carter, 2019, p. 202). We seek out experiences we consider to be authentic because of the affective responses we feel and continue to feel as we are reminded of the things and places these auras of authenticity are linked to (p. 212). These affective responses we feel when we engage with experiences that contain “authentic” value become the way humans can choose to live lives they consider to be authentic. However, this choice to consume becomes a requirement of avoiding further alienation in capitalist society. Therefore, when authenticity is branded and sold through experiences and objects human agency is removed from the process, and further

alienation occurs for those unable to purchase authenticity (Swier, 2019, p. 215). Our pursuit of authenticity can no longer be fulfilled on our own, cultural objects now have within them the symbolic value of authenticity that can only be experienced by consuming the products. Therefore, the marketplace has created the need for the branding of “authentic” cultural objects, craft being one of these categories that is given relevance as a result.

Craft products typically appeal to consumers seeking to purchase products and experiences branded through narratives of authenticity because of the overall characteristics that have historically defined craft. “Craft making values the experience, an understanding that there is more value to the product than the use value of the product itself” (Sennett, 2008, p. 288). Particularly relevant to the branding of craft is that the purchase of craft products is marked by an experience of consumption characteristically in opposition to experiences of mass-production. “Unlike large-scale producers, craftspeople are characterized by their skilled labor, typically working with their hands in a creative and autonomous fashion while motivated by a commitment to quality-driven work” (Schifeling and Demetry, 2021, p. 135). Behind the scenes tours and face-to-face engagement with craft makers are two of many experiences aimed at appealing to those consumers looking for an experience distinct from that in the mass market, an experience that invokes an emotional response in the consumer.

Pete Brown in *Craft: An Argument* (2020) establishes the historical connections between craft making and craft beer production. Brown, an English beer writer, tells the story of craft beer production from a largely Western perspective. Some of this history will be discussed in this dissertation as well in order to situate my arguments of craft and authenticity within this understood history; however, I aim to pick up where Brown left off, developing an understanding of how craft and authenticity are tied together philosophically and culturally in the craft beer

industry. There are four main themes that will be explored throughout this dissertation. These are: 1) the labor of craft, 2) the performance of “authentic” culture, 3) authenticity as a social construct and 4) developing an “authentic” brand identity. These four themes overlap extensively and are weaved in and out of the overarching story being told about craft beer in the United States. As I will discuss in further detail below, the way this dissertation is structured reflects this reliance on storytelling as a technique for craft branding.

As has been alluded to throughout this introduction, there are basically three theoretical streams I am engaging with as a part of this dissertation. I work within critical theorists’ conceptual frameworks of authenticity to understand power, labor and performance. Particularly, Adorno, Benjamin, Arendt and Marcuse are central to my exploration of authenticity in the craft beer industry. Inseparable from claims of authenticity in my dissertation are claims of craft, mostly due to the fact that *craft* is in the name of *craft beer*. Although the history of the philosophical understanding of craft is immense, I have chosen to engage with Richard Sennett, William Morris, Pierre Bourdieu and Karl Marx to develop an argument of the ways craft is being branded in the craft beer industry in the United States. Lastly, I am a critical branding scholar, and throughout this dissertation I explore brand identity and the power to claim craft in branding narratives as connected to place, storytelling and performance. There are many scholars I am indebted to throughout this stream of theoretical engagement; however, Sarah Banet-Weiser and Sharon Zukin are among the two most central to my arguments.

The Labor of Craft

Central to understanding the ways that authenticity is branded in craft spaces is critiquing the labor that goes into this branding. Processes of craft making begin long before a craft product is made and long after it is sold. Social constructions of authenticity, which will be explored in

further detail in a few paragraphs, require continuous maintenance of craft brands, which develop claims of authenticity to communicate the economic and cultural value of their products. Amanda Koontz and Nathaniel Chapman (2019) have connected this social construction to the labor involved in developing and maintaining a craft brand:

Because authenticity is socially constructed, it requires authenticity work to distinguish products and create a niche within the broader commercial market. Industries and individuals do this work to demarcate the value of their products through multiple traits, such as connections with longstanding traditions, originality, the touch of the creator's hand, and space and place (p. 355).

The branding labor here, then, is based on the ongoing social negotiations of what craft is in a particular category. The value of craft products partially comes from the symbolic value attributed to these products from this ongoing social construction of what is valued as craft. The branding labor here is significant to this study; however, it would be inadequate to not mention the labor of the craft making process itself. As we know, the labor that goes into making a craft product is extensive and draining of the mind, body and soul. A key characteristic of a craft maker is their engagement with the labor of the craft for the sole reason to make a high quality product, their dedication to quality over everything else (Sennett, 2008, p. 20). The craft maker must go through hours, and often years, of extensive hands-on training to become a master of their craft. Therefore, behind the labor of branding is the labor of actually becoming a craft maker, one that is capable of maintaining their relevance in the market through the production of the craft itself.

Obviously, this intensive labor of creating the craft product is one way that the product itself is branded through narratives of authenticity. Maker's marks, typically placed on a craft

product through a stamp, have historically been used to show who made the product, to serve as a reminder that the craft maker exists, that the labor of a human being was exerted to make the product. These marks did not typically carry any further messages of any sort (Sennett, 2008, p. 130); however, they could also relate a product to a place. Further, in some cases, especially in the realm of pottery, these marks could be painted on elaborately, making them more desired and therefore worth more money (p. 134); therefore, increasing their cultural and economic value. Thinking about labor in historic craft spaces, although many modern examples can be found, particularly in the fast fashion industry, the mark of a slave on a craft product served as a reminder of the slave's existence. This reminder of existence is relevant to our present day discussions about considering the immense amounts of physical, mental and emotional labor that go into a craft product, much of that labor being unpaid (p. 134-135). Additionally, in our modern world, the labor of craft does not end when the physical craft is made. There is an ongoing digital and in-person performance that we expect of craft makers. "Artisan kinship is a fictive sensibility that strengthens producer-consumer relations as it allays a range of marketplace manifestations" (Gaytán, 2019, p. 4). This sensibility provides both craft makers and their consumers with a relationship based on shared ideals, rather than being solely a financial exchange with the end goal of profit gain. This relationship must be cultivated and maintained by craft makers to remain relevant and valued (p. 5).

In the digital world, we expect craft makers to post about their process and tell us the story of the product, including its connection to maker, place, ingredients, etc.. When consumers purchase a craft or artisanal product they expect to gain more from the object than its pure use value. They expect to engage with the object on a personal level, as the object becomes a part of who they are, helping to define their sense of self. The craft maker creates this sense of

authenticity for the consumer through their craft process, including the materials used and the relationship they build with the consumer (Bergadaá, 2008, p. 7). Authenticity in social media branding is claimed and communicated through positioning the brand as “relatable, intimate, and vulnerable” while abiding by society’s expectations based on social constructions of gender, race, class and sexuality (Banet-Weiser, 2021, p. 141-142). Banet-Weiser (2021) explains that social media plays an essential role in branding products and organizations as “authentic,” which is complicated because of the innate inauthenticity of these mediated performances:

Social media assures users that what they are seeing is, somehow, unmediated and authentic. Yet of course, all representations are mediated, and perhaps even more so on social media, where programs and apps enable us to create an ‘authentic’ yet fabricated identity. Social media, in other words, makes this production of a contrived authenticity easy (p. 142).

Social media platforms have been developed to allow for the affective dimensions of this mediated brand experience to feel “authentic”, even as we are well aware of the innate inauthenticity of these performances. Therefore, the affective labor of authenticity on social media is expansive. Not only are influencers expected to be transparent and vulnerable, they must make these aspects of themselves vulnerable within the accepted social norms established by our ever changing culture. Being “authentic” takes the knowledge of what is currently acceptable and the skill to negotiate which parts of your true self fit this expectation (p. 143).

The in-person performance, whether occurring at a place of business, craft fair or out of a person’s garage expects similar engagements. Because craft makers become attached to the identity of their products due to the hands-on nature of making processes, their personal identity

as a craft maker becomes a part of the branding of the product, as is explored by Susan Luckman (2015):

In a creative micro-economy that fetishises buying ‘directly’ from the maker, consumers buy into a particular identity idealised for themselves and seen as enabled by the maker. This requires substantial performative promotional aesthetic labour on the part of the contemporary craft micro-entrepreneur, and sets new hegemonic standards for the rest of us to aspire to (p. 128).

This branding and marketing of both the maker and the product consists of additional labor craft makers take on to differentiate their products in the market (p. 113). “An authentic artisanal product carries with it more than just tangible qualities - it carries the intimate relationship of the producer to the product” (Kremlick, 2016, p. 2). After the product is sold, the craft maker must continue this emotional labor of branding in these spaces to continue their display of relevancy in a market where definitions of what characteristics are valued to be distinguished as a craft is always changing.

The Performance of “Authentic” Culture

As was made clear in the previous section, a majority of the labor of authenticity in craft spaces comes from the performances socially accepted as “authentic” in these spaces, both for producers and consumers. Before discussing the ways that culture is performed in craft spaces, I would like to take a step back to define what culture is more broadly. Raymond Williams (1961), a key contributor to cultural studies, distinguishes between three levels of culture. “There is the lived culture of a particular time and place, only fully accessible to those living that time and place. There is the recorded culture... There is also...the culture of the selective tradition” (p. 49). The importance of distinguishing between these levels of cultures is seen when exploring the

limitations of analyzing cultures of a specific time period. Culture recorded while it is taking place has different political and social contexts attached to it that are unable to be realized by someone not living in that time period. This differentiation of culture based on time periods is especially relevant to what is considered an authentic representation and performance of craft culture in modern day. Much of our understanding of craft spaces branded through narratives of authenticity is informed by the history of craft, which is steeped in the history of industrialization. These connections will be explored in much greater detail in the first chapter of this dissertation study.

Also relevant to developing an understanding of what constitutes “authentic” craft are the ways that craft is thought to fit into our culture more broadly. There are fundamentally two different ways of conceptualizing and analyzing culture. They are culture as an idea and culture as a practice (Hall, 1980, p. 59; Denning, 2004, p. 119). The purpose of analyzing culture “is to grasp how the interactions between all these practices and patterns are lived and experienced as a whole, in any particular period. This is its ‘structure of feeling’” (p. 60). Culture is the experience of the everyday, and in this way contains life’s struggles as they are lived and experienced (Grossberg, 1996, p. 158). “Cultural studies is thus committed to the study of the entire range of a society’s arts, beliefs, institutions, and communicative practices” (Nelson et al., 1992, p. 4). We use culture to define and make sense of our experiences. One way that we do this is through our engagement with mediated performances of craft. “They provide us with the most available categories for classifying the social world. It is primarily through the press, television, film, etc. that experience is organized, interpreted, and made to cohere in contradiction as it were” (Hebdige, 1979, p. 84-85). Media give us the tools we need to make sense of our

experiences and define the way that others see us. It is through mediated performances of craft culture that we develop an understanding of “authentic” craft as an idea and as a practice.

The importance of developing this understanding of culture, and craft culture more specifically, as an idea and as a practice comes from our need to understand how to create an understanding of self-identity, particularly as it relates to how we should structure the way we live in the world. Culture contains the ways of life and our knowledge of how to exist in the world (Williams, 1983, p. xviii; Eagleton, 2000, p. 34-35). This culture is not static but is constantly made and unmade, determining and determined, artificial and natural (Eagleton, 2000, p. 2, 5). Henry Giroux (2000) argues that our understanding of culture and its relationship to power is central to our ability to act politically:

Culture becomes political not only as it is mobilized through the media and other institutional forms as they work to secure certain forms of authority and legitimate specific social relations but also as a set of practices that represents and deployed power thereby shaping particular identities, mobilizing a range of passions, and legitimating precise forms of political culture. Culture in this instance becomes productive, inextricably linked to the related issues of power and agency (p. 9).

Intellectually, we recognize the power and importance of culture when it comes to mean something politically (Eagleton, 2000, p. 26). The political nature of cultural studies explore debates over “how identities are to be shaped, democracy defined, and social justice revived” (Giroux, 2000, p. 8). Culture’s relationship to power and politics is linked through questions of “ownership, access and governance” as well as through “the forms of knowledge, values, ideologies, and social practices it makes available” to different communities (p. 10). Therefore, the political power of culture is contained in our relationship to the culture and our desire to act

politically. This will become immensely relevant to the discussion of craft culture as a counterculture, especially as it pertains to engaging in craft experiences as a means of opposition to the mass-produced market.

Engagement with craft through narratives of oppositionality is key to the development of a transformative counterculture. More broadly, a fundamental goal of cultural studies is not merely to define but to transform. “Cultural theorists, consciously and emphatically, aim not merely to describe or explain contemporary cultural and social practices, but to change them, and more pointedly, to transform existing structures of power” (Slack and Whitt, 1992, p. 572). Cultural studies scholars should actively have a role in intervening in cultural phenomena to produce political change (Nelson, Treichler and Grossberg, 1992, p. 5). Michael Denning shows that one way to establish an emancipatory cultural studies is through a critical lens. This critical lens involves acknowledging that “All culture is mass culture under capitalism” (2004, p. 103) and culture is “fundamentally about theorizing people” (p. 141). Cultural studies informs my study of authenticity in the craft beer industry in a myriad of ways. By understanding that craft beer culture and the media representations produced and perpetuated by breweries are fundamentally hegemonic productions, I am able to analyze the political significance contained within.

This second theme, then, connects with the labor of craft, as these ongoing performances are really performances of an “authentic” craft culture. The character of craft products considered authentic is not valued or even understood without the narratives and performances of authenticity created and conducted by the craft makers themselves (Thurnell-Read, 2019, p. 1451). “If authenticity is constructed and subject to continual change, then it clearly takes an effort to appear authentic” (Peterson, 2005, p. 1086). To regulate and maintain authentic claims

of craft culture, craft makers must be constantly involved in the discourses being negotiated within the market. Many craft makers maintain this involvement through digital communication, particularly on social media. Digitally mediated performances complicate the relationship between space and time of a performance. Although the performance was recorded and occurred in the past, the audience is experiencing it in the present (Sandahl-Sands and Finn, 2015, p. 812). “Mediated performances no longer *require* a loss of aura, that inevitable displacement of a distinct location in space and time. Indeed the perception of the space—time of performance is influenced by historical circumstance” (p. 812). Our increasing interest in and dependence on digitally mediated performances shifts our socially constructed definition of “authentic” performances (p. 812). “In all cases, the ‘authenticity’ of the mediated performance is based on the imagined authenticity of its first rendering, thus the viewer/listener becomes an active participant in making meaning out of the past, in the present” (p. 811). Audiences engage in performances considered authentic that are recorded in the past to experience authenticity in the present (p. 811). Clearly, mediated performances complicate the authenticity narrative often touted in craft spaces where authenticity is tied directly to originality.

Originality is contained in history and tradition. That which claims to be historical, traditional and/or original holds power and authority over others not making the same claims. This is the distinction between “authentic” and “inauthentic,” in the world of consumer goods (Benjamin, 1968, p. 38). The reality is that capitalist production allows for the creation of reproductions of the original. These reproductions are void of the history and tradition contained in the original because they are “lacking in one element: its presence in time and space” (p. 222). Without an original product, there cannot be reproductions. And without reproductions, the concept of authenticity is irrelevant (p. 222). “The authenticity of a thing is the essence of all that

is transmissible from its beginning, ranging from its substantive duration to its testimony to the history which it has experienced” (p. 223). The power and authority of the original product is jeopardized by reproductions when authenticity becomes a descriptor of the reproductions (p. 223). Benjamin’s argument here is found in craft spaces when discussing narratives of oppositionality against the mass-produced products. Products that are mass-produced lack “authentic” character because of their status as reproductions. The craft product is one that is original every time, based on commitment to quality and tradition. As will be discussed throughout this dissertation study, craft beer spaces balance this commitment to tradition and history with a desire for innovation through aesthetic choices and ingredient selection.

The performance of authenticity in craft culture spaces also takes place on the side of consumers, which becomes an integral part of the purpose of branding craft products as “authentic”. Our modern use of authenticity to verify and experience an object as real is directly connected to our increasing anxiety to develop and maintain our personal identities, the performance of the self considered authentic (Lindholm, 2013, p. 363). “Brands and consumption became the traditions of modern culture and devotion contributes to consumers’ self-realization and self-identification through shared experiences and beliefs” (Koch and Suaerbronn, 2019, p. 5). Consumers who use brands and products to construct their identities are committed to maintaining the character of the brands and/or products considered authentic as an effort to maintain the “authentic” character of their personal identity (p. 7).

In conclusion, understanding the labor of craft is essential to exploring the constraints of “authentic” craft branding in the United States. Claims of craft considered to be authentic must be actively engaged with at every stage in the craft making process, from ingredient and material selection to long after the first product is sold. This maintenance of a craft brand identity

considered to be authentic is physically, emotionally, mentally and financially draining as ongoing craft performances are expected of the craft makers, whether in-person or digitally mediated. These performances require behind the scenes access, forcing the craft maker to be fully engaged in the branding of “authentic” craft throughout their entire making process. Further, because authenticity is a social construct, the claims of authenticity in craft spaces are not static, but must be constantly negotiated and rebranded. This constant negotiation and rebranding is occurring by both producers and consumers, as both claims of authenticity are at stake but with varying consequences.

Authenticity as a Social Construct

As I have introduced throughout this introduction, authenticity is largely regarded as a social construct throughout scholarly literature. Authenticity is defined as the character of an object constantly negotiated by a culture’s social interaction with the object (Duggan, 2015, p. 11; Hartmann and Ostberg, 2013, p. 885). As I have discussed, this constant negotiation of what is “authentic” requires extensive labor for all involved in the culture, as “authenticity is a social construct resulting from authenticity work, or the active processes by which individuals, industries, and organizations make authenticity claims” (Koontz and Chapman, 2019, p. 351). In order for claims of authenticity to be appealing, society must believe that “authentic” products are better and consuming “authentic” products makes you as a consumer better (Edwards, 2010, p. 198-199). This is the moral claim of authenticity, and this connection to identity formation brings to light the political significance of investigating claims of authenticity (Bramadat, 2005, p. 14).

The third theme, then, engages with critiques regarding who has the power to negotiate these discourses and use their value for cultural and/or economic benefit. Obviously, with all

cultures, what is valued by the market and the consumer is a part of an ongoing negotiation. Therefore, our cultural understanding of authenticity and its place of political, economic and social significance is constantly negotiated by society. In light of this, of importance to developing an understanding of the uses of authenticity in our culture is an investigation of the processes of production and consumption (Ocejo, 2017, p. 54). “Production and consumption are more than simple occupations and actions; they are defining characteristics of ways of life and the communities that practice them” (Kremlick, 2016, p. 1). In craft making, the craft way of life is defined by valuing quality above all else. Clearly, this aspiration for quality impacts processes of production and consumption in significant ways, creating limitations on who can engage in these craft processes and experiences.

Oftentimes, those in power are not the same ones that started a culture or that are expending physical and emotional labor every day to maintain that culture. Lee Edwards (2010) explains this power struggle in detail, stating:

Fields of production are essentially competitive arenas, where the organisations and individuals that belong to it attempt to secure symbolic power that will allow them to define the field’s parameters and norms in their own interests... This immediately raises questions of power: which individuals and organisations have the symbolic power to define the nature of authenticity in a field?... What are the origins of this power (e.g. tradition, product quality, coercion, commercial success)? Who is excluded on the basis of this definition? And how are consumers affected by these power dynamics? (p. 199).

For those producers in power, definitions of authenticity that are rigid and consistent make the most sense, as these definitions allow these producers to stay relevant and in power as social and cultural changes take place (p. 201).

In much the same way that claims of authenticity are constantly being redefined and negotiated in the field of cultural production, the individual on a quest to develop their “authentic” self is engaged in a continuous project of personal definition. This need to construct the self considered to be authentic originated in the disconnect between ourselves and our work, brought on by industrialization. “But when labor in the open market was no longer hereditary or connected to any larger meaning system, work began to lose its capacity to define identity” (Lindholm, 2013, p. 369). The production and maintenance of the “authentic” self is done in the market, through purchasing cultural products with authenticity claims (p. 371). Clearly, the power to engage with the experiences and products considered to be authentic in the market is available only to those that have the cultural capital to understand what is “authentic,” the social capital to be accepted in these spaces and the economic capital to pay for these “authentic” experiences. As will be discussed throughout this dissertation, craft categories considered to be authentic struggle to determine inclusion and exclusion criteria, as these criteria are directly influenced by these constant negotiations to define craft in society (Korn, 2013, p. 31).

Developing an “Authentic” Brand Identity

This fourth overarching theme, then, explores how craft brands develop an “authentic” brand identity among the constant struggle to maintain relevance in a market defined by a concept that is in neverending flux due to its nature of being socially constructed. Perhaps the most compelling example of the study of brand authenticity comes from Sarah Banet-Weiser (2012) in *AuthenticTM: The Politics of Ambivalence in a Brand Culture*. Banet-Weiser argues that a brand’s value has expanded beyond something that you can apply a dollar value to. Kleenex and Post-Its are just a couple of examples of extreme brand value, since even if we buy the Kroger brand we still call the product by these name brands. These few examples show why

branding itself is so important to study; however, Banet-Weiser uses a large portion of her book to solidify this importance:

Rather than positioning the market as my entry point in this analysis, following Williams I center culture, focusing on the ways in which it is continually reimagined and reshaped, a process inherently ambivalent and contradictory. US culture is predicated not on the separate domains of individual experience, everyday life, and the market but rather on their deep interrelation (p. 9).

This interrelation is what Banet-Weiser studies throughout the book, centering the conversation around claims of authenticity. Banet-Weiser acknowledges that in our culture, “inauthentic” and commercial have become synonymous with one another (p. 11). As has been reiterated throughout this introduction, one of the primary claims of craft spaces when touting their authenticity is their use of narratives of oppositionality to mass-produced products. This distancing from the commercial gives significance to claims of authenticity when developing a brand identity, especially in the craft market.

Moving forward to provide an argument for why studying a product as mainstream as beer is relevant to our understanding of our culture and economy, I would like to cite Raymond Williams’ (1980) introduction to the concept of magic:

It is important to look at modern advertising without realizing that the material object being sold is never enough: this indeed is the crucial cultural quality of its modern forms. If we were sensibly materialist, in that part of our living in which we use things, we should find most advertising to be of an insane irrelevance. Beer would be enough for us, without the additional promise that in drinking it we show ourselves to be manly, young in heart, or neighborly...it is clear that we have a cultural pattern in which the objects are

not enough but must be validated, if only in fantasy, by association with social and personal meanings which in a different cultural pattern might be more directly available. The short description of the pattern we have is *magic*: a highly organized and professional system of magical inducements and satisfactions, functionally very similar to magical systems in simpler societies, but rather strangely coexistent with a highly developed scientific technology (p. 185).

This “magic” of advertising, and of the need for consumption more broadly, is why we should study the products that people consume regularly. These objects that people buy are relevant because they usually do not think twice about their need for the object. They don’t see that hidden in the object is actually their need for “social respect, discrimination, health, beauty, success, power to control your environment” (p. 189). Advertising hides these facts because realizing them would lead to the desire for real economic change through acquiring these needs outside of consumption.

Prior to Williams’ argument that the source of this “magic” was advertising, Dick Hebdige (1979) made a similar argument about ideological subconsciousness:

The failure to see through appearances to the real relations which underlie them does not occur as the direct result of some kind of masking operation consciously carried out by individuals, social groups or institutions. On the contrary, ideology by definition thrives *beneath* consciousness. It is here, at the level of ‘normal common sense’, that ideological frames of reference are most firmly sedimented and most effective, because it is here that their ideological nature is most effectively concealed (p. 11).

While Williams suggests that beneath advertising our real needs that are being replaced by objects can be realized, Hebdige seems to suggest that our real needs are buried beneath

something far more invasive, our ideological understanding. For Hebdige, one way that we can see this ideological formation taking place is through the subsumption of subcultures into mainstream culture (p. 94). Taking a subculture that threatens the established ideology and way of things and making it a part of the mainstream culture allows those with power to give the public what they want by furthering the capitalist needs — economic gain through consumption. “Each new subculture established new trends, generated new looks and sounds which feed back into the appropriate industries” (p. 95). Subcultures are threatening in their original form to capitalist industries because they create a “noise” (p. 133) in the everyday way of things. This “noise” is created by “repositioning and recontextualizing commodities” (p. 102). Through designing new ways that commodities are used, subcultures allow for diversions from the established ideology, However, because subcultures remain in the established capitalist economic structure, they are easily acquired and transformed to be a part of the mainstream culture.

More broadly, this ideological structure remains in place because folks are taught that through consumption they can find and define who they are. “The need for social identity could be reinterpreted as the need to find individuality within and not over and against society” (O’Connor, 1984, p. 165). Culture itself is a construct that celebrates these values of “self-realization, self-gratification, and an obsessive search for novelty” (p. 167-168). All of these values can be found and realized through consumption. Novelty is consistently introduced through the addition of new products or subcultures into mainstream culture, as James O’Connor explores in *The Process of Consumption*:

Within the production process there originated boredom, aging, fear, sickness, insecurity, and loss of privacy which constituted the subjective moment of alienated labor. Also in

production originated the commodities designed to alleviate boredom, aging, etc., and restore privacy. Illusory promises to alleviate boredom, slow down aging, etc. were sold with the commodity (p. 168).

The mass production of physical products in industrialization were accompanied by the creation of social needs. Further, the needs that the capitalist economy and production processes create can be met by purchasing and using the commodities created by it.

This culture created and maintained by mass production through industrialization expands beyond pure economic control. The larger goal behind this economic structure is political power (Eagleton, 2000, p. 7). Only through lasting political power can the economic system continue to meet the needs that it has created and perpetuated through generations of patriotic citizens. So, the question then becomes, where does the media fit into this capitalist economic puzzle? Media become the source of “familiar and formulaic narratives.” (van Zoonen, 1994, p. 37). As such, these narratives are able to connect the accessible and the inaccessible, mediating the world of fame and celebrity for those that can only dream of these worlds in their everyday lives. According to Liesbet van Zoonen (1994), media becomes a part of the advertising structure outlined by Williams. Media fulfill the “magic” through “myth”:

In other words the ritual approach to communication focuses on the construction of a community through rituals, shared histories, beliefs and values. In such a view, media create an artificial though nonetheless symbolic order that operates to provide not information but confirmation, not to alter attitudes or change minds but to represent an underlying order of things, not to perform functions but to manifest an ongoing and fragile social process (p. 37).

The goal of media organizations becomes maintaining the order of things, maintaining the power dynamics. They do this through reassuring the consumer that their needs are being met. This use of culture by capitalism is not completely uncontested. As, “culture is neither the ‘authentic’ practice of the ‘people’ nor simply a means of ‘manipulation’ by capitalism, but the site of active local struggle, every and anywhere (Chen, 1996, p. 312). Instead, cultures are being questioned and critiqued by individuals every day. Through the investigation of the maintenance of craft culture through branding, this dissertation seeks to critique the perpetuation of manipulated narratives of authenticity with the goal of maintaining or gaining cultural power.

Therefore, the empirical study of this dissertation is an investigation of how craft breweries in the United States brand themselves as “authentic.” Using craft brewery website data, Facebook data, Instagram data and TikTok data, I look at how craft breweries brand themselves as “authentic” in the midst of constantly changing consumer expectations of authenticity. When attempting to brand an organization or product as “authentic,” producers must take into consideration that authenticity is socially constructed and that the brand or product must constantly be maintained to reflect these fluid cultural and social changes (Edwards, 2010, p. 193). Historically, a craft’s connection to its maker through name or craft space was not emphasized or valued. The Renaissance’s focus on material culture brought significance to these features and the branding of the maker and associated craft space (Sennett, 2008, p. 68). As has been illustrated, capitalism’s focus on industrialization has reinforced the value of material culture and therefore branding.

Important to this investigation of the branding of craft culture is a distinction between commodification and branding, as will be argued in chapter 1, many craft makers center their claims of craft around narratives of oppositionality to industrialization. Although commodities

are branded, the processes of branding and commodification are distinct. Commodities live in the realm of economics, brands live between the economic and the cultural. Brands use culture as much as they become a part of culture, as Sarah Banet-Weiser (2012) argues:

More than just the object itself, a brand is the perception — the series of images, themes, morals, values, feelings, and sense of authenticity conjured by the product itself. The brand is the essence of what will be experienced; the brand is a promise as much as a practicality (p. 4).

Branding is what gives commodities cultural value. This cultural value is contained in the way commodities look, are talked about, are packaged and are distributed.

Further, branding is essential for commodities to differentiate themselves in a competitive market (Banet-Weiser, 2012, p. 6). “In the contemporary US, building a brand is about building an affective, authentic *relationship* with a consumer, one based — just like a relationship between two people — on the accumulation of memories, emotions, personal narratives, and expectations” (p. 8). In contemporary society, there are many spaces outside of the packaging and purchasing of a product where a brand can be built and maintained. These spaces, both physical and virtual, require the labor of the brand and the labor of the consumer to reinforce the cultural value of the product (p. 7-8). “This transformation of culture of everyday living into brand culture signals a broader shift, from ‘authentic’ culture to the branding of authenticity. Contemporary brand cultures are so thoroughly imbricated with culture at large that they become indistinguishable from it” (p. 5). The connection between the economic and the cultural within the process of branding is most clear when looking at the role of the consumer. The object is branded with cultural values that are then experienced by the consumer when they purchase the object. This economic exchange reinforces the value of this branding (p. 7). Authenticity must be

branded rather than solely claimed because overt claims of authenticity are instantly questioned by consumers (Schifeling and Demetry, 2021, p. 134). Therefore, authenticity becomes a branding mechanism of capitalist organizations where affective consumer relationships are built through the development and ongoing communication of “memories, emotions, personal narratives, and expectations that resonate in a felt ‘organic’ way (Banet-Weiser, 2021, p. 141). Organizations seek to connect with consumers on a personal level, connecting the accessible and inaccessible worlds previously discussed.

Because the “authentic” is socially constructed and up for negotiation at all times, organizations invoke more than one type of authenticity when branding themselves and their products. In the same way, consumers evaluate claims of authenticity using more than one set of expectations regarding authenticity (Theodossopoulos, 2013, p. 355). Consumers value products for both what they do and what they mean. Therefore, consumers evaluate both the physical and nonphysical aspects of an object. The nonphysical aspects of an object are tied to the object’s symbolic value (Frake, 2017, p. 3931). “Symbolic goods also allow audiences to enact their deeply held moral or ethical beliefs” (p. 3931). The branding of “authentic” products seeks not just to sell the qualities of the product itself but also how “the objects would contribute to the well-being of those who bought them” (Rosenblatt, 2013, p. 608). Commercially, authenticity can be used to brand a product and/or organization as appealing for consumers looking for a product marked by characteristics considered to be authentic. “People who see themselves as authentic, or would like to see themselves as authentic, may use goods from authentic producers to enhance their self-image” (Frake, 2017, p. 3933). These “authentic” characteristics can distinguish the producer and the consumer as being a member of a specific social or cultural

group (Edwards, 2010, p. 196), giving significance to their adoption and use by cultural groups that are considered to be a subculture or counterculture.

Historically, products were marked as “authentic” to designate them as genuine. Increasingly, products are marked as “authentic” to designate them as differentiated from commercial brands (Beverland et al., 2008, p. 5), allowing consumers an escape from those on the commercial market:

Authentic products and experiences allow consumers to momentarily escape from a commercial, exploitative consumer world, and if relevant enough in their brand values and personality can connect with consumers on a deep level, even becoming part of the culture itself (Gundlach and Neville, 2012, p. 486).

Claims of authenticity keep the hope alive that there is something beyond the commercial, something that contains within it cultural and economic value (Botterill, 2007, p. 106). The “authentic” becomes socially progressive when the “authentic” is branded as morally superior to the “inauthentic” produced in modern society (O’Neill et al., 2014, p. 587). Brands considered to be authentic are developed through messaging that emphasizes connections to history and place, while decentering profit and/or growth motivations (p. 558). The downsides of craft, such as the fact that products are not uniform and are more expensive to produce, become aspects of their branding as small-batch and one-of-a-kind (Kolb, 2020, p. 62).

Methodology

In contrast to many empirical studies conducted on authenticity in the craft beer industry to date (Alexander, 2009; Beverland et al., 2008; Carroll and Wheaton, 2009; Duggan, 2015; Frake, 2017; Hernandez-Fernandez and Lewis, 2019; Hubbard, 2019; Koontz and Chapman, 2019; Konnelly, 2020; Money, 2017; O’Neill et al., 2014; Pozner et al., 2021; Spracklen et al.,

2013; Thurnell-Read, 2019; Verhaal and Dobrev, 2020; Verhaal et al., 2017), the purpose of this dissertation study is not to propose a conceptualization of authenticity or a branding guide to establishing an authentic organization, which are the two main objectives of these studies. Rather, I seek to garner an in-depth understanding of the authenticity narratives being branded and employed to tell the story of individual craft breweries and the larger craft beer community through engaging with the concept of authenticity in popular craft culture and through the lens of critical theory, a theoretical perspective largely missing from these studies listed above. The collection and examination of the stories craft breweries tell about themselves and the industry more broadly exist in a popular culture narrative about the authenticity discount that comes with selling out.

Jones et al. (2005) state there are three basic question central to developing an understanding of the “authentic:” 1) what strategies are being used to develop definitions and claims of authenticity, 2) how are these strategies being used to maintain and/or redefine the “authentic” and 3) who is in a position of power in these ongoing negotiations of definition and redefinition (p. 894). In a similar vein, Rickly-Boyd (2012) contends that there are three central questions we should ask about authenticity: 1) who needs authenticity and why, 2) how is authenticity used and 3) what does authenticity do (p. 269-270). In seeking to answer this final question, Rickly-Boyd connects authenticity and aura, arguing the authenticity of the object is found in its connection to history and tradition, while the authenticity of the experience is found in the engagement with aura (p. 271). Thinking through these and other contributions of scholars engaging with critical theory to study cultural phenomena, my investigation of the role of authenticity in popular culture is guided by the following three research questions:

Research Question #1: What are the philosophical and economical contributions of

critical theory to the theorizations of authenticity in culture?

Research Question #2: What are the ways that craft culture is informed by authenticity narratives and how is this related to narratives of “selling out”?

Research Question #3: What are the distinguishing aspirations of craft breweries that set them apart from mass-producers of beer in the United States?

Cultural studies does not claim one or even a set of methodologies. Rather, it is a “choice of practice, that is, is pragmatic, strategic and self-reflexive” (Nelson, Treichler and Grossberg, 1992, p. 2). Qualitative content analysis is used as the primary methodology in this dissertation study. “Qualitative research is based on the belief that knowledge is constructed by people in an ongoing fashion as they engage in and make meaning of an activity, experience, or phenomenon” (Merriam and Tisdell, 2015, p. 23). Various digital communication texts created by craft beer producers are examined to develop an understanding of the characteristics that distinguish craft beer production from the same making processes in the world of mass-produced beer. First, I have qualitatively coded websites from breweries in the United States that are designated as craft breweries by the Brewers Association. As of September 2021, there were 8,833 craft breweries listed on the website. On their websites, I have specifically examined the about section and any other areas where they might discuss their mission and/or organizational aspirations. I have used simple random sampling with a random number generator to determine which 100 of the brewery websites I analyzed.

Second, I have qualitatively coded Facebook, Instagram and TikTok posts from craft breweries in the United States. These are three of the most popular social media platforms based on the number of active users (Statista, 2021). These three social media platforms were chosen based on their differences in engagement with and advertisement to consumers. Although all platforms allow for likes and comments, breweries lean on Facebook events as an additional source of engagement, Instagram emphasizes visual appeal and TikTok focuses on video production. My coding of this qualitative data takes into consideration the differences in engagement type. Considering that the same content could be posted on all three platforms, separate random sampling sets of 100 for each social media platform have been created from the list of 8,833 discussed above. These random sampling sets were generated using the Random Sequence Generator on random.org. The sampling sets can be found in Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Duplicates were removed for exact address matches; however, if a brewery of the same name had more than one location, all locations were included in the data set, even if they had the same website and/or social media page(s). Also, if a brewery had two different names at the same address, both names were included in the data set as separate entries. Breweries that were temporarily closed were included in the data set; however, breweries that were permanently closed were not included. For the social media pages, in order for a brewery's page to be added to the data set, they needed to have at least one post. This was especially relevant for TikTok, as many breweries had an account but no posts. I anticipate that this was a part of best practices for anticipating the need to use TikTok as a branding tool in the future if the brewery's target audience begins to use TikTok regularly. Social media data was studied from January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2021, a five year period.

Kvale (2007) summarizes the ethical issues that must be considered at each stage of the research process (p. 27). When in the brainstorming stage of a research study, it is important to think beyond the academic value of the study and work to improve the lives of those being investigated. This goal will be discussed throughout this essay by emphasizing the importance of integrating a critical lens into the research process. This critical lens is guided by Sharan Merriam and Elizabeth Tisdell's (2015) conceptualization:

In critical inquiry the goal of the study in its findings or results is to critique and challenge, to transform, and to analyze power relations. In most critical studies, the hope is often that people will take action as a result of the study...Thus critical research is not a 'type' of qualitative research...Rather, critical research is about a worldview, and this worldview and the tools of analysis from this perspective can be applied to many types of qualitative research (p. 59-60).

Implementing a critical lens from the beginning helps to ensure that the research will serve as a platform for folks to take action and improve the conditions of those being studied, while maintaining ethicality in the research (Boser, 2007, p. 1061). "In-depth qualitative inquiry can illuminate system and systemic issues and potential solutions" (Patton, 2015, p. 8). This critical lens assumes that reality is shaped by historical, cultural, racial, gender, political and economic conditions that are driven by racism, sexism, oppression and inequality (Blee and Currier, 2011, p. 403; Brennen, 2017, p. 9; Crotty, 1998, p. 59-60; Iphofen and Tolich, 2018, p. 111; Lindlof and Taylor, 2017, p. 47).

Validity in this study, and in studies within social sciences more broadly, is defined by whether or not the study investigated what I set out to investigate (Kvale, 2007, p. 125). Creswell (2016) goes as far as to argue that validity in qualitative research should be called verification

instead (p. 195). Further, issues of validity can be avoided by approaching data with a critical lens, questioning what I produce from this data in an iterative manner (Kvale, 2007, p. 126; Merriam and Tisdell, 2015, p. 60), once again guided by Sharan Merriam and Elizabeth Tisdell's (2015) conceptualization:

In critical inquiry the goal is to critique and challenge, to transform and empower...Those who engage in critical research frame their research questions in terms of power - who has it, how it's negotiated, what structures in society reinforce the current distribution of power, and so on (p. 10).

