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CLAIRE MICHELE DUGGAN

ABSTRACT

Brewing has a long history in this country—first making an appearance in 1620 with the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock in Massachusetts. Today, beers can be easily categorized into one of two types: 1) industrial, and 2) craft. The focus of this paper is on this second type, the "craft beer" and the so-called "renaissance" it experienced during the 1980s. In 1983, there were only 43 operating breweries in the United States—today there are over 3,000 (Brewers Association, 2014). The resource-partitioning model, established within the organizational ecology field, has been used to explain this rapid growth (Carol & Swaminathan, 2000). However, of particular interest to me, are the reasons for why craft breweries are so appealing to consumers. Pulling from literatures in Urban, Cultural, and Economic Sociology, I argue that the key characteristic that has allowed craft breweries to experience such success is their apparent "authenticity" (Zukin, 2010; Brown-Saracino, 2007; Peterson & Anand, 2004; Sherman, 2007). To date, the majority of analyses focused on "authenticity" have centered its creation within the realm of production (Johnston & Baumann, 2007). It is true that craft breweries cultivate a sense of "authenticity" based on their location, as well as the well curated image they project within their own space. However, I argue that it is through the consumption experience, in which both producers and consumers play a crucial role, that
craft breweries are able to further cultivate this "authentic" image, as well as hold onto it (Jones et al., 2005; Sherman, 2007). The idea that “authenticity” is not only found within the realm of production, but also consumption (such as at coffee shops and restaurants), has been explored by sociologists such as Richard Lloyd and Sharon Zukin (Lloyd, 2006; Zukin, 2011). It is my intent to explore the ways in which this is the case at breweries, as well as the variables, such as space and place, that contribute to the experience of “authenticity.”
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Figure 1: p. 8

Density of beer firms by organizational form (Carroll & Swaminathan, 2000).
Introduction: A Brief History of the Beer Industry in this Country:

Brewing has a long history in this country—first making an appearance in 1620 with the landing at Plymouth Rock in Massachusetts. At this point, beer was brewed in small batches within the home. The first commercial brewery was founded by William Penn during the late 1600s in Pennsbury, Pennsylvania. Many of our founding fathers were also great beer aficionados, including George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Sam Adams—who all brewed beers in their own homes. Benjamin Franklin is often quoted as having said: "Beer is proof that God loves us and wants us to be happy" ("Empires of Industry: Brewed in America," 2006).

It wasn't until the early 1800s, however, that beer truly became a business in this country. At this point in time, a commercial brewery could be found in most cities and large towns. Simultaneously, a large influx of immigrants came to this country and found many opportunities within the beer industry. During the mid-nineteenth century, four million German immigrants settled in the United States, mainly in the Western part of the country, in states such as Wisconsin and Minnesota. With them, they brought new tastes and technologies, including the lager style beer and the bottom-fermenting technique. However, breweries at this time could still only distribute their beers locally, due to a lack of refrigeration and transportation ("Empires of Industry: Brewed in America," 2006).

Soon, in the 1870s, one of these obstacles was overcome with the discovery of pasteurization. This process made it possible to rid the beer of the bacteria responsible for spoiling when exposed to sunlight. Additionally, with the spread of railroads, it
became possible to distribute nationally. The 1890s became the gilded age of beer, and brewery owners became a part of the new American aristocracy. With this new national industry, marketing and advertising became important to promoting one brand of beer over the other. Production increased greatly with the invention of the bottle cap and high speed bottling machines. By 1910, breweries were able to produce unprecedented amounts of beer and distribute their product across many state lines ("Empires of Industry: Brewed in America," 2006).

This exponential growth was soon slowed with the advent of WWI and anti-German sentiment. And of course, the prohibition movement was gaining in strength. The Coors brewery was the first victim of the prohibition movement, when Colorado became one of the first dry states in 1914. By the end of WWI in 1918, prohibition was made national. Breweries tried to survive by manufacturing different products. For example, the Pabst brewery started producing cheese, but this didn't work for everyone. Of the 1,700 breweries in operation before prohibition, only thirty-one were still in existence by 1933 when prohibition ended. However, breweries made a strong comeback—within one year 700 new breweries had opened. And in 1935, with the invention of the beer can and the increase of refrigeration within the home, the brewing industry surged again ("Empires of Industry: Brewed in America," 2006).