As described throughout this introduction, critical inquiry is central to developing a rigorous qualitative research study. Reliability does not ensure validity and validity does not ensure reliability. Rather, each is necessary for a rigorous research study and each must be considered separately as well as jointly (Kirk and Miller, 1986, p. 20). Further, most scholars argue that "reliability is always a precursor to validity" (Potter and Levine-Donnerstein, 1999, p. 272). Generalizability in data analysis is not about generalizing findings to a broader population, which is typically the case for quantitative studies. Rather, generalizability refers to a reader's ability to connect to and understand the experiences the researcher has provided (Seidman, 2013, p. 54). "The logic and power of statistical probability sampling derives from its purpose: generalization. The logic and power of qualitative purposeful sampling derives from the emphasis on in-depth understanding of specific cases: information-rich cases" (Patton, 2015, p. 53). There are, however, two principles that qualitative researchers can use to appeal to a more "quantitative" definition of generalizability. These are completeness and similarity/dissimilarity. Completeness refers to the study's reaching a saturation point in data collection. Similarity/dissimilarity refers

to interviewing different viewpoints and the same viewpoints, or different and similar sites (Rubin and Rubin, 1995, p. 73).

Positionality

This research design also includes my positionality and/or reflexivity as a researcher and a craft beer “fan” and is overall critical in nature (Madison, 2012, p. 8; Merriam and Tisdell, 2015, p. 64-65; Patton, 2015, p. 70). Michael Patton (2015) describes the centrality of positionality in qualitative research more broadly, stating:

Qualitative inquiry is personal. The research is the instrument of inquiry. What brings you to an inquiry matters. Your background, experience, training, skills, interpersonal competence, capacity for empathy, cross-cultural sensitivity, and how you, as a person engage in fieldwork and analysis - these things undergird the credibility of your findings (p. 3).

Positionality is central to establishing credibility and revealing why the research matters to me and should matter to other people. I have honestly reflected and contemplated this section of my dissertation at every stage. I have engaged in conversations with both scholars and family members, read countless positionality statements in articles and theses focused on craft beer and spent many hours looking at field notes and photos from my craft beer explorations over the past three years. Colleagues have told me to reflect on methodological texts and guidelines, articles and theses have taught me to be transparent and move forward and friends and family members have urged me to just be myself. So, in honor of craft being an ongoing endeavor of skill and knowledge through experience, I will take all three viewpoints into consideration while reflecting on my positionality throughout this dissertation.

In the methodology section, I provided background for why my reflection on positionality is so essential to research in general, but especially for a project so qualitatively dependent on data from a culture I am intimately a part of. At the end of this section, I will briefly, and transparently, summarize my place, space and tastes in conducting this research. Lastly, at the beginning of the six main chapters of my dissertation you will find a brief story about my experiences in and around craft beer culture. These stories are meant to provide you with my positionality in regard to the topic being discussed, and in many cases the story that I was constantly being reminded of and reflecting on while writing that chapter. These stories are not meant to serve as a substitute or distraction from the theoretically engaged empirical research discussed. Rather, these stories should allow you to understand where I, the researcher and writer, am coming from when engaging with these texts and examples. A window into my state of mind.

As I mentioned, in the spirit of craft beer research written by scholars before me, I would now like to briefly and transparently summarize my place, space and tastes in conducting this research. First, all of this research and the personal stories described throughout were conducted and/or experienced in areas throughout the United States. This dissertation is a study based in the United States for many reasons, the three main ones being I live in the United States, no external funding was used for this dissertation and definitions of craft beer in the United States are built upon by researchers and organizations throughout the world (The Society of Independent Brewers, 2022; Ontario Craft Brewers, 2022; BC Craft Brewers Guild, 2022). Second, because of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all of the empirical research in this dissertation was done virtually. In the future, as I will discuss in the limitations and future research considerations sections, in-person research in these craft beer branding spaces is vital to develop a better

understanding of how constructs of “authentic” craft are being created and maintained in these spaces. Lastly, I consider myself an active member of craft beer culture. At least once per week you can find me at a brewery, usually after biking, hiking or skiing. Many of my social interactions take place in craft beer spaces. Lastly, in terms of my tastes⁵, I am a New England IPA⁶ and Barrel-Aged Imperial Stout⁷ fan; however, these personal tastes in no way bias my analysis of the empirical data collected. In the spirit of full transparency, I have provided data on which breweries in my random sample sets I have visited and/or consumed beer from.

Terminology

Authenticity

Craft authenticity is a socially constructed concept largely influenced by a commitment to quality — through careful attention to ingredients, materials, knowledge and skill — above all other motives, most notably a history of economic motives related to profit and growth. This definition of authenticity is based on an extensive review of the literature connecting craft beer, craft production and the branding of authenticity. This definition

⁵ The reason I am transparently explaining my craft beer tastes here will become relevant as you read about the history of craft beer production in the United States, one that is heavily tied to the desire for innovative beer and to explore flavors outside of the “beer flavored beer” available on the mass-market. As I will illustrate, post-Prohibition in the United States, for many reasons, led to the “lagerization” of beer, a phenomenon that valued purity of flavor and mass-marketability of product over the desire to explore innovative flavors. My inclusion of the beer types I tend to drink here is meant to serve as an acknowledgement that I am a typical craft beer drinker in the sense that I am interested in innovation and new flavor combinations. However, these personal tastes in no way biased the collection of craft brewery digital data for breweries that specialized in traditional lagers.

⁶ “New England India Pale Ales are a style of IPA invented in Vermont in the early 2010s. They are characterized by juicy, citrus, and floral flavors, with a more subtle and less piney hop taste than typical IPAs. They also have a smooth consistency or “mouthfeel,” and a hazy appearance. These characteristics are achieved using a combination of brewing techniques including the use of particular strains of years, the timing of adding the hops, and adjusting the chemistry of the water. Although the style has become popular among New England brewers, New England IPAs need not be brewed in New England. They are sometimes known as Northeastern IPAs or hazy IPAs” (UnTappd, n.d.).

⁷ “The imperial stout is the strongest in alcohol and body of the stouts. Black in color, these beers typically have an extremely rich malty flavor and aroma with full, sweet malt character. Bitterness can come from roasted malts or hop additions” (UnTappd, n.d.). Barrel-aged refers to the fact that the beer has been aged in some type of alcohol barrel, typically whiskey but I have also had beers aged in Mezcal, Tequila, Rum and wine barrels.

was used to guide the empirical inquiry that will be connected to the literature review and theoretical engagement embedded throughout this dissertation.

Craft Beer

Craft beer in this dissertation is defined by the Brewers Association's current definition of craft beer producers. As of 2022, this definition is as follows: "An American craft brewer is a small and independent brewer. Small: Annual production of 6 million barrels of beer or less (approximately 3 percent of U.S. annual sales). Beer production is attributed to a brewer according to rules of alternating proprietorships. Independent: Less than 25 percent of the craft brewery is owned or controlled (or equivalent economic interest) by a beverage alcohol industry member that is not itself a craft brewer. Brewer: Has a TTB Brewer's Notice and makes beer" (Brewers Association, n.d.).

Craft Makers

Borrowing from the terminology used by Luckman (2015) in their study of the creative economy, I will be referring to folks who make or are involved in the production of crafts throughout this dissertation as craft makers.

Craft Space

Rather than using the term workshop to describe the place where craft makers engage in making processes, this dissertation uses the term craft space. The purpose of this is two-fold. As Sennett (2008) reiterates throughout *The Craftsman*, the term workshop carries with it a long history of power dynamics, including religious ones, and traditions with and around the family. Because this dissertation is not focused on home brewing or the relationships between craft makers in an individual craft space — although both of these areas will be discussed in their relation to craft brewery branding — this history is not as

essential to understanding the space where craft work takes place as are the spaces where branding takes place. Secondly, and much more importantly, “craft workshop” narrows the focus of the possibilities for where craft beer production and branding take place. As I will describe in the coming chapters, craft beer branding occurs in a wide variety of places and spaces, only one being the workshop itself. Sennett argues this in a way as well, showing that the craft workshop is a social space, and conversations and branding work need not happen within the workshop to be impactful to that space (p. 73). This reflection on workshop versus space may seem mundane or inconsequential; however, as I will argue, the labor of branding that occurs outside of the workshop itself is as important as that which occurs within. Further, craft beer’s impact on places occurs throughout the space, not just the individual brewery.

Making Processes

In addition, when discussing the production process of craft makers, I will be using the phrase making processes. This phrase emphasizes the labor involved in craft making that transcends actual production of the product, including, but not limited to emotional and promotional labor to differentiate craft products in the market.

Mass-Produced Beer

“Mass-producers” will be used throughout this dissertation study to refer to any beer organization that does not fall within the Brewers Association’s current definition of craft beer producers. As of 2022, this definition is as follows: “An American craft brewer is a small and independent brewer. Small: Annual production of 6 million barrels of beer or less (approximately 3 percent of U.S. annual sales). Beer production is attributed to a brewer according to rules of alternating proprietorships. Independent: Less than 25

percent of the craft brewery is owned or controlled (or equivalent economic interest) by a beverage alcohol industry member that is not itself a craft brewer. Brewer: Has a TTB Brewer's Notice and makes beer" (Brewers Association, n.d.).

Chapter 1: History and Narrative

“Craft beer emerged from the wider cultural turn against global capitalism and commodification of culture broadly, and where the search for authenticity through consumption marks the primary way by which consumers come to make meaning in their lives” (Kuehn and Parker, 2021, p. 520).

This is my second WeldWerks tour. The first time I did it because I was truly curious about the history and wanted to know more about the company and what they were planning for the future. After I found out that they give out a free, hefty pour of a Medianoche at the end I committed to going on another. Medianoche is WeldWerks’ flagship barrel-aged imperial stout, and on that first tour I had the Peanut Butter Cup Medianoche, a beer that previously had been reserved for pretty high-profile craft beer events, ones that are out of my beer budget price range. So, this time I was excited for the end of the tour, the coveted Medianoche. I ordered a full pour of a new release beer to prepare for the next thirty minutes of information I had already heard; however, I was happy to find a new tour guide, one that has been around since before the start, when Neil Fisher (Co-Founder) was dabbling in homebrewing. So, I paid a bit more attention than I had planned on. The part of this tour that surprised me the most was that their commitment to quality goes to the extreme, entire barrels of beer that just didn’t work out down the drain. In the barrel-aged stout world this is typically 12-18 months of time and \$1000s down the literal drain. I was not the only one in the tour group surprised, as someone stated “I’m happy to take anything you don’t think is good enough off your hands,” at which point everyone giggled in agreement. This narrative of quality over profit really stuck with me and made me complain less about that 6-ounce pour of Coffee Maple Medianoche I just paid \$12 for.

[Shortened Field Notes, February 29, 2020 - WeldWerks Brewing in Greeley, CO]

The history of craft beer production in the United States begins long before the term craft was used to differentiate innovative brewing recipes from the increasingly bland mass-produced brews on the market in the late twentieth century. As will be explored in this chapter and referenced throughout this dissertation, the craft beer industry that we see operating today engages in narratives that set them apart from mass-produced beer for a variety of political, economic and cultural reasons. Politically, Prohibition blocked strides that the beer industry was making to diversify production and create innovative recipes. Further, legislation legalizing homebrewing was not passed until 1978, decades after Prohibition ended. Economically, laws around who could distribute beer greatly impacted the ability for craft brewers to get their product out into the market. Additionally, mass-producers to this day actively inhibit distributors from working with breweries other than their own. And, culturally, the norm for branding craft products as distinct for more than a century has been tied to the British Arts and Crafts Movement, which emphasized specific cultural goals for craft. As this chapter will elaborate upon, craft breweries today rely on storytelling as a means for creating and maintaining their brands. This history and the related narratives will be discussed in terms of narratives of oppositionality, ingredients, taste, space, place, tools, skills, knowledge, community and collaboration in the following chapters of this dissertation study.

A Brief History of Craft Beer in the United States

The history of craft beer in the United States spans the history of the country itself. As Theresa McCulla from the Smithsonian's National Museum of American History has been quoted saying, "If you want to talk about the history of immigration in America, or urbanization or the expansion of transportation networks, really any subject that you want to explore, you can

talk about it through beer” (Shapiro and Kenin, 2017). An interactive timeline of the history of beer in CraftBeer.com showcases the big political and cultural moments in beer, the first being in 1800 BC where “Hymn to Ninkasi, the Sumerian goddess of beer is inscribed on a tablet, about 4000 years after men first left evidence of brewing activity” (CraftBeer.com, n.d.). The global history of beer is extensive, which is why it isn’t hard to believe that all stories can be told through the lens of beer. The history of beer in the United States is particularly interesting because of the waves production has gone through, beginning with homebrewing, leading to mass-production, to secret home brewing during Prohibition, back to mass-production and now with a focus back on small-batch production (Shapiro and Kenin, 2017). “Authentic” beer in the United States was regulated as early as the nineteenth century when *American Magazine* reported on which lagers were simply imitations (Money, 2017, p. 419-420). Clearly, this does not even take into account pre-European America, as Native Americans brewed maize-based brews (Beer Institute, n.d.).

For the purposes of this brief history, I will provide an overview of post-prohibition beer production in the United States, leading to a conversation surrounding the recent craft beer resurgence. “The 21st Amendment, which rolled back Prohibition in the United States, was ratified on December 5, 1933” (Malin, 2018). During Prohibition, many beer producers continued operating and making other products. So, these breweries were able to start back up beer production relatively quickly. Some of these beers are still around today, such as Yuengling, Old Milwaukee and Pabst Blue Ribbon (Malin, 2018). For decades, Prohibition left a lasting impact on American beer production. At the peak of American brewing 1871, there were 4131 breweries in operation. In 1970, there were only 89 (Collelouri, 2015).

This all began to change in 1978 when homebrewing once again became legal in the United States. Beer experimentation took off exponentially (Collelouri, 2015), and there are now over 8000 breweries in America (Conway, 2021). In 1982, the Great American Beer Festival began, originally being a part of the annual American Homebrewers Association meeting (Great American Beer Festival, 2017). The Great American Beer Festival has since become the largest ticketed beer festival in the United States and is known for bringing together breweries both new and old. Craft beer fans from around the world show up to drink rare beers from beloved breweries and chat with brewers and fellow beer fans in a party atmosphere where beer is being poured everywhere you look (Breslouer, 2016). This festival may be the biggest of them all, but it is also a place where breweries can try out new products with the opportunity to gather feedback from folks that know and love craft beer.

This brings us to Goose Island Brewing. Goose Island Brewing opened in 1988 with a clear business plan designed and led by John Hall, a successful businessman (Noel, 2018, p. 23). Hall had led many businesses before this one and knew that he could make a lot of money by introducing Chicagoans to craft beer, a beverage he knew from experience folks could fall in love with. In the process of making people fall in love with craft beer in Chicago, he and his son Greg changed what people knew beer could be, with the Bourbon County Stout in 1995. This is the beer that forced the Great American Beer Festival to create a new category, more than once (p. 47). The beer has since developed a cult following, and people across the country get in line early at their local liquor stores every year on Black Friday to collect the latest release (D.J., 2020).

The overarching story of Goose Island Brewing is in many ways a story of the American Dream being realized. Goose Island and many craft breweries throughout the 1980s and 1990s

fought hard to get their beers on the shelves of local liquor stores and ultimately into the hands of customers. Following Prohibition, the three-tier distribution system was developed, which is still widely used throughout the United States today. This distribution system placed power to decide which products are distributed and in which locations in the hands of the distributor, not necessarily based on consumer wants and needs producer or the consumer (Money, 2017, p. 424-425). Local distribution was easy enough to maintain without the assistance of distribution companies; however, distribution outside the local area required contracts with regional alcohol distributors, and most of those had non-compete clauses with big brands like Molson Coors Beverage Company⁸ and Anheuser-Busch InBev⁹ (Noel, 2018, p. 80). This, among other reasons, is why so many craft beer producers and consumers felt betrayed in 2011 when Goose Island Brewing sold their business to Anheuser-Busch InDev, as explained by Josh Noel (2018):

Goose Island's sale in 2011 to Anheuser-Busch wasn't just a sale to the biggest beer company in the world — it was a sale to the company that had spent decades thwarting the American beer industry with confusion, trickery, and dullness. To Anheuser-Busch, less choice was less competition. It was more market share. When American beer was nothing but stadium sponsorship and Super Bowl commercials, Anheuser-Busch was able to account for nearly one of every two beers sold in the United States. Then came craft beer. American beer drinkers discovered variety. Tastes diversified. Anheuser-Busch could no longer simply suffocate competition. It needed craft beer. So it bought Goose Island (p. xi).

⁸ Molson Coors Beverage Company had 22% of the United States beer market share in 2020 (Statista, 2021).

⁹ Anheuser-Busch InBev had 41% of the United States beer market share in 2020 (Statista, 2021).

And with this history, the definition of craft, the difficulties with distribution and the betrayal of selling out have become the narrative of the recent craft beer resurgence in America.

The Recent Craft Beer Resurgence in the United States

Legislation legalizing homebrewing in the United State spurred an interest in experimenting with new ingredients and flavor combinations. These impacts from the late 1970s continue today, as a primary path to becoming involved in a craft brewery is by first homebrewing (Koontz and Chapman, 2019, p. 353). Kellie Money (2017) explains the underlying consumer-specific reasons behind this homebrewing resurgence in the United States:

The resurgence in homebrewing was a response to the lack of variety in the market, as light, domestic lager had saturated supermarket shelves and bar selections. The only way beer lovers could gain access to different styles of beer was to brew their own (Money, 2017, p. 425).

Therefore, in many ways, homebrewing blurs the lines between consumption and production (Drakopoulou Dodd et al., 2018, p. 641). The consumer first and homebrewer next roots of the craft beer industry largely influence its concentration on the craft themes of “hands-on, artisanal, small-batch and experimental” (Dodd et al., 2021, p. 10).

It is impossible to talk about the history of beer, and specifically the history of creating classification criteria for beer, without at least mentioning Reinheitsgebot. In 1516, the Reinheitsgebot was instituted in Bavaria as a beer “purity law” permitting beer to be made with only barley, hops and water (CraftBeer.com, n.d.). Although beer in the United States is not legally defined by any rules like this, other types of alcohol, such as Bourbon, are (American Bourbon Association, n.d.). These strict definitions are in place for a variety of reasons, including government regulation and insurance for the production of “authentic” products. It is

also worth noting that although German lagers have become stigmatized in the United States due to the mass-production of pilsners, there is still much recognition and celebration of these German roots, especially through Oktoberfest events. The best example I found of bringing these two cultures together comes from 12 Fox Beer Co. from Dripping Springs, Texas. One of their employees is shown wearing a shirt that says “Prost y’all” in a TikTok post (May 17, 2021).

The beer industry in America has had a similar history in trying to differentiate the different types of beer being made, with the *superior* product being dubbed *craft*. This connection is explained in further detail by Pete Brown (2020):

But there’s a big difference between talking about brewing as a craft or beers being crafted, and creating the term ‘craft beer.’ Rather than talking about the discipline of brewing in general as a craft, when we designate some specific beers as craft beers, we are attempting to create a distinction between different types of beer, suggesting that some beers are crafted and others are not, or at least that some beers are more crafted than others (Brown, 2020, p. 47).

The history of the motivation behind the most recent resurgence in craft beer in the United States is central to understanding the overwhelming discourse of economic independence being tied to claiming the tag of craft (Money, 2017, p. 418). Luckman (2015) describes three different waves of interest in craft products and processes in the global West over the past century and a half. These three waves are: 1) the British Arts and Crafts Movement of the late nineteenth century, 2) the countercultural hippie movement of the 1960s and 1970s and 3) the current movement (p. 17-22). Our current wave of the craft movement is characterized by nostalgia, a renewed interest in the production process and environmental concerns (p. 23-24).

A new wave of interest in craft making and the consumption of craft products was met with an exponential increase in the number of breweries operating in the United States. Bartosz Wojtyra (2020) explains this craft beer revolution in further detail:

The ‘craft beer revolution’ is a term proposed in the literature to describe the phenomenon of a dynamic increase in the number of craft breweries and their new products, as well as the popularity of craft beer. It is a concept defining the fashion for consuming such products (Wojtyra, 2020, p. 82).

Although the Brewers Association, located in Boulder, Colorado, only oversees the craft beer industry in the United States, many countries look to their definition of a craft brewery in order to maintain and regulate their own craft beer industries. “By rejecting the mass produced industrial lagers and experimenting with unique flavours and traditional brewing methods, the craft beer industry offers consumers choice, the potential for self-expression and status” (Mathews and Picton, 2014, p. 338). The culture that has been established by craft breweries in the United States is therefore heavily influenced by this history of establishing and maintaining values of craft while distancing one’s brewery from the mass-producers and avoiding the temptation to sell-out. Keith Gribbins (2016) describes both the motivation for craft breweries avoiding this temptation in further detail:

The money. The distribution. The marketing prowess. The buying power. All of those tantalizing attributes that come with selling a craft beer brand to one of the world’s giant beer conglomerates also comes with a small downside — you gotta get the fuck out of the club. Over the last few months, associations, guilds and even festivals are beginning to ostracize craft brewing businesses that ‘sell out’ to the likes of Anheuser-Busch InBev, Miller Coors, Constellation and beyond (Gribbins, 2016).

Selling out is not just considered a betrayal of the fellow breweries that have worked alongside you to establish their business in the face of impossible competition with mass-producers. It is a betrayal of craft beer culture itself. Those breweries that betray this counterculture are no longer welcome to engage with it.

In conclusion, the history of craft beer in the United States is influenced by the broader history of craft and the worry of a loss of craft in the face of industrialization, the halt to innovative beer production during Prohibition, the legalization of homebrewing in the late 1970s, a fight for distribution networks and the recent resurgence of craft breweries with over 8000 operating in the United States today. Much of this success, as explained by Sarah Dodd and colleagues (2021), comes from innovation and diverse flavors:

It has been argued that the absence of linkages to any tradition helped brewers to express their identity and creativity in production, shaping a hyper-differentiated product. This hyper-differentiation strategy of continual innovation and experimentation, producing novel beers to meet passionate consumer demand for diversity, authenticity and quality is a defining characteristic of the sector (Dodd et al., 2021, p. 3).

As will be explored throughout this dissertation, there are many factors that have led to the success of craft breweries over the past decade, including commitment to an overarching oppositionality narrative, devotion to local ingredients and communities, tapping into the rise of interest in craft consumer tastes and an extremely collaborative industry environment excited to create ongoing opportunities for skill and knowledge development. However, there are also many issues of power and labor that the industry is working to overcome through consistent “authentic” craft narratives aimed at maintaining and oftentimes growing market share.

Communicating “Authentic” Craft Brand Narratives

To brand a product as special or unique in a market with many choices, organizations must establish and communicate brand stories that are contained within products (Williams et al., 2020, p. 558). Through establishing cultural identity norms focused on political, economic and/or social issues and/or beliefs, certain cultural industries can institutionalize these issues and/or beliefs (Stoffelen, 2020, p. 3). Therefore, we should not just be concerned with which stories are being told about the history and quality of a cultural product but also with how these stories are being told and how they are becoming the identity of the industry itself (p. 4). Authenticity claims can be communicated and reinforced through developing a brand story that incorporates the reasons the brand should be seen as relevant and high-quality (Beverland, 2005, p. 1003). When we consider the role of advertising in branding products as “authentic,” oftentimes stories of the enchanted or magical are communicated to invoke “authentic” experiences with a product (Hartmann and Ostberg, 2013, p. 883). Hartmann and Ostberg (2013) find that there are five ways that craft producers communicate discourses of enchantment in an effort to mediate authenticity. These are by: 1) connecting a brand to the craft makers and the making process, 2) communicating the brand’s dedication to creating a craft product, 3) connecting the craft product to history and tradition of craft makers and craft processes, 4) romanticizing the craft process and 5) associating the brand with other craft makers or products deemed “authentic” (p. 896).

The production of authenticity narratives is more than just a branding exercise for craft breweries. These narratives become performed by producers, and, eventually, they become communicated by customers that have bought into the cultural value of the craft brewery (Thurnell-Read, 2019, p. 1463). Storytelling acts as the means for which craft breweries can create and defend their authenticity (p. 1464). Discursive practices of craft beer producers and

consumers establish the underlying culture, marked by messaging aimed at creating discussions of democracy, authenticity and prestige (Konnolly, 2020, p. 69). One of the ways that craft beer culture establishes a discourse reflecting prestige and elite character is through the appropriation of terminology previously preserved for the discussion of wine (p. 69).

Depending on the stage a brewery is in on their roots to expansion journey, different stories are told to claim their “authentic” character. Many craft breweries use narratives of self-discovery and self-expression in order to reveal the connections between the beer and those brewing it (Thurnell-Read, 2019, p. 1461). From tales of discovering one’s true passion to stories of hard work and vision, these narratives help brand breweries in ways that ensure their passionate fans will stick around when their inevitable growth comes (Koontz and Chapman, 2019, p. 357-358). Clearly, growth and expansion, within the boundaries set by the Brewers Association, are difficult to sell when most claims of authenticity up to this point have been related to small size, localism and quality over profit. To avoid contradictions, craft breweries explain their growth as being initiated by their fans, for their fans (p. 364-365):

Craft brewers perform authenticity work that enables them to navigate these contradictions with the storyline of the hero’s quest. Across breweries, companies describe their humble beginnings, construction of an identity that often merges brewer and brewery, awards that reinforce their original values, and their supposedly organic approach to growth and expansion (p. 367).

Through engaging with the history of an organization, a brand can merge time by emphasizing past success while committing to a future devoted to their customers (Brunninge and Hartmann, 2019, p. 231). Examples of growth narratives centering customers will be explored throughout this dissertation.

Because authenticity claims have been used by industries across the world to brand products, consumers have become increasingly skeptical when presented with claims of authenticity. One way beer brands address this is by creating branding materials that over exaggerate the authenticity claims through exaggerating the real stories by applying mythical elements. (O'Neill et al., 2014, p. 594-595). These narratives complicate authenticity as a value while also claiming the value for their brands. There were only a few mythical narratives found throughout my sample set. "But looking back on how we got here, it is more like a handful of moments, a handful of moonshot ideas, a handful of occasions where the stars aligned in a way that can only be credited to divine intervention." This story from Parts and Labor illustrates the overall narrative of craft breweries from a mythical stance. Craft breweries exist because of a love and passion for craft beer. This love and passion culminates into a career focused on creating high quality brews for a local community.

Assessing the stories women tell about the beer they produce, Kuehn and Parker (2021) find that rather than using the opportunities to make women in beer culture more visible these women tell stories about their beer that are typical in the industry, which are narratives tied to authenticity and place (p. 520). SHE Beverage Company departs from this narrative, as the organization's name centers on the fact the organization is woman-owned. Clearly, the need for these narratives promoting the inclusion of women in craft beer spaces, both consumers and producers, comes from a long history of the sexualization and/or exclusion of women from these spaces. There are still many examples of breweries using sexualized imagery on their branding materials. Parkersburg's beer label designs almost exclusively feature images of women with their breasts and/or shoulders exposed. Holy Craft's logo features a naked woman in heels with angel wings and a halo. City Steam Brewery's logo varies based on the type of beer; however,

each variation features a woman with exposed breasts and/or legs. Many of these beers have sexualized names as well, such as “naughty” and “innocence.” These few examples are not meant to suggest that this phenomenon is still largely experienced; however, these few examples do suggest that sexism in the craft beer industry is still very much a reality. Although this dissertation study is not focused on gender, the power of these breweries to impact community opinions of gender in the craft beer space cannot be ignored.

Heritage

As was illustrated through the brief history of craft beer at the beginning of this chapter, understanding the history of beer, even just in the United States, is influenced by many more histories. This is a similar phenomenon to studying authenticity, as “to chase the authentic is to trace the origins of something that will always let us know that it has another origin further back” (Graham, 2001, p. 60). History and authenticity are tied to one another, and values of authenticity in the present often claim their value based on some element in the past that they are connected to. Therefore, history has the power to legitimize claims of authenticity in the present. The power to define what histories are relevant to claims of authenticity in the present is where the political, economic and cultural significance of claims of authenticity are located (Theodossopoulos, 2013, p. 351).

Craft also makes its way into the conversation through thinking about the narrative surrounding which historical claims of authenticity should be valued “The world of craft is fascinated with the past. Craft connoisseurs see themselves as the torchbearers of supposedly lost skills” (Kolb, 2020, p. 62). Within craft spaces, specific narratives of the past are created and maintained by individual craft makers to establish their relevance in the present.

Interpretations of the past influence how we understand the present and what we expect from the future. However, this relationship also works in the reverse direction, as visions of the future and present need to decide what aspects of the past are considered relevant and how they are to be interpreted (Brunninge and Hartmann, 2019, p. 230).

For the craft beer drinkers interviewed by Gundlack and Neville in 2012, “heritage, pedigree and history contributed directly to authenticity” (p. 488). Throughout the craft beer industry, we find different narratives of breweries using their past or the past of the industry more broadly to discuss relevance in the present.

One way that I found that craft breweries regularly use the past of the industry to exert their relevance in the craft beer market is by relating the history of the brewery to the history of Prohibition. Many breweries are able to make this connection because they are the first brewery to open in their city or region since Prohibition, marking a renewed interest in craft beer, and craft products more broadly. Other breweries are able to make even more closely related ties to Prohibition. One such example comes from Macon Beer’s American Queen Witbier. “Georgia, 1908. Prohibition forces Macon’s own Acme Brewing Company to close its doors in just a few short years. Losing the acclaimed American Queen Beer in the process. Our brewers succeeded in brewing this famous witbier again, and after 108 years the American Queen is back home again in Macon.” This description of the beer illustrates the brewery’s attempt to use Prohibition and the history associated with it to bring relevance to their present-day brewery.

Another way that breweries use their particular brewery’s history to exert relevance in the present is through discussing their roots in homebrewing. As will be discussed in much greater detail in chapter five, homebrewing is one of the primary ways that brewers begin in the business. These homegrown roots allow a brewery to show their commitment to the local area as

they grow. However, these homegrown roots also illustrate the amount of labor that went into becoming skilled in this craft, showing that the commitment to quality has been built through extensive experience in the homebrewing space. Old Capitol Brewing brings both of these together, stating, “It all started as a hobby...and was revitalized when he received a homebrewing kit as a gift...They both felt a responsibility to to give back to the community that raised them by sharing these moments they’ve been able to create for those close to them with the entire Chillicothe community.” The brewery being built on a history of homebrewing shows the brewer’s commitment to quality and community.

As previously stated, reproductions are essential to the success of capitalism. Therefore, “the technique of production detaches the reproduced object from the domain of tradition” (Benjamin, 1968, p. 223). This detachment from tradition is what creates the “aura” of authenticity. Purchasing repercussions that are marked “authentic” only results in the collection of products. The ritual function of the product ceases to exist. Instead, the product is purchased so an individual can define “what” they are. The individual, and society at large, attaches identities to products, political and otherwise (p. 226). The aura is no longer unique to the original object. It has become commodified (p. 233). Not only does this change our relationship to that specific object, but it also changes our relationship to the entire realm from which that original object originated (p. 236).

Historic authenticity is no longer measured solely by a thing’s connection to the past. Rather, historic authenticity serves as a reminder of the need for “authentic” values (Graham, 2001, p. 65). The pursuit of the “authentic” can therefore become a pursuit for value (p. 74). “By embedding an object in tradition, associated rituals establish aura and authenticity” (Rickly-Boyd, 2012, p. 276). Because authenticity is so intertwined with tradition, as time moves on, this

tradition and the value of authenticity become threatened. However, this is a natural transgression, as at one point in time all traditions were valued as “authentic” (Mufti, 2000, p. 88). “The *aura* of a thing, then, is its authenticity. A thing is authentic in so far as it generates an authoritative effect of duration in time, in relation to a place and moment of origin” (Johnson, 2018, p. 113). Within craft spaces, then, the three factors of historic “authentic” value that are regularly communicated and supported are 1) an object’s connection to and rootedness in the past, 2) an object’s connection to a specific location and 3) the use of natural ingredients in the making process of an object (O’Neill et al., 2014, p. 596-597).

As I have already covered, Benjamin argues that the thing that makes the original “authentic” is its existence in a specific time and place. Adorno argues that the culture industry works best when it can sell us mass culture that is not tied to a specific place of time in its original form. This way, they can sell it to us over and over again as “authentic” and their only task being to shape it so we believe that it is from a different time or place every time (2001, p. 75). This process occurs through advertising.

Advertising becomes information when there is no longer anything to choose from, when the recognition of brand names has taken the place of choice, when at the same time the totality forces everyone who wishes to survive into consciously going along with the process. This is what happens under monopolistic mass culture (p. 85).

The customer becomes the real object of the industry, that which must be trained and designed (p. 99). Rather than being consciously aware of what we are doing and why, we have been trained by the industry itself to remember that our job is to conform, not to question (Adorno, 2001, p. 104). “And finally, criticism is dying out because the critical spirit is as disturbing as sand in a machine to that smoothly-running operation which is becoming more and more the

model of the cultural. This critical spirit now seems antiquated, irresponsible and unworthy, much like ‘armchair’ thinking” (p. 123). We are not only trained not to critique, but that being critical makes us irresponsible consumers, and further, citizens.

The connection between history, place and ingredients is communicated regularly in the craft beer industry. Ouray Brewery discusses this connection eloquently, as the brewery is located in a unique mountain town filled with history. “Ouray Brewery offers craft beers for every taste. Our ingredients are locally sought and sourced, providing the rich character that is unique to our region and to Ouray, Colorado. We seek the best ingredients and vary them according to season and selection, resulting in some of the finest beer on the Western Slope of Colorado.” Other breweries make this connection through specific beers, many discussing how a historical style is innovated with local ingredients. Other breweries discuss how a historical style is innovated to appeal to local people with local ingredients. Many of these beers attempt to appeal to the taste of “hard-working folks” (Bond’s Brewing).

As I explored with Walter Benjamin’s theorization of the “authentic” in the introduction of this dissertation study, in craft spaces where craft objects are regularly made based on recipes or largely through mechanical interventions, these reproductions complicate our understanding of what is considered to be authentic. Authenticity is only possible because of the existence of reproductions. “That means, however, that authenticity is compromised from the beginning, inauthentic from the start, for its origin lies not in itself, but rather in its opposite, reproduction” (Jay, 2006, p. 19). Further, authenticity is not an objective measure. As previously discussed, authenticity is a socially constructed value constantly being negotiated based on history and the present time. Its value then is time-dependent. The value of authenticity is not claimed outright but rather communicated through narratives and performances that “tether different meanings

and values together in a way that appears congruent with prevailing values, ideals and desires” (Thurnell-Read, 2019, p. 1463). These time-dependent narratives typically take on one of two forms. The first comparing the “authentic” value of something in the present to its “authentic” value in the past. The second is comparing the “authentic” value of a reproduction in the present to the “authentic” value of another reproduction in the present (Johnson, 2018, p. 112).

Packaging and design that is considered to be authentic is that which is consistent and reflects the original, not that which is new (p. 491). After beer brands started using images of monks to claim Trappist origin, in 1997 the International Trappist Organization created a logo to designate true Trappist beers from imitators (Beverland et al., 2008, p. 6). Beverland et al. (2008) found that in some cases, such as when a website is printed on a bottle or when modern branding techniques are used, this logo claiming authenticity is ineffective (p. 14). Therefore, a logo claiming authenticity must be accompanied by other branding techniques in order for consumers unaware of the meaning behind the logo to read the product as “authentic.” The Brewers Association launched an independent craft brewer seal in June 27, 2017 (Figure 1). The seal was quickly adopted by craft brewers looking for a way to certify their brews as authentically craft. As a part of these efforts, in October of that same year the Brewers Association launched a campaign to support the adoption of the seal and to communicate the importance of using the seal on the producer end and searching for the seal on the consumer end. Now, over 85% of craft breweries use the seal on their packaging (Brewers Association, 2022).

In conclusion, origin and heritage are essential branding techniques used by craft makers through narrative and performance in order to claim “authentic” value. This branding of heritage is done through the communication of awards and independent beer seals in the present and through connecting to the histories of homebrewing, Prohibition, places and ingredients in the

past. These narratives are so powerful to brands, a 2019 student by Brunninge and Hartmann finds it may be worth exaggerating a brand story to claim heritage.

Although lacking in authenticity, an invented corporate heritage may still be attractive to consumers since it can construct an aura of authenticity by delivering an enchanting experience to consumers, irrespective of its substantive genuineness. However, such inventions carry considerable risk since they represent a fabrication of the past (Brunninge and Hartmann, 2019, p. 229).

The reliance on narratives of heritage become complicated in craft spaces where innovation is prized, which will be the topic of the next section.

Innovation

As was alluded to in the previous section, historic authenticity is based on our understanding of the past in the present. Authenticity is a time-dependent concept where our present understanding of the world mediates our sense of the past and what is valued in claims of historic authenticity. “Tradition is a trajectory, and authenticity becomes a function of genealogy” (Weiss, 2011, p. 75). Authenticity becomes a value that is dependent on all the variations of a thing throughout time and space (p. 76).

I would argue that tradition without awareness of history and without possibility of change is mere stereotype, and that innovation without consciousness of genealogy and situatedness is sheer experimentation. Consequently, the proper question to ask is not, ‘Is it authentic?’ but rather, ‘*How* is it authentic?’ (p. 77).

Although we often see innovation as removed from history, or as an escape from history, innovation is impossible without reflecting on and taking into consideration the history that came before it.

A very clear example of authenticity being time and context dependent is found in Gundlach and Neville's 2012 article seeking to understand the ways in which authenticity is claimed in the craft beer industry. Although their interview respondents tie "authentic" beer as being sold in a bottle, this is a packaging form we rarely see today, only a decade later (p. 488). Just recently, Blind Pig Brewing made the switch, telling consumers that their transition was both cultural and economic, as most craft beer is in cans now and packaging costs are less with cans. The entire process of switching from bottles to cans is captured on their TikTok account from the last beer ever bottled to the first one ever canned (May 2021). This particular example also shows that authenticity in the craft beer industry when connected to innovation is also place-dependent, as certain consumers expect particular innovations to remain "authentic," whereas consumers in another part of the country, or even in another part of the state, may not expect these innovations.

One way that craft breweries can support their claims of quality over profit is through offering a wide variety of products. This is seen as support for the pursuit of innovation, not the pursuit for expansion and growth (Hoskins et al., 2021, p. 572; Verhaal et al., 2015, p. 1470). This wide variety of products being created for the consumer's benefit is captured throughout digital media platforms. There are countless examples of breweries using their social media accounts to showcase videos and images that capture their large variety of product offerings. This variety is represented in many ways, including but not limited to through connecting specific beer types to a particular season and through connecting a beer type to a national holiday. "Anything goes' will always be our calling, and we will never be afraid to experiment or try new ingredients and techniques to keep our customers eager to see what we'll come up with next. We won't limit ourselves to a certain style, coast, or country. We want every

Hopsquad beer to be its own character that has its own identity that personifies its distinct taste” (Hopsquad). Hopsquad connects this need for variety to making beers for a variety of tastes, which will be explored further in chapter three.

Because authenticity is connected to the past through a reimagining of the past based on the knowledge of the present, both heritage and innovation are the keys to understanding its value. “Authenticity is an ambiguous concept. It represents *origins* in two quite different senses: on the one hand, an almost mythically primordial rootedness in place and time and, on the other, a capacity for historically new, creative innovation” (Zukin, 2009, p. 544). Duggan (2015) argues that craft breweries are able to accomplish two typically oppositional paths to authenticity, which are to honor tradition and create something new and innovative. Craft breweries often do this through manufacturing flagship or staple beers alongside seasonal or limited edition beers (p. 5). In addition to having a variety of beers, most breweries feature both traditional and experimental beers. “This brewery was built around the art of brewing. We love brewing the extreme and the traditional. The best way to describe Point Ybel is never settling and always improving” (Point Ybel). Once again, this variety and commitment to innovation and tradition is communicated as being a desire to appeal to all consumers. The branding language in these situations informs consumers that there is something for everyone, and even people who come to the brewery regularly will always have their tried and true beers to rely on and a mix of new ones to experiment with.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the history of the craft beer industry, and of craft more broadly, is essential to developing an understanding of the value of authenticity. A variety of historical events and circumstances, such as Prohibition, homebrewing and plays by mass-producers to claim the craft

beer market, are regularly touted as being central to differentiating craft beer today. This heritage of individual breweries has become the heritage of the industry itself. Even if a craft brewery enters the market tomorrow, they have this overall history of the craft beer industry to pull from and communicate in their own way through narrative and performance. Further, reimaginings of the history of craft beer give fuel to claims of authenticity when creating new and innovative products. Although authenticity being both tied to heritage and innovation may be seen as contradictory on the surface, we see that craft beer producers rely on both to craft “authentic” brands and brews. They manage these contradictions through balancing heritage and innovation in their making spaces, emphasizing the heritage of craft beer in the United States, which was originally marked by a desire to experiment with beer styles and flavors. The next section explores this aspect of the heritage of craft beer in further detail, focusing on how the craft beer industry has become an oppositional market through its countercultural claims.

Chapter 2: An Oppositional Market

“The lack of clarity on the term craft beer has left this industry segment open for the large-scale breweries to produce new beer ranges that may be craft in name only, and that may not be produced using the traditional methods associated with a traditional craft brewery” (Morgan et al., 2020, p. 2).

Kings of Beer is a 2019 documentary film funded by Anheuser-Busch. The documentary film offers a look inside how Budweiser maintains its quality standard process. Budweiser’s operations include 65 breweries internationally. Each Budweiser production facility sends their best sample of the brew to headquarters, located in St. Louis, MO, each month for the corporate tasting. The main purpose of this tasting is to maintain high quality Budweiser across the globe. When the beers arrive at headquarters, they are poured into unmarked glasses for the blind tasting. A table full of Budweiser executives rate the beers and add their comments. At the end of the tasting, the moderator recites the results and the tasters dispute amongst themselves. Meanwhile, the brewmaster of each brewery sits by nervously to await the results. The yearly cumulative rankings end in a celebratory event to congratulate the top four brewmasters. The film avoids becoming an Anheuser-Busch advertisement in its ability to add a human face to Budweiser. The film zooms in on the lives of five particular brewmasters and their personal obstacles throughout 2017 to become one of the top breweries of the year. Houston, Merrimack, Columbus, Fort Collins and Wuhan, China are represented in the film. As viewers, we see the amount of history, culture and celebration that goes into the production of Budweiser. Although beer lovers do not typically think of Budweiser as being high quality, the film reveals the extensive measures that the company goes through to maintain taste across the globe.

[Shortened Field Notes, November 20, 2019 - *Kings of Beer* Documentary Film]

This chapter continues the discussion around oppositional and countercultural narratives created and maintained by the craft beer industry. As the previous chapter argued, many of these narratives are embedded in the overall history of beer in the United States. The desire for and experimentation with innovative beer styles and flavors was brought to an abrupt halt in 1920 with Prohibition. When alcohol became legal again over a decade later, many beer companies had shut down or began producing other products. Homebrewing was illegal for almost another half of a century before those passionate about beer were able to legally begin experimenting again on a small-scale. By this time, the beer market in the United States was filled with blandness and corporate dominance. When small craft brewers found success locally, they were prevented from distributing regionally or nationally due to outdated distribution laws and the incentives distributors were receiving from mass-producers. This chapter expands upon the narratives of oppositionality in the craft beer industry, including a discussion of the influences from the craft economy to these overarching narratives, understanding authenticity and “authentic” experiences as being valued on a spectrum, which complicates the authentic/inauthentic binary often touted, and concludes with a discussion of social, economic and political power to define and make plays on the craft market.

Defining Narratives of Oppositionality in a Craft Context

As I explained in the previous chapter, the British Arts and Crafts Movement and the craft economy’s ties to industrialization more broadly are directly linked to the claims of “authentic” craft production today. A clear aspect of the branding we see comes from this oppositional stance against industrialization and corporatization of the economy. Therefore, it is important to define here what narratives of oppositionality are in a craft context and how this is tied to conceptualizations of craft in the craft beer industry specifically. As I have noted a few

times, the Brewers Association's definition for craft in the United States focuses on size and ownership, two factors that are difficult for mass-producers of beer to adopt as they are inherently large in size. This current definition of craft beer provided by the Brewers Association is structured to focus on size and ownership because of a decades long history of mass-producers of beer making craft claims through creating "crafty" brands and buying previously independent craft breweries. Some of these other claims on craft by mass-producers of beer are explored towards the end of this chapter. However, when discussing how narratives of oppositionality are defined in the modern craft beer economy, it is important to note that this definition tends to be tied to themes that are economic in nature rather than cultural.

One lens to view this difference between oppositionality in an economic sense versus a cultural sense is through Raymond Williams' discussion of oppositional versus alternative culture in *Marxism and Literature* (1977). Although the following quote refers to cultures in the rural community, there are significant overlaps in our understanding of "authentic" craft branding more broadly:

Again, the idea of rural community is predominantly residual, but it is in some limited respects alternative or oppositional to urban industrial capitalism, though for the most part it is incorporated, as idealization or fantasy, or as an exotic — residual or escape — leisure function of the dominant order itself (p. 122).

This residual culture can stand in opposition to or as an alternative to the mainstream culture itself while still being tied to that culture, and oftentimes serve as an adopted part of mainstream culture in certain ways. These residual cultures are sources of nostalgia, ways that mainstream culture neglects to include certain values or beliefs honored and valued by the residual culture (p. 124). Therefore, when we look at the culture simply in terms of values and beliefs, it tends to

lack economic significance and serves as more of an alternative to mainstream culture. Rather, when we add in a residual culture's ties to class, the culture can be seen as economically distinct from the mainstream culture and therefore as more in opposition to mainstream culture (p. 126).

As the beginning of this section summarized, the craft beer movement's ties to defining "authentic" craft in an economic sense defines this narrative oppositionality, which has strong ties to anti-corporate sentiments throughout the Western craft movements of the past two centuries. Therefore, in a cultural sense, much of the debate surrounding craft comes from the nostalgia for certain values and beliefs missing or neglected in narratives in mainstream culture. Craft culture can be seen here as an alternative to mainstream culture. Rather, when we examine the economic situation of craft, and particularly when we look at who has the power to engage with and define craft economies, the branding of craft is oppositional in nature. Not only are mass-producers excluded from these oppositional craft spaces, but so are those folks that do not have the economic means to engage in this oppositional craft economy. This discussion of class is largely missing from these craft narratives. These narratives of opposition in their relationship to the craft economy will be explored further throughout this chapter, particularly in relation to spectrums of "authentic" experience and ways that mass-producers have worked to decenter the oppositional narratives and instead co-opt the desire for an alternative culture that is looking for innovative tastes and values.

Oppositional Branding in a Capitalist Economy

In developing, communicating and performing narratives of authenticity, craft breweries position themselves and their products as oppositional to mass-produced narratives. The processes of production, distribution and consumption are where craft and artisanal producers are able to differentiate themselves from mass-produced products. They do this through narratives

focused on quality, tradition and taste. They argue that these characteristics of mass-produced products become lost when profit is the main consideration (Thurnell-Read, 2019, p. 1451). The revolutionary, and therefore “authentic,” character of craft breweries is captured and communicated in their opposition to mass-producers of beer. The narrative therefore becomes community over profit (Rice, 2016, p. 243). “If artisan products are revolutionary, it is because of how that category suggests not only a new order but a complete rejection of and disgust for the old order” (p. 242). These radical narratives give value and appeal to the tags of handmade, small-batch and craft (Thurnell-Read, 2019, p. 1465).

The narrative of economic independence is key to establishing brand relevance in the craft beer market. Studying the about pages on websites of craft breweries in the United States, Koontz and Chapman (2019) find that a regular narrative breweries use to explain their history and significance is economically based in being successful among the pressures of mass-producers and selling out (p. 353).

That is, images of authenticity involve projecting an image that is partly true and partly rhetorical. This combination of real and stylized attributes helps create an aura around the brand that differentiates these brands from mass-market firms by allowing them to appear committed to values that are above commercial considerations (Beverland, 2005, p. 1008).

Therefore, authenticity in this space is accomplished by breweries that can claim economic independence after decades of existence, as these breweries avoided selling out throughout their growth, expansion and overall success (Konnelly, 2020, p. 74). Further, selling out is a privilege only available to those able to establish their product or experience as tasteful and valued by those seeking “authentic” culture in the first place (Rosenblatt, 2013, p. 602).

Given the recent influx of breweries that have sold out and the commitment of the craft beer industry to agree on a collective identity of economic independence, I found many examples of breweries directly stating that they are committed to economic independence. Once again, many of these examples characterize this commitment as being driven by a desire to put the consumers first. There is a spectrum of authenticity that can be seen in these examples, as some breweries avoid packaging and distributing due to the concerns, while other breweries only desire to distribute their beer locally or regionally. “Joymongers Brewing Company is owned and operated by Greensboro natives... We are not interested in packaging or distributing. We don’t aspire to get big and be bought out by national giants... Corner breweries like ours have existed for over 500 years in Europe” (Joymongers). In any case, most breweries cite that the issue that comes from statewide or national distribution is the purpose of making beer becomes a desire for profit rather than a desire for a high quality product that appeals to the local consumer. Without placing the focus on community over profit, breweries brand themselves according to this narrative.

In craft beer spaces, the authentic/inauthentic binary is easy to maintain and easy to form a narrative around. As the Brewers Association’s definition of an independent craft brewery shows, economic independence is easily categorizable. When the focus is taken away from the product and placed instead on the producer, more rigid definitions of authenticity are possible. When the producer is seen as being oppositional in the mainstream market, the products they make become revolutionary. And, through interacting with these products, consumers can therefore become revolutionaries (Rice, 2016, p. 240).

Even if revolution is the basis of a craft beer industry — with its turning away from the corporate and industrial markers of identity — that topos is not a stable marker, and it too

shifts as it interacts with other actors in the narrative, notably consumers (Rice, 2016, p. 252).

As I will examine towards the end of this chapter, mass-producers are regularly making craft claims in an effort to gain parts of the craft market share. Because this authenticity/inauthenticity binary is only successful if consumers value it, craft brewers must also claim craft authenticity in other more subjective ways, which is the topic of chapters three through six.

One place where craft breweries tend to brand their product as a part of their social movement in opposition to mass-producers is when naming the beers (Verhaal et al., 2015, p. 1469). For branding purposes, the branding of one product is much less time-consuming and labor intensive than the branding of an entire brewery. Therefore, branding individual products as oppositional slowly builds an entire brand that is oppositional (p. 1470). Overall, oppositional beer names are effective for most breweries and most beer styles. Oppositional beer names here refers to the naming of a beer using themes or keywords from the anti-mass-production narratives. For lagers in particular, oppositional beer names are not as effective because of their overwhelming presence in the mass-produced beer market. Also, breweries that have established their overall brand as oppositional benefit less from oppositional beer names and must turn to other branding mechanisms (p. 1480-1481).

Although oppositional beer names are not as common as when Verhaal et al. studied them in 2015, there is still an overwhelming commitment to narratives of oppositionality that comes across when discussing the history of a beer or the situationality of a beer. For example, breweries communicate their desire to purposefully innovate traditional styles, particularly lagers. I Love Lamp, which is a Pineapple Hefeweizen from Evil Genius was purposefully brewed to stand in opposition to the traditional style. “A German wheat beer with a Hawaiian

twist. This refreshing German Hefewrizen got taken on a tropical vacation with the addition of natural pineapple flavor. Does this go against the German beer purity law? Yep. Is that the way we like it? Also yep” (Evil Genius). This narrative of oppositionality when it comes to beer styles is markedly different from the narrative of innovation just for the sake of innovation. Another interesting example of a narrative of oppositionality comes from Biscayne Bay Brewing in their discussion of their beer at Miami Heat games. “As the Official Independent Brewery of the Miami HEAT, we’re proud to bring HEAT fans thoughtfully crafted Miami-made beer. You can find Miami’s finest Independent beer at all HEAT games in American Airlines Arena.” The emphasis on “Independent Brewery” here is hard to miss, as it is mentioned twice in these two short sentences. Although they will not be the only beer being poured for fans, they want to make sure that fans know they are the only independently-owned craft beer being poured for fans.

One way that craft breweries create an opportunity for consumers to engage with their brand, other than drinking the craft brews, is through the purchase of branded clothing and gear. Kremlick (2016) finds that stickers in particular fuel this desire for narratives of oppositionality.

Stickers manifest the value of creativity — they allow community members to distance themselves from the uniform advertising and marketing strategies of macro-brewers.

Stickers also reflect the values of locality and loyalty by offering consumers ways to showcase their experiences and allegiances (Kremlick, 2016, p. 31).

Although stickers may be a financially accessible way for consumers to claim the “authentic” value of being associated with the craft beer brand, most breweries also sell t-shirts, hats, sweaters, koozies and other branded merchandise to further support this consumer desire.

Throughout the digital media studied in this dissertation, there are countless examples of traditional advertisements for shirts, hats and stickers.

Influences of the Craft Economy

Clearly, one of the major motivating forces behind the craft beer industry is historic representations oppositionality to the mass-produced beer market in the United States, and oftentimes globally. However, because the craft beer industry is attached to both the beer economy and craft economy, the values of “authentic” craft beer production are influenced by the values of craft production more broadly. As I discussed briefly in the introduction to this dissertation, our contemporary craft economy is influenced by a long history of centering the value of craft in industrial society.

The contemporary craft economy challenges the industrial and post-industrial model of production, and does so by placing not only the hand of the maker — and thus the makers themselves — but also the place of making back at the centre of our relationship with things (Luckman, 2015, p. 86).

The craft producer and the craft product and the values of craft they embody are essential to a continued craft economy. However, important to the success of this economy is a renewed interest by consumers to engage with this craft economy and center its products in their everyday lives.

It is inadequate to define craft as “authentic” in capitalist consumer culture if the authenticity of craft is defined solely by an aspiration for quality and not being connected to profit motives (Hartmann and Ostberg, 2013, p. 888). The act of consuming “authentic” products, which are defined as not being mass-produced, is seen as being a “symptom of dissatisfactions with modernity” (Thurnell-Read, 2019, p. 1448). Consumers search for brands

that are made by craft makers, folks that are passionate about making craft products and maintaining the value of “authentic” craft (Beverland et al., 2008, p. 12). “Consumers are aware that brewers have a profit motive, yet they still wish to believe that what they are consuming is produced by craftsmen who are primarily motivated by professionalism, tradition and a love of what they are doing” (Gundlack and Neville, 2012, p. 492). The impact of the craft economy on the craft beer economy is the overall desire for quality and commitment to a craft product driven by a passion for the craft itself. The value of “authentic” craft production is placed ahead of any economic influences or motives.

Attention to “authentic” craft quality is the number one motive that all craft breweries share. “We started Biscayne Bay Brewing to bring Miami what it deserves: QUALITY. CRAFT. BEER. Founded in 2012, Biscayne Bay Brewing Company is committed to growing the beer culture of Miami. With a focus on classic styles of beer, Biscayne Bay Brewing has built a reputation for quality above all else.” To illustrate this commitment to quality, breweries communicate narratives focused on local, natural and sustainably sourced ingredients, a focus on community development and pursuit of continuous skill and knowledge development.

The value of the “authentic” is fetishized as having value outside of economic value. Rather than serving as a counter to capitalism, this value of the “authentic” reinforces its economic value within capitalism (Jay, 2006, p. 22).

The opposition between legitimate and illegitimate, imposing itself in the field of symbolic goods with the same arbitrary necessity as the distinction between the sacred and the profane elsewhere, expresses the different social and cultural valuation of two modes of production: The one a field that is its own market, allied with an educational

system which legitimizes it; the other a field of production organized as a function of external demand (Bourdieu, 1985, p. 32).

Although the craft beer industry is branded as “authentic” due to its representations of oppositionality to the mass-produced beer industry, the economic success of this oppositional market depends on the existence of the mainstream market. This is where binary definitions of authenticity/inauthenticity lose their revolutionary potential. If the capitalist economy needs to exist in order to position and brand the craft economy as relevant and “authentic,” there are limited paths forward that allow the destruction of the capitalist market.

Capitalism cares about attaching the marker of “authenticity” to reproduced objects because as these commodities become fetishized political power can be assigned to them. Through this political power tied to commodities, capitalist governments can organize and mobilize societies to their benefit (Marcuse, 1964, p. 3). “The process always replaces one system of preconditioning by another; the optimal goal is the replacement of false needs by true one, the abandonment of repressive satisfaction” (p. 7). Through commodities, capitalist governments can claim social progress.

If the worker and his boss enjoy the same television program and visit the same resort places, if the typist is as attractively made up as the daughter of her employer, if the Negro owns a Cadillac, if they all read the same newspaper, then this assimilation indicated not the disappearance of classes, but the extent to which the needs and satisfactions that serve the preservation of the Establishment are shared by the underlying population (p. 8).

Therefore, commodities become the way that individuals recognize their place in their community (p. 9). When people accept that certain commodities are tied to specific groups in a

community, they are accepting the rules established by capitalism, not developing their own rules of society (p. 11).

The craft beer industry has established itself as an oppositional beer category in order to distinguish itself from the mass-produced beer category. Oppositional markets center their opposition around beliefs about the production process and the product itself (Verhaal et al., 2015, p. 1468). By identifying as small, independently owned and utilizing traditional methods, craft breweries use themes of craft-based work to distinguish their industry sector as oppositional (Mathias et al., 2020, p. 2548). “At the heart of the craft beer industry’s collective identity is the anti-mass-production sentiment centered on “authentic” production of craft beer by using only craft methods, high-quality ingredients, and small production scale” (Verhaal et al., 2015, p. 1467). Innovation and creativity are key traits differentiating craft brewers from mass producers of beer (Kremlick, 2016, p. 15).

These key themes used by craft breweries to establish and maintain narratives of authenticity will be explored in the following chapters. However, as I have argued in these two opening sections of this chapter on narratives oppositionality in the craft beer industry, the overall influence of these branding techniques come from the history of the craft beer industry standing in opposition to the mass-produced beer industry and the history of craft motives in the face of industrialization. Both of these influences impact binary narratives of the “authentic” versus “inauthentic,” which are narratives that lose their relevance when the mass-produced market ceases to exist. Therefore, this binary narrative limits the revolutionary potential of craft beer, and of craft more broadly. Rather than standing in opposition to capitalism, it becomes an alternative market within capitalism, thereby reinforcing the capitalist market because of its dependence on it.

The Spectrum of “Authentic” Experiences

As argued in the previous section, although the craft beer industry and craft makers more broadly have seen success through oppositional branding techniques, these binary definitions of authenticity/inauthenticity limit their transformative potential.

The Arts and Crafts Movement has an unprecedented global impact in its own time, but it has also handed down a legacy that has proven difficult to escape. The complexity of the movement’s history and personalities is often lost in a kind of shorthand for its most renowned tenets: Craft sits in opposition to industrialization; craft centers on the experience of hand-making; all beauty derives from nature; and the worker must be free for the work to be good (Kettley, 2010, p. 13).

Rather than depending on historic definitions of craft, we need instead to use this history to construct a fluid definition of craft, tied to the ever changing process and cultures of a craft object (p. 14). When we decenter our dependence on historic definitions of craft, we also dismantle the need to define authenticity using outdated dichotomies. Rather than focusing on predetermined classifications of craft and authenticity, we can focus on the experiential processes of meaning making by craft producers and consumers based on fluid craft culture influenced by the social, political and economic (p. 15).

Because many of the narratives that craft breweries use to distinguish themselves from their mass-produced counterparts emphasize people over profit, authenticity is difficult for breweries to maintain when they experience growth. One expansion narrative that many craft breweries employ to continue claiming the appeal of craft when they expand or grow is by communicating that the growth is organic and does not impact organizational values (Thurnell-Read, 2019, p. 1459).

In contrast to modern work and mass consumption, both seen as alienated and rationalized and as such lacking in meaning or worth, narratives of authenticity allow these individuals to position their labour and its outputs as meaningful in a holistic sense and operative not solely in relation to the ‘cold’ logic of market capitalism (p. 1464).

Throughout the branding narratives of craft breweries studied in this dissertation, there is an overwhelming commitment to the local consumer. As I have previously stated, growth is always tied to this commitment, as authenticity as it applies to packaging and distributing beer occurs on a spectrum, where some craft breweries refuse to package or distribute their brews as a part of this commitment to the consumer and others insist on packaging and distributing their beers also touted as a commitment to the consumer. “Owned and operated by lifelong Macon residents, Macon Beer Company has developed into a fixture of downtown Macon as well as a player in the beer industry across the entire state. An unstoppable dedication to quality and customer service has pushed Macon Beer Company from its humble beginnings to a true powerhouse, with multiple locations in Georgia and an international presence” (Macon Beer). Reminding consumers that the craft beer brand began as a small local craft space and connecting their growth to the demand from the consumers allows breweries to navigate organic growth outside of selling out.

By situating craft in opposition to industrial or modern, craft producers develop a need for emphasizing the historical ties of their product, when in reality this history is in constant flux based on its ties to modern materials and methods (Kettley, 2010, p. 12-13). Therefore, the focus becomes tied less to historical craft making processes and tied more closely to the concentration on the craft maker and the craft consumer.

As we can see, authenticity as a concept and cultural practice not only related to the notion of binding the reality of the present self to past and future ideals, but also exists in an unsolvable dialectical tension between the need to articulate cultures against the alienating effects of capitalism and modernity, and the authoritarian imperatives that seek to impose purist forms of culture as a self-evident norm or duty (Prado, 2020, p. 577).

Although modern methods of craft making may be used in varying ways, the historic value of the “authentic” craft is maintained because of the devotion to quality above all other motives and the passion of the craft maker being communicated through brand narratives and performances.

Therefore, “authentic” consumption, particularly those experiences with anti-corporate missions, can occur on varying levels. For example, many consumers of farmers’ markets can find similar, more familiar experiences at small chain grocery stores like Natural Grocers while still having an experience they consider authentic (Zukin, 2008, p. 737). Zukin (2008) uses Whole Foods to illustrate the mutual need for varying “authentic” consumption spaces. Although Whole Foods has sold to Amazon since Zukin’s article was published, and therefore this specific argument may need to be reevaluated, I believe the core of the argument stands (p. 737).

Despite their competition for customers, a synergy unites Whole Foods and the farmers’ market. The high rent and high volume of the organic superstore are legitimized by the farmers’ market’s lower rent and artisanal quality, and it is this synergy that created the meaning of the space as a whole as a site of authentic cultural consumption (p. 737).

Within craft spaces, there is a spectrum of “authentic” experiences. We see this same variety in the craft beer industry, as most breweries pick and choose which values of craft to emphasize in their making and branding processes. Creek Bottom’s practice of determining what beers to brew illustrates this point well. “Selecting the right type of beer styles to brew is as much an art as a

science. When we select our beer types we consider both the history of the beer type and how it fits local traditions as well as beer recipes that can brew well using as many locally sourced ingredients as possible.” Depending on the beer style, the brewery must navigate which ingredients can be local and what local traditions can be honored throughout the brewing process. Authenticity throughout the brewing process, then, occurs on a range for local, traditional, innovative and hand-on factors.

Power to Define the Craft Market

This spectrum of authenticity in craft spaces is negotiated and maintained by the producers and consumers invested in the space. Craft beer subculture has become socially constructed and reconstructed over time to become a countercultural community (Cipollaro et al., 2021, p. 2). The oppositional agenda of the craft beer industry classifies it as a social movement. Production, distribution and consumption in this sector are actions against the hegemonic power of mass producers (Kremlick, 2016, p. 3). Authenticity of craft breweries is tied to size for two reasons. First, small breweries are those that are economically independent, less influenced by capitalism. Second, small breweries allow the “us” versus “them” narrative to prosper, drawing a very clear distinction between which breweries are industrial and which breweries are craft (Rice, 2016, p. 247-248). “Consequently, oppositional categories can attempt to maintain identity distinctiveness by increasing the centrality of those codes that cannot be co-opted and decreasing the centrality of those that can” (Mathias et al., 2020, p. 2551). Because the craft-based identity of the craft beer industry emphasizes small size and independent ownership, the growth and selling of these organizations is contradictory to their original branding (p. 2552).

For many reasons, narratives of oppositionality in the craft beer industry have become collective narratives, as each individual brewery communicates the ways they relate to maintain

the oppositional identity of the collective. With this counterculture of craft, the different actors have varying degrees of power to determine what the collective identity values as “authentic” craft. Clearly, these values and the narratives tied to them shift over time.

The relationship maintained by producers of symbolic goods with other producers, with the significations available within the cultural field and, consequently, with their own work, depends very directly upon the position they occupy within the field of production and circulation of symbolic goods. This, in turn, is related to the specifically cultural hierarchy of degrees of consecration. Such a position implies an objective definition of their practice and of the products resulting from it. Whether they like it or not, whether they know it or not, this definition imposes itself on them as a fact, determining their ideology and their practice, and its potency manifests itself never so clearly as in conduct aimed at transgressing it (Bourdieu, 1985, p. 33-34).

Although some craft breweries are more committed to maintaining and exerting their oppositionality, the industry as a whole is impacted by these commitments to an oppositional narrative. Therefore, this counterculture has the power to turn their backs on transgressors and kick them out of the craft club. This is why breweries that have sold out are no longer allowed to claim the cultural capital given to those breweries deemed craft. The collective identity of the craft beer industry exerts its power to exclude those that have discounted their values of “authentic” craft making.

Oppositional craft breweries do not necessarily make better beer, they just brand their beer as ideologically superior and distinct from the industrialized identity-lacking brews produced by the profit-focused mass-producers (Mathias et al., 2020, p. 2551). “In our view, these oppositional identity strategies work in this context because the microbrewery movement

actually resembles a true social movement in many respects” (Carroll and Swaminathan, 2000, p. 731). One way that craft breweries situate themselves and their products as being oppositional and ideologically superior to mass-produced beer is by centering their mission and values in their branding materials. “As a values-based company, we believe why you drink is as important as what you drink” (Reformation). Reformation’s values reflect both the individual and the community, encouraging their consumers to accept and serve all people and value all stories, while finding their “authentic” self. These themes are seen throughout the craft beer industry. Those breweries that do not have clear mission and value statements like these communicate their ideological and moral superiority through examples on their digital media platforms of the ways they engage with their community and consumers.

Because the spectrum of what is viewed as “authentic” craft beer production varies widely based on beer style and type, one way that craft breweries have been able to create and maintain a collective identity is by shifting the focus from the beer to the brewery. “Although the BA¹⁰ initially claimed craft beer could only be made by craft brewers, it eventually abandoned any effort to define ‘craft beer’ and instead focused on defining ‘craft brewers’” (Mathias et al., 2020, p. 2575). This is evidenced by the increase in the limited production requirements set by the Brewers Association in 2010 to accompany the expansion in beer production by Boston Beer (p. 2576). The Brewers Association also encourages consumers and brewers to educate themselves and others on ways to distinguish craft beer brands from crafty beer brands, which will be discussed further in the next section.. A central way the Brewers Association has attempted to oversee the claim of the craft brand is through the regulation of their independent craft brewery seal (Money, 2017, p. 428), mentioned in the previous chapter..

¹⁰ “BA” refers to the Brewers Association.

Studies on the craft beer communities in England (Hubbard, 2019) and Brazil (Koch and Saurbronn, 2019) have found significant themes of those that identify as craft beer consumers regularly and openly distinguishing themselves from those that drink mass-produced beer for the sole purpose of getting drunk.

Opposite to industrial, craft beer emerges as an experience-based and symbolic product rather than utilitarian one. The main motivation for drinking craft beer seems to be the quest for authenticity...Craft consumers do not drink the product for its functional attributes, they consume it for what it means and as a consequence they build an identity, perceived as more authentic and unique, in comparison to the mainstream industrial beer consumption in Mexico (Gómez-Corona et al., 2015, p. 358).

Craft beer is not beer you drink to get drunk, overall this is a major point of differentiation from the general alcohol consumer (Kremlick, 2016, p. 22). We see similar examples here in the United States. Craft breweries emphasize the role of taste throughout digital media discourses, emphasizing that craft beer is meant to be enjoyed not chugged. One particular example that stands out comes from Rowland's Calumet, stating, "Warning! Micro-brewed beer has a lot of flavor and may cause you to actually taste your beer!" This desire to commit to drinking to enjoy beer rather than feel the effects is nowhere near universal, as I will explore later with many examples of craft breweries sponsoring drinking games where the beer is most definitely not sipped.

Mainstream Market Plays on Craft

As previously discussed, nineteenth-century definitions of craft posited by William Morris and the Arts and Crafts Movement he founded are being utilized by the craft beer industry today. These definitions are largely dependent upon the construction and distribution of

a binary narrative with the industrial and the craft on either side (Rice, 2016, p. 239). Craft beer is defined as much, if not more, by what it is not as by what it is. That is, the narratives distinguishing craft beer as oppositional to mass-produced brews is prevalent among asserting craft beer's relevance as a counterculture (Konnolly, 2020, p. 72). Mass producers of beer, at least in the United States, have been linked with a lack of options and a failure to adopt innovation, that is aside from innovative brewing practices that lead to lower overhead costs (Money, 2017, p. 418).

Organizations that produce mass quantities of beer have employed various tactics to assert their relevance in the craft beer market. The two tactics discussed most often are the creation of crafty brands and the purchase of previously independently-owned craft breweries (Money, 2017, p. 418). When describing humans as crafty, we typically mean for the descriptor to be taken in a negative connotation (Langlands, 2017, p. 19-20). The same is true here for mass-producers of crafty beer brands. Crafty brands are those created by mass-producers but made to look like separate, unique organizations with "authentic" craft backgrounds (Money, 2017, p. 426-427).

Handmade, uncompromised, small, traditional, and true — these are authentic topoi that build a craft identity as each term interacts with the other. This authenticity simultaneously creates an opposing and similarly circulated taxonomy, *crafty*. As a narrative indicator of the inauthentic, craft identifies conglomerates pretending to be small craft breweries (Rice, 2016, p. 245).

Crafty breweries, or those brands tagged craft but owned by brewing conglomerates, complicate this "us" versus "them" narrative and challenge the binaries defined through ongoing claims of authenticity in the craft beer industry (p. 249).

One way mass-producers attempt to claim the craft identity is by hiding the true ownership of crafty beer brands from advertising materials, including their website, social media posts and oftentimes not including this information on the beer can or packaging itself (Money, 2017, p. 428). When mass production breweries create crafty products they tend to focus their target audience on folks that are relatively new to the craft beer scene and drinking craft beers that do not stray too far from the palate of the general population, in terms of both beer style and flavor (Carroll and Swaminathan, 2000, p. 727). “Consumers should not be expected to anticipate deceit and to investigate the true origin of a particular beer because they remain unaware of the trade name loophole afforded macrobrewers in labeling” (Money, 2017, p. 431). Further, crafty beers introduce innovative tastes to consumers of mass-produced beer, expanding the possible market for craft beer producers. Crafty beers, therefore, have the ability to slowly transform the overall taste and preferences of the entire beer industry (Verhaal et al., 2017, p. 2548).

In addition to creating crafty beers or brands to gain some of the craft beer industry’s market share, many brewing conglomerates “have begun to acquire craft brewers in an attempt to purchase their authentic identities” (Frake, 2017, p. 3934). As craft breweries began selling their businesses to mass-producers of beer, those that remained in the oppositional category worked together to emphasize independent ownership as the identity that signified “authentic” craft beer, as this is the identity that cannot be bought (Mathias et al., 2020, p. 2548-2549). This shift in messaging meant that it was less important to distinguish the *beer* as craft and more importantly to distinguish the *brewer* as craft (p. 2550). “By losing the positive attribute of small size, the narrative contends, the brewery loses its soul” (Rice, 2016, p. 249). Not all stories of selling out in the craft beer industry lead to the same conclusion. Although these strict binaries outlining the

defining characteristics of craft are violated by selling out, the consumers determine which breweries they continue to engage with. We saw with Goose Island, for example, that their rare, barrel-aged and handmade brews were still valued by the craft community after they sold out (Rice, 2016, p. 255). Based on personal experience with the Bourbon County Stout line from Goose Island that Rice is citing as an example here, some of the appeal may be lost now that it has been several years since Goose Island sold. Further studies would need to be conducted to understand how selling out impacts a brand several years later, not just in the months following the sale. Through their study of Mezcal craft consumers, Gaytán (2019) finds that one way to maintain long-term relevance and value in the craft market after selling out is through creating a brand centered around “experiential and interpersonal consumption-based options” prior to selling out (p. 10), a value of craft making we see employed regularly in the craft beer industry.

Following the sale of many craft breweries to mass-producers throughout the 2010s, independent craft breweries had to double-down on the importance of independence to eliminate the blurring of what identities are most important to being defined as craft (Mathias et al., 2017, p. 3110).

By shifting emphasis to producer- or ownership-based identity codes, craft brewers have attempted to provide a more distinctive identity from incumbents, but time will tell if consumers care enough about these producer codes to continue supporting the oppositional category. Indeed, not surprisingly, these efforts by the craft brewing category have not halted Big Beer’s quest to co-opt ‘craft’ as they continue to downplay the differences between the two groups, highlight the irrelevance of ownership, and assert that they too produce ‘craft’ beer (Mathias et al., 2017, p. 2577).

This move by craft brewers to emphasize independent ownership is a move that broader audiences may not identify with personally. Therefore, this aspect of their branding, while successful for staking an oppositional claim in relation to mass-producers, may only resonate with a small portion of those that consume craft beer (Mathias et al., 2017, p. 2578). Purchasing and drinking craft beer adds value to the arguments that it is “authentic” as compared to “inauthentic,” mass-produced brews (Schroeder, 2020, p. 218).

One final way that breweries have blurred the line between “authentic” and “inauthentic” craft beer production is through contract brewing. Contract brewing blurs the definitions of craft because oftentimes those that own the recipes will not ever touch the production process. “These differences are often hidden behind marketing” (Ocejo, 2017, p. 64). There are many examples of the ways that contract brewing operated historically and how this phenomenon has changed in the present-day. This area is most definitely one that deserves further exploration outside of this dissertation, as the branding and economical considerations are expansive. Based on the breweries studied, there were two overarching ways that contract breweries operate. The first is that there is a physical brewery location that owns recipes for beer and serves beer in a taproom but for whatever reason no longer brews their own beer on site. One example of this particular phenomenon occurs with Cooperstown, which changed ownership in 2014 and now is owned by Northern Eagle Beverages, a distribution company. Although brewing for Cooperstown historically took place on site, all brewing is now done at Glens Falls Brewing Company in Queensbury, NY. The second way that this dissertation found contract breweries operating in the present-day is through solely packaging and distributing beer; however, there is no onsite location where consumers can go to try the beers. “City Brewery currently brews approximately 40 different brew recipes for contract brewing customers.” The history of breweries using this

type of contract service is uncertain and not the focus of this study. Rather, what is important to note here is that when examining craft beer from the perspective of craft more broadly, it is difficult to make an argument that contracted brews can still be considered “authentic” craft products given the brewery owning the recipes is no longer making the actual craft beer.

Conclusions

In conclusion, representations of oppositionality are branded and maintained by the craft beer industry in a variety of ways. Although the transformative potential of craft brands is limited when tied to binary understandings of authenticity/inauthenticity, more important, at least currently, to the craft beer industry is collective market share. These narratives of oppositionality exist on spectrums of authenticity, influenced by the history of craft and the desire and commitment to a continuation of craft in capitalist economies marked a reliance on increasing industrialization. The power of the craft beer market, both socially and economically, exists in its collective identity of narratives of oppositionality. This power is questioned and challenged by mass-producers of beer through the creation of crafty beers and brands and the purchase of craft breweries. To appeal to consumers in other ways, craft breweries have also branded their organizations by using craft narratives that emphasize “authentic” commitments to taste, place, knowledge and community. The exploration of the branding of these factors is the topic of the following chapters of this dissertation study.

Chapter 3: Ingredients and Taste

“The discriminating craft brew consumer works as an agent of taste, perceptive of the symbolic value contained within each bottle and every pour” (Mathews and Picton, 2014, p. 340).

I heard about Side Project Brewing awhile ago, but I have been talking about coming ever since hearing rave reviews from a craft beer fan I chatted with at a bar before Shelton in 2019. When I walked into Side Project on this late Friday afternoon a seat opened up pretty quickly at a community table near the center of the room. I sat down and the couple across from me, a man and woman about 50-years old based on the stories they told about their empty nest, started the typical small talk banter right away. I shared where I was from, that I was just driving through. They shared a few beer recommendations and I sent off my order for a beer and continued small talk about kids, beer, St. Louis. By the time my beer had arrived, the conversation with the couple had moved into a space I was less familiar with, exerting one’s significance in the beer space. They name-dropped executives they knew at Budweiser and detailed the extent to which they knew them, talking about the living in the same neighborhood and having been in their houses on many occasions. But the part of the conversation that struck me the most was the woman’s need to communicate that she likes beer more than wine. As a woman very engaged in the craft beer space, I reflected for the rest of the night on how I have never felt the need to prove my taste in this space. But, this woman did and for her it was important to communicate with people she had met that although most women like wine, she prefers beer. I mostly just nodded my head, not really sure what to say and thankfully we began talking about our recent Netflix binges and recommendations for food in the area.

[Shortened Field Notes, July 9, 2021 - Side Project Brewing in Maplewood, MO]

Up to this point, I have discussed the ways that the craft beer industry brands itself as “authentic” through economic independence and narratives of oppositionality to the mass-produced beer industry. As argued, these narratives of economic independence and narratives of oppositionality are limited to terms of their ability to create transformative and revolutionary changes because the success of these narratives is tied to the mass-produced beer market existing. In the chapters that follow, I will be returning to the overarching theme of “authentic” craft production, which is the pursuit of quality above all other motives, by examining the ways the craft beer industry employs narratives of ingredients and taste, space and place, tools, skills and knowledge and community and collaboration to brand their breweries as “authentic” craft spaces. This chapter focuses on the role of ingredients in an overall commitment to quality and how these ingredients help communicate cultural value and claim cultural capital. I will also explore how consumer tastes and desire for identity formation influence the experiences a brand offers, thinking about craft tastes more broadly and the role of power in terms of defining these tastes.

Ingredients of High Quality and Cultural Value

Morgan et al. (2020) contend that the overarching characteristics that designate a brewery as craft are the commitment to flavor and high quality ingredients over profit or restrictions for brewing processes. Depending on the brewery and the beer, craft can be defined by either traditional or modern brewing practices (p. 13), which is one area where we can see the spectrum of “authentic” craft beer production. Quality has always been a factor weighed against time and cost when making things, including craft products. Therefore the nostalgic desire for craft is not necessarily for quality products but for an overall aspiration for quality to be pursued and valued above all other factors (Korn, 2013, p. 12). “Throughout the entire process, the quality

achievable at each stage is utterly dependent on the care with which the craftsman has accomplished every previous step” (p. 29). This aspiration for quality above all else is not a one-time decision made by a craft maker but a continuous conscious commitment at each stage in the making process.

Clearly, one of the main themes of craft in this dissertation and in craft spaces more broadly is the commitment to quality throughout the production process. One of the first decisions that breweries must make when it comes to a commitment to quality involves selecting the water that will be used to brew the beer. Many breweries include what makes their beer high quality in their branding materials, which is often the reference to either a natural source of water or the mechanical intervention to set the PH of the water to a traditionally set level for a particular beer style. Ironhill Brewery & Restaurant uses their TikTok account to showcase some other commitments to quality, such as videos of taste testing beer from the brew tank and the process of cleaning out a brew tank. Duck Foot Brewing Co. posts about similar cleaning processes, showing the beer lines in the taproom being purged before the taproom opens for the day, ensuring a high quality product from brew tank to glass . Other breweries use their websites to showcase static imagery of the different stages in the production process. However, as 10k Brewing has communicated that the testing of beer at every stage in the brewing process is not a burden but something to be celebrated. In their particular brewery, this commitment to quality is celebrated through dancing while employees test the brews.

Narratives about ingredients and materials used throughout a craft making process are typically very detailed, including notes on the connection to the maker and the place and space where the craft is being made.

The purpose of close discussion of ingredients seems to be twofold. First, it is possible to differentiate the product as being made of good quality ingredients which possess superior qualities in terms of the tastes, textures or aromas that they contribute to the final product. Second, and perhaps as importantly, discussing materials allows a story to be told about the ethos of the makers, who narrate their ability to skillfully identify ingredients to use and to gauge their impact on the quality of the final product (Thurnell-Read, 2019, p. 1456).

A craft maker's quest for a high quality product is directly linked to the maker's "curiosity about the material at hand" (Sennett, 2008, p. 120). Therefore, oftentimes these long and detailed narratives are not necessarily branding language, although they do add to the claims of "authentic" craft, but are instead explanations of how the maker is attached to and engaging with the ingredients and materials being used. "The attribution of ethical human qualities — honesty, modesty, virtue — into materials does not aim at explanation; its purpose is to heighten our consciousness of the materials themselves and in this way to think about their value" (p. 137). Therefore, the way that ingredients and materials are talked about relay the connection between them and the maker.

Visual representations of these tangible natural ingredients are shown through imagery and videos on social media platforms, such as an example from Ironhill Brewery & Restaurant where we are shown fresh spruce needles being placed directly into the brew tank. Great Basin Brewing takes this a step further through showing their employees picking and collecting juniper berries and sage to be used in their Harvest Ale. These are not one off examples but rather the norm when it comes to the in-depth discussion and representation of the raw ingredients that are used in the making process. Breweries are committed to making sure that consumers are aware

of the labor that goes into creating these recipes and then finding the highest quality ingredients which are then handpicked or processed before making their way into the actual beer. The raw ingredients are also used throughout the branding materials created for the beers where grain, hops or fruit are placed next to the poured beer or even inside the glass itself.

Craft production is marked by a full picture view of how the materials and ingredients being used impact the world they are being taken from and used in. As, “being able so easily to dispose of things desensitizes us to the actual objects we hold in hand” (p. 110). Langlands (2017) proposes the following trajectory of craft production: tended landscape → sustainable production of raw materials → intelligently processed → beautifully made → fit for purpose → fondly used → ingeniously reused → considerately discarded → given back to the earth (p. 340). One way that breweries incorporate sustainable practices into their making processes is through using used barrels to age their beers in. Pretty much any barrel that has ever been used for another alcohol product, with Bourbon being a favorite, is used to age the beer. After the barrel has been used by the brewery, many use the barrels throughout their decor, as tables, flower pots, chair material, photoshoot backgrounds, etc. Sustainability within the making process at a craft brewery is illustrated throughout the drinking space as well. South Gate Brewing Co. touts on their website, “Our ‘Industrial Chic’ design is stylish and inviting, and, mindful of sustainable building practices, we have utilized reclaimed wood and other locally procured materials whenever possible.” Sustainable building practices are also used throughout determining the locations for breweries, which will be explored in much greater detail in chapter four; however, most breweries look for opportunities to renovate buildings that have “good bones” (Ragged Island).

Another way craft breweries emphasize sustainability is through ingredient selection, making a point to communicate where the ingredients came from. Sometimes the brewery conducts business on a working farm, so they can acquire ingredients directly from their land. More often, craft breweries rely on local farms. It is important to note that some of the ingredients used in beer, such as hops, can only be grown in certain areas of the country. Rather than making sustainability claims for these ingredients, breweries typically refer to this sourcing of ingredients by communicating that they are coming from a family farm or a farm local to a particular beer style. Other ways that breweries brand their sustainability efforts is through local or state-level sustainability certifications or organic certifications. Elliott Bay has an entire section of their website dedicated to the many sustainability efforts they have implemented throughout their history, which are focused on community support and environmental concerns. These efforts culminate in their extensive line of organic beers, the most of any brewery in the Northwest. It is important to note here that when branding their emphasis on the role of local ingredients as a branding tactic, craft breweries tend to ignore including information on the processes used to create and collect these ingredients, such as impacts on the environment and sustainability efforts (Cipollaro et al., 2021, p. 11).

Much of the value of beer for the middle-class is cultural value, which comes from its craftsmanship characteristics (Kuehn and Parker, 2021, p. 521). “Where authenticity operates as a question of value it is viewed by those who buy into it as part of an economy of cultural politics in which signs, as measures of value, circulate for the production of cultural commodities” (Ellis, 2014, p. 507). A consumer’s desire for a craft product, then, transcends the object’s physical characteristics. Although the product and the process in which it was made are considered of higher quality and contain “authentic” characteristics, consumers also are

consuming the affective qualities of the product (Thurnell-Read, 2014, p. 46). The “authentic” character of an object is therefore not inherent, regardless of the ingredients and materials used. Rather, authenticity is the medium through which we see craft products as culturally valuable (Hansen, 2008, p. 342).

Consumer Identity Formation through Brand Experiences

The ways that craft products are branded in modern society are directly related to the overwhelming consumer desire for craft products in our increasingly industrialized world.

At the same time that craft was being displaced in the economic order, there was a major shift in how people viewed themselves as individuals. For all of recorded history, beliefs about the nature of humanity and the purposes of life had been in flux, but every major belief system, had agreed that a person became fully human only through participation in a larger entity, whether that entity was a tribe, a polity, a divine cosmology, or a social class. By the mid-twentieth century, however, where people had once looked to external sources for validation, truth was now to be found within. With this change, external scaffoldings began to fall away and the task of constructing one’s identity became the life project of the individual. The demands of self-definition strongly shaped the nature and practice of craft, in essence converting it to a form of spiritual practice (Korn, 2013, p. 96).

In light of these changes to society, craft culture became a way for producers and consumers to find their own truths. This increase in the centrality of consumer culture has led to the ability to buy products that allow one to construct their identity.

The purchase of products to form a consumer identity is old news. What I am interested in here is how this desire for identity formation influences the types of experiences offered by a

craft brand. “Commodities are now purchased not for the pleasure of use-value derived from the ownership of the commodity, but for the experience associated with the commodity” (Swier, 2019, p. 212). Brands are not just relevant economically, but also culturally. Although a brand may be created to tell the story of a product, brands can become a space for consumers to experience a story. As a result, the brand’s story becomes a part of the consumer’s individual story (Banet-Weiser, 2012, p. 4). “Branding in our era has extended beyond a business model; branding is now both reliant on, and reflective of, our most basic social and cultural relations” (p. 4). These brand experiences and stories become a part of the brand culture itself, becoming expectations that consumers have when they engage with a craft brand product or experience.

The act of craft beer consumption is directly linked to identity formation. This identity formation is motivated by accumulation of craft beer knowledge, experiencing new tastes and avoiding mass-produced beer (Koch and Sauerbronn, 2019, p. 3). Taste is where the quality of an object becomes conscious. Satisfaction transcends happiness. Taste enters,

into the realm of fabrication and of quality it introduces the personal factor, that is, gives it a humanistic meaning. Taste debarbarizes the world of the beautiful by not being overwhelmed by it; it takes care of the beautiful in its own ‘personal’ way and this produces a ‘culture’ (Arendt, 1961, p. 224).

Craft beer consumption occurs both through the consumption of actual beers but also through the experience of going to a brewery and being around other craft beer consumers. Breweries even brand their organization and their products as appealing to consumers looking for something unique, as with Great Basin Brewing touting that they are “Brewing craft beer that speaks to modern-day pioneers.” While the brewery can be branded as being a location for a person looking for a personal experience, larger breweries can make these intimate experiences happen

through beer clubs. Ebullition's beer club is called "The High Society," which appeals to those consumers looking for one-of-a-kind tastes. Other breweries complement the local people as having unique or innovative tastes in order to appeal to a larger range of consumers interested in identity formation through craft beer consumption.

Our society is set up in a way that requires individuals to answer the question of "what" they are, which is different from "who" they are. Individuals find ways of describing "what" they are through purchasing fetishized commodities that contain claims of authenticity, allowing individuals to claim uniqueness and originality (Benjamin, 1968, p. 3).

Benjamin's thesis derived ultimately from Marx's idea of a potential contradiction between the forces and relations of production, was that mechanical production *per se* had altered the relationship of the audience to the cultural artefact in such a way as to destroy its aura, and introduce a more 'scientific' way of seeing the world (Garnham, 2000, p. 67).

This distinction between "who" and "what" further breaks the concept of authenticity according to existentialism. An individual's ability to construct their identity through commodities places the focus of branding and brand culture on personalization, not on systemic cultural and political change (Banet-Weiser, 2012, p. 42). Instead, brand culture provides a platform for consumers to build relationships with the brand, and also to create social relationships with other consumers based on their shared brand affiliation (p. 46). Consumers are faced with the need to exert both capital and labor in order to stay relevant and attached to their chosen brand culture. And the brand must exert labor as well to maintain this culture of authenticity (p. 112).

Capitalism cares about attaching the marker of "authenticity" to reproduced objects because as these commodities become fetishized political power and cultural status can be

assigned to them. Through this political power, organizations operating in a capitalist system can organize and mobilize societies to their benefit (Marcuse, 1964, p. 3). Through the production and distribution of “authentic” commodities, capitalists can claim social progress.

If the worker and his boss enjoy the same television program and visit the same resort places, if the typist is as attractively made up as the daughter of her employer, if the Negro owns a Cadillac, if they all read the same newspaper, then this assimilation indicated not the disappearance of classes, but the extent to which the needs and satisfactions that serve the preservation of the Establishment are shared by the underlying population (p. 8).

Therefore, commodities become the way that individuals recognize their place in their community (p. 9).

Significant to this dissertation are studies investigating concepts of authenticity defined by its purchase power in a capitalist business context. Researchers have found that this particular conceptualization of authenticity occurs most frequently when organizations are discussing “authentic” emotions and feelings, which are manufactured by capitalist organizations in order to sell a product as “authentic” (Aslama and Pantii, 2006). Looking at why certain people and products are characterized as “authentic,” even if this “authentic” character has been manufactured, helps to understand the process that the concept of authenticity undergoes to become a character of the commodity in capitalist society and to become a cultural phrase used to describe desirable products. Authenticity has become central not only to the way we study culture but to how we talk about culture and cultural products colloquially.

The Craft Consumer Tastes

The discourse that craft breweries manufacture about their organizations and products are aimed to appeal to their ideal consumer. That is, a consumer who can recognize and distinguish taste while attributing “good” flavor to the culture of craft beer itself (Konnolly, 2020, p. 74). The transformation of a historically working-class choice for alcohol to one for elites occurs through the development of a technical narrative. The knowledge required to understand the tasting practices communicated by craft beer producers appeals to consumers looking for a cultural experience. While, overall branding norms constructing democratic discourses about the beer speak to appeals for the working class (p. 70). For consumers that may not fit this “ideal” type, breweries have manufactured branding materials to incorporate typical white, working-class narratives, such as language emphasizing appeals related to the outdoors, patriotism and sports (p. 75-76). This language typically contradicts that appealing to consumers looking for a beverage created for elites (p. 76).

Drinking for differentiation of taste, rather than drinking to feel the physical and mental effects of alcohol, is one way in which drinkers exhibit their accumulated cultural capital (Hubbard, 2019, p. 773). “Those who can ‘taste the difference’ recognize taste in a symbolic sense, differentiating craft brews as a premium product versus the mass produced commercial brewers as boringly mainstream” (Mathews and Picton, 2014, p. 342). Although drinkers do not need to value or recognize this cultural capital to engage in this subculture, all drinkers “are being inculcated into a set of rituals that involve a studied appreciation of the flavor and quality of real ale” (Hubbard, 2019, p. 774).

As previously discussed many breweries emphasize that craft beer is meant to be tasted and enjoyed, not drunk solely to feel the effects of alcohol, as the tagline from Bond’s Brewing

illustrates, “Elevate your taste buds.” However, it is important to note that there are many examples of employees or customers drinking craft beer to get drunk, usually illustrated through a game or contest. 10k Brewing communicates this through a video of an employee shotgunning¹¹ a beer on their TikTok account. A similar example is found with 12 Fox Beer Co. which held a stick horse race competition for derby¹² weekend. Because the race ended in a tie, there was a drink off to determine the winner. These examples should be considered as just a few instances found throughout a narrative of responsible drinking that focuses on quality over quantity; however, as was stated with the examples of breweries engaging in the overt sexualization of women, it is important to note that breweries are not fully opposed or in opposition to drinking primarily to feel the buzz.

Another aspect of taste that is branded by the craft beer industry is its connection to concepts such as small, slow and local. Clearly, these are oppositional claims tied directly to taste, and therefore cultural value.

The notion that crafted goods are superior to mass-produced ones is of course questionable, but in beer production, as in other spheres, hierarchies of taste and value are currently constructed around the juxtaposition of the slow and small with the fast and large. On this basis, microbrewers claim their beer is made with both passion and pride, playing up the embodied and affective nature of their work. As producers they authenticate their own products by claiming they, and by extension their products, represent real, local culture (Hubbard, 2019, p. 776).

¹¹ Shotgunning a beer refers to chugging a beer at a very fast speed. This is usually done through puncturing the can on both ends to allow for a very fast flow (Urban Dictionary, 2007).

¹² The Kentucky Derby is an annual horse race held in Louisville, Kentucky typically the first Saturday in May. Restaurants and bars across the United States hold special watch parties to celebrate the occasion (Kentucky Derby, 2022).

Real culture in these craft beer spaces is typically reflected in the local environment. Imagery of mountains, rivers and oceans reflect both adventure and a sense of peace. The history of small, slow and local in the craft beer industry is illustrated throughout the production process. “We brew small batches, working to refine the art propelled by generations of craftsmen...Every day, they continue to be humbled by the opportunity to share their craft with others” (Coldfire Brewing). Other breweries emphasize their hands-on practices as counter to the hustle and bustle of the city they are brewing in. Beer from these breweries becomes an escape, a moment to savor something local.

The appeal of branding a business in terms of taste is also incorporated by bars and taprooms that bring in craft beers from other breweries.

Commerce is far more than an exchange of goods between those who make and those who acquire...Just as makers create to construct meaning and identity for themselves, and buyers purchase to bolster their personal narratives, so vendors shape their own identities through the exercise of taste and the conduct of business. Taste, after all, is a matter of defining oneself through one’s likes and dislikes, and the craft merchant exercises taste above all else in selecting his inventory (Korn, 2013, p. 150).

Although the sample set for this dissertation did not include bars, there were a few breweries that also sell other craft beer products. Ocean Beach makes their own beer and offers “a wide selection of the best local taps for every beer palate.” Many other breweries sell craft cocktails, hard cider and hard seltzer to appeal to other consumers looking for a craft beverage that is beer. In some cases, the branding of these products is distinct from the branding of the brewery, as the cider or seltzer line of products are bottled or canned with unique labels, and sometimes even different brand names.

Therefore, the appeal of branding a craft producer or craft distributor as “authentic” in terms of the pursuit for quality and therefore taste above all other possible motives comes from the desire to meet consumer needs for products and experiences that allow a consumer to express their tastes and claim “authentic” value (Frake, 2017, p. 3933).

The trope of authenticity becomes ideally suited for this context for in principle it is antithetical to any attempt to provide a rationalized blueprint for life. Like capitalism itself, authenticity is a moral, pertaining less to what kinds of things you should do and more to how a life is styled (Botterill, 2007, p. 114).

Therefore, although craft beer is a commodity, its “authentic” appeal is not just economic, but also cultural, as cultural capital within the scope of political economy does not divorce the cultural from the economic (Prado, 2020, p. 576). “The handmade object is marked by its solid oneness in the world, and is a sign of consumer distinction in a globalised marketplace...the handmade appeals to people in search of the unique” (Luckman, 2015, p. 68-69). Cultural capital when it comes to ordering a beer is deemed highest when the consumer has the ability to distinguish what types of beers are ordered in specific settings and specific contexts (Darwin, 2018, p. 303).

Our economy has shifted, our craft economy and therefore capitalist economy due to their connections explored in the previous chapter, to produce opportunities and spaces for consumers to engage with “authentic” craft products and experiences.

By extension, therefore, the consumption of craft goods, alongside the growth of farmers’ markets and fair-trade items has become part of a set of ethical and self-aware middle-class purchasing behaviours. Often focused on the local, but also made available through the affordances of the internet, a diversity of niche lifestyle goods are available to those

who can afford them to a degree never previously historically possible (Luckman, 2015, p. 25).

Although many of the experiences in these spaces are branded as oppositional and transformative, the tags of small-batch, local, handmade, etc. are passive ways that consumers believe they are taking political action. This is the jargon of authenticity in the politics of eating well (Young, 2014, p. 395).

Adorno argues that following World War II, terms based in existentialism, such as “authenticity,” have become jargon (1973, p. xiii). The jargon comes to be because the connection between language and truth is broken. The word authenticity no longer has a true meaning, it has become the jargon of existential philosophy (p. xiii). Because the world has become the arbitrator of determining what is “authentic” and not (p. 129-130), we can begin to see applications in the world of advertising (p. 43). Expanding on Marx’s analysis of commodity fetishism, Adorno argues that authenticity’s entrance to the world of advertising marks its “masking of human freedom with the freedom of authentic consumption” (p. xiv, 17). Using the term authenticity, then, becomes a way to further fetishize commodities. In this way, authenticity is unable to escape industries of production and consumption and plant itself in true human satisfaction and experience, as existentialism would have it do. Instead, it is contained in the world of wants, not the world of needs (p. 112). It becomes a product of the culture industry rather than solely serving as a way to reflect on the objects contained within it (p. 49).

The authenticity of a thing can only be measured against other things that are different from it. Authenticity is never a pure concept, in this case, because it is always measured against inauthenticity (Adorno, 1973, p. 123). “The jargon of authenticity is ideology as language, without any consideration of specific content” (p. 160). No thing is automatically “authentic.”

The term is always relative and can easily become unattached to an object previously deemed “authentic” (p. 125). Further, authenticity is a subjective concept and is “determined by the arbitrariness of the subject, which is authentic to itself” (p. 126). This argument provided by Adorno is in opposition to the existential definition of authenticity provided by Heidegger, where authenticity lives within the subject and is not determined arbitrarily (p. 126). Additionally, the Kierkegaardian distinction between authenticity and inauthenticity is lost here. For Adorno, these definitions are determined by the advertising world, not the individual self (p. 114-115).

Cultural omnivorousness is marked by a consumer’s ability to enjoy both highbrow and lowbrow goods that are considered to be of high quality (Darwin, 2018, p. 301; Schifeling and Demetry, 2021, p. 136). “It is not enough to consume, but to add an intellectual level to it. The cultural omnivore intellectualizes and formalizes the common” (Veitch, 2011, p. 5). Through experiencing a variety of products, the cultural omnivore adds evidence to their claims of high cultural capital, making them a distinctive member of these craft spaces (Schifeling and Demetry, 2021, p. 126).

With a heightened premium on intimate endeavors, taste-based connections that bring together creativity, invention, and the potential for refinement are potent compounds for durable familial-like affinities. Artisan kinship is a key signaling system of the omnivore era through which consumers simultaneously perceive connection and accrue experiential capital (Gaytán, 2019, p. 5).

These consumers then have the power to engage in and define what is high taste in these craft spaces, which is the topic of the next section.

The Power to Engage in and Define Craft Tastes

Authenticity is inextricably linked to power, as it is a socially constructed concept. Those that claim authenticity can also gain power due to claims of authenticity often being claims of moral superiority in one way or another (Zukin, 2009, p. 544-545).

It is clear that media images and consumer tastes grease the wheels of global urbanism, anchoring the power of both capital and the state in the spaces of our individual desires, persuading us that consuming the authentic city has everything to do with aesthetics and nothing to do with power (Zukin, 2009, p. 551).

This power will be discussed in terms of its connection to claiming spaces and places in the next chapter. However, here I am arguing that craft experiences are branded in a way where more experiences, specifically more intimate experiences, with craft makers and craft products lead to high cultural capital and more power to define craft tastes.

In the craft beer industry, because of a history of overwhelming blandness of lagers, certain historic tastes continue to inform the ability for certain beer styles to be seen as an example of high taste. Therefore, consuming these beer styles is not a marker of high cultural capital. (Thurnell-Read, 2018, p. 540). “In Bourdieusian terms, real-ale is seen as a marker of good taste and distinction. In choosing to drink real-ale, one chooses to reject the lagerisation of the mainstream, the instrumentalist of commodification and modernity” (Spracklen et al., 2013, p. 317). Because the mass-produced market overwhelmingly consists of lagers, and the craft beer industry historically came to be in opposition to this flaw in the market, it is difficult for craft breweries to successfully make the argument that the lagers they are producing are superior in flavor and quality to those on the mass-produced market because the lager style itself has been historically stigmatized (Barlow et al., 2018, p. 2944). Roaring Table calls out this stigmatization

of lager in their description for Sunwork, their Kolsch. “Our take on the delicate and sublime beer of Cologne, this one rewards casual sipping and more introspective pours alike. It’s nuanced, unhypeable, and we absolutely love it. Drink it and be awesomely uncool!” Overall, most breweries selling lagers recognize this stigmatization and emphasize that the beer is still crafted with high quality ingredients, just like all their others. Bathtub Row even goes as far as to reference the mass-produced product that theirs is a reproduction of. New Mexi Lager is “Just plain beer-flavored beer. Light flavor, low bitterness. Ice cold, yellow, fizzy, delicious. Inspired by your favorite Mexican lagers, but this one’s brewed in New Mexico for New Mexicans.” Of course, the brewery is talking about Corona here; however, the relevance of this reproduction is the “authentic” commitment to community and local ingredients.

Obviously, not all consumers of craft beer have the same power in socially constructing these definitions of authenticity. Taste cultures exert their power in consumptive spaces. “One’s recognized ability to ‘taste’ provides them with a sense of prestige, which they desire to achieve and be recognized for within the community” (Kremlick, 2016, p. 14). The maintenance of what is tasteful occurs by those with the economic standing to financially support those products and experiences deemed tasteful and therefore reiterate the cultural value of these tastes (Rosenblatt, 2013, p. 593). Consumers that are considered more knowledgeable of the industry and more interested in sharing this knowledge have a more central role in the social construction of authenticity (Barlow et al., 2018, p. 2938). The way a person talks about beer can be used to confirm their identity in the culture, “assert status and reproduce social distinction” (Thurnell-Read, 2018, p. 550). “Taste is both a way of defining self and distancing others, creating distinctions of class, gender, ‘race’ and other markers such as local and regional identities” (Spracklen et al., 2013, p. 305). Further, if a person has already been included in the space

because of their tastes, they have the power to police performances of knowledge in the spaces. (Nanney et al., 2020, p. 454). Overt policing of “authentic” craft was not found in this study. In my personal experience, I can only think of one specific example of a social media post from one craft brewery condemning the actions of another craft brewery. However, there are many subtle ways in which authenticity is policed in the craft beer industry. One such way is clearly through the Brewers Association. These definitions, even if broad, do police which breweries can authentically claim craft status in the United States. Craft beer festivals and awards also police which beers and breweries are worth being included and/or honored. Beer collaborations also tend to occur between breweries that have become friends throughout their mutual appreciation for each other’s beer.

Notably, much research has been done on the policing of women in these craft beer places and spaces.

While women are assumed to lack the knowledge that men ‘naturally’ possess, this assumption does not prevent women from engaging in craft beer consumption. When confronted with gatekeeping, women are more likely than men to feel the need to prove their knowledge with more outward and explicit displays of cultural capital, most often in the form of beer knowledge and past drinking experiences (Nanney et al., 2020, p. 464). By assuming beer style preferences based on gender — women like lighter, fruity beers and men like heavier, dark beer — we are classifying beer types themselves as appropriate for a specific gender (Chapman et al., 2018, p. 303). These classifications of beer type based on gender are further problematized when beer made for men becomes “real” beer (p. 305).

Whether or not women can access the craft beer industry is at the mercy of men who interpret whether or not women’s performance of gender is within the realm of

acceptability in terms of upholding the meaning and differences between gender categories, as well as their associated power relationship (p. 308).

In these ways, beer is gendered and the ability to experience it is regulated by those with power in the space, typically white men (Nanney et al., 2020, p. 464). As discussed previously, it is clear, at least in some areas of the United States, the gendering of beer is a major issue. However, due to the limited focus of this dissertation I must focus solely on how this gendering of beer impacts the branding of the craft beer industry more broadly. Overall, I found very few examples of overt gendering. Since this is a virtual study of craft beer branding, I believe data collection would need to be expanded to include interviews with craft beer producers that do not identify as male in order to better understand the gendering of beer in craft beer spaces.

Women cannot be cultural omnivore in the world of craft beer because if they choose to extend their cultural capital by becoming immersed in this world their gender capital suffers as they are then seen as being less feminine. On the other hand, since men are in the dominant position in this world, their ordering of a feminine beer does not impact their gender capital but extends their cultural capital as this is assumed to be a choice based on their extensive knowledge of beer taste rather than a choice based on their preferences due to gender (Darwin, 2018, p. 311). “Therefore, when members of a culture declare it to be omnivorous, sociologists should ask, ‘omnivorous for whom?’” (p. 313). This dissertation study is not prepared to examine this issue in detail; however, future studies should examine how other folks are policed or restricted from craft beer spaces due to their socially constructed differences, such as race, sexuality, class and ability.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the role of ingredients and quality in branding craft beer as “authentic” is extensive and highly problematic. Because ingredients and quality are aspects of a product and experience that are best represented in terms of connecting to consumer taste, consumption of these products and experiences is connected to the construction and branding of an “authentic” self. Because of the ways these products and experiences have been branded, and the influences of the oppositional and craft markets to this branding, these claims of authenticity are typically linked to moral claims. Therefore, not only is the product and producer superior, but so is the consumer engaging in these craft spaces. Knowledge and experience then become the ways power is exerted in the space, sometimes excluding folks based on socially constructed differences, such as gender. Because this dissertation is concerned with the ways craft is branded and maintained in the craft economy, I have not fully examined this issue of power in the detail it deserves. Future studies need to look at this issue more extensively, which is also true of the issue of displacement discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 4: Space and (Dis)Place

“In this sense, making things (or consuming ‘made’ things, or indeed living in proximity to the makers of things) might have emerged as a means of managing or retarding the accelerations and precarities of modern life for some, but we are reminded that the very polarities, erasures and injustices that brought us to this point do not disappear with the neo-artisanal invocation, but can still be glimpsed with an attuned critical gaze” (Wallace, 2019, p. 962).

When I was in the Uber on the way to The Festival, I was a little surprised to hear the driver ask my cousin, “What are you headed to this part of town for?” My cousin without hesitation told the driver about the beer festival. She had gone to The Festival the year before in Denver, CO. When she told me about the venue I was surprised because I didn’t know that an unused industrial area would or could be used for an event like this. So, I should not have been surprised when I showed up at Buffalo Central Terminal. The area was empty aside from the crowd outside waiting to get in. The building clearly needed major renovations on the outside; however, as I walked inside, I saw why the festival was there. There was so much natural light, and as the night came the golden yellow lights made the space glow in the way they do in a speakeasy. In the center of the crowded room was a beautiful clock, one that made me think of countless movies set in train stations of the past. I could not help but think about the history of this place, the people who once used this station. These questions were anticipated. As I was handed my tasting glass, I saw posters and dioramas featuring restoration plans for this historic place. Plans that made this a usable space for the community it was originally built for, not tourists.

[Shortened Field Notes, October 4, 2019 - The Festival by Shelton Brothers Inc. in Buffalo, NY]

The history of the branding of craft breweries in the United States has established that craft beer is made by “authentic” craft brewers, which is defined by a brewery’s connection to space and place through concentration on quality and community. These definitions of authenticity are socially constructed with the historical roots of craft brewing constantly influencing this social construction (Gatrell et al., 2018, p. 362). The spaces and places where craft breweries decide to call home are oftentimes historic homes of businesses or people in these communities. This is not a dissertation about gentrification; however, it is impossible to ignore gentrification concerns when engaging with scholarly work on the branding of spaces and places, as well as the example pulled from my empirical data set related to these themes. As this chapter will demonstrate, the creation and claiming of “authentic” spaces in the craft beer industry consists of the active capitalization on specific elements of a place with the goal of connecting place and tastes. Although people and cultures may not be excluded or displaced as a direct result of craft breweries claiming these historic spaces, craft breweries, broadly speaking, are not taking active steps to prevent exclusion or displacement. This is most definitely not an exhaustive representation or analysis of this phenomenon. However, my hope is that this overview will provide a glimpse of this area’s significance to the construction of “authentic” craft brands and encourage the much-needed research in this area, as there are clear connections between the aspirations to reclaim craft and the aspirations to revitalize urban communities.

Capitalizing on Select Elements of a Place

The stories we tell about places we have experienced are constructed from the memories we have collected in those places over time. When we construct the story of a place based on the memories we have experienced there, we include all sorts of stimuli, both bad and good, sad and

happy, old and new. The place that we construct in our minds is not a complete picture, but one that emphasizes the parts of the memories that stand out to us the most. The same is true for the stories of brands and the places that they are connected to. In the same way that we select elements of a place to include in our stories, brands pick and choose which parts of the full story to emphasize and which parts to downplay or ignore. Brands capitalize on select elements of a place to describe who they are and why they do what they do. To create representations of a place that brands can claim as “authentic,” and therefore a place where consumers can have “authentic” experiences, brands emphasize stories about the places that relate to local identity, and therefore local relevance.

A theme seen throughout the cultural studies literature is authenticity being linked to place, especially when discussing “authentic” experience as they are related to tourism (Gibson and Connell, 2005; Hurych, 2017). This particular theme is connected to our theoretical understanding of authenticity, as it demonstrates that the perceived “authentic” character of other individuals, groups and products is informed by our own lived experiences. As it pertains to food, local and traditional foods are considered “authentic” and consuming them provides consumers, particularly tourists, an “authentic” experience of that culture (Sims, 2009, p. 321). Authenticity in this sense assumes that individuals produce their own personal constructions of authenticity (p. 325). Additionally, we see the politicization of the concept of authenticity here because money is required to consume the “authentic” experience, creating an economic barrier to authenticity.

One of the factors of managing a brand in a capitalist economy is the recognition of the need to differentiate one’s product in a sea of similar goods and services. One tactic that brands

use to assert relevance is through claiming cultural value (Banet-Weiser, 2012, p. 6). “Authentic” cultural relevance is claimed and communicated through stories tied to historical references (p. 7). When authenticity claims are used to appeal to consumers, even if these claims are connected to a culture of non-conformity and/or anti-corporate culture, these spaces deemed “authentic” become commodified (Zukin, 2008, p. 745). Authenticity claims, particularly from the perspective of a consumer, are connected to an array of values. These values are used to brand a good or service as relevant to a particular consumer and their search for identity.

Experiences branded as “authentic,” based on ongoing negotiations in society, allow a consumer to claim these values as their own. When these authenticity claims are related to the revitalization of urban spaces and places, the ongoing production and execution of these experiences can result in the displacement of the businesses, people and cultures that once called these places their own (Zukin, 2009, p. 543). As will be explored throughout this section, important to the study of the branding of places is acknowledging which stories get told and which ones do not. The power to brand is the power to determine which stories are relevant to the history of a place.

Verhaal et al. (2017) found that the two consistent claims of authenticity by craft breweries that lead to growth are a local identity and offering a diverse set of products (p. 2532). Craft breweries implement branding tactics and production practices focused on characterizing themselves as “authentic” when they use local ingredients and references to local “history, folklore, cultural and natural heritage” (Cipollaro et al., 2021, p. 3). In the craft beer realm, connecting to established spaces in local places allows breweries to assert their relevance in the local community. Through these connections, breweries become invested in the success of the

local community. “Microbreweries have purposefully catered to these cravings for connection through targeted marketing strategies that emphasize local identity and distinctiveness. In the process, these establishments have become important purveyors and promoters of place attachment in local communities” (Schnell and Reese, 2003, p. 47). Often, breweries reflect extensively on their physical location’s history when determining an appropriate name for their brewery. They want to find a name that is unique to their specific sense of place (Schnell and Reese, 2003, p. 57). These histories require a person to physically experience the place to develop an understanding of what makes it special (p. 59).

8th Wonder Brewery in Houston, Texas began their quest for establishing local relevance and pride when they decided on the name for their brewery. The name of the brewery refers to local history of global significance, as the Houston Astro’s Dome, which was the first air-conditioned dome stadium, was touted as the “8th Wonder of the World.” During its time, the dome was an architectural feat and this accomplishment helped put Houston on the map in terms of global relevance. 8th Wonder Brewery has made this story their own, and because they are located close to the professional stadiums in Houston, this historic story lives on and helps establish them as a “destination brewery.” This example illustrates how craft breweries have become actual tourist destinations and ways for tourists to experience places and spaces with and among locals (Fletchall, 2016, p. 556, p. 564).

As previously discussed, craft breweries rely on local places and physical spaces as sources of authenticity claims. Some of the ways that they establish their “authentic” character through these places and spaces are through connecting to nature, history, regionalism and local ingredients (Koontz and Chapman, 2019, p. 362). Although the buildings in which craft

breweries produce and sell their brews can communicate these connections to place, especially in the cases where the buildings were once an integral part of the local community's life, such as a post office or industrial warehouse, the way that these spaces are designed can add to this local appeal and connection to history.

The stock of tangible cultural capital assets consists of many different artifacts, such as historical buildings with cultural significance as well as objects such as artwork (painting, sculptures, etc.), books, music, video, and multimedia. Intangible cultural capital includes a corpus of ideas, practices, beliefs, tradition, etcetera, which maintain significance and relevance for a certain social group (Crociata, 2020, p. 182).

In many ways, craft breweries that integrate cultural capital assets significant to the local community's history become a location where that history can live on. The stories that breweries tell about these assets become the platform where forgotten artifacts of overlooked times can have a new life. Angelina Brewing Company in Lufkin, Texas has made direct connections to the local community and their brand through bringing some of these artifacts into their building. Although these artifacts serve as aesthetic décor, many of the artifacts were once integral to the daily lives of local residents, such as 75–100-year-old wood panels, a saw blade from a 250-pound lumber saw and an advertising sign from the town's gas station. Angelina Brewing Company uses these artifacts to reinforce the stories that they tell about their connection to their community to reiterate the cultural capital that they have in this place, and therefore strengthen their claims of the “authentic” space that consumers can experience through consuming their craft beer (Dodd et al., 2021, p. 14).

In conclusion, craft breweries capitalize on select elements of the places and spaces that they are surrounded by through incorporating local history and narratives into the aesthetic branding of their spaces, recipes, beer names and packaging designs. By entering historic places and picking which pieces of history will and will not become a part of the brewery's brand aesthetic, craft breweries erase conflict and undesirable aspects of a place's history (Mathews and Picton, 2014, p. 338). Local cultures are claimed in craft beer spaces with their own purposes in mind, and, regardless of their mission, the branding of these cultures is overall meant to exert position and status in the local community and economy (Arendt, 1961, p. 202). The authenticity of the histories that craft breweries claim is "authentic" because of their connection to and embeddedness in these histories. Once these histories are branded to adapt to the needs of the present, they lose their historical quality, no longer being artifacts used to define the progression of history but becoming artifacts that are used for asserting local relevance in the present (p. 202-203).

Although a new place identity may play off elements of the area's past — and present itself as respectful of the community's authenticity — social and cultural networks of new producers and consumers create, nurture, and often capitalize on a completely new sense of place (Zukin, 2011, p. 164).

Craft breweries capitalize on a completely new sense of place to connect the elements they have chosen to represent that place to the tastes that they are offering. These tastes are defined by local elements, and certain local elements are emphasized over others, leading to the exclusion and displacement of people and their stories.

Creating and Claiming “Authentic” Spaces

The rise of craft breweries and the public’s overall interest in them has been tied to the overall rise in neolocalism (Fletcher, 2016, p. 541). “Neolocalism is where aspects of local production and the specific use of place branding are interwoven to embed a product within a specific place” (Drakopoulou Dodd et al., 2018, p. 641). Craft breweries help construct the images, meanings and experiences of physical places through their aesthetic branding, including the actual name of the brewery, and through their memorable locations (Fletcher, 2016, p. 540). Craft breweries use their beer names and other marketing tactics to tap into the overall interest in neolocalism (Schnell and Reese, 2003, p. 45) and the historical roots of the place where they operate (Cipollaro et al., 2021, p. 1). Like claims of authenticity, the development and maintenance of the neolocal movement is undergoing a continuously active process of negotiation by members of a community (p. 47). Neolocalism is a response to the development of fragmented communities and the subsequent loss of connection to a physical place that has been brought on by postmodernity. Neolocalism, therefore, acts as a way for people to reclaim their place-related identities (p. 46).

Claims of authenticity by residents and businesses in an area become claims of the space itself. When these claims reflect the interests of new residents and new businesses, authenticity becomes an agent of the gentrification of the space (Zukin, 2008, p. 745). “We can only see spaces as authentic from outside them... The more connected we are to its social life, especially if we grew up there, the less likely we are to call a neighborhood *authentic*” (p. 728). Craft beer experiences in historic industrial spaces that have been claimed by craft breweries are composed of reflection on both nostalgia and hope for the future. These experiences emphasize elements of

the past to claim the space as “authentic,” rather than concentrating on the impacts of this space no longer being used industrially. “Emphasis is placed on the consumption of the past through the looking glass of beer” (Mathews and Picton, 2014, p. 352). Abandoned Building Brewery in Easthampton, Massachusetts does just this when communicating their founding story. The name itself focuses on the potential the brewery gives to a previously abandoned building. Although it was once abandoned, the building is now the home of “award winning beer.” The community lost the mill jobs that took place in this building, but they gained award winning beer. No worries, though, the owner “performed limited renovations in order to maintain the ambiance of the original mill building.” The jobs may be gone, but the aesthetic has been saved. Aesthetic history is worth saving. Aesthetic history can be branded, repackaged and sold. The history of the people who once worked here, the people who have blood and sweat embedded in these floors, the people who would not be able to afford the brews being produced here after their long day of work, not worth saving. These forward-looking nostalgic experiences are branded as “authentic” consumption based on socially constructed definitions negotiated by producers and consumers of craft beer, which downplay the craft brewery’s role in the ongoing gentrification of these spaces.

Although breweries often rely on and utilize historic authenticity tied to place, many breweries still brand themselves as “authentic” when they are situated in locations tied to the present-day, such as strip malls and suburbs. The “authentic” character of these locations is not tied to place but to “carefully staged spaces, their appreciation by consumers, and very importantly, social interaction” (Duggan, 2015, p. 19). Buffalo Creek Brewing in Long Grove, Illinois is located in a former art studio. On the homepage of their website, they call out this

familiar trope of breweries being located in revitalized industrial warehouses, stating, “What makes our brewery a destination? We’re not in a warehouse or an old run down building, but have transformed the former Art Studio of Long Grove Academy of Fine Arts into a state of the art brewing facility.” The brewery goes on to emphasize their Bavarian themed taproom; therefore, they are still using history to emphasize their authenticity in this space. The history they use to brand themselves as “authentic” is not the familiar trope connecting to a historic space, but one that emphasizes that the space they have created is “authentic” because of its roots in German history, and in many ways the history of American beer.

A key factor in the management of authenticity through social interaction is the de-commercialization of experience. The de-commercialization of consumer experience occurs through reciting brewery founding stories (Duggan, 2015, p. 22), and in-depth discussions of beers with brewery employees and fellow beer drinkers (p. 25).

Tellingly, even in the most urban settings, modern city images are rarely emphasized.

And modern lifestyles are almost always slighted in favor of historical, or at least blue-collar, lifeways such as blacksmiths, or miners, or steamboat captains...People who work with their hands, whose very livelihood is entwined with the geography of where they live, are those used to represent the ‘true’ place (Schnell and Reese, 2003, p. 59).

Angelina Brewing Company, which was previously discussed in relation to their use of historic artifacts to construct the aesthetic history of their space, brands the experiences consumers can expect to engage in within their space as de-commercialized. Although the skyscraper life works for some people, that is not Angelina. Angelina Brewing Company is about gathering with those closest to you and enjoying life over a glass of beer. Angelina Brewing is about allowing room

for people to grow together and become close-knit. Angelina Brewing is about the small-town vibes.

In conclusion, an “authentic” place is crafted through the claiming of a historic space and/or the creation of “authentic” narratives about a place. Craft breweries are selling a lot more than beer. Beer may be what they make money off, but consumers also want to receive an “authentic” experience for their money (Banet-Weiser, 2012, p. 7).

Culture is some thing, some place, that is made and remade, and therefore depends on individuals in relation to a system of production. In the contemporary moment, branding is part of the making and remaking, and is part of culture that is produced and given meaning by consumers (p. 9).

The culture of craft beer is defined by these tropes, as revitalization of spaces and the development of the small-town vibes we are nostalgic for. In a quest for creating community through the process of claiming and creating spaces based on the local history of an area, many craft breweries leave out the histories of the people of the community these spaces once served.

Connecting Place and Taste

As I have discussed throughout this dissertation, one of the main themes that craft breweries adopt is to brand themselves as countercultural to those organizations that produce beer on a mass-scale. Another narrative that craft breweries adopt to distinguish themselves as oppositional to corporate beer producers is through their connection to physical place.

Incorporating aspects of local culture into branding materials, such as their logo or taproom aesthetic, and larger discourses about the brewery allows craft producers to claim local attachment and relevance (Konnelly, 2020, p. 77). “This self-positioning a local(ly-relevant),

egalitarian, and artisanal alternatives to brews produced by mass franchises imparts an *authenticity* on both the product and the brewers, leading both to be perceived as genuine” (p. 77-78). In addition, tying a brewery to the local environment, usually through local imagery, phrases and words and/or local events allows breweries to distinguish themselves from national and international brands (Thurnell-Read, 2019, p. 1457). “Localness is a particularly powerful authenticity claim for firms to make, as it easily and directly contrasts against what is not local and, thus, has no heritage and is not authentic” (Hoskins et al., 2021, p. 570). Craft breweries rely on the culture and imagery of their physical location to build their brand (Cipollaro et al., 2021, p. 10). “Brands seek their aura of distinction and pedigree through allusion to time and place” (Alexander, 2009, p. 551). For “authentic” brands, messages of quality, methods and history are most successful when connected to place, rather than communicated alone (Alexander, 2009, p. 558).

For craft beer drinkers, choosing a local product is at the same time a choice to avoid or distance oneself from mass-produced brews (Hoskins et al., 2021, p. 571). The labor of shopping for “authentic” products is extensive for consumers, as they are required to be knowledgeable about the product’s origins and connection to place while demonstrating their skills of noticing and appreciating the product’s tasteful characteristics (Zukin, 2008, p. 736). “In judging whether a brand/product is local or not, consumers are likely to rely on simple cues such as whether the brand is headquartered and/or produced in the same city or state in which they live” (Hoskins et al., 2021, p. 568). In the late 1990s, those craft breweries in the United States that had seen success began to attempt distribution outside of their local markets. Due to distribution issues

and other issues related to being marketed as “craft” most of these breweries returned to local distribution only (Schenell and Reese, 2003, p. 53).

In other words, the success of the microbrewery revolution has really been about more than just beer. If taste was all it was about, the faux micros would have had much more success in capturing a share of the market, since they have the distribution networks and multibillion dollar advertising budgets of the large brewers behind them. Instead, it was about supporting the local, about drinking beers produced in your own backyard, or getting a taste from somebody else’s backyard (p. 53).

Newman and Dhar (2014) find that products made in the original location and/or factory are perceived as more “authentic,” even if the products are identical to ones made elsewhere (2014, p. 372).

The “authentic” character of a craft beer transcends the beer itself and is also found in the brewery aesthetic and physical location. Breweries in previously industrial neighborhoods summon a direct connection to the desire for products that are hand-crafted and artisanal (Duggan, 2015, p. 17). “They are not drinking a brand but an idea, which is often the connection to a place” (Wojtyra, 2020, p. 85). Biscayne Bay Brewing emphasizes this connection between taste and place when describing their new location. They describe the old post office building that will house their new brewery as “historic and inspiring.” The building engages with history while inspiring what will be crafted in the space moving forward. According to Biscayne Bay Brewing, this space offers an opportunity to create “quality craft beer in a quality crafted space.” Relating to the expansion narratives explored in Chapter 1, Biscayne Bay Brewing explains that

the driving factor of expansion is the people of Miami, as Miami “deserves quality craft beer in a quality crafted space.” The expansion is about the needs of the community, not a drive for profit.

In their investigation of brewery and beer names in 2003, Schnell and Reese find:

...the focus of brewpub ale names is overwhelmingly on local landmarks, local history — in short on local knowledge. These are insiders’ clubs, places intended to be unlike any other... This is marketing, not for the masses, but for the select few... To be initiated, we have to learn the local lore, we have to engage with the stories that give shape to a local sense of place (p. 65).

The same is true nearly 20 years later, as many of the breweries I investigated used similar tactics to brand their beers. Buffalo Creek Brewing in Long Grove, Illinois incorporates local landmarks and history into many of their brews, including the 360 Pils and Long Grove Lager. The Long Grove Lager is particularly interesting, as the can art shows an image of a covered bridge, a clear symbol of history; however, without the beer description or in-depth knowledge of the local area the imagery is just that, an image. “The Historic Long Grove Covered Bridge symbolizes a simpler time where one can relax and enjoy the flowing waters of Buffalo Creek while sipping a well-crafted lager.” This local landmark embodies feelings of nostalgia, the desire for a time when you could sit by the bridge and enjoy the sounds of nature while cracking open a cold beer.

As craft makers, brewers and the beverage they produce become inseparable in the eyes of the consumer, as the consumer is not just drinking a beer, they are drinking a personal story of history tied to place. A consumer experiences this story with every sip. Breweries use a variety of branding techniques and tactics to connect their craft to physical places; however, although

other food and beverage industries can grow their own ingredients to claim authenticity through place, few breweries have been able to do this (Fletchall, 2016, p. 558). Craft beer's connection to the local environment is social rather than being solely based on the use of local ingredients, as many of the ingredients needed to make beer are grown oftentimes in other countries (p. 150-151). Critz Farms Brewing and Cider Co. is one brewery that can authentically make these connections to ingredients and place. Since the brewery is also a farm, the many images on Instagram of glasses of beer set between pumpkins, apples and cherries make sense. These are "authentic" representations of a farm to table beer. The imagery on their Instagram page also consistently shows their products outside. Although the operations take place in the barn onsite, whether in the flower fields, on the lawn or on a stroll through the orchards, the consumer can expect to have an experience that engages all of their senses around the farm. This social construction of the centrality of the local community and culture to the process of creating craft brews is apparent in the marketing efforts of craft breweries (Sjölander-Lindqvist, 2020, p. 158).

It is important to reiterate that although this dissertation is focused on craft beer production, distribution and consumption in the United States, there are many parallels that have been investigated globally that can help us understand the branding of craft beer in the United States, such as real ale in England (Hubbard, 2019, p. 765). The branding of real ale by micropubs in England was successfully accomplished "by emphasizing particular notions of simplicity, locality, and tradition" (p. 765). Authenticity in the micropub is characterized by a commitment to local, limited-edition ale (p. 775). Although there is a professional association for micropubs, there are not set guidelines governing claims of authenticity for being a micropub. Instead, Hubbard (2019) argues, "micropubs can probably be most easily distinguished by virtue

of their design and setting, not by what they sell” (p. 769). In many ways, this argument is the perfect summary of how craft breweries use spaces and places to brand their crafted brews and breweries as “authentic.”

In conclusion, the beer that breweries are selling and the consumer tastes that these brews will fulfill are branded by their connection to the places where they are produced. Although many food and beverage companies are able to use imagery of the ingredients on the lands they were grown or raised, most breweries are disconnected from these lands. There are a decent amount of farm breweries in the United States that can make these connections, but most other breweries have to instead make connections to the physical places where their breweries are located. Oftentimes, breweries brand their products as being inspired by local places and tastes. These local inspirations become the symbol of the brewery, whether that be on the product packaging or featured on other branding materials. Being local is the most indisputable way that craft breweries can differentiate themselves from global producers of beer. Localism becomes a branding claim of this counterculture that invokes symbols and themes that are oppositional without being directly so.

Exclusion and Displacement

As I mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, many of the examples cited throughout point to a clear connection between the aspirations of craft breweries to reclaim craft culture in their communities while at the same time revitalizing their local area. This phenomenon is two-fold because of ways in which space and place are treated and discussed. The discourses about the spaces and places where craft breweries are operating are not purely aesthetic and not purely descriptive of the craft process, rather they join the two through a branding of the craft brewery

through a discussion of the space and place. This branding tends to appeal to broader cultural values, such as sustainability, revitalization and honoring community history. The critique here is how craft tastes lead to the selection of certain values over others, leading to the exclusion of local elements that are not “on brand.” This section outlines some of the examples I have found throughout my data set to illustrate this phenomenon. However, it should be noted that these examples are nowhere near exhaustive and extensive research and critique is needed to better connect craft and gentrification, research I will describe in further detail in the conclusion of this dissertation study.

Issues connected to class, race and gender inequality become glaringly apparent when the disconnects in craft beer branding are viewed through Bourdieu’s conceptualization of social capital, cultural capital and economic capital, and their connections to individual and collective identity formation (Konnelly, 2020, p. 78). Konnelly (2020) engages with Bourdieu’s conceptualization of these capitals to explain the power of craft beer branding on identity formation, particularly craft beer’s influence on the perpetuation of class inequality in a narrative emphasizing beer’s egalitarian potential (p. 71).

Thus, everyday tastes are not arbitrary, but based on power, social status, and access thereto. Taste is shaped not just by what you can afford, but what you have been socialized to believe tastes good. That is, ‘good taste’ is linked to social status, and aesthetic preferences are far from accidental — they actively reinforce and reproduce class inequality (p. 71).

As I have discussed, the branding of craft breweries is not necessarily done in a way to promote or perpetuate the exclusion of peoples or cultures. However, the tastes that breweries develop

and market are not financially accessible for those without economic capital. Therefore, craft beer becomes a product that is directly linked to social status, excluding many people, including many people who would have called these places and spaces claimed by craft breweries their home.

This form of authenticity, tied to a historic place, is experienced by consuming craft beers in neighborhoods that are in different stages of gentrification (Duggan, 2015, p. 18). The gentrification of urban places through the placement of craft breweries, regardless of the stage in the ongoing gentrification process, is referred to as “craftwashing” (Wallace, 2019, p. 959). “New urban cultures and communities formed around specific lifestyles and taste cultures, like craft beer, often use and re-produce the spaces and places shaped by these processes” (Schroeder, 2020, p. 206). Through my research, I found many narratives produced and reproduced by breweries that communicate this exact story. Burial Beer Co. located in Asheville, North Carolina has short blurbs throughout their website describing their role in revitalization efforts in the places they produce beer in. Their original location is in the South Slope District of Asheville, an area they claim their brewery is actively revitalizing. Their mission includes the following: “Embracing an intentional revivalist approach, we aim to infuse our brands, products and experiences with intriguing storylines that celebrate artistry, history, and a reverence for quality.” Similar statements are made under their approach to connectivity in their values section. Claiming to be an active agent of revitalization is not what is problematic about this narrative. Rather, excluding from these narratives ways in which members of the community are being prevented from being excluded and displaced from these areas is the issue. Revitalizing an area “intentionally” is just a defense for gentrification. True, intentional gentrification looks to

the community for direction, not just to craft beer drinkers. In many ways, it appears that “craft beer production and consumption are used to aestheticize the industrial past and pacify resistance to central-city gentrification” (Mathews and Picton, 2014, p. 337). Through their claiming of historic places and spaces, craft breweries become a part of the narrative surrounding gentrification. Their lack of engagement in these narratives, other than apolitical claims of revitalization, lack commitment to their role in gentrification or efforts to prevent exclusion and displacement.

Bathtub Row engages in this narrative of displacement through their Native Land Hazy IPA. “A national collaboration beer brewed to acknowledge the contribution and history of Native American People in the United States. Hosted by Bow and Arrow Brewing Company in Albuquerque, the first Native Woman Owned brewery. Proceeds benefit our neighbors’ Pueblo de San Ildefonso Young Adult Scholarship for College or Trade School. Bathtub Row Brewing is situated on unceded Indigenous land, ancestral home to the Tewa Pueblo People.” Although this discussion is largely limited to this one beer, engagement in the narrative of displacement and the steps that the brewery is taking to correct this phenomenon in their local community is a step forward that is worth investigating throughout the craft beer industry more broadly.

The political and economic implications of the restructuring of historical spaces and places must be taken into consideration when examining how craft breweries are claiming urban spaces and who is behind these projects (Wallace, 2019, p. 953). Wallace (2019) finds that craft brewery ownership and leadership in London is overwhelmingly white and male (p. 954). These identities are problematic for a variety of reasons, but most significantly for this dissertation is to consider the ways breweries brand themselves. “Of course, it is the ‘edgy’ industrial and working

class setting that craft breweries trade on to some degree” (p. 957). Although craft breweries often bring along progressive social and economic agendas to their chosen localities, their further displacement of and polarization of cultures is incredibly apparent (p. 961). One of the ironies of considering “authentic” beer as that tied to a history is that the working-class folks who historically consumed beer cannot afford the high prices of the craft brews being branded as “authentic” (Spracklen et al., 2013, p. 313).

Spaces of consumption host many different “authentic” experiences for varying groups of people. The consumption of these “authentic” experiences is under constant negotiation by consumers, and these negotiations result in the continuous exclusion of diverse groups on a basis of class and race, among other factors (Zukin, 2008, p. 734-735).

Whether the specific discourse of consumption is based on distinction or inclusion, alternative consumers are not so innocent agents of change. Their desire for alternative foods, both gourmet and organic, and for ‘middle class’ shopping areas encourages a dynamic or urban redevelopment that displaces working-class and ethnic minority consumers (p. 724).

Although this dissertation is focused on the branding of craft, it is difficult to ignore that consumers have a direct role in how brands are constructed, especially in an economy where success is based on appealing to the market. “At least as much as it reflects economic factors like price, exclusion from urban space depends on cultural factors like aesthetics, comfort level, and the tendency to use, and understand, consumption practices as expressions of difference” (p. 735). Exclusion in the craft beer market is not initiated by product price alone, although for many people this is an immediate barrier. As I have discussed in previous chapters, gender can

also serve as a barrier to inclusion, as can the ability to communicate knowledge of the space, which will be explored in further detail in the next section.

Conclusions

In conclusion, both space and place are fundamental to the branding of craft breweries throughout the United States. The local environment outside of the brewery walls is brought into the physical space in a variety of ways. In the case of farm breweries, the brewery is able to make direct connections to the natural environment they operate within by branding their taprooms and beers with these farm themes. Unlike most breweries, farm breweries are able to claim links to the place through the use of ingredients from their farm. Other breweries rely on local artifacts, natural elements and histories in order to create a theme and brand for their space. Further, many breweries aim to revitalize old buildings as a part of their impact on the city. There are countless examples of these heroic stories of owners coming in and taking on a huge project for the betterment of the community. “We believe local independent breweries are an important part of the long term health of communities. Independent breweries bring life to underutilized real estate spaces and create a place for conversations to happen face to face” (Reformation, similar quote from Jackson Street). What is often overlooked and missing from these narratives is the ways in which people are displaced as a result of the overall revitalization of these areas. It has been seen through this content analysis that some breweries are making efforts to prevent displacement; however, more research is needed to explore these examples in detail, including understanding the possible ways that breweries are directly connected to gentrification.

Chapter 5: Tools, Skills and Knowledge

“Important to the industry of craft distillers is how and when in the process they use their hands, or what personal elements they add to the production of spirits and how they distinguish their products... While this practice will not change the taste or flavor of the final product, to craft distillers it signifies its overall quality and justifies the work they do” (Ocejo, 2017, p. 64).

This is my second Casey tour. I try to only go on beer tours that are free, but making a trip out of Casey and Glenwood Springs is well worth the ticket charge. The last time I was here I hung out in the garage and chatted with the tour guide at the bar. This time I took advantage of the chairs and tables in the driveway looking out onto the Roaring Fork River. I am always blown away by this hidden little garage that makes the best fruit beers I've ever had. There are two main stories that stood out to me today. The first is that when we were shown the equipment used to pit the stone fruits for the beers the tour guide made a point to spend about five minutes discussing the process before they had this machine. He described in detail how messy and time-consuming pitting hundreds of pounds of various stone fruits was. When he told this story though, he was excited and said that the whole process by hand was very rewarding, even though it tastes no different from pitting fruits by hand or machine. The second story that stands out to me is the journey that the owner, Troy Casey, took to get to this point. Troy worked at AC Golden Brewing Company, a pilot program by Coors. Casey is family-owned and operated, but not overtly. The stories being told about Coors are not ones that condemn the lack of innovation. Rather, Troy appreciates the experiences he had at Coors.

[Shortened Field Notes, August 30, 2019 - Casey Brewing & Blending Barrel Cellar in Glenwood Springs, CO]

This chapter examines the ways historic craft making processes are used and branded by modern-day craft makers. As the opening quote suggests, many of the hands-on time consuming craft making processes used today are no longer needed because a machine can do the same job, typically just as well. However, the use of historically relied on tools, skills and knowledge occurs for one of two reasons. First, the historic relevance of craft in industrial society is tied to the desire to not lose craft skills and knowledge. Although mass-production allows for products to be created of comparable quality, particularly today with continued technological advancements, the desire to create a product using craft making processes is connected to a desire to keep craft skill and knowledge alive. Of course, there are many other purposes of making crafts with minimal mechanical intervention, which will be examined throughout this chapter. Second, the commitment to the use of historic craft making processes becomes an aspect of the branding of craft cultures. As mentioned previously, we should be thinking of the branding of craft authenticity as existing on a spectrum, where craft makers engage in varying levels of commitment to craft skills and knowledge. The use of machines is not seen as “inauthentic,” but less “authentic” than doing everything by hand.

The Craft Process

A craft product contains within it three meanings which can be connected to overall meanings about life. First, the craft product exists within a specific cultural narrative, and its style is influenced by this narrative, and in turn influences this narrative. Second, the details of the craft product directly reflect the skill and knowledge of the makers involved in its making process. And, third, the aspirations of quality in the craft product are proof of a counterculture opposed to consumerism (Korn, 2013, p. 58-59). “Making reminds us that one of the defining qualities of the human, with our opposable thumbs, is the capacity to work with and upon

materials...Making reminds us of our agency within the physical world” (Luckman, 2015, p. 81-82). The aura or enchantment contained in a craft object has less to do with how much or how little mechanical intervention was used to create the object and more to do with the fact that the object was made with human hands as a part of its production process (p. 81-82). “Craftsmanship names an enduring basic human impulse, the desire to do a job well for its own sake” (Sennett, 2008, p. 9). The aura of a craft object lies in the object itself and in the process used to make the object (Luckman, 2015, p. 82).

There are no set guidelines to determine what craft processes must be followed in the craft beer industry. As previously discussed, the Brewers Association and the industry as a whole have shifted the focus in the twenty-first century to be more on defining craft breweries; therefore, they are shifting away from defining craft beer, as economic independence is a definition of craft that cannot be co-opted by mass-producers. “The notion of what constitutes craft production is open to negotiation and grounded in firm tradition, vocational practices, and culturally shaped understandings and beliefs about craft production in popular culture and among consumer groups” (Hartmann and Ostberg, 2013, p. 906). Although there is no one set definition of craft production, the history of the nineteenth century Arts and Crafts Movement and an overall desire for homebrewers to make a career out of their craft hobby are two of the main ways that a commitment to craft technique and making processes is branded by craft breweries. The desire to achieve a high quality craft product by using high quality ingredients is an overarching theme of the breweries studied.

What do we mean by good-quality work? One answer is how something should be done, the other is getting it to work. This is a difference between correctness and functionality. Ideally, there should be no conflict, in the real world, there is. Often we subscribe to a

standard of correctness that is rarely if ever reached. We might alternatively work according to the standard of what is possible, just good enough — but this can also be a recipe for frustration. The desire to do good work is seldom satisfied by just getting by (Sennett, 2008, p. 45).

Further, becoming a craft maker is financially challenging in a capitalist economy. Developing the skills and knowledge needed to become a craft maker is time consuming and usually involves unpaid labor (Luckman, 2015, p. 143). Therefore, the commitment to craft making processes is not one easily rewarded.

Overwhelmingly, homebrewing is the place where brewers develop their craft skills and knowledge. Although there are technical training programs throughout universities in the United States for those interested in brewing to practice their skills, many of the histories of the breweries currently in operation begin with homebrewing. This will be an interesting phenomenon to follow as more brewers graduate from these professional training programs and become skilled enough to start their own operations. One of the reasons this is an important narrative to follow is due to the often touted connections between craft brewing in the twenty-first century and the rise of homebrewing in the late twentieth century. This may also displace the centrality of homebrewing competitions and awards as evidence for success in the craft beer space.

For Sennett (2008), process and technique are cultural (p. 8). In order to understand a culture and an object's significance to a culture, we must develop an understanding of the object itself, including the processes behind which it was made (p. 8). "Probably the most common question people ask about craft is how it differs from art. In terms of numbers this is a narrow question; professional artists form a mere speck of the population, whereas craftsmanship

extends to all sorts of labors. In terms of practice, there is no art without craft; the idea for a painting is not a painting” (p. 65). Rather than being alienated from their work, the work of craft makers becomes an aspect of their personal identity. “We think with materials and objects at least as much as we think with words, perhaps far more. They are conduits through which we construct ourselves and our world” (Thurnell-Read, 2014, p. 68). Their engagement with the labor if their work is both embodied and affective (p. 47).

For many brewers, craft beer is tied to their personal identities. They do not just love drinking beer, they love being involved in the entire making process. “For them, beer is more than just a liquid and a brewery is not just a pet project. It’s a lifestyle, so they take pride in everything they do and everything 12 Fox makes.” In describing the history of their brewery, Duck Foot Brewing Co. communicates their passion for opening a brewery being tied to their personal medical diagnosis. “When you get diagnosed with Celiac Disease and can’t drink beer and now you own a whole brewery specializing in Gluten Reduced and Celiac Safe Beers.” The owner’s identity has influenced the brewery’s identity and the brewery’s overall source of differentialization in the craft beer market. “Brewer identity is described as being embodied, felt and performed through the working on and with ingredients and equipment at the brewery. It is suggested that the tangibility of both the process involved and the product produced mean that significant intrinsic value is derived from the embodied craft of brewing. Thus, being engaged in the material processes of the brewery and, in the finished beer, being able to see a tangible reflection of one’s labour in the final product highlights the ways in which brewers draw meaningful rewards from the affective and embodied facets of skilled craft work” (Thurnell-Read, 2014, p. 46). As these examples show, much of the reward that craft brewers gain from their work is not tied to economics but to the ability to engage in the craft of brewing beer.

Tools and Machines

Although historically craft and mass production were seen to be dichotomous as defined by their use of machinery, these divisions of “authentic” and “inauthentic” are no longer valid (Hartmann and Ostberg, 2013, p. 888). “As machine culture matured, the craftsman in the nineteenth century appeared ever less a mediator and ever more an enemy of the machine. Now, against the rigorous perfection of the machine, the craftsman became an emblem of human individuality, this emblem composed concretely by the positive value placed on variations, flaws, and irregularities in handiwork” (Sennett, 2008, p. 84). The absence of machines does not itself define whether or not an object can be classified as craft. We must also look at the scale of production and the ownership structure of the brand (Luckman, 2015, p. 86). “These cultural and social changes remain with us. Culturally we are still struggling to understand our limits positively in comparison to the mechanical; socially we are still struggling with anti-technologism; craftwork remains the focus of both” (Sennett, 2008, p. 84). Our reliance on technology is an ongoing topic of political debate and a constant theme of popular culture texts. Because “authentic” craft production exists on a spectrum, society’s view and expectations of technology greatly impact the role of mechanical intervention in craft making processes.

There are many examples of craft breweries branding their limited mechanical intervention, emphasizing their hands-on process. Various phrases are used almost universally among craft breweries to emphasize their hands-on approach to brewing, such as handcrafted, hand forged, made with love, hand built. “We utilize our state-of-the-art equipment to hand craft the best products possible” (Missouri Ridge). Oftentimes, these types of phrases are used to distract from discourses of mechanical intervention, which in this example you can see handcrafted being tied to mechanical production. Machines are being used to maintain quality

while hands are being used to maintain craft. Alexander Langlands (2017) explores this connection between materials, machines and the human body:

Against a rising tide of automation and increasing digital complexity, we are becoming further divorced from the very thing that defines us: we are makers, crafters of things. When our lives once comprised an almost unbroken chain of movements and actions as we interact physically with the material requirements of our existence, today we stare at screens and we press buttons. When we made things, we accumulated a certain kind of knowledge, we had an awareness and an understanding of how materials worked and how the human form has evolved to create from them. With the severance from this ability we're in danger of losing touch with a knowledge base that allows us to convert raw materials into useful objects, a hand-eye-head-heart-body co-ordination that furnishes us with a meaningful understanding of the materiality of our world (p. 22).

Processing ingredients is another place where breweries tend to brand their use of hands-on processes, such as the juicing of fruits to be added to beers . Blind Pig Brewery showcases one example on TikTok showing that even the owner was involved in zesting and juicing limes by hand. Some aspects of the making and branding processes themselves are emphasized as involving hands-on labor, such as the application of labels on cans or even the canning of beer itself.

Because of the political history of machines, including which jobs we have aimed to replace with machines, overall we have come to a place in modern society where advancements in technology are directly tied to the increase in power and financial standing of a select few at the expense of the many (Sennett, 2008, p. 108). Modern inventions should be used to save time, to allow for more leisure time, rather than being used to increase profit margins (Morris, 1885).

“But the use of machines for manufacture can create a social and economic jarring, the results of which are inundation, devaluation, waste and inequality” (Langlands, 2017, p. 23). Machines need not exist to imitate the work of a craft maker and therefore displace the need for craft. Rather, machines and the models they follow can serve as the platform for innovation, the basis on which originality can be expressed (Sennett, 2008, p. 101).

The enlightened way to use a machine is to judge its powers, fashion its uses, in light of our own limits rather than the machine’s potential. We should not compete against the machine. A machine, like any model ought to propose rather than command, and humankind should certainly walk away from command to imitate perfection. Against the claim of perfection. Against the claim of perfection we can assert our own individuality, which gives distinctive character to the work we do. Modesty and awareness of our own inadequacies are necessary to achieve character of this sort in craftsmanship (p. 105-106).

The craft maker’s only defense for relevance in a market where machines can more effectively and more efficiently create a product is to argue that they, the craft maker, can detect the differences between the craft product and the industrially produced product (Sennett, 2008, p. 143). To illustrate this, some breweries include notes in their beer descriptions to emphasize that certain flavors are or are not present when the beer is made correctly. These notes help to educate consumers on ways to detect true craft beers from imitators. One such example comes from Ouray’s Portland Porter, explaining, “No hop aroma or bitterness are present in this beer when it is properly aged.” These tasting notes are meant to help consumers also notice these differences in taste as compared to mass-produced beers.

In craft spaces, tools, particularly those tools that cannot easily resolve a challenge, force the craft maker to consider other ways of working with the craft materials. Using tools in these

ways, with this mindset, does not limit what the craft maker can accomplish but instead allows for the expansion of possibilities for what can be accomplished (Sennett, 2008, p. 194-195). “Tools used in certain ways organize this imaginative experience and with productive results. Both limited and all-purpose instruments can enable us to take the imaginative leaps necessary to repair material reality or guide us toward what we sense is an unknown reality latent with possibility” (p. 213). Although repetitive experiences in craft spaces are linked to technical skill development to the point where knowledge and skill, particularly in messy situations, can become intuitive, so too can tools be a part of this intuition (p. 213).

Overall, craft breweries typically produce branding materials that frame their processes as being natural with limited technological intervention, as most intervention is done by engaged human hands (O’Neill et al., 2014, p. 593). “The collision of definitions of success with authenticating claims creates a bind for microbrewers” (Koontz and Chapman, 2019, p. 354). Craft producers are able to overcome contradictions over innovative production processes while creating a historic product by claiming adherence to the craft principles and values that are socially constructed by a particular group (Schifeling and Demetry, 2021, p. 149). Authenticity claims in craft production can be seen as existing on a sliding scale where one business may have more “authentic” production practices and another may have more “authentic” ingredients (Ocejo, 2017, p. 69).

Soggy Bottom’s logo is a great example of how breweries balance the art and science of craft brewing, as the logo features grains, hops, water and a test beaker (Figure 2). “At Point Ybel, our beer is as much art as it is science. From grain to glass, to the pour and presentation, we only brew beers we are proud to serve” (Point Ybel). Other breweries use science terms, phrases and imagery, such as calling beer spaces labs and including periodic tables or chemistry

equipment as aesthetic decor in the taproom. The focus on ingredients and craft processes is often shown to be a part of the skills development for the brewery and oftentimes a collaborator. Beachwood Blendery showcases the brewing process behind one of their recent collaboration brews, focusing on close up video content of the process for preparing and incorporating the coffee beans. Although almost every brewery uses a mash tank to mix the beer, many breweries include videos or images in their digital branding materials focused on the brewer using a wooden paddle to mash the beer while the machine mashes as well. This hands-on process is not needed, as the machine is clearly mashing the product; however, the hands-on process is used and branded to show attention to a high quality product throughout the making process. Overall, this use of machinery and hands-on processes is meant to show that the brewery is committed to using science to manage the quality of craft.

Skills and Knowledge

Craft making is marked by a skill and knowledge acquired through physical training, minimal machine intervention, an in-depth understanding of the materials and an ability to anticipate and predict constraints of time and finances (Langlands, 2017, p. 38). “Pride in one’s work lies at the heart of craftsmanship as the reward for skill and commitment” (Sennett, 2008, p. 294). Craft making is not just a process, it consists of and is differentiated by the knowledge and skill that drives this process. The knowledge and skill are where the power of the craft maker lies (Langlands, 2017, p. 39). There are two, often overlapping, narratives surrounding the value of craft products in culture. The first narrative places the value of craft in the skill and knowledge acquired and the resulting quality product. The second narrative, connected to Karl Marx, communicates the loss of personal control and self-alienation in a world of mass-produced commodities (Thurnell-Read, 2019, p. 1451). Repetition in the craft space is therefore distinct

from repetition in the industrial space. In the craft space, repetition always requires full engagement of the mind and body with a forward-looking mindset. In the industrial space, repetitive labor requires only the body, the mind is no longer needed (Sennett, 2008, p. 175). “Craft appears to be embedded in skill and knowledge, which are accumulated and passed on from generation to generation. Skills and knowledge provide the glue that bonds craftsmen to their historical ancestors and their craft communities” (Hartmann and Ostberg, 2013, p. 887). For brewers, craftwork is defined by both the skill they employ to create the beers and the passion they have for the craft itself (Thurnell-Read, 2014, p. 47).

The personal identity of a craftsperson is constantly under development as they are doing the physical and emotional labor needed to gain knowledge and skill. This knowledge of craft must then be put on display to sell the importance of their craft and their competency in achieving their craft (Thurnell-Read, 2014, p. 48). The occupational identity of craft brewers is two-fold, including both knowledge and skill and a passion for the craft itself (p. 49).

Craft authenticity celebrates the artistry and mastery of the chef, the cooking staff and the service staff. It recognizes that the knowledge, skills and techniques of the chefs and other staff are beyond the normal person’s reach, requiring special training and apprenticeships and a range of specialized experiences (Carroll and Wheaton, 2009, p. 268).

The focus on craft authenticity puts the focus on the brewer rather than on the beer. “The emotional rewards craftsmanship holds out for attaining skill are twofold: people are anchored in tangible reality, and they can take pride in their work” (Sennett, 2008, p. 21). Skill, commitment and judgment are the three characteristics a craft maker must constantly build and maintain. There is nothing mindless or given to a craft process, rather the craft maker must discipline

themselves to seek the highest quality at every stage in the craft process, amongst financial and social constraints (Sennett, 2008, p. 9).

In many cases where the branding materials are focused on the brewer rather than the beer, the roots of this focus comes from the personal identity of the brewer. Several times, this influence comes from the brewer being a veteran. Other breweries emphasize the experiences and accomplishments of a brewer to add evidence to their claims of significance in the craft beer market. This is especially relevant if a brewery is new, as previous successes of a brewer show that their new products have been tested and found to be of high taste previously.

Our economy does not necessarily reward the accumulation of knowledge and skill. Rather, organizations seek workers with the highest level of skill for the cheapest price (Sennett, 2008, p. 35-36). Developing skill as a craft maker requires the ongoing repetition of work. Much of the debate surrounding our dependence on machines involves concerns regarding the displacement of workers. However, we also need to be concerned with the displacement of opportunities for workers to gain skill through the repetitive processes machines are being used to do (Sennett, 2008, p. 39). “When the natural and the artificial are set as opposites, human virtue can be attached to the first, freedom to the second. Craft skills are necessary to make these attachments and so heighten the conscious value of objects” (p. 141). As will be explored in further detail in chapter six, one of the most common opportunities that craft breweries have for hands-on learning opportunities is through collaboration brews. Typically, two breweries will come together to try out a new ingredient or flavor combination or a new type of beer. Rather than being a way to make money, these collaborations are typically seen as sites of experimentation and camaraderie.

At least in this cultural moment, craft breweries are finding their relevance and success in the market by differentiating themselves as knowledgeable and innovative (Wojtyra, 2020, p. 84). “History has drawn fault lines dividing practice and theory, technique and expression, craftsman and artist, maker and user; modern society suffers from this historical inheritance. But the past life of craft and craftsmen also suggests ways of using tools, organizing bodily movements, thinking about materials that remain alternative, viable proposals about how to conduct life with skill” (Sennett, 2008, p. 11). There are many examples showing that craft breweries are different than mass-producers because of their commitment to the pursuit of knowledge. “We exist to foster human connection. Our hope is to build an industry-respected craft brewery that helps people navigate the beautiful and complex world of beer” (Creature Comforts). This pursuit of knowledge is emphasized for both consumers and producers, as both are always looking for the best traditional brews or new, innovative tastes.

Power dynamics are not only inevitable but required in the workspace of a craft maker. Because skill building and knowledge transfer of a craft takes place in a space with varied levels of skill and knowledge, “there must be a superior who sets standards and who trains” (Sennett, 2008, p. 54). The two clear designations between power in a craft making space are those craft makers that produce through imitation versus those that use the skill and knowledge they have accumulated to produce a craft (p. 58). “‘Authority’ means something more than occupying a place of honor in a social web. For the craftsman, authority resides equally in the quality of his skills” (p. 61). This is seen clearly in the goals of living in the historic craft making space being to acquire skills related to the craft. Although individuals were brought into this family space as a surrogate part of the family, they were there to learn craft skills, not life skills (p. 64). The democratic craft space is one that balanced tacit and explicit knowledge. However, this is a

theoretical concept, as the authority of a craft maker exists in their skill and knowledge, seeing and knowing what others cannot. “Craftwork establishes a realm of skill and knowledge perhaps beyond human verbal capacities” (p. 95). Regardless of democratic aims, so much of the craft process is one that cannot be learned, one that cannot be shared (p. 78). It is an embodied skill (p. 80).

From Knowledge to Understanding

Craft making is marked by high quality achieved through hands-on experience and knowledge gained through constant critique (Sennett, 2008, p. 51). “Doing something over and over is stimulating when organized as looking ahead. The substance of the routine may change, metamorphose, improve, but the emotional payoff is one’s experience of doing it again. There’s nothing strange about this experience. We all know it; it is *rhythm*. Built into the contractions of the human heart, the skilled craftsman has extended rhythm to the hand and the eye” (p. 175). This rhythm occurs in craft work through the conscious decision by a craft maker to engage in this way. Craft work is done through the constant physical, mental and emotional engagement of a craft maker, there is nothing passive about it. The end goal of a high quality product is always in sight (p. 97).

The craft maker’s ability to balance the head and hand is nowhere more apparent than when working with the materials of the craft product. The craft maker becomes an extension of the materials only so far as to always be aware of and thinking through the next steps (Sennett, 2008, p. 174-175). “The craftsman is forced to come to terms with the physical properties of materials, the mechanical properties of tools, and the real capacity and limits of his own dexterity, discipline, and imagination. In this way, craft’s materiality imposes cooperation on the sometimes discordant factions of the mind. By necessity it reconciles the desire to interpret the

world in ways that are emotionally gratifying with the countervailing need for accurate information to facilitate effective decision making. Thus the holistic quality of craft lies not only in engaging the whole person, but also in harmonizing his understanding of himself in the world” (Korn, 2013, p. 56). Our understanding of the world is only fully shaped if we are reflecting on and engaged in the world as its history is unfolding. We cannot solely reflect after the work is done, we must acknowledge “that thinking and feeling are contained within the process of making” (Sennett, 2008, p. 7). As I previously have illustrated, there are countless examples of breweries demonstrating the processes for testing beers throughout the making process. These testing practices are communicated both throughout static imagery and videos on their websites and social media accounts.

A craft maker can only be fully engaged in their craft when they have achieved a high level of skill, high enough that the craft maker no longer is dictated by process. The craft maker begins to feel their way through the craft process, with a conscious engagement and understanding of what they are doing (Sennett, 2008, p. 20). “Technique develops, then, by a dialectic between the correct way to do something and the willingness to experiment through error” (Sennett, 2008, p. 160). Craft makers develop their skill and technique by dwelling on the errors, making sense out of the mess. It is in the errors that craft makers transition from knowledge to understanding, a transition that is only reached through full engagement with the materials (p. 160-161). “Resistances, then, can be either found or made. Both cases require toleration of frustration, and both require imagination. In found difficulties, to cope we will identify with the obstacle, seeing the problem, as it were, from the problem’s point of view. Made difficulties embody the suspicion that matters might be or should be more complex than they seem; to investigate, we can make them even more difficult” (Sennett, 2008, p. 226). The

continuous pursuit of knowledge, a key factor of craft making, is illustrated most clearly through the habit of a craft maker to create issues in order to learn through solving them.

Branding the Craft Process

The marketing of a craft object extends beyond the product itself to include the artisanal processes of making (Luckman, 2015, p. 13-14). Distinguishing craft products in the marketplace appeals to differences in both production and pre-production decisions. The skills and manual labor of the craftsperson are complemented by their attention given to the ingredients selected and their craft's basis in a local identity (Dodd et al., 2021, p. 3). It is difficult to recreate connections to place and product origin when marketing a product; however, aspects of a consumer's physical encounter with a place can be communicated through marketing materials. This includes communicating a craft maker's passion for materials and a craft maker's process. Also, maintaining two-way communication reflects the valued relationship craft makers develop with their consumers (Bergadaá, 2008, p. 20-21). One way the authenticity narrative of craft makers is communicated is through the transparency of labor practices. These include windows into the production process, — oftentimes these are literal windows to view the process from the taproom — behind the scenes tours, feature sections of websites and/or feature posts on social media platforms (Thurnell-Read, 2019, p. 1455).

Overwhelmingly, social media is used to show behind the scenes videos and images of the canning or bottling of beer. Many breweries have more than one video or image showing this process. Other behind the scenes processes that consumers can experience through social media are about the branding process of craft, showing videos of what goes into capturing photos of the brews and top secret beers or those reserved only for consumers following the brewery on social media. In our COVID-19 restricted environment, many breweries have created digital tours

featured on their social media accounts to allow for consumers to feel connected to the production process and get the insider view without actually going on a physical tour. “We love what we do and we want to show you how we do it” (Buffalo Creek Brewing). Lastly, the production process can be viewed from most taprooms, either across a rope blocking off the area or through a glass window. These intimate making spaces allow the consumer to feel as if they are in the room the beer was made with the makers that made it.

Creating spaces for consumers to gain knowledge of the craft beer production and distribution processes is more than just a marketing tactic of providing a behind the scenes look. This behind the scenes look establishes supporting evidence of their existence as a craft, and, therefore, reinforces the high prices requested for these hand-crafted brews (Dodd et al., 2021, p. 10). Production tours with tastings allow consumers to make direct connections to taste and the properties that craft producers have claimed make their product “authentic,” such as the ingredients and the production process (Ocejo, 2017, p. 75). The behind the scenes experience that is sold to customers as a part of the overall experience allows producers to justify their prices by exposing the labor involved in making the craft. This education of production processes also sets expectations for what a customer should be receiving from other craft producers (Kolb, 2020, p. 62). There is significant labor required of consumers wishing to purchase “authentic” hand-crafted goods. These consumers must acquire the skills and knowledge required to distinguish goods hand-crafted from those mass-produced, and they must do the labor necessary in order to afford the high prices of those goods that are hand-crafted (Morris, 1888, p. 605).

Some of these behind the scenes experiences showcased on brewery social media accounts are targeted towards consumers wanting to know more about the more involved craft

beer processes, such as the fermentation process. Many breweries create and host beer festivals to allow consumers the opportunity to taste beers from many breweries in one location.

Rowland's Calumet is one such example of a brewery that hosts craft breweries from all over Wisconsin at the county fairgrounds, "Allowing patrons to sample from 30 or more Wisconsin Breweries, and more than 100 types of Micro Brews." Hosting this festival is a way to bring craft beer and the economy that supports it to the local community. Craft beer festivals create a space where consumers wanting to know more about a brewery or their beer can have one-on-one conversations with representatives from the brewery.

The internet has enabled makers of handmade crafts to expand their consumer base beyond their local communities. One particular website that has had a central role in the expansion of the craft economy is Etsy.com (Luckman, 2015, p. 1). "On Etsy pictures show the home-based workspace being integrated into the rhythms of the household. Pictures of loving familial, even pet, relationships are presented as seeming evidence of the caring domestic habitus from which the lovingly made or collected products emerge into the global market" (p. 16). As most craft consumers desire an inside look at the process of the product and the makers, those craft makers that sell on the internet take additional steps to put their story out there and build a relationship with their consumers. Branded websites, social media pages and consumer reviews help to establish and maintain these relationships (p. 27).

One way that craft breweries engage in digital relationship building is through branding materials that emphasize the personal or familial nature of the brewery. "We are a mom and pop, family-owned, small batch, artisan distillery nestled in the beautiful Ozark Mountains of Branson, Missouri" (Missouri Ridge). The origin story of many breweries feature a purpose of brewing rooted in a family history. In many cases, breweries are honoring their family's German

roots through the naming of the brewery and/or beers, and in other cases committing their brewery to unique takes on traditional styles that their family drank. Oftentimes, those that are a part of the brewery's community are featured on social media, especially when their life is being remembered. This includes both human beings and animals, as brewery cats and dogs are regularly a part of the digital branding material for breweries, they also have beer brewed in their honor.

The affective dimension of craft brewing is not necessarily an aspect of labor that can always be sold or even branded, but instead is the “embodied emotions and feelings related to the ‘sense’ of doing a job well” (Thurnell-Read, 2014, p. 51). In some cases, the affective dimensions of craft brewing that appeal to those doing the labor of crafting the beer are also affective appeals for those consuming the beer, such as the brewery smells and sounds (p. 51). We obviously see similar connections to the product itself, as the beer is enjoyed by both the producers and the consumers (p. 52). “We just love good beer. We always have, even from the beginning” (Abandoned Building Brewery). This commitment to the love of good beer is most often found on branding materials that are discussing job openings at the brewery. Overall, as has been illustrated throughout this dissertation, all are welcome at craft breweries no matter your tastes they will have something you will enjoy. However, if you are going to be employed by the brewery, you need to be passionate about “authentic” craft beer.

Conclusions

In conclusion, this chapter has explored the branding of the tools, skills and knowledge that go into making a craft product. As has been communicated throughout this dissertation study, the history of craft making, and the history of craft beer making specifically, has had profound impacts on what is considered the “authentic” use of tools and machines in craft

spaces. In craft spaces, “authentic” practices are seen to exist on a spectrum, where the use of mechanical intervention is not seen as being outrightly “inauthentic.” Instead, a hands-on process would be seen as more “authentic.” Most importantly to craft is the constant pursuit of high quality products. When it comes to knowledge and skill development, a craft maker is always in training. Once the process of craft making becomes embodied, an extension of the craft maker, the habit is not to become mentally and emotionally disengaged, which is the norm in industrial production, but instead to make the conscious choice to stay engaged. One of the ways seasoned craft makers make this transition from knowledge of the craft process to understanding of the tools and materials is through purposefully creating issues to learn through solving the, All of these habits and quirks of the craft making process are branding through intimate looks at the connections between the craft and the craft maker’s identity as well as behind the scenes performances. This branding helps to communicate the ongoing narratives about craft being better. Further, the behind the scene look at the hand-on nature of craft work gives support for the higher prices being requested for craft products.

Chapter 6: Community and Collaboration

“Brewers are not just faceless entities that make the drinks a customer wants. They are hands-on producers who are active members of the community” (Kremlick, 2016, p. 21).

This is my second time at Vantabrews. The first time was one of my last beer adventures before life changed, February 2020. I remember standing in line and talking to the two people behind me and chatting about the beer, offering a taste. Now I stand in line 6 feet from everyone. Life has most definitely changed. It is not just me though, even the people in line are only talking with those in their group. The group behind me are here for the Craft Brewers Conference and talking about Cerebral's recent achievements. It was just announced that Cerebral won Gold at GABF in the Chili Beer category for Humo y Espejos with Fuego!, which is a Rye and Mezcal Barrel Aged Imperial Stout. Needless to say, the category Chili Beer does not do the beer justice for all it is. It truly is an amazing beer with so many complex flavors. Humo y Espejos with Fuego! is a collaboration beer with J. Wakefield Brewing in Miami, FL. Part of the reason the group behind us are talking about this specific beer is because of Cerebral's reputation for being an engaging member in the craft beer community. We are all here for Vantabrews, Cerebral's yearly event to celebrate their best dark beers with their craft brewery friends. Keeping with the friendly spirit, Cerebral has several guest taps today with dark beers from breweries around the country. Regulars we have seen at this event are Bottle Logic (Anaheim, CA) and Other Half Brewing (Brooklyn, NY). This is not your typical festival format, there are no tickets. Folks just stand in long lines to get a taste of a beer that they would otherwise have to travel thousands of miles to enjoy. This year, the line is much less chatty.

[Shortened Field Notes, September 11, 2021 - Cerebral Brewing in Denver, CO]

This chapter examines how both community and collaboration are key themes throughout the craft beer industry, and throughout craft spaces more broadly. In one way, this chapter is the culmination of all the chapters before it, as throughout the discussions of ingredients, materials, place, space, tools, skills and knowledge, there has been one source of the purpose of craft in

each of these areas, and that is community. Using ingredients and materials made by the local community supports that community financially. Revitalizing local places gives them new life, and using the history of a place to design a space allows the old life to live on. Keeping craft alive through the use of craft tools, skills and knowledge reawakens the desire in a community to be connected to work and the making of craft products. In another way, this chapter begins to reflect on the future of craft beer in the United States. As suggested in chapter two, mass-producers are increasingly making moves on the craft market. At the heart of the craft beer industry is a sense of camaraderie, the desire to maintain and grow craft for the purpose of maintaining narratives of oppositionality. Therefore, community and collaboration themes are found both in the individual local communities where breweries are located and in the larger craft beer community on a national scale.

Collective Identity

The claims of authenticity by craft breweries are supported and challenged by craft beer drinkers and craft breweries themselves (Duggan, 2015, p. 28). “Oppositional collective identity is commonly rooted in notions of authenticity (i.e., being true to ‘who we are’), and offers differentiation from and protection against dominant ‘generalist’ market categories” (Mathias et al., 2017, p. 3089). It is important for craft breweries to maintain and police claims of authenticity because the characteristics of authenticity that have been socially constructed can be renegotiated as a result of challenged claims of authenticity, damaging the ability to make similar claims moving forward (Duggan, 2015, p. 29). “When thinking of craft breweries, the loss of ‘authenticity’ of one brewery may in turn affect the status of others. It is important that all craft breweries retain the qualities set out by the community of craft breweries in order not to undermine the authority of other breweries’ claims of ‘authenticity’” (Duggan, 2015, p. 30).

Because of this collective identity structured around narratives of oppositionality towards mass-production, there is ongoing labor of maintaining cooperation among breweries, while, at the same time, policing breweries that do not cooperate or honor this collective identity (Mathias et al., 2017, p. 3097).

Both awards and attendance at craft beer events help to strengthen and legitimate a brewery's claim of authenticity in this cooperative craft beer industry (de Jong and Steadman, 2021, p. 14-15). "Breweries use national awards as a means of legitimation, in other words, awards and recognition validate their claims of authenticity" (Koontz and Chapman, 2019, p. 362). The beer description for Parkersburg's Cell Block 304 emphasizes that beer that win awards are those that balance tradition and innovation. "Gold Winner of the 2018 World Beer Cup! A unique American Brown Ale that overtly breaks the laws of style." Ocean Beach's GABF bronze medal winning Tres Tres Mexican Lager emphasizes the role of community in craft success, as the beer is named after a favorite local surf spot. Biscayne Bay Brewing's menu features a logo next to each beer that they have won an award for. These are just a few of the examples that stand out among the many that represent the role of awards in branding a craft brewery as "authentic."

As previously discussed, craft beer festivals are important for maintaining "authentic" craft beer production in the craft beer industry and for bringing together craft beer consumers in regional communities. Even for those consumers not attending a particular festival, a brewery posts videos and images from the festival they attended to claim this relevance on their social media accounts. The relevance of beer festival culture to the craft beer industry has even been emphasized when festivals are not taking place, such as during the first several months of the COVID-19 pandemic. Beards Brewery posts a video reminiscent of festivals, stating, "We're

missing beer fests and enjoying our glass collections from festivals past. What fest do you miss most?” Reminiscing about these festivals serves as further branding material, exerting a brewery's relevance in the craft beer space even when new festivals cannot be used to brand this authenticity.

Craft breweries find that social media is a communication platform where they find success in further differentiating themselves from mass-producers of beer by humanizing their brand through personal posts featuring their small teams (Drakopoulou Dodd et al., 2018, p. 650). Most breweries feature their small teams either on their websites through imagery and biographies or through their social media accounts. Barley and Board features videos of the hands-on work that their small team do every day to bring high quality brews to their fans. Blind Pig Brewing has devoted a TikTok video to each team member so their consumers can learn more about the people (and cat) behind the beer.

Success in these craft spaces is social and cultural, not necessarily economic, which allows for the focus on community and collaborative efforts.

Traditional capitalism, and its models of entrepreneurship, assume profit maximization through striving for monopoly power, by cultural domination, specifically separating elites from the masses. Craft entrepreneurship, rather strives for maximization of multiple forms of value, or capital, using knowledge and social interaction to build ever wider communities of knowledge, engagement and enactment (Dodd et al., 2021, p. 17). Efforts to cooperate with and assist other craft breweries even occurs when these other breweries are near or in the same city. Instead of being worried about competition, craft breweries see mutual success as an opportunity to engage more community members in craft beer and improve local and state laws regarding beer regulations (Mathias et al., 2017, p. 3100).

Clearly, the strategy behind these products is not to gain the largest market share possible or leverage cost-based economies of scale but, rather, to signal a shared system of values and beliefs that is predicated on creativity, artistic expression, and authenticity (Barlow et al., 2018, p. 2943).

Notably, the terminology used to describe organizations that breweries are collaborating with is usually personal and friendly, as we see with one of Beachwood Blendery's recent collaborations. "Roasting up Tovarish with our friends Portola Coffee." Although breweries in a regional area are competitors, they share their products with one another as a part of a friendly exchange. This friendly exchange even occurs when the brewery is on the other side of the country, as breweries take advantage of the travel for beer festivals or craft beer industry events as an opportunity to exchange brews with their friends. Sometimes, but not always, these exchanged brews have the opportunity to make it into the hands of the local consumers.

Collective Knowledge

The high competition structure for work in modern society has created a fragmented workforce where most workers are discouraged and stressed by the need to compete. Rather than creating an equal society, this competition environment encourages and rewards further differentiation of social classes (Sennett, 2008, p. 34-35).

The modern world has two recipes for arousing the desire to work hard and well. One is the moral imperative to do work for the sake of the community. The other recipe involves competition: it supposes that competing against others stimulates the desire to perform well, and in place of communal cohesion, it promises individual rewards. Both recipes have proved troubled. Neither has — in naked form — served the craftsman's aspiration for quality (p. 28).

Competition within craft making must be structured in a way where the pursuit for problem solving is also understood as a pursuit for problem finding. Solutions are shared, as are rewards. Rewards are not the sole result or goal of competition (p. 33). Craft making is not marked by an absence of competition or cooperation, but brings both together in its pursuit of high quality making of craft products (p. 32).

To illustrate the unusual situation of craft makers thriving in the digital world, especially our digital world increasingly marked by conglomeration and monopolization, Sennett (2008) shares the craft characteristics of open-source coding, specifically that of Linux programmers. In modern culture, controlled by modern communication systems, the skill development of Linux programmers occurs much faster than for a traditional craft maker. The problem solving mindset also encourages problem finding, opening an unending stream of ways to test and improve the craft product. Linux programmers donate their time and skill to develop a community craft product in a world where economic rewards are reserved for commercial products created by digital monopolies. Linux programmers; however, struggle to maintain high quality in their open sourced space considering the inability to regulate who can and cannot add to the code in this open community (p. 24-27).

One way that the competition narrative encourages an overall pursuit for high quality in the craft beer industry is through beer festivals and national beer competitions. As I have previously mentioned, many breweries use the awards from these competitions as literally badges on their beers. Although not all consumers will find these awards relevant to their brewery and beer selection, most craft breweries will. Awards open opportunities, especially for newer breweries, to be invited to festivals hosted by other breweries. These friendships and partnerships among breweries lead to collaboration brews, which allow each brewery to test out

new flavors or skills with a partner in the industry that may have more experience and knowledge to share.

Our division of work in modern society is both a physical and social division. Oftentimes, this division is along the lines of workers who use their head and workers who use their hands. Although much of the work planned and configured in the head needs to be adjusted and reconfigured by the hand, this division of work prevents the two from coming together to discuss possible implications and problematic scenarios (Sennett, 2008, p. 45). “Sociable expertise doesn’t create community in any self-conscious or ideological sense; it consists simply of good practices. The well-crafted organization will focus on whole human beings in time, it will encourage mentoring, and it will demand standards framed in language that any person in the organization might understand” (p. 249). Craft spaces are not driven by written instructions but by the conversations that take place around and outside of those instructions. Learning and creating are discursive spaces, not just written ones (p. 179).

In the craft beer industry there exists the mentality that the industry will only grow and succeed long-term if individual breweries continue producing high-quality products. Therefore, craft breweries engage in activities to assist each other and share knowledge about products and the industry as a whole. Through friendly beer competitions they are able to encourage and reward high-quality production (Mathias et al., 2017, p. 3087-3088).

The aim is not cultural domination, but rather the democratization of knowledge.

Knowledge and social interaction combine to build ever wider communities of knowledge, with legitimation accruing as much from community building through knowledge sharing, as through the creation of novelty. This ensemble, through their

embedded conversations, both co-creates the craft beer sector and negotiates its artisanal identity (Dodd et al., 2021, p. 16).

The sharing of knowledge in the craft beer industry, especially with consumers, occurs through social media, festivals, tastings and beer tourism more broadly (p. 16).

Collaboration

Continued innovation in the craft beer industry is pursued through beer collaborations, competitions, festivals and interactions with beer focused media professionals (Drakopoulou Dodd et al., 2018, p. 654). Even after craft brewers start their own breweries, they oftentimes continue their ties to their local homebrewing community through competitions, collaborations and ongoing conversations (p. 640). Even after the brewery is up and running they often talk about their success in the homebrewing community to brand their beers as high quality and relevant for the craft beer connoisseur. Great Basin Brewing does this through advertising one of their beers as the “Nevada State Homebrew Competition Best of Show winner.” Other breweries use their homebrewing roots to encourage others in the homebrewing space to expand and support their efforts through sharing lessons learned in the industry.

Collaboration beers allow for a brewery to gain hands-on experience of skill and knowledge development while building relationships in an industry marked by co-creation and innovation (Dodd et al., 2021, p. 11). There are countless examples of breweries collaborating to share knowledge or just to enjoy an afternoon with good friends while bending over the brewing process. Other breweries use collaborations as a space for community involvement. Reformation has an entire category of beers called “Drink Well with Others,” which are collaboration brews to benefit local community organizations. This practice is common among craft breweries, some creating collaboration brews to support the local craft brewing community more broadly. As

Orono touts for its Maine Brewers Guild IPA V2, “Brewed to support the Maine Brewers’ Guild, the non-profit trade organization that has helped build Maine’s brewing industry.” There are even collaboration projects that span breweries across the nation to encourage the support of a specific cause. National and international awards for craft breweries serve as a form of symbolic capital which is beneficial for building relations with other breweries and with the sector of consumers interested in these types of measures of quality (Dodd et al., 2021, p. 14).

Community

The work involved in producing craft beer expands beyond the brewing process. Craft brewers must also engage in communicative and performative labor in order to establish and maintain the cultural value of their products (Thurnell-Read, 2019, p. 1448). As craft breweries typically are constrained by cash flow, word of mouth communication is often relied upon for advertising (Rice, 2016, p. 237). Social media acts as a source of social capital for craft breweries and craft beer consumers. Consumer engagement on social media “adds still further credibility and prestige to breweries” (Dodd et al., 2021, p. 13). Breweries can build relationships with their communities and consumers can engage with these communities as well.

Cultural participation may take place through consumption in the craft beer industry, but its impacts transcend economics. People that consume craft beer and participate in this industry’s culture in return shape their personal identity, the industry’s collective identity and the broader local community’s identity (Crocata, 2020, p. 183). Brewery’s take their responsibility to transforming their local communities personally.

It’s simple...This place is our home, and it’s really important to us. We live here. We work here. We play here. The people around us are family, friends, neighbors,

employees, customers. That's why we make a point of helping out when we can (Barley Creek).

Many breweries argue that their main purpose is to provide a space where people can come together and enjoy their local environment. Building these relationships is important for the success of the brewery but also for the success of the the community at large. "Great craft beer has the power to bring local people together. And it's our mission to do just that. We're continually striving to produce delicious, drinkable craft beers while simultaneously building and bringing together our local mountain community" (Howlin Wind). As illustrated in the quote above, the identity of the brewery is usually based on the identity of the area more broadly. In many cases, this identity comes from nature, whether that be mountains, a river or the ocean.

For other breweries, the need to transform their communities comes from a need that they or their own employees are experiencing. Some breweries have gone through tough times, which is the case for Common Roots Brewing, and the community rallied behind them to get the brewery up and running again. Common Roots has since recommitted the mission and vision of their brewery to building "a more sustainable, inclusive, and safe community." Further, the community identity of craft breweries came into focus throughout the first several months of the COVID-19 pandemic, as many brewery employees no longer had full time employment and breweries responded by asking the community to support these workers through community staff funds.

We have been facing a housing crisis for some time, and it only seems to be worsening. Simply put, there is insufficient affordable housing for staff... We're appealing to you for help not just for our own business, but for the business community at large... (Ouray).

Other times, these calls for community assistance are more broad and impact many folks living in the community, not just those employed by the brewery.

Beer clubs are a common way for breweries to create a community of consumers who all support and enjoy the beer of a particular brewery. Soul Squared has taken on a community supported agriculture format for their beer club, becoming one of the first in the nation to do so. This CSA format reflects their mission, stating, “Our name comes from belief in the exponential power of the local community and our farm-based approach to craft brewing.” Community for Soul Squared is at the heart of the organization. Although most breweries support the local community in many ways, few make building community relationships the sole focus on their organizations.

Another way that breweries bring the focus of community into their existence is through being cooperatively owned.

By its simplest definition, a cooperative is a business that is owned and directed by the people that it serves, its membership. As a member of Bathtub Row Brewing, you will actually OWN one membership share, have a say in how the brewery and taproom are operated, be able to elect the Board of Directors, and help set the long term goals and policies of the co-op.

After Bathtub Row’s brewery is profitable, the profits are returned to those that own shares. The brewery also encourages shareholders to get involved with the brewery through fundraising, marketing and outreach.

A craft brewery’s commitment to their local community often transcends the work they do at the brewery itself, as they are also typically involved with and major supporters of other local businesses and community events (Schnell and Reese, 2003, p. 61-62). One way that many

breweries become involved in and support the local craft scene is through sponsoring live musicians or artists. The videos and images from these events are then posted on social media where the musician or artist is often tagged to increase visibility. Cactus Land Brewing Co. hosts a weekly craft fair market to support their local craft scene.

Some breweries take on the mission of creating beer for the community, such as Cabin Boys Brewery who have the mission statement “Crafted for Community.” Being committed to the community that they serve can occur in a range of ways for craft breweries. Although some make it their entire mission, others become involved in the community through donations of products, space or time. Many even hold raffles, donation drives, and host charity events. One very popular trend occurring throughout the craft beer industry is brewing a beer for a non-profit organization where all of the proceeds from the beer go to the non-profit. Breweries acknowledge that there are limits to consumer activism; however, they are taking steps as an organization outside of these donations as well, such as including pronouns in emails, creating gender neutral restrooms and other anti-discriminatory practices.

Outside of the local arts and crafts community, breweries also tend to focus on hosting or supporting community events that focus on physical health and wellness. Some popular examples are bike ride groups, taproom exercises and selling beer at sporting events throughout the community. Many of these community events have a cover charge that is donated to local community organizations and nonprofits. Several breweries also donated their time and materials when hand sanitizer was nowhere to be found during the first few months of the COVID-19 pandemic. Missouri Ridge became the state’s largest producer of hand sanitizer during this time.

Conclusions

In conclusion, community and collaboration are central to the vision, identity and branding of the craft beer industry. As I am sure you have noticed, this chapter is quite a bit shorter than the others. This is mostly because the research connecting craft and community is significantly limited. As previously mentioned, specifically in the research on craft beer, there is an overwhelming call by researchers to investigate the connections between craft beer, place and space in further detail. This call is the result of a connection between craft brewery success in urban areas and gentrification. I agree that this research is needed both for cultural and political reasons. However, it is clear from this chapter and the overarching themes of community and collaboration discussed throughout this dissertation that there is something truly transformative that breweries are attempting to do in their local communities and in the craft community more broadly. Although, as I have previously argued, our capitalist society and the overall oppositional claims being made by these craft breweries limit transformative systemic change, it is worth exploring the economic, cultural and possibly political changes craft breweries are being able to influence and support in their local communities. The history of the craft beer industry in the United States dramatically impacts the current cultural trajectory; however, I believe that the future opportunities lie within a brewery by brewery focus on collaborative work with their local communities.

Conclusion

“Craft beer is thus a material in evolution, consistently being (re) made through processual relations within the scene (brewers, brewing and tasting), and entanglements with the scene’s vocabularies” (de Jong and Steadman, 2021, p. 8-9).

The overarching goal of this dissertation study has been to develop an understanding of the ways craft is being branded within the historical influences of industrialization. To begin, I discussed the history of the nineteenth century Arts and Crafts Movement and the beer industry in the United States to develop this historical understanding. I also discussed how narrative and storytelling are the key branding mechanisms of craft makers. Next, I examined how narratives of oppositionality are embedded in the ongoing branding of craft and how these claims limit craft’s transformative potential because an oppositional claim is only successful if the opposition exists, which in this case means capitalism must exist. Third, I developed an argument of the ways in which ingredients and materials are directly tied to craft identity and a craft maker’s personal identity. Next, I examined the role of place and space in defining and branding a craft space. Fifth, attention to high quality is the key to craft making, which means attention to high quality skill development. The knowledge acquisition process of a craft maker need not be interrupted by tools and machines, rather tools and machines should serve as platforms for further knowledge development and connection to the ingredients and materials. Lastly, I briefly alluded to what I believe is the future of craft differentiation and branding, a focus on community and collaboration.

In this concluding chapter, I will begin by outlining the theoretical, philosophical and practical contributions of this dissertation study. Next, I will bring the dissertation full circle by

arguing how craft beer is an example of the four themes discussed in the introduction: 1) the labor of craft, 2) the performance of “authentic” culture, 3) authenticity as a social construct and 4) developing an “authentic” craft identity. Following this summary, I will briefly reflect on where I believe the study of craft culture is headed, based on this research, the literature review and anecdotal evidence from branding classrooms. Lastly, I will discuss some of the limitations of this dissertation study and future research considerations.

Philosophical and Theoretical Contributions

As I have outlined in the introduction of this dissertation study and references throughout, there are three theoretical streams I have engaged with and explored within the context of craft culture. I have worked with critical theorists’ conceptual frameworks of authenticity to understand power, labor and performance in craft culture spaces and their relation to craft economies in a capitalist society. The history of craft beer production in the United States and the recent resurgence we have experienced are directly related to these themes, as the power to define “authentic” craft production is regularly touted as being held by the market. However, as I have shown, market power can only go so far in an economy where corporate economic incentives and political interventions have become the norm. Craft makers resort to historic narratives of craft to appeal to the market; however, these “authentic” craft brand performances are marked by extensive physical, emotional and social labor on the part of the craft maker. Many of these narratives are marked by an opposition to mass-producers, which is tied to historical opposition to industrialization. However, outside of these economic categorizations of “authentic” craft productions, craft makers brand other aspects of their operations to appeal to a variety of consumer tastes and appeal to a more diverse market, further expanding their market share.

This dissertation reveals ways that the branding of authenticity in the craft beer industry in the United States can be better understood from a perspective informed by critical theory and cultural studies. By connecting the ways that authenticity operated in the market to the ways that it is performed by craft producers digitally, this philosophical concept becomes an everyday ideology produced continuously in the market and sought after by consumers seeking to brand themselves as “authentic.” The economic phenomenon of selling out and the cultural baggage that goes along with it lend valuable insight to the ways that craft values of authenticity can be complicated when mass producers take over. Loss of ownership of the means of production in the craft beer industry leads to the loss of underlying craft processes. The control of labor conditions and the ability to abide by a sustainable production process are just a couple of the craft values that tend to become lost when the commercial success is placed before all else in the mass production processes of capitalism.

Significant to cultural studies are the ways in which claims of authenticity can serve as a way to critique the power dynamics and cultural hierarchies that are occurring in socially constructing definitions of “authentic” experiences in the craft beer industry and in craft spaces more broadly. Throughout this dissertation there are many examples of the ways in which the idea of authenticity becomes a site of ideological struggle. The stakes for both the consumer and the producer of craft beer are high for maintaining their particular meaning of “authentic” craft experiences, as authenticity becomes the way that we are able to brand ourselves. The ability to brand ourselves is becoming ever more important as the spaces for establishing cultural identity and meaning become more prevalent. Therefore, the power dynamics in these spaces of “authentic” branding are significant to understand as not all consumer and producer voices are equal in this struggle for ideology. We need to question and interrogate these spaces where

cultural meaning is being claimed and branded, and this dissertation serves as a critique of the phenomenon of authenticity being a brand itself.

Inseparable from claims of authenticity in my dissertation are claims of craft, as “craft” is in the name of craft beer. This exploration of the ways conceptualizations of authenticity are being branded by the craft beer industry introduces a much needed connection between this modern phenomenon and our historic philosophical understanding of the constraints of craft in industrialization. Drawing from Sennett and Morris, I connect this history to the ways ingredients, taste, space, place, tools, skills, knowledge, community and collaboration are central to our understanding of the ways “authentic” craft is branded.

Which leads me to the third theoretical stream of craft branding, where I explore brand identity as connected to place, storytelling and performance. The branding of “authentic” craft is clearly influenced by these cultural and economic histories summarized in the previous two paragraphs. However, there are also branding norms and expectations we have been trained through the increasing mediation of branded experiences being presented to us in both our personal and professional lives. Craft beer exists within this world, and therefore adopts many of the same narratives, performances and storytelling techniques found throughout craft spaces more broadly. The problems I have explored here include, but are not limited to capitalizing on select elements of a place, the exclusion and displacement of peoples and/or cultures and limited community engagement.

Directly linked to the branding of authenticity is the jargon of authenticity, as various narratives become the marker of “authentic” craft production rather than the act of craft production itself being engaged in conceptualizations of authenticity. In many ways, as we see articulated by the craft beer industry, this engagement with authenticity is not a theoretical or

philosophical one. Although tied to philosophical themes we see historically regarding craft and authenticity in capitalist society, craft beer production often fails to engage with many of the narratives it considers to represent “authentic” craft beer production on more than just a branding level. A clear example of this lack of involvement beyond branding is found in terms of the connections between craft beer production and gentrification in the United States. This critique is not meant to dismiss the community work that craft breweries across the country are engaging in. Instead, my purpose here is to shed light on the constraints, issues and limitations with “authentic” craft brand narratives in a capitalist economy.

As I have demonstrated throughout this dissertation study, authenticity is both a concept and a popular culture phenomenon. The authenticity that is bought and sold on the market cannot be divorced from its conceptual roots. Therefore, to critique the branding of authenticity is also an endeavor to critique the jargon of authenticity itself. Authenticity in this dissertation is also treated as being directly tied to the notion of craft in the craft beer industry and all of the historical cultural baggage that comes from using the term craft. As such, this dissertation serves as an ideological critique of the concept of authenticity that gives insight to the ways that authenticity is embedded in economic and political systems, but also our systems of cultural ideas and values.

The contribution of this dissertation to critical theory then is a critique of modern branding techniques, particularly the use of digital media, in order to authenticate a product as craft. Part of the critique here is of this act of branding as a form of authentication; however, the more glaring contribution is to the overall ideological critique of authenticity as a cultural and economic concept. As I have shown through the history of beer in the United States and the history of craft in the industrialized Global West, authenticity as an ideology is embedded in the

ways we understand and expect craft experiences to take place. Although economically the craft market is not removed from the mass market, and I have shown arguments for the craft market actually reinforcing the need for the mass market, culturally we treat them as distinct. Our value system of craft in a cultural sense is disconnected from our value system of craft in an economic sense. We see this very clearly in the craft beer industry, as the concrete definition of craft beer, provided by the Brewers Association, in the United States is concerned with the economic side and the digital media I have studied is more concerned with the cultural side.

One of the major limitations of this dissertation is the lack of engagement with these craft breweries outside of their digital media representations; however, I believe that this study of digital media as a distinct branding mechanism adds insight to the field of media studies more generally. One of these ways is through connecting how craft processes have been branded and communicated throughout history to the use of digital media to brand these processes in the modern craft beer industry. Although this would need to be explored in much further detail, this example of a market that has roots in anti-industrialization and therefore is innately connected to a particular set of economic values is largely missing from communication on digital media. Lastly, this project helps us to better understand how craft makers are using digital media to brand themselves individually and as a whole through authenticity narratives and storytelling techniques.

The Labor of Craft Beer

As previously discussed, the labor that goes into the craft making process begins long before the person is deemed a craft maker and long after the craft product is sold. Establishing and maintaining a craft identity involves ongoing emotional, social and physical labor on the part of the craft maker. The field of cultural production is constantly being defined and redefined

based on new entries to the field and the ongoing criticism of consumers. This constant redefinition forces cultural producers to engage in ongoing labor to establish their relevance in the history and foundation of the culture. Throughout this research I found countless stories of brewery owners beginning their craft through homebrewing and other unpaid labor. Oftentimes, brewers leave stable jobs for careers that allow them to explore and connect to their craft, making beer.

Making beer is the passion for these people. They do it because they love being around it, the smells, the sights. It is a community production process where the emphasis is placed on the attention to high quality from ingredient sourcing to the environment of the taproom. The brewer and their small team of passionate beer folk perform their passion at every possible opportunity that these narratives can be communicated. The decision to become a craft brewer is not one a person takes lightly. Based on these overarching narratives about starting a craft brewery, the secret ingredient is a never ending desire to create and be around high quality craft beer. And the key to keeping this dream alive is lots of physical, emotional and social craft labor.

The Performance of “Authentic” Craft Beer Culture

Connecting to the labor of craft, to regulate and maintain “authentic” claims of craft culture craft makers must perform their authenticity in various spaces as a means of survival in these spaces. This performance occurs most often through storytelling and connection to place. One of the ways that breweries establish cultural value for their products is through communicating narratives centered around claims of authenticity. The stories that breweries tell about their beer, their organizations and their industry as a whole have become a key part of their business practice to add and maintain their product value. Overwhelmingly, the narrative of these performances is one of oppositionality. Although this narrative is one that cannot be co-opted

easily by mass-producers, most breweries also rely on more personal craft narratives for their “authentic” brand claims as well.

Digital media serve as modern spaces for both craft beer producers and consumers to perform “authentic” craft beer culture. Social media in particular allows for two-way communication to occur between both producers and consumers and consumers with other consumers. This is significant to the branding of craft as these ongoing conversations, as well as the sharing of these craft experiences with friends and family not a part of craft beer culture allows for the expansion of and reinforcement of craft values. Digital media also allow for performances of an “authentic” craft culture to occur on an international scale, creating the ability for craft values to be monitored and supported by an international community of fellow craft makers and consumers. The definition of “authentic” craft and the power dynamics associated with who and how this culture can be performed are easily studied through the digital discourses on social media platforms. Further, the stories being told by craft breweries on social media can be related to one another. Therefore, these stories become a part of the cultural value and expectations of “authentic” craft performances and experiences.

Craft Beer Authenticity as a Social Construct

As authenticity in the craft beer industry is largely considered to be socially constructed, this means that beer itself is not “authentic.” Authenticity is socially constructed by consumers, but also by producers. Every time a new cultural product is produced it adds to the ongoing discourse debating authenticity in that cultural field. The object of beer is not inherently “authentic,” but rather it is branded as “authentic.” Authenticity can be claimed by sticking with tradition to recreate originals or by embracing innovation and creating something entirely new. Our cultural understanding of authenticity and its place of political, economic and social

significance is constantly negotiated by society. However, not all are equal in this discursive negotiation.

Craft beer consumers evaluate a brewery's authenticity by comparing the branding of the brewery to the branding of "inauthentic" beer producers. Authenticity in this way is evaluated by assessing which breweries are associated with things that matter for the individual craft beer consumer. Within the craft beer industry, there are a set of consumers who stand in between cultural production and consumption. These consumers are called cultural intermediaries and they help shape cultural narratives by communicating what should be consumed and how it should be consumed.

The social construction of what is considered authentic also constructs a cultural power for those producers and consumers that are able to engage in these experiences defined as authentic. However, there is also a political and economic significance to this social construction and its place of authority in defining desirable cultural experiences. Part of the underlying purpose of this social construction to the broader economic market is the construction of a value system that reinforces capitalist politics and mass production economics. We see even in the craft beer industry countless examples of the creation of socially constructed experiences of authenticity that are then claimed and recreated in different ways by mass producers of beer in the United States. This phenomenon of authentic craft value construction is not taking place outside of capitalism but within it. Authentic craft values therefore act as reinforcers of capitalism when mass producers adapt their products, production process and labor conditions, to name a few of the possible ways, to reflect the values being constructed and desired within the craft market. In this way, we can see how the craft market exists in constant negotiation with the mass market in an economic sense, even if it is branded as being opposed in a cultural sense.

Developing an “Authentic” Craft Beer Brand Identity

Craft stories are communicated on and through a variety of communication platforms, including the brand’s website, product packaging, print materials, newsletters and social media. Beer is obviously not the first commodity to be transformed to a cultural product through branding. The many studies cited throughout shows that the branding of craft beer culture is only successful once consumers are educated and well-versed on the significant distinctions. Once consumers value and taste the difference of craft products, cultural relevance has been established.

Craft breweries typically differentiate themselves from their mass-produced counterparts by emphasizing their commitment to historic styles and innovative styles, their commitment to community activism and their personal connection to customers. Over time, originality rather than imitation became valued in craft spaces. This value of originality, which has always been valued by art, further blurs the line between art and craft. Further, for a craft brewery to be considered “authentic,” consumers of craft beer and other producers of craft beer must perceive the brewery’s actions and practices as “authentic.”

Coming Up Next in “Authentic” Craft Beer Brand Culture

I debated many times whether or not I should make the oppositional market chapter the last chapter of this dissertation. This is mostly because I believe based on this research and my personal experiences in the craft beer industry that the future of the socially constructed definition of “authentic” craft beer culture in this market is largely dependent on what happens next in the market. Instead, I made the decision to discuss the ways the craft beer industry is an oppositional market towards the beginning of the dissertation, because so many stories being told in these spaces revolve around this oppositionality. Therefore, I have placed the chapter on

community and collaboration as the last one because this is the one that I believe gives us hope, us as craft beer drinkers but also as individuals living in a capitalist society. As I have shown throughout this dissertation, especially in that final chapter, there are countless ways in which craft breweries are engaging in oppositional behaviors with the aim of creating better communities. These aims may be used as a part of the branding narrative; however, they should not, and I believe for the sake of democracy cannot be dismissed strictly as branding work.

There are clearly so many issues that have arisen as a result of the lack of a concrete definition for craft beer, and craft more broadly, including most importantly the increased amount of craft labor expected of craft makers, particularly in our increasingly digital world. The expectations of this labor are brought on by the need to create an “authentic” self-identity, one that is thoroughly engaged and knowledgeable about these spaces. Given that the “authentic” character of an object is socially constructed, as individual breweries grow, and as the industry as a whole grows, the concerns and considerations of the wider market influence the value of claims of authenticity. Unless the craft beer industry can separate its cultural significance from its narrative stance of oppositionality towards mass-producers of beer, a change that is difficult to imagine based on the history of craft beer in the United States, transformative systemic change on a national level is unattainable. However, as the final chapter of this dissertation study suggests, community change might be possible. As a focus on community-based collaboration is a possible future trajectory for the craft beer industry in the United States, that is where I suggest we, as researchers, educators and politically-engaged community members, turn our focus and provide much needed insight into these community projects, particularly regarding questions of power and displacement of peoples and cultures.

Limitations of this Dissertation

The major limitation of this dissertation is probably one you have read for the past two years and will continue reading for the near future, the COVID-19 pandemic. The hope for a dissertation studying the branding of a craft market that is so dependent on personal interaction is to engage in extensive personal interaction, through in-depth interviews and observational study. However, because of the heavy reliance on digital platforms of communication by craft breweries for branding, this dissertation is able to continue the discussion around the role of “authentic” narratives in these spaces. Also, as you have read, I included a few personal narratives to begin an exploration of observational data.

Although a surprising number of breweries have TikTok profiles, most of these accounts have a limited amount of content. Therefore, it has been difficult to pull full stories or even a full understanding of the use of TikTok for craft brewery branding. Based on the ways TikTok is being used to brand organizations more generally, I believe that TikTok will become increasingly more important for the branding of craft breweries as Generation Z becomes increasingly able to consume craft beer. However, continued research on the labor of branding, particularly digital branding, is needed to develop an understanding of how craft is transformed by these spaces.

Further, scholars in the craft space broadly (Sennett, 2008) and the craft beer space more specifically (Thurnell-Read, 2014; 2018; 2019) have developed fascinating studies of the connection between craft and affect and craft and embodiment. I have briefly mentioned affect as it relates to aura and authenticity throughout this dissertation. Also, I have engaged with embodiment as it relates to skill and knowledge. However, I do not believe that this dissertation is theoretically or philosophically equipped to engage with affect and embodiment beyond these

two specific applications. That being said, these areas are extremely important for future research, especially as it pertains to the mediation of digital performances of craft.

My Next Steps

To better understand the connection between digital craft brewery branding and point of sale craft brewery branding, I anticipate the next phase of this dissertation to explore the actual places and spaces where craft breweries are produced, distributed and consumed. Many authors have urged future scholars to engage with the relationship between gentrification and craft beer, Duggan (2015) and Hubbard (2019) being two. I touch on this topic briefly throughout this dissertation; however, it is difficult to engage in this type of research without doing field work and engaging deeply with consumers in these spaces and people who have been displaced from these spaces. I believe that this work is essential not only to understanding the ways in which craft breweries brand themselves, particularly using working-class themes and industrial histories, but also to understanding and critiquing craft beer culture more broadly. I would like to join the call of other scholars in this field to prioritize work on the displacement of peoples and cultures as the result of the expansion of craft beer culture in the United States. Clearly, this phenomenon is most recognized and acknowledged in urban areas undergoing active projects of revitalization and renewal; however, I also believe that we need to include smaller cities and towns in this discussion. Our understanding of the struggle for space and place in gentrification can be understood as a site of struggle for ideology. Therefore, I plan to study the role of space and place in gentrification through an ideological critique of authenticity. I plan to examine the role of craft and the displacement of craft in a historical context in order to understand the ways that craft beer is involved in gentrification. My critique of gentrification and craft beer will be a

production study; however, as I plan to examine as well ways that craft breweries counteract the displacement of people and culture through community engagement and support.

The digital nature of the data collected throughout this dissertation study significantly limited the ability to explore the origins of production and associated labor conditions in craft beer production, and craft production more broadly. I plan to work with craft beer producers and other stakeholders in the future to better understand how discourses about authenticity influence the behind-the-scenes production practices occurring. Further, I plan to relate these labor practices to media representations of labor practices of craft production historically, particularly in the United States. This historic understanding of the ways craft processes have been represented throughout time can help us to better understand the cultural expectations of the ways “authentic” craft are branded today and the possible disconnect to the actual labor practices that are occurring behind these media representations.

Future Research Considerations

Future studies should consider the role of TikTok and other social media platforms in social listening for craft brands. Although the use of TikTok by craft breweries at the time of this study was limited, and there were many examples of craft breweries that had registered for TikTok accounts but had not yet posted, TikTok may simply be used by these brands as a way to see how other breweries and brands are using the platform to communicate with each other and their consumers. The study of social listening by craft brands should also include other social media platforms; however, TikTok is particularly interesting due to its recent popularity and somewhat married target audience at the time of this study.

Although the TikTok data for this dissertation is limited, through data collection from craft brewery websites it was noted that YouTube is an overwhelmingly popular platform used

by craft breweries. Finally, Twitter was found to be the only platform for a small number of breweries. I found this to be interesting due to the limited capacity of Twitter to engage in branding. I suspect that these situations may be the result of craft brewers making the decision to only engage in digital spaces that they are familiar with, in which case this insight would be particularly important to understanding craft labor in the craft beer industry. Therefore, future research should take into both of these platforms and their role in craft brewery branding. YouTube should be given special attention as it pertains to craft skill development and craft knowledge sharing, which are two important aspects of craft culture explored throughout this dissertation.

I did not include UnTappd, Beer Advocate or any other consumer beer rating platform as a part of this study for two reasons. First, this study is focused on craft production and while craft consumption is a very important aspect of how craft beer is branded, these apps limit the ability for producers to participate in two-way communication. Second, the ratings of beers for a particular brewery are not significant to the contributions of this study. However, I do believe that future research can begin to pull data from these types of rating platforms to inform the ways that selling out and other “inauthentic” moves in the craft beer industry can lead to decreased support from consumers. It is also important to note that these beer rating platforms can involve significant amounts of labor from the production side. Anecdotal evidence from a brewery tour at Weldwerks in Greeley, CO revealed that they take the ratings of consumers seriously when determining if a beer should be brewed again. In-depth interviews with craft beer makers would need to be conducted to understand this phenomenon in greater detail. Another aspect of the

labor and performance of craft that should be explored is the Cicerone¹³ program, as some breweries, especially mass-producers, have used this program to show that their brewers are skilled and knowledgeable of the craft of beer.

Future studies should also examine the ways in which authenticity and the social construction of authentic experiences are connected to masculinity and gender norms more broadly. Studying authenticity as a rhetoric in historically gendered spaces, such as craft beer or beer production and consumption more broadly, could add much needed insight to the ways that the branding of present-day authentic experiences are connected to a history of authenticity embedded in a gendered and largely masculine rhetoric. We see these examples in the branding of beer but also when we examine the people that work and consume in these spaces. Therefore, the branding of craft beer, the labor conditions in production spaces and the experiences of consumers are essential to exploring this masculine rhetoric of authenticity.

¹³ The Cicerone Certification Program is a four-level program that tests beer experts on their knowledge and skill for producing, storing, tasting and serving beer. It is very similar to the sommelier program in the world of wine (Cicerone, n.d.).

References

- Adorno, T. W. (1973). *The Jargon of Authenticity* (K. Tarnowski & F. Will, Trans.). Northwestern University Press. (Originally published 1964).
- Adorno, T. W. (2001). *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture* (J. M. Bernstein, Ed.; Trans.). Routledge Classics. (Original work published 1972-1981)
- American Bourbon Association. (n.d.). *What is Bourbon*.
<https://americanbourbonassociation.com/bourbon-what-is>
- Alexander, N. (2009). Brand Authentication: Creating and maintaining brand auras. *European Journal of Marketing*, 3/4, 551-562. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560910935578>
- Arendt, H. (1961). The Crisis in Culture: Its Social and Its Political Influence. In *Between Past and Future: Six Exercises in Political Thought* (p. 197-226). The Viking Press.
(Original work published 1954)
- Aslama, M. and Pantii, M. (2006). Talking Alone: Reality TV, Emotions & Authenticity. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9 (2), 167-184.
- Banet-Weiser, S. (2012). *AuthenticTM: The politics of ambivalence in a brand culture*. New York University Press.
- Banet-Weiser, S. (2021). Gender, Social Media, and the Labor of Authenticity. *American Quarterly*, 73(1), 141-144. <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2021.0000>
- Barlow, M. A., Verhaal, J. C. & Hoskins, J. D. (2018). Guilty by Association: Product-level category stigma and audience expectations in the U.S. craft beer industry. *Journal of Management*, 44(7), 2934-2960. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316657593>

- BC Craft Brewers Guild. (n.d.). *About the Guild*. Retrieved from <https://bccraftbeer.com/about-the-guild/>
- Beer Institute. (n.d.). *Beer & American History*. <https://www.beerinstitute.org/news-media/additional-beer-resources/beer-american-history/>
- Benjamin, W. (1968). *Illuminations* (H. Zohn, Trans.). Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc. (Original work published 1955)
- Belasco, W. J. (2007). *Appetite for Change: How the counterculture took on the food industry*. Cornell Paperbacks. (Original work published 1989)
- Bergadaà, M. (2008). Craftsmen of Art, and their Craft: The experience of authenticity and its materialization in the places where craftspeople and enlightened clients meet. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing*, 23(3), 5-24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/205157070802300302>
- Beverland, M. B. (2005). Crafting Brand Authenticity: The case of luxury wines. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(5), 1003-1029. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2005.00530.x>
- Beverland, M. B., Lindgreen, A. & Vink, M. W. (2008). Projecting Authenticity Through Advertising: Consumer judgments of advertisers' claims. *Journal of Advertising*, 37(1), 5-15. <https://doi.org/10.2753/JOA0091-3367370101>
- Blee, K. M. and Currier, A. (2011). Ethics Beyond the IRB: An Introductory Essay. *Qualitative Sociology*, 34, 401-413. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-011-9195-z>
- Boser, S. (2007). Power, Ethics, and the IRB: Dissonance Over Human Participant Review of Participatory Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13(8), 1060-1074. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800407308220>

- Botterill, J. (2007). Cowboys, Outlaws and Artists: The rhetoric of authenticity and contemporary jeans and sneaker advertisements. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 7(1), 105-125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540507073510>
- Bourdieu, P. (1985). The Market of Symbolic Goods. *Poetics*, 14(1-2), 13-44. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-422X\(85\)90003-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-422X(85)90003-8)
- Bramadat, P. A. (2005). Toward a New Politics of Authenticity: Ethno-cultural representation in theory and practice. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 37(1), 1-20.
- Brennen, B. (2017). *Qualitative Research Methods for Media Studies* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Breslouer, L. (2016, September 30). *The One Beer Festival You Must Go to Before You Die*. Thrillist. <https://www.thrillist.com/drink/nation/great-american-beer-festival-is-best>
- Brewers Association. (n.d.). *Craft Brewer Definition*. Retrieved from <https://www.brewersassociation.org/statistics-and-data/craft-brewer-definition/>
- Brewers Association. (n.d.). *Independent Craft Brewer Seal*. Retrieved from <https://www.brewersassociation.org/independent-craft-brewer-seal/>
- Brown, P. (2020). *Craft: An Argument*. Storm Lantern Publications.
- Brunninge, O. & Hartmann, B. J. (2019). Inventing a Past: Corporate heritage as dialectical relationships of past and present. *Marketing Theory*, 19(2), 229-234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593118790625>
- Carroll, G. R. & Swaminathan, A. (2000). Why the Microbrewery Movement? Organizational Dynamics of Resource Partitioning in the U.S. Brewing Industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106(3), 715-762. <https://doi.org/10.1086/318962>

- Carroll, G. R. & Wheaton, D. R. (2009). The Organizational Construction of Authenticity: An examination of contemporary food and dining in the U.S. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 29, 255-282. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2009.06.003>
- Carter, P. L. (2019). Looking for Something Real: Affective encounters. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 76(1), 200-213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2019.04.004>
- Chapman, N. G., Nanney, M., Lellock, J. S. & Mikles-Schluterman, J. (2018). Bottling Gender: Accomplishing gender through craft beer consumption. *Food, Culture & Society*, 21(3), 296-313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15528014.2018.1451038>
- Chen, K. (1996). Post-Marxism: Between/Beyond Critical Postmodernism and Cultural Studies. In D. Morley and K. Chen (Eds.) *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (p. 311-325). Routledge.
- Cicerone. (n.d.). *About Cicerone*. Retrieved from <https://www.cicerone.org/us-en/about-cicerone-0>
- Cipollaro, M., Fabbri, S., Sottini, V. A., Fabbri, B. and Menghini, S. (2021). Linking Sustainability, Embeddedness and Marketing Strategies: A study on the craft beer sector in Italy. *Sustainability*, 13, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su131910903>
- Colleluori, S. (2015, July 7). *The Rise and Fall (and Rise Again) of America's Breweries*. War on the Rocks. <https://warontherocks.com/2015/07/the-rise-and-fall-and-rise-again-of-americas-breweries/>
- Conway, J. (2021, April 15). *Number of Operating Craft Breweries in the U.S. 2006-2020*.

- Statista. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/267549/number-of-operating-craft-breweries-in-the-us/>
- CraftBeer.com. (n.d.). *Beer History*. <https://www.craftbeer.com/beer/beer-history>
- Crociata, A. (2020). The Role of Cultural Capital in Beer Consumption in Italy: An exploratory study. *Papers in Applied Geography*, 6(3), 180-189.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23754931.2020.1741431>
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process*. SAGE Publications.
- Darwin, H. (2018). Omnivorous Masculinity: Gender capital and cultural legitimacy in craft beer culture. *Social Currents*, 5(3), 301-316. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2329496517748336>
- de Jong, A. & Steadman, C. (2021). (Re)crafting Belonging: Cultural-led regenerations, territorialization and craft beer events. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 1-19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2021.1939126>
- Denning, M. (2004). *Culture in the Age of Three Worlds*. Verso.
- D.J. (2020, November 27). *Goose Island Beer Co. 2020 Bourbon County Stout Release*. Brewpublic. <https://brewpublic.com/beer-releases/goose-island-beer-co-2020-bourbon-county-stout-release/>
- Dodd, S., Wilson, J., Karampela, M. & Danson, M. (2021). Crafting Growth Together. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 1-27.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2021.1914741>
- Drakopoulou Dodd, S., Wilson, J., Mac an Bhaird, C. & Bisignano, A. P. (2018). Habitus

- Emerging: The development of hybrid logics and collaborative business models in the Irish craft beer sector. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, 36(6), 637-661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242617751597>
- Duggan, C. M. (2015). Creating and Retaining Authenticity Among Craft Breweries: A case study of local breweries in Boston, Massachusetts. *ProQuest Dissertations*.
- Eagleton, T. (2000). *The Idea of Culture*. Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Edwards, L. (2010). Authenticity in Organisational Context: Fragmentation, contradiction and loss of control. *Journal of Communication Management*, 14(3), 192-205. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13632541011064481>
- Ellis, W. (2014). Simulacral, Genealogical, Auratic and Representational Failure: Bushman authenticity as methodological collapse. *Critical Arts*, 28(3), 493-520. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02560046.2014.929213>
- Fletcher, A. M. (2016). Place-Making Through Beer-Drinking: A case study of Montana's craft breweries. *Geographical Review*, 106(4), 539-566. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1931-0846.2016.12184.x>
- Frake, J. (2017). Selling Out: The Authenticity Discount in the Craft Beer Industry. *Management Science*, 63(11), 3930-3943. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2620918>
- Garnham, N. (2000). *Emancipation, the Media and Modernity*. Oxford University Press.
- Gatrell, J., Reid, N. & Steiger, T. L. (2018). Branding Spaces: Place, region, sustainability and the American craft beer industry. *Applied Geography*, 90, 360-370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2017.02.012>
- Gaytán, M. S. (2019). Extending Authenticity: Going corporate in a craft market. *Poetics*, 77, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2019.101380>

- Gibson, C. and Connell, J. (2005). Music, Tourism and Culture: Authenticity and Identity. In C. Gibson and J. Connell (Eds.), *Music and Tourism: On the Road Again*. Channel View Publications.
- Giroux, H. A. (2000). *Impure Acts: The Practical Politics of Cultural Studies*. Routledge.
- Gómez-Corona, C., Escalona-Buendía, H. B., García, M., Chollet, S. & Valentin, D. (2016). Craft vs. Industrial: Habits, attitudes and motivations towards beer consumption in Mexico. *Appetite*, 96, 358-367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2015.10.002>
- Graham, C. (2001). 'Blame It On Maureen O'Hara: Ireland and the trope of authenticity. *Cultural Studies*, 15(1), 58-75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380010006754>
- Great American Beer Festival. (2017, September 1). *Then and Now*. <https://www.greatamericanbeerfestival.com/news/then-and-now/>
- Gribbins, K. (2016, August 15). *WARNING: Craft Breweries Selling to Big Beer Should Expect Backlash and Sense of Betrayal from Peers*. Craft Brewing Business. <https://www.craftbrewingbusiness.com/business-marketing/warning-craft-breweries-selling-big-beer-expect-backlash-sense-betrayal-peers/>
- Grossberg, L. (1996). History, Politics and Postmodernism: Stuart Hall and Cultural Studies. In D. Morley and K. Chen (Eds.) *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (p. 151-173). Routledge.
- Gundlach, H. & Neville, B. (2012). Authenticity: Further theoretical and practical development. *Journal of Brand Management*, 19(6), 484-499. <https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.2011.51>
- Hall, S. (1980). Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms. *Media, Culture and Society*, 2, 57-72.
- Hansen, M. B. (2008). Benjamin's Aura. *Critical Inquiry*, 34(2), 336-375. <https://doi.org/10.1086/529060>

- Hartmann, B. J. & Ostberg, J. (2013). Authenticating by Re-enchantment: The discursive making of craft production. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 29(7-8), 882-911.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2012.732596>
- Hebdige, D. (1979). *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. Methuen & Co.
- Hernandez-Fernandez, A. & Lewis, M. C. (2019). Brand Authenticity Leads to Perceived Value and Brand Trust. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 28(3), 222-238. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMBE-10-2017-0027>
- Hoskins, J., Verhaal, J. C. & Griffin, A. (2021). How Within-Country Consumer Product (or Brand) Localness and Supporting Marketing Tactics Influence Sales Performance. *European Journal of Marketing*, 55(2), 565-592. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-11-2018-0787>
- Hubbard, P. (2019). Enthusiasm, Craft and Authenticity on the High Street: Micropubs as ‘community fixers.’ *Social & Cultural Geography*, 20(6), 763-784.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2017.1380221>
- Hurych, E. (2017). Authenticity in the Perspective of Sport Tourism: Some Selected Examples. *Physical Culture and Sport Studies Research*, 73 (1), 44-53.
- Iphofen, R. and Tolich, M.. (2018). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research Ethics*. SAGE Publications. <https://dx-doi-org.colorado.idm.oclc.org/10.4135/9781526435446>
- Jay, M. (2006). Taking On the Stigma of Inauthenticity: Adorno’s critique of genuineness. *New German Critique*, 97(33,1), 15-30. <https://doi.org/10.5422/fso/9780823231263.003.0003>
- Johnson, P. C. (2018). Fakecraft. *Journal for the Study of Religion*, 31(2), 105-137.
<https://doi.org/10.17159/2413-3027/2018/v31n2a5>

- Jones, C., Anand, N. & Alvarez, J. L. (2005). Guest Editors' Introduction: Manufactured authenticity and creative voice in cultural industries. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(5), 893-899. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2005.00525.x>
- Kentucky Derby. (n.d.). *Kentucky Derby*. Retrieved from <https://www.kentuckyderby.com>
- Kettley, S. (2010). Fluidity in craft and authenticity. *Interactions*, 17(5), 12-15. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1836216.1836219>
- Kirk, J. and Miller, M. L. (1986). *Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research*. SAGE Publications. <https://archive.org/details/reliabilityvalid0000kirk/>
- Koch, E. S. & Sauerbronn, J. F. R. (2019). "To Love Beer Above All Things": An analysis of Brazilian craft beer subculture of consumption. *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, 25(1), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10454446.2018.1431577>
- Kolb, K. H. (2020). Feeding the Cultural Omnivores. *Contexts*, 19(1), 62-63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1536504220902207>
- Koontz, A. & Chapman, N. G. (2019). About Us: Authenticating identity claims in the craft beer industry. *The Journal of Popular Culture*, 52(2), 351-372. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpcu.12787>
- Konnely, L. (2020). *Brutoglossia*: Democracy, authenticity, and the enregisterment of connoisseurship in 'craft beer talk.' *Language Communication*, 75, 69-82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2020.09.001>
- Korn, P. (2013). *Why We Make Things and Why it Matters: The education of a craftsman*. David R. Godine.
- Kremlick, K. R. (2016). Crafting an Identity: Value, practice, and the making of craft beer community in San Antonio, Texas. *ProQuest Dissertations*.

- Kuehn, K. M. & Parker, S. (2021). One of the Blokes: Brewsters, branding and gender (in)visibility in New Zealand's craft beer industry. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 21(3), 519-538. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540518806956>
- Kvale, S. (2007). *Doing Interviews*. SAGE Publications.
<https://dx-doi-org.colorado.idm.oclc.org/10.4135/9781849208963>
- Langlands, A. (2017). *Crafft: An inquiry into the origins and true meaning of traditional crafts*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Lindholm, C. (2013). The Rise of Expressive Authenticity. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 86(2), 361-395. <https://doi.org/10.1353/anq.2013.0020>
- Lindlof, T. and Taylor, B. (2017). *Qualitative Communication Research Methods*. SAGE Publications.
- Luckman, S. (2015). *Craft and the Creative Economy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Madison, D. S. (2012). *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics and Performance* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Malin, J. (2018, June 20). *The Art of Repeal: Exploring America's Post-Prohibition Beer Labels*. VinePair. <https://vinepair.com/articles/1930s-beer-labels-prohibition/>
- Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Beacon Press Boston.
- Marx, K. (1992). *Early Writings* (R. Livingstone & G. Benton, Trans.). Penguin Books.
(Originally published 1975).
- Mathews, V. & Picton, R. M. (2014). Intoxifying Gentrification: Brew pubs and the geography of

- of post-industrial heritage. *Urban Geography*, 35(3), 337-356.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2014.887298>
- Mathias, B. D., Huyghe, A., Frid, C. J. & Galloway, T. L. (2017). An Industry Perspective on Coopetition in the Craft Beer Industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39, 3086-3115.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2734>
- Mathias, B. D., Huyghe, A. and Williams, D.W. (2020). Selling Your Soul to the Devil? The Importance of Independent Ownership to Identity Distinctiveness for Oppositional Categories. *Strategic Management Journal*, 41, 2548-2584.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3180>
- Merriam, S. B. and Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation* (4th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ucb/detail.action?docID=2089475>
- Money, K. (2017). Certifying Craft: Preserving authenticity in the craft beer market. *University of Louisville Law Review*, 55(3), 413-444.
- Morgan, D. R., Lane, E. T. & Styles, D. (2020). Crafty Marketing: An evaluation of distinctive criteria for “craft” beer. *Food Reviews International*, 1-17.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/87559129.2020.1753207>
- Morris, W., & Morris, M. (2012). How We Live and How We Might Live [1885]. In *The Collected Works of William Morris: With Introductions by his Daughter May Morris* (Cambridge Library Collection - Literary Studies, pp. 3-26). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139343152.004>
- Morris, W. & Morris, M. (2012). The Revival of Handicraft [1888]. In *The Collected Works of*

- William Morris: With Introductions by his Daughter May Morris* (Cambridge Library Collection - Literary Studies, pp. 331-341). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139343145.015>
- Mufti, A. R. (2000). The Aura of Authenticity. *Social Text*, 18(3), 87-103.
- Nanney, M., Chapman, N. G., Lellock, J. S. & Mikles-Schluterman, J. (2020). Gendered Expectations, Gatekeeping, and Consumption in Craft Beer Spaces. *Humanity & Society*, 44(4), 449-468. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0160597620932888>
- Nelson, C. Treichler, P. A. and Grossberg, L. (1992). Cultural Studies: An Introduction. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson and P. A. Treichler (Eds.) *Cultural Studies* (p. 1-22). Routledge.
- Newman, G. E. & Dhar, R. (2014). Authenticity is Contagious: Brand essence and the original source of production. *Journal of Marketing Research*, LI, 371-386.
<https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.11.0022>
- Noel, J. (2018). *Barrel-Aged Stout and Selling Out: Goose Island, Anheuser-Busch, and how craft beer became big business*. Chicago Review Press.
- O'Connor, J. (1984). The Process of Consumption. In *Accumulation Crisis* (p.149-187). Basil Blackwell Inc.
- O'Neill, C., Houtman, D. & Aupers, S. (2014). Advertising Real Beer: Authenticity claims beyond truth and falsity. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 17(5), 585-601.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549413515254>
- Ocejo, R. E. (2017). *Masters of Craft: Old jobs in the new urban economy*. Princeton University Press.

- Ontario Craft Brewers. (n.d.). *Brewing Philosophy*. Retrieved from <http://www.ontariocraftbrewers.com/content.html>
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Peterson, R. A. (2005). In Search of Authenticity. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(5), 1083-1098. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2005.00533.x>
- Phelan, S. (1990). The Jargon of Authenticity: Adorno and feminist essentialism. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 16, 39-54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019145379001600103>
- Potter, W. J. and Levine-Donnerstein, D. (1999). Rethinking Validity and Reliability in Content Analysis. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 27, 258-284.
- Pozner, J., Desoucey, M., Verhaal, J. C. & Sikavica, K. (2021). Watered Down: Market growth, authenticity, and evaluation in craft beer. *Organization Studies*, 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840621993236>
- Prado, I. M. S. (2020). Diana Kennedy, Rick Bayless and the Imagination of ‘Authentic’ Mexican Food. *Bulletin of the Spanish Studies*, 97(4), 567-592. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14753820.2020.1699330>
- Rice, J. (2016). Professional Purity: Revolutionary writing in the craft beer industry. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 30(2), 236-261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651915620234>
- Rickly-Boyd, J. M. (2012). Authenticity & Aura: A Benjaminian approach to tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 269-289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.05.003>
- Rosenblatt, D. (2013). Stuff the Professional Managerial Class Likes: “Distinction” for an

egalitarian elite. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 86(2), 589-623.

<https://doi.org/10.1353/anq.2013.0019>

Roszak, T. (1995). *The Making of a Counter Culture*. University of California Press.

Rubin, H. J. and Rubin, I. S. (1995). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. SAGE Publications.

Schifeling, T. & Demetry, D. (2021). The New Food Truck in Town: Geographic communities and authenticity-based entrepreneurship. *Organization Science*, 32(1), 133-155.

<https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2020.1369>

Schnell, S. M. & Reese, J. F. (2003). Microbreweries as Tools of Local Identity. *Journal of Cultural Geography*, 21(1), 45-69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08873630309478266>

Schroeder, S. (2020). Crafting New Lifestyles and Urban Places: The craft beer scene of Berlin. *Papers in Applied Geography*, 6(3), 204-221.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/23754931.2020.1776149>

Schwabsky, B. (2017). Aura as Medium: Walter Benjamin reconsidered. *Raritan*, 36(4), 92-105.

Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.

Sennett, R. (2008). *The Craftsman*. Yale University Press.

Shapiro, A. and Kenin, J. (2017, July 3). *How the Story of Beer is the Story of America*. NPR.

<https://www.npr.org/sections/thesalt/2017/07/03/532250762/how-the-story-of-beer-is-the-story-of-america>

Sims, R. (2009). Food, Place and Authenticity: Local Food and the Sustainable Tourism Experience. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(3), 321-336.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580802359293>

- Sjölander-Lindqvist, A., Skoglund, W. & Laven, D. (2020). Craft Beer — Building social terroir through connecting people, place and business. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 13(2), 149-162. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPMD-01-2019-0001>
- Slack, J. D. and Whitt, L. A. (1992). Ethics and Cultural Studies. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson and P. A. Treichler (Eds.) *Cultural Studies* (571-592). Routledge.

Somdahl-Sands, K. & Finn, J. C. (2015). Media, Performance, and Pastpresents: Authenticity in the digital age. *GeoJournal*, 80, 811-819. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-015-9648-0>

Spracklen, K., Laurencic, J. & Kenyon, A. (2013). ‘Mine’s a Pint of Bitter’: Performaticity, gender, class and representations of authenticity in real-ale tourism. *Tourist Studies*, 13(3), 304-321. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468797613498165>

Statista. (2021, February). Market Share of Leading Beer Suppliers in the United States from 2014 to 2020. Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/972647/leading-beer-suppliers-market-share-us/>

Statista. (2021, September 10). Most Popular Social Networks Worldwide as of July 2021, Ranked by Number of Active Users. Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/272014/global-social-networks-ranked-by-number-of-users/>

Stofflen, A. (2020). Revitalising Place-Based Commercial Heritage: A cultural political economy approach to the renaissance of lambic beers in Belgium. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2020.1862275>

- Swier, G. M. (2019). *Homo Touristicus*, or the Jargon of Authenticity 2.0. *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 38(2), 210-218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02580136.2019.1616920>
- The Society of Independent Brewers Association. (n.d.). *About SIBA*. Retrieved from <https://www.siba.co.uk/about-siba/>
- Theodossopoulos, D. (2013). Laying Claim to Authenticity: Five anthropological dilemmas. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 86(2), 337-360. <https://doi.org/10.1353/anq.2013.0032>
- Thurnell-Read, T. (2014). Craft, Tangibility and Affect at Work in the Microbrewery. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 13, 46-54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2014.03.001>
- Thurnell-Read, T. (2018). The Embourgeoisement of Beer: Changing practices of 'Real Ale' consumption. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 18(4), 539-557. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540516684189>
- Thurnell-Read, T. (2019). A Thirst for the Authentic: Craft drinks producers and the narration of authenticity. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 70(4), 1448-1468. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12634>
- Urban Dictionary. (2007, November 7). *Shotgunning*. Retrieved from <https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=shotgunning>
- UnTappd. (n.d.). *About Style: IPA-New England/Hazy*.
- UnTappd. (n.d.). *About Style: Stout-Imperial/Double*.
- van Zoonen, L. (1994). *Feminist Media Studies*. SAGE Publications.
- Veitch, S. A. (2011). Distinctive Drinking: Beer consumption and cultural capital. *ProQuest Dissertations*.
- Verhaal, J. C. & Dobrev, S. D. (2020). The Authenticity Paradox: Why the returns to authenticity

- on audience appeal decrease in popularity and iconicity. *Journal of Management*, 48(2), 251-280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320950414>
- Verhaal, J. C., Hoskins, J. D. & Lundmark, L. W. (2017). Little Fish in a Big Pond: Legitimacy transfer, authenticity, and factors of peripheral firm entry and growth in the market center. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38, 2532-2552. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2681>
- Verhaal, J. C., Khessina, O. M. & Dobrev, S. D. (2015). Oppositional Product Names, Organizational Identities, and Product Appeal. *Organization Science*, 26(5), 1466-1484. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2015.1000>
- Wallace, A. (2019). 'Brewing the Truth': Craft beer, class and place in contemporary London. *Sociology*, 53(5), 951-966. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038519833913>
- Weiss, A. S. (2011). Authenticity. *Gastronomica*, 11(4), 74-77. <https://doi.org/10.1525/gfc.2012.11.4.74>
- Williams, A., Atwal, G. & Bryson, D. (2020). Developing a Storytelling Experience: The case of craft spirits distilleries in Chicago. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 32(4), 555-571. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijwbr-06-2019-0040>
- Williams, R. (1961). *The Long Revolution*. Chatto & Windus.
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford University Press.
- Williams, R. (1980). *Culture and Materialism*. Verso Books.
- Williams, R. (1983). *Culture and Society: 1780-1950*. Columbia University Press.
- Wojtyra, B. (2020). How and Why Did Craft Breweries 'Revolutionise' the Beer Market? The Case of Poland. *Moravian Geographical Reports*, 28(2), 81-97. <https://doi.org/10.2478/mgr-2020-0007>

- Young, K. E. (2014). Adorno, Gastronomic Authenticity, and the Politics of Eating Well. *New Political Science*, 36(3), 387-405. <https://doi.org/10.1090/07393148.2014.924248>
- Zukin, S. (2008). Consuming Authenticity: From outposts of difference to means of exclusion. *Cultural Studies*, 22(5), 724-748. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380802245985>
- Zukin, S. (2009). Changing Landscapes of Power: Opulence and the urge for authenticity. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 33(2), 543-553.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2009.00867.x>
- Zukin, S. (2011). Reconstructing the Authenticity of Place. *Theory and Society*, 40, 161-165.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-010-9133-1>

Appendix

Table 1: Breweries Included in Website Data Set

Brewery Name	City	State	Website
12 Fox Beer Co	Dripping Springs	TX	www.12foxbeer.com
5 Stones Artisan Brewery	New Braunfels	TX	https://www.5stonesbrewery.com
8th Wonder Brewery	Houston	TX	www.8thwonder.com
Abandoned Building Brewery	Easthampton	MA	www.abandonedbuildingbrewery.com
Ad Astra Brewing Company	Prescott	AZ	https://www.adastrabrewingcompany.com
Angelina Brewing Company	Lufkin	TX	www.angelinabeer.com
Aztec Brewing Company	Vista	CA	www.aztecbrewery.com
Barley Creek Brewing Co	Tannersville	PA	www.barleycreek.com
Bathtub Row Brewing Co-op	Los Alamos	NM	https://www.bathtubrowbrewing.coop
Bennidito's Brewpub	Spokane	WA	www.benniditosbrewpub.com
Biscayne Bay Brewing Co	Miami	FL	https://www.biscaynebaybrewing.com
Bond's Brewing Company	Laramie	WY	bondsbrewing.com
Buffalo Creek Brewing	Long Grove	IL	http://www.buffalocreekbrewing.com
Burial Beer Co ¹⁴	Asheville	NC	www.burialbeer.com
Burning Bush Brewery	Chicago	IL	www.burningbushbrewery.com
Cactus Land Brewing Company	Adkins	TX	www.cactuslandbrewing.com
City Barrel Brewing	Kansas City	MO	www.citybarrelbrewing.com

¹⁴ I have consumed beer from this brewery.

Co ¹⁵			.com
City Brewing Co	La Crosse	WI	www.citybrewery.com
City Steam Brewery	Hartford	CT	www.citysteambrewery.com
Coldfire Brewing	Eugene	OR	www.coldfirebrewing.com
Common Roots Brewing Company	South Glens Falls	NY	www.commonrootsbrewing.com
Cooperstown Brewing Co	Milford	NY	https://www.cooperstownbrewing.com
Creature Comforts ¹⁶	Athens	GA	www.creaturecomfortsbeer.com
Creek Bottom Brew LLC	Oldenburg	IN	www.creekbottombrew.com
Dreaming Dog Brewery	Elk Grove	CA	https://www.dreamingdogbrewery.com
Ebullition Brew Works	Vista	CA	www.ebullitionbrew.com
Elliott Bay Brewhouse & Pub - Burien	Burien	WA	www.elliottbaybrewing.com
Evil Genius Beer Co	Philadelphia	PA	www.evilgeniusbeer.com
Forged Brewing Co	Bainbridge	NY	www.forgedbrewing.com
Fort Loramie Brewing	Fort Loramie	OH	www.theloramiebrewbank.com
Fortress BeerWorks	Spring	TX	https://fortressbeerworks.com
Four Bullets Brewery	Richardson	TX	www.fourbulletsbrewery.com
Franklin Street Brewing Company	Manchester	IA	www.franklinstreetbrewing.com
Free State Brewing Co	Lawrence	KS	www.freestatebrewing.com

¹⁵ I have consumed beer from this brewery.

¹⁶ I have consumed beer from this brewery.

Geronimo Brewing Inc	Doylestown	PA	www.geronimobrewing.com
Holy Craft Brewing Co	San Francisco	CA	www.holycraftbrewery.com
Honey Hollow Brewery	Earlton	NY	www.honeyhollowbrewery.com
Hopsquad Brewing Company	Austin	TX	www.hopsquad.com
Horned Owl Brewing	Kennesaw	GA	www.hornedowlbrewing.com
House Divided Brewery	Ely	IA	www.housedividedbrewery.com
Howlin Wind Brewing & Blending	Rollinsville	CO	https://www.howlinwindbrewing.com
Ironclad Brewery	Wilmington	NC	www.ironcladbrewery.com
Itasca Brewing Company Inc	Itasca	IL	www.itascabrewingcompany.com
Jackson Street Brew Co.	Perryville	MO	http://www.jstreetbrewco.com
Joymongers Brewing Co.	Greensboro	NC	www.joymongers.com
Langhorne Brewing Co	Langhorne	PA	www.thelanghornebrewingco.com
Lazy Horse Brewing	Ohiowa	NE	lazyhorsebrewing.com
Level Crossing Brewing Company	South Salt Lake	UT	https://levelcrossingbrewing.com
Lizard Tail Brewing Nob Hill	Albuquerque	NM	www.lizardtailbrewing.com
Mackenzie Brewing Company	Valley Park	MO	www.mknzbrewing.com
Macon Beer Company	Macon	GA	www.maconbeer.com
Mash Lab Brewing	Windsor	CO	www.mashlabbrewing.com
Missouri Ridge Distillery & Brewery LLC	Branson	MO	www.missouriridgedistillery.com

Mixed Breed Brewing	Guilderland Center	NY	www.mixedbreedbrewing.com
Nerdspeak Brewery LLC	Bettendorf	IA	www.nerdspeakbrewery.com
Ocean Beach Brewery	San Diego	CA	www.obbrewingco.com
Ocmulgee Brewpub	Macon	GA	www.ocmulgeebrewpub.com
Ogres Brewing	Clinton	WA	www.ogresbrewing.com
Old Capitol Brewing	Chillicothe	OH	www.oldcapitolbrewing.com
Orono Brewing Bangor Draught Room	Bangor	ME	www.oronobrewing.com
Ouray Brewery	Ouray	CO	www.ouraybrewery.com
Parkersburg Brewing Co	Parkersburg	WV	www.parkersburgbrewing.com
Parts & Labor Brewing Company	Sterling	CO	www.partsandlaborbrewing.com
Pitt Street Brewing Company	Greenville	NC	www.pittstreetbrewing.com
Point Ybel Brewing Company ¹⁷	Fort Myers	FL	www.pointybelbrew.com
Ragged Island Brewing Company	Portsmouth	RI	www.raggedislandbrewing.com
Reformation Brewery	Canton	GA	www.reformationbrewery.com
Roaring Table Brewing	Lake Zurich	IL	www.roaringtable.com
Route 66 Junkyard Brewery	Grants	NM	https://www.junkyardon66brewery.com
Rowlands Calumet Brewery Co (#2)	Chilton	WI	https://www.rowlandsbrewery.com
Ruddy Duck Brewery and Grill	Dowell	MD	www.ruddyduckbrewery.com

¹⁷ I have visited and consumed beer from this brewery.

SHE Beverage company	Lancaster	CA	https://shebeverages.com
Small Craft Brewing Co	Amityville	NY	www.smallcraftbrewing.com
Soggy Bottom Brewing Co.	Dunedin	FL	www.soggybottombrewery.com
Soul Squared Brewing Co.	Fort Collins	CO	www.soulsquaredbrewing.com
South Gate Brewing Co	Oakhurst	CA	www.southgatebrewco.com
South Of North Brewing Company	South Lake Tahoe	CA	www.southofnorthbeer.com
Southern Hops Brewing Co.	Florence	SC	www.southernhops.com
Stark Brewing Company	Manchester	NH	www.starkbrewingcompany.com
Stein Brewing Company	Mount Vernon	OH	www.SteinBrewCo.com
Stockholms Vardshus	Geneva	IL	www.stockholmsbrewpub.com
Structures Brewing	Bellingham	WA	www.structuresbrewing.com
That Witch Ales You	New York	NY	www.thatwitchalesyou.com
The Best Of Hands Barrelhouse	Seattle	WA	www.bestofhandsbarrelhouse.com
Welton Brewing Co.	Land O Lakes	FL	www.thebrewcraftery.com
The Sanford Beverage Company, Inc. D.B.A. Steele Street Brewing	Ionia	MI	www.steelestreetbrewing.com
The Tubby Pig	Fort Myers	FL	https://thetubbypigbrewpub.business.site/?utm_source=gmb&utm_medium=referral
Three Blondes Brewing	South Haven	MI	www.threeblondesbrewing.com

Three Roads Brewing Company - Lynchburg	Lynchburg	VA	www.thirdstbrewing.com
Throwback Brewery	North Hampton	NH	www.throwbackbrewery.com
Tractor Brewing Co	Albuquerque	NM	www.getplowed.com
Trustworthy Brewing Co	Burbank	CA	www.trustworthybrewingco.com
Twisted Roots Brewing	Saint Louis	MO	www.twistedrootsbrewing.com
Two Frays Brewery	Pittsburgh	PA	www.twofraysbrewery.com
Urban Chestnut Grove Brewery and Bierhall	Saint Louis	MO	https://www.urbanchestnut.com
Weird Window Brewing	South Burlington	VT	www.weirdwindowbrewing.com
Willimantic Brewing Co and Main Street Cafe	Willimantic	CT	www.willimanticbrewingcompany.com/
Wise I Brewing Company	Le Mars	IA	www.wiseibrew.com
Wrecking Crew Brew Works	Medina	OH	www.wreckingcrewbrewworks.com

Table 2: Breweries Included in Facebook Data Set

Brewery Name	City	State	Facebook Link
12Degree Brewing ¹⁸	Louisville	CO	facebook.com/12degreebrewing
3 Keys Brewing	Bradenton	FL	https://www.facebook.com/3keysbrewing
3rd Planet Brewing	Niceville	FL	https://www.facebook.com/1416695698635209
5 Stones Artisan Brewery	New Braunfels	TX	https://www.facebook.com/5StonesBrewery/
5th Line Brewing Company	Yakima	WA	https://www.facebook.com/5thlinebrewing
Adelbert's Brewery LLC	Austin	TX	https://www.facebook.com/adelbertsbeer/
Ale Spike	Camano Island	WA	https://www.facebook.com/alespikebeer/
Altruist Brewing Company	Sturbridge	MA	https://www.facebook.com/altruistbrewingco/
Amery Ale Works	Amery	WI	http://www.facebook.com/100008822283532
Arbor Brewing Co	Ann Arbor	MI	https://facebook.com/ArborBrewingCo
Armistice Brewing Company	Richmond	CA	http://www.facebook.com/armisticebeer
Astronomy Aleworks	Henderson	NV	https://www.facebook.com/Astronomyaleworks/
Back Pew Brewing	Porter	TX	http://www.facebook.com/backpewbrewing
Barley Brown's Brewing Co	Baker City	OR	https://www.facebook.com/pages/Barley-Browns-Brew-Pub/111640788872909
Barn Brewers	Lawton	MI	https://www.facebook.com/barnbrewersbrewer

¹⁸ I have visited and consumed beer from this brewery.

			y
Battlemage Brewing Co	Vista	CA	https://www.facebook.com/Battlemagebrewing/
Best End Brewing Company	Atlanta	GA	http://www.facebook.com/bestendbrewing
Black Rock Brewing Company - Linglestown	Harrisburg	PA	https://www.facebook.com/blackrockbrewing
Blue Frog Brewing Company	Fairfield	CA	https://www.facebook.com/BlueFrogBrewingCo/
Blue Star Brewing Co	San Antonio	TX	https://www.facebook.com/BlueStarBrewCo/
Bottle Bay Brewing	Spokane	WA	http://facebook.com/bottlebaybrewing/
Brewery 44	Carver	MA	https://www.facebook.com/105173391184999
Brockopp Brewing LLC	Valley City	ND	https://www.facebook.com/BrockoppBrewing/
Bully Brewing	Leesburg	FL	https://www.facebook.com/BullyBrewing
Chattahoochee Brewing Co.	Phenix City	AL	https://www.facebook.com/ChattahoocheeBrewing/
Chesepiooc Real Ale Brewery	Crofton	MD	https://www.facebook.com/BrewCrab
Comet Brews	Littleton	CO	https://www.facebook.com/101374508572094
Common Block Brewing Company	Medford	OR	https://www.facebook.com/commonblockbrewing
Country Monks Brewing	Subiaco	AR	https://www.facebook.com/SubiacoMonks
Creative Creature Brewing Company	El Cajon	CA	https://www.facebook.com/pg/creativecreaturebrewing

Cycle Brewing	St Petersburg	FL	https://www.facebook.com/Cycle-Brewing-454861824560821/
Diamond Mountain Brewery	Susanville	CA	https://www.facebook.com/DiamondMountainCasino/
Dr. Scofflaw's At The Works ATL	Atlanta	GA	https://www.facebook.com/scofflawbrewingco
Elliott Bay Brewhouse & Pub - Burien	Burien	WA	https://www.facebook.com/ElliottBayBrewingCompany
Euryale Brewing Co	Riverside	CA	https://www.facebook.com/pg/euryalebrewing
Five Dollar Ranch Brewing Company	Walla Walla	WA	https://www.facebook.com/fdrbeer
Flying Ace Farm	Lovettsville	VA	https://www.facebook.com/flyingacefarm
Foam Brewers	Burlington	VT	https://www.facebook.com/FoamBrewers/
Great Adirondack Brewing Company	Lake Placid	NY	https://www.facebook.com/greatadirondackbrewing/
Great Divide Brewing Co ¹⁹	Denver	CO	https://www.facebook.com/greatdividebrew
Great North Aleworks	Manchester	NH	https://www.facebook.com/greatnorthale/
Gritty McDuffs - Freeport	Freeport	ME	http://www.facebook.com/grittymcduffs
Half Barrel Beer Project	Orlando	FL	https://www.facebook.com/hbbproject
Hapa's Brewing Company	San Jose	CA	https://www.facebook.com/hapasbrewing
Hello Brew Co.	Spokane	WA	https://www.facebook.com/HelloBrewCo/
Horned Owl Brewing	Kennesaw	GA	https://www.facebook.com/hornedowlbrewing/

¹⁹ I have visited and consumed beer from this brewery.

Indian Valley Brewing	Novato	CA	https://www.facebook.com/IndianValleyBrewing/
Ironclad Brewery	Wilmington	NC	http://www.facebook.com/ironcladbrewery
Kassik's Brewery	Kenai	AK	https://www.facebook.com/109504170532434
Key City Brewing Co.	Vicksburg	MS	https://www.facebook.com/keycitybeer/
Labyrinth Brewing Company	Manchester	CT	https://www.facebook.com/labyrinthbrewing
LaGrow Organic Beer Co	Chicago	IL	https://www.facebook.com/LaGrow-Organic-Beer-Co-117723385278408/?ref=aymt_homepage_panel
Lake Monster Brewing	Saint Paul	MN	https://www.facebook.com/lakemonsterbrewing/
Lena Brewing Company	Lena	IL	http://www.facebook.com/lenabrewingcompany
Lone Pine Brewing Company - Gorham Tasting Room	Gorham	ME	http://facebook.com/lonepinebrewing
Lucette Brewing Company	Menomonie	WI	https://www.facebook.com/lucettewoodfireeatery/
Lynnwood Brewing Concern	Raleigh	NC	http://facebook.com/lynnwoodbrewing
Main & Mill Brewing Company	Festus	MO	https://www.facebook.com/mainandmillbrewingco
Mancos Brewing Company	Mancos	CO	https://www.facebook.com/mancosbrewery
Mare Island Brewing Co. - Coal Shed Brewery	Vallejo	CA	https://www.facebook.com/MareIslandBrewingCo

Marley's Brewery	Bloomsburg	PA	https://www.facebook.com/MarleysBrew/
MashCraft Brewing	Greenwood	IN	https://www.facebook.com/search/top/?q=Mashcraft
McMenamins Spar Cafe Brewery	Olympia	WA	https://www.facebook.com/McMenamins
Mistress Brewing Company	Ankeny	IA	https://www.facebook.com/mistressbrewing
MoonRidge Brewpub	Cornell	WI	www.facebook.com/MoonRidge-Brew-Pub-1501996800095070
New Crescent Brewing Co.	Irwin	PA	https://www.facebook.com/newcrescentbrewing/
Origin Beer Lab	Ashland	VA	http://facebook.com/originbeerlab
Printer's Ale Manufacturing Co.	Carrollton	GA	https://www.facebook.com/printersbeer/
Public Coast Brewing Co.	Cannon Beach	OR	https://www.facebook.com/publiccoastbrewing
Public House 28 Brewery	Anthony	NM	https://www.facebook.com/publichouse28brewery
Public House Kitchen and Brewery	Manassas	VA	https://www.facebook.com/publichousekitchenandbrewery/
RoHa Brewing Project	Salt Lake City	UT	https://www.facebook.com/RoHaBrewingProject/
Round Trip Brewing Company	Atlanta	GA	https://www.facebook.com/RoundTripBeer/
San Diego Brewing Co	San Diego	CA	https://www.facebook.com/SanDiegoBrewing/?rf=177852462266403
Sandy Springs Brewing Co	Minerva	OH	https://www.facebook.com/1240472246034544
Santiam Brewing Co	Salem	OR	https://facebook.com/S

			antiamBrewingCo
Schmohz Brewery	Grand Rapids	MI	http://www.facebook.com/SchmohzBrewery
Scratch Brewing Company	Ava	IL	https://www.facebook.com/Scratch-Brewing-Company-286084918098477/?ref=bookmarks
Seabright Brewery	Santa Cruz	CA	https://www.facebook.com/SeabrightSocial
Sean Patrick's Pub	San Marcos	TX	https://www.facebook.com/186227088080643
Shmaltz Brewing Co	Elmsford	NY	https://www.facebook.com/ShmaltzBrewing/
Superior Coast Brewery / Karls Cuisine Winery and Brewery	Sault Sainte Marie	MI	https://www.facebook.com/Karls-Cuisine-Cafe-Winery-163234720378439/?fref=ts
Tecopa Brewing Company	Tecopa	CA	https://www.facebook.com/Delightshotspringsresort
The Lone Wolfe Brewing Co.	Wolfeboro	NH	http://www.facebook.com/lonewolfbrewing
Thin Man Brewery	Buffalo	NY	http://facebook.com/thinmanbrewery
Thompson Island Brewing Co	Rehoboth Beach	DE	https://www.facebook.com/Thompson-Island-Brewing-Company-1715508558552202/
Three Odd Guys Brewing	Apopka	FL	https://www.facebook.com/ThreeOddGuysBrewing/
Tideland Brewing	North Charleston	SC	https://www.facebook.com/TidelandBrewing/
Titonka Brewing Company	Titonka	IA	https://www.facebook.com/titonkabrewingcompany/
Triple C Brewing	Charlotte	NC	https://www.facebook.com

Company			om/Triple-C-Brewing-Co-235594437177492/
Unseen Creatures Brewing & Blending	Miami	FL	https://www.facebook.com/unseencreaturesbrewing/
Vaulted Oak Brewing	Charlotte	NC	https://www.facebook.com/Vaulted-Oak-Brewing-107677717682844
Vicious Fishes Brewery	Angier	NC	https://www.facebook.com/ViciousFishesBrewery/
Virant Family Winery / Black Angus Brewery	Geneva	OH	https://www.facebook.com/virantfamilywinery/
Wandering Hop Brewery	Yakima	WA	https://www.facebook.com/wanderinghop/
Water's End Brewery	Lake Ridge	VA	http://www.facebook.com/watersendbrewery
Willow Rock Brewing Company	Syracuse	NY	https://www.facebook.com/willowrockbrew/
Yokefellow Beer	Austin	TX	http://facebook.com/yokefellowbeer
Young Veterans Brewing Company	Virginia Beach	VA	https://www.facebook.com/youngveteransbrewingco

Table 3: Breweries Included in Instagram Data Set

Brewery Name	City	State	Instagram Link
105 West Brewing Co	Castle Rock	CO	https://www.instagram.com/105westbrewing/
3 Gatos Brewery	Wyoming	MI	https://instagram.com/3gatosbeer
93 Octane Brewery	Saint Charles	IL	http://www.instagram.com/93octanebrewery
Abjuration Brewing	Mc Kees Rocks	PA	https://www.instagram.com/abjurationbrewing
Adesanya Mead & Microbrewery	Grandville	MI	https://www.instagram.com/adesanyamead/
Albion Malleable Brewing Company	Albion	MI	https://www.instagram.com/albionmalleable/?hl=en
Alesatian Brewing Co.	Winchester	VA	https://www.instagram.com/alesatianbrewing/
Appalachian Brewing Co - Harrisburg	Harrisburg	PA	https://www.instagram.com/abcbrewco
Astral Brewing	Houston	TX	https://www.instagram.com/astralbrewing/
Athens Brewing Co	Athens	TX	http://instagram.com/athensbrewingco
BAKFISH Brewing Company	Pearland	TX	http://instagram.com/bakfishbrewing
Baleen Brewing Co.	Ketchikan	AK	https://www.instagram.com/almacgillivray/
Bearded Tang Brewery LLC	Stanton	CA	https://www.instagram.com/beardedtang/?hl=en
Benson Brewery	Omaha	NE	http://instagram.com/bensonbrewery
Boulder Dam Brewing Company	Boulder City	NV	http://instagram.com/boulderdambrew#
Bow and Arrow Brewing Co	Albuquerque	NM	http://instagram.com/ramblertaproom

Brewer's Alley Restaurant and Brewery	Frederick	MD	https://www.instagram.com/brewersalley/
Coin Toss Brewing Co	Oregon City	OR	https://www.instagram.com/cointossbrewing/
Community Fermentation Union	Eugene	OR	https://www.instagram.com/eatdrinkcfu
CooperSmiths Pub and Brewing ²⁰	Fort Collins	CO	https://www.instagram.com/coopersmithspubco/
Critz Farms Brewing & Cider Co.	Cazenovia	NY	https://www.instagram.com/critzfarms/
Dalton Union	MARYSVILLE	OH	https://www.instagram.com/daltonunion
Departed Soles Brewing	Jersey City	NJ	https://www.instagram.com/departedsoles/
Devil's Purse Brewing Co	South Dennis	MA	https://www.instagram.com/devilspursebrewing/
Dingus McGee's Roadhouse	Auburn	CA	https://www.instagram.com/dingus_mcgees/
Dos Luces Brewery ²¹	Denver	CO	https://www.instagram.com/doslucesbrewery/
East Brother Beer Company	Richmond	CA	https://www.instagram.com/eastbrotherbeer/
Elk River Brewing Co.	Elkton	MD	https://www.instagram.com/elkriverbrewing/?hl=en
Fat Bottom Brewing	Nashville	TN	https://www.instagram.com/fatbottombrews/
Fermentery Form	Philadelphia	PA	https://www.instagram.com/fermentery_form/?hl=en
Five Dollar Ranch Brewing Company	Walla Walla	WA	https://www.instagram.com/fdrbeer/

²⁰ I have visited and consumed beer from this brewery.

²¹ I have visited and consumed beer from this brewery.

Florida Keys Brewing Co.	Islamorada	FL	https://www.instagram.com/floridakeysbrewingco/
Full Mile Beer Company and Kitchen	Sun Prairie	WI	http://instagram.com/fullmilebeerco
Golden Avalanche Brewing Co	Kutztown	PA	https://www.instagram.com/goldenavalanchebrewing/
Gordon Biersch Brewery Restaurant - Burbank	Burbank	CA	https://www.instagram.com/gordonbiersch/?hl=en
Grayton Beer Company	Santa Rosa Beach	FL	https://www.instagram.com/graytonbeer/
Hickory Nut Gorge Brewery - Mars Hill	Mars Hill	NC	https://www.instagram.com/hickorynutgorgebrewery/?hl=en
Hinterland Brewery	Green Bay	WI	https://www.instagram.com/hinterlandbeer/
Holsopple Brewing	Louisville	KY	https://www.instagram.com/holsopplebrewing/?hl=en
Housatonic River Brewing	New Milford	CT	https://www.instagram.com/hrbrewing/?hl=en
Hysteria Brewing Company	Columbia	MD	https://www.instagram.com/hysteriabrewery/?hl=en
Idiom Brewing Company	Frederick	MD	https://www.instagram.com/idiombrewingco
Institution Ale Company	Camarillo	CA	https://www.instagram.com/institutionales/?hl=en
Island Hoppin' Brewery	Eastsound	WA	http://instagram.com/islandhoppinoi
J.J. Ratigan Brewing Company	Pottstown	PA	https://www.instagram.com/jjratiganbrewingco
Jackrabbit Brewing Co	West Sacramento	CA	https://www.instagram.com/jackrabbitbrewing/
Kelsen Brewing	Derry	NH	http://instagram.com/kelsenbrewing

Company			lsenbrewing
Knotted Root Brewing Company ²²	Nederland	CO	https://www.instagram.com/knottedrootbrewing/?hl=en
Knuth Brewing Company	Ripon	WI	https://www.instagram.com/knuthbrewingcompany/?hl=en
Mad Anthony Brewing Co	Fort Wayne	IN	https://www.instagram.com/madanthonybrewing/?hl=en
Mad Hatchet Brewing	SHOREWOOD	IL	http://instagram.com/madhatchetbrew
McMenamins Highland Pub and Brewery	Gresham	OR	https://www.instagram.com/mcmenamins/
Milk Money Brewing	LaGrange	IL	https://instagram.com/milkmoneybrewing/
Mineral Springs Brewery	Owatonna	MN	https://www.instagram.com/mineralspringsbrewery/
Minhas Craft Brewery	Monroe	WI	https://www.instagram.com/minhasbrewery/?hl=en
Morgan Street Brewery	Saint Louis	MO	https://www.instagram.com/morganstreetbrewerystl/?hl=en
Mud Run Beer Co.	Stockton	IL	https://www.instagram.com/mudrunbeerco/
MyGrain Brewing Company	Joliet	IL	https://www.instagram.com/mygrainbrewing/
North Country Brewing Co. LLC	Slippery Rock	PA	https://www.instagram.com/northcountrybrewpub/
Nowhere Brewing	Covington	VA	http://instagram.com/nowhere_brewery
Optimism Brewing Company	Seattle	WA	https://www.instagram.com/optimismbrewing/

²² I have visited and consumed beer from this brewery.

Piedmont Brewery and Kitchen	Macon	GA	https://www.instagram.com/piedmontbrewery/
Point Labaddie Brewery	Labadie	MO	https://www.instagram.com/pointlabaddie
Polar Brewing	Bozeman	MT	https://www.instagram.com/p/CMfX3vrrmPF/
Precious Things Fermentation Project	Spokane	WA	https://www.instagram.com/preciousthingsbeer/?hl=en
Proper Brewing Co	Salt Lake City	UT	https://www.instagram.com/properbrewingco/?hl=en
Purgatory Beer Co, LLC	Whitinsville	MA	https://www.instagram.com/purgatorybeerco/
Quincy Brewing Company	Quincy	IL	https://www.instagram.com/quincybrewingcompany/
Raised Grain Brewing Company	Waukesha	WI	https://www.instagram.com/raisedgrainbrewingco
Reuben's Brews ²³	Seattle	WA	https://www.instagram.com/reubensbrews/
River North Brewery - RiNo ²⁴	Denver	CO	https://www.instagram.com/rivernorthbrew/?hl=en
Rock Bottom Brewery - Milwaukee	Milwaukee	WI	https://www.instagram.com/rockbottombrewery/
Rocky Reef Brewing Company	Woodruff	WI	https://www.instagram.com/rockyreefbrewing/?hl=en
Ronan Cooperative Brewery	Ronan	MT	https://www.instagram.com/ronancoopbrewerymt/
Secatogue Brewing Co.	West Islip	NY	https://www.instagram.com/secatoguebrewing

²³ I have visited and consumed beer from this brewery.

²⁴ I have visited and consumed beer from this brewery.

			co/
Settle Down Easy Brewing Company	Falls Church	VA	https://www.instagram.com/sdebrewing
Six Pack Brewing	Bristol	RI	https://www.instagram.com/6packbrewing/
Sky High Brewing	Corvallis	OR	https://www.instagram.com/skyhighbrewpub/%20
Sobremesa	Albuquerque	NM	https://www.instagram.com/sobremesanm/?hl=en
Stein Brewing Company	Mount Vernon	OH	https://www.instagram.com/steinbrewco2017/?hl=en
Stone Corral Brewery	Richmond	VT	https://www.instagram.com/stonecorralbrewery/?hl=en
Stones Throw Brewery	Bellingham	WA	https://www.instagram.com/fairhaven_stonesthrowbrewery/?hl=en
Strawberry Alley Ale Works	Clarksville	TN	http://instagram.com/strawberryalleytn
Stripe Nine Brewing Co.	Somersworth	NH	https://www.instagram.com/stripeninebrewing/
Thousand Lakes Brewing Company	Parkers Prairie	MN	https://www.instagram.com/thousandlakesbrewing/
Tidal Brewing Co	Spring Hill	FL	http://instagram.com/tidalbrewingco
Topwater Brewing Co.	Barrington	NH	https://www.instagram.com/topwaterbrewingco/?hl=en
Trademark Brewing	Long Beach	CA	https://www.instagram.com/trademarkbrewing/
Trek Brewing	Newark	OH	https://www.instagram.com/trekbrewing/
Turn 2 Brewing	Sebring	FL	https://www.instagram.com

Company Inc.			com/turn2brew
Twisted Bine Beer Co.	Mount Joy	PA	https://www.instagram.com/twistedbinebeer/?hl=en
Twisted Gingers Brewing Company	Philadelphia	PA	https://www.instagram.com/twistedgingersbeer/?hl=en
Two Blokes Brewing Co.	Mount Pleasant	SC	https://www.instagram.com/twoblokesbrewing
Two Weeks Notice Brewing	West Springfield	MA	https://www.instagram.com/twoweeksbrewco/
Versailles Brewing Company	Versailles	KY	https://www.instagram.com/versaillesbrewingcompany/?hl=en
Walking Stick Brewing Company	Houston	TX	https://www.instagram.com/walkingstickbrewing/
Watauga Brewing Company	Johnson City	TN	https://www.instagram.com/wataugabrewingco/
Wild Wolf Brewing Co	Nellysford	VA	https://www.instagram.com/wildwolfbeer/?hl=en
Yard Owl Craft Brewery	Gardiner	NY	http://instagram.com/yardowlbeer

Table 4: Breweries Included in TikTok Data Set

Brewery Name	City	State	TikTok Link
10K Brewing	Anoka	MN	https://www.tiktok.com/@10kbrewing
12 Fox Beer Co	Dripping Springs	TX	https://www.tiktok.com/@12foxbeerco
1820 BrewWerks	Kalida	OH	https://www.tiktok.com/@1820brewwerks
3rd Turn Brewing	Louisville	KY	https://www.tiktok.com/@3rdturnbrewing
3 Trails Brewing	Independence	MO	https://www.tiktok.com/@3trailsbrewing
5ive Cities Brewing	Bettendorf	IA	https://www.tiktok.com/@5ivecities?lang=en
Barley & Board	Denton	TX	https://www.tiktok.com/@barleyandboard?lang=enBackRoad%20Brewery
Beachwood Blendery ²⁵	Long Beach	CA	https://www.tiktok.com/@beachwoodbrewing?lang=enBackRoad%20Brewery
Beards Brewery	Petoskey	MI	https://www.tiktok.com/@beardsbrewery?lang=enBackRoad%20Brewery
Big ALICe Brewing Company	Long Island City	NY	https://www.tiktok.com/@bigalicebrewing?lang=enBackRoad%20Brewery
Blacklist Artisan Ales	Duluth	MN	https://www.tiktok.com/@blacklistbrewing
BlackStack Brewing	Saint Paul	MN	https://www.tiktok.com/@blackstackbrewing
Blind Pig Brewery	Champaign	IL	https://www.tiktok.com/@blindpigbrewing

²⁵ I have consumed beer from this brewery.

Bluestone Brewing Company	Sayre	PA	https://www.tiktok.com/@bluestonebrew
Bradford Brew Station	Bradford	PA	https://www.tiktok.com/@bradfordbrew
Brewers At 4001 Yancey	Charlotte	NC	https://www.tiktok.com/@brewersat4001yancey
Cabin Boys Brewery	Tulsa	OK	https://www.tiktok.com/@cabinboysbrewery
Claremont Craft Ales	Claremont	CA	https://www.tiktok.com/@claremont_craft_ales
Copper Trail Brewing Co.	Alexandria	MN	https://www.tiktok.com/@coppertrailbrewingco
Creative Creature Brewing Company	El Cajon	CA	https://www.tiktok.com/@creativecreaturebrewing
Crossroads Brewing Company - Catskill Taproom	Catskill	NY	https://www.tiktok.com/@crossroadsbrewingco
Duck Foot Brewing Co.	San Diego	CA	https://www.tiktok.com/@duckfootbeer
Dueces Wild Brewery	Colorado Springs	CO	https://www.tiktok.com/@dwbbrewery
Endeavor Brewing Company	Columbus	OH	https://www.tiktok.com/@endeavorbrews
Fate Tap + Barrel	Scottsdale	AZ	https://www.tiktok.com/@fatebrewingaz
Florida Beer Co	Cape Canaveral	FL	https://www.tiktok.com/@fbcspacecoast
Fiddlin' Fish Brewing Company	Winston Salem	NC	https://www.tiktok.com/@fiddlinfish
First Street Brewing	Hastings	NE	https://www.tiktok.com/@firststreetbrewingco
The Flagship Brewing Company	Staten Island	NY	https://www.tiktok.com/@flagshipbrewingco
Flying Fish Brewing Co	Somerdale	NJ	https://www.tiktok.com/@flyingfishbrew

Foam Brewers	Burlington	VT	https://www.tiktok.com/@foambrewers
Fort George Brewery	Astoria	OR	https://www.tiktok.com/@fortgeorgebeer
Funk Brewing Company	Emmaus	PA	https://www.tiktok.com/@funkbrewing
Grains of Virtue Brewing Company	Oakdale	CA	https://www.tiktok.com/@grainsofvirtue
Great Basin Brewing Co - Taps & Tanks Production Brewery	Reno	NV	https://www.tiktok.com/@greatbasinbrewing
Groundwork Brewing	Lewiston	ID	https://www.tiktok.com/@groundworkbrewing
Hog Island Beer Company	Orleans	MA	https://www.tiktok.com/@hogislandbeer
Inbound Brewco	Minneapolis	MN	https://www.tiktok.com/@inboundbrewco
Iron Flamingo Brewery	Corning	NY	https://www.tiktok.com/@ironflamingo_barrelhouse
Iron Hill Brewery & Restaurant - Center City	Philadelphia	PA	https://www.tiktok.com/@ironhillbrewery
Jasper Ridge Brewing Co	Ishpeming	MI	https://www.tiktok.com/@jasperridgebrewer
Jekyll Brewing - Alpharetta City Center	Alpharetta	GA	https://www.tiktok.com/@jekyllbrewing
KettleHouse Brewing Co - Bonner Brewery	Bonner	MT	https://www.tiktok.com/@kettlehousebeer
Legacy Ale Works	Jacksonville	FL	https://www.tiktok.com/@legacyale
Lithology Brewing	Farmingdale	NY	https://www.tiktok.com/@lithologybrewing
Lively Beerworks	Oklahoma City	OK	https://www.tiktok.com/@livelybeerworks
Lone Eagle Brewing	Flemington	NJ	https://www.tiktok.com/@loneeaglebrew

Lost Forty Brewing	Little Rock	AR	https://www.tiktok.com/@lost40beer
Loveland Aleworks	Loveland	CO	https://www.tiktok.com/@lovelandaleworks
Mad Swede Brewing Co.	Boise	ID	https://www.tiktok.com/@madswedebrewing
Mayday Brewery	Murfreesboro	TN	https://www.tiktok.com/@maydaybrewery
Migration Brewing Co	Portland	OR	https://www.tiktok.com/@migrationbrewing
Montclair Brewery	Montclair	NJ	https://www.tiktok.com/@montclairbrewery
Neutral Ground Brewing Company	Fort Worth	TX	https://www.tiktok.com/@neutralgroundbrewing
NoFo Brew Co	Cumming	GA	https://www.tiktok.com/@nofobrewco
Olde Hickory Brewery (Corp)	Hickory	NC	https://www.tiktok.com/@oldehickorybrewery
Olde Mother Brewing, LLC	Frederick	MD	https://www.tiktok.com/@oldemotherbrew
Orono Brewing Company	Orono	ME	https://www.tiktok.com/@oronobrewingcompany
Payette Brewing Co	Boise	ID	https://www.tiktok.com/@payettebrewing
Persuasion Brewing Co	Modesto	CA	https://www.tiktok.com/@pbco2018
Point Ybel Brewing Company ²⁶	Fort Myers	FL	https://www.tiktok.com/@pointybelbrew
Port Jeff Brewing Co	Port Jefferson	NY	https://www.tiktok.com/@portjeffbrewing
Proper Brewing Co	Salt Lake City	UT	https://www.tiktok.com/@properbrewingco
Provincetown Brewing Co.	Provincetown	MA	https://www.tiktok.com/@ptownbrewingco

²⁶ I have visited and consumed beer from this brewery.

Pulpo Beer Company	Willoughby	OH	https://www.tiktok.com/@pulpobeercompany
Recon Brewing	Butler	PA	https://www.tiktok.com/@reconbrewing
Riley's Brewing Co	Madera	CA	https://www.tiktok.com/@rileysbrewing
Rincon Reservation Road Brewery	Valley Center	CA	https://www.tiktok.com/@rinconreservationroadbre
Rocky Mountain Brewery	Colorado Springs	CO	https://www.tiktok.com/@rockymountainbrewery
Running Dogs Brewery	Saint Helens	OR	https://www.tiktok.com/@runningdogsbrewery
Scofflaw Brewing Co	Atlanta	GA	https://www.tiktok.com/@scofflawbrewing
Severance Brewing Company	Sioux Falls	SD	https://www.tiktok.com/@severancebrewing
Shebeen Brewing Company	Wolcott	CT	https://www.tiktok.com/@shebeenbrewing
Silver Moon Brewing	Redmond	OR	https://www.tiktok.com/@silvermoonbrewing
Skyline Beer Company	Westfield	MA	https://www.tiktok.com/@skylinebeerco
Sociable Cider Werks	Minneapolis	MN	https://www.tiktok.com/@sociablecider
Sprecher Brewing Co	Glendale	WI	https://www.tiktok.com/@sprecherbrewery
Stilt House Brewery	Palm Harbor	FL	https://www.tiktok.com/@stilthousebrewing
Stone Bridge Brewing Company	Johnstown	PA	https://www.tiktok.com/@stonebridgebrewingco
Stone Church Brewing	Corona	CA	https://www.tiktok.com/@stonechurchbrewery
Stormcloud Brewing Company Production Facility	Frankfort	MI	https://www.tiktok.com/@stormcloudbrewing

TailGate Brewery	Nashville	TN	https://www.tiktok.com/@tailgatebrewery
Tarantula Hill Brewing Co	Thousand Oaks	CA	https://www.tiktok.com/@tarantulahillbrewingco
Tradition Brewing Company	Newport News	VA	https://www.tiktok.com/@tbc2022
Ten20 Craft Brewery	Louisville	KY	https://www.tiktok.com/@ten20beer
The Terminal Brewhouse	Chattanooga	TN	https://www.tiktok.com/@terminalbrewhouse
The Bronx Brewery	Bronx	NY	https://www.tiktok.com/@thebronxbrewery
Bruery Terreux	Anaheim	CA	https://www.tiktok.com/@thebruery
The Ouachitas of Mena	Mena	AR	https://www.tiktok.com/@theouachitas
The Veil Brewing Company	Richmond	VA	https://www.tiktok.com/@theveilbrewing
Thunderhead Brewing Co	Kearney	NE	https://www.tiktok.com/@thunderheadbrewing
Treaty Oak Distilling	Dripping Springs	TX	https://www.tiktok.com/@treatyoak
Tribus Beer Co.	Milford	CT	https://www.tiktok.com/@tribusbeerco
Two Beers Brewing Co	Seattle	WA	https://www.tiktok.com/@twobeersbrewing
Wildlife Brewing	Victor	ID	https://www.tiktok.com/@wildlifebrewingco
Wilmington Brewing Company	Wilmington	NC	https://www.tiktok.com/@wilmingtonbrewingcompany
Wise Man Brewing	Winston-Salem	NC	https://www.tiktok.com/@wisemanbrewing
Wolf Branch Brewing Co. - Mount Dora	Mount Dora	FL	https://www.tiktok.com/@wolf_branch_brewing

Wolf Brewing Company	Mechanicsburg	PA	https://www.tiktok.com/@wolfbrewco
----------------------	---------------	----	---

Figure 1: The Brewers Association Independent Craft Brewer Seal



Figure 2: Soggy Bottom Brewing Logo