The post WWII emphasis for breweries became 'bigger and better,' leading to the emergence of 'Beer Barons.' Television advertising could only be achieved by the wealthiest breweries, in turn forcing smaller breweries out of the market ("Empires of Industry: Brewed in America," 2006). By 1978, only 48 breweries remained ("Beer
Wars, 2009). The billion dollar beer wars had begun, and the ultimate goal of breweries became mass production and reaching a large market base. By 2008, beer became a $97 billion industry. Currently, Anheuser-Busch sells one out of every two beers sold; and together, Anheuser-Busch and MillerCoors account for 78% of all beer sales ("Beer Wars," 2009). However, a sort of 'Beer Renaissance' has been taking place since the late 1980s, in which consumers have begun to demand more variety from breweries—in turn opening a new market for craft breweries ("Empires of Industry: Brewed in America," 2006). Entering this market has not been easy however, as these craft breweries are faced with many obstacles. To date (2014), 3,040 craft breweries are in operation; they account for only 7.8% of the beer sold in this country by volume, and approximately 14% by dollars (Brewers Association website, 08/01/2014).

At this point, it is important to understand what exactly “craft” stands for in the title "craft beer" or “craft brewery.” According to the Brewers Association, “an American craft brewer is small, independent, and traditional” (Brewers Association website, 02/02/2013). In order to be considered small, a brewery’s annual production of beer cannot exceed 6 million barrels. An independent brewery is one in which less than twenty-five percent of the brewery is owned or controlled by any industry member that is not a craft brewer itself. Finally, to be traditional, the flavor of the majority of [the brewery’s] total beverage alcohol volume in beers must derive from traditional or innovative brewing ingredients and the fermentation process” (Brewers Association website, 02/02/2013).

Most importantly, a craft beer cannot be brewed using corn or rice as a major
ingredient (unless they are used to achieve a specific flavor), unlike industrial-style beers, in which corn and rice are used as less expensive alternates to barley and wheat. However, craft breweries differentiate themselves further by embracing several core principals. These include constant innovations, such as interpreting “historic styles with unique twists and develop[ing] new styles that have no precedent” (Brewer’s Association website, 02/02/2013). Additionally, “craft brewers tend to be very involved in their communities through philanthropy, product donations, volunteerism, and sponsorship of events” (Brewers Association website, 02/02/2013). Finally, and very importantly [particularly in the context of this paper], craft brewers aim to connect with their customers, not only through advertisement, but through “distinctive, individualistic approaches” (Brewers Association website, 02/02/2013).

Market Emergence and the Creation of an Identity:

There is no doubt that in order to be part of a competitive market, a product must be recognizable. The beer market, especially among craft breweries [due to the emphasis they place on artisanal and traditional processes], can be considered a cultural industry, and in order to succeed in such an industry a new player in the market must manufacture an “authentic” and creative voice for itself. Jones et al., in their 2005 work entitled "Manufactured Authenticity and Creative Voice in Cultural Industries," explore this process. The authors of this article put forth the idea that all culture industries are in some way preoccupied with “authenticity”. Jones et al. explain how many of these culture industries can be described as “invented traditions,” in which both producers and
consumers declare “authenticity” (Jones et al. 2005: 893). This “authenticity” is then used as a resource in perpetuating the popularity of the product (Hosbawm & Ranger, 1983; Jones et al. 2005: 893).

According to Peterson, there are two routes to “authenticity”. The first is to recreate canonical works, and the second is to offer something completely new (Jones et al. 2005: 893). I believe that both these strategies are employed by craft breweries. For example, Dogfish Head brewery, located in Maryland, recreates ancient beers using recipes dating back hundreds, if not thousands of years. Simultaneously, they are creating completely new beers, using non-traditional ingredients and brewing techniques (Dogfish Head website, 02/02/2013). Breweries often rely on one or several 'trademark' beers that they consider staples and are specifically known for, while also experimenting with new beers that either become part of their regular offerings, their seasonal offerings, or remain limited editions.

Through a systematic review of several articles on the subject of “authenticity” in cultural industries, Jones et al. identify three key dilemmas. The first of these three is whether “authenticity” is created through deliberate, or rather emergent strategies (Jones et al. 2005: 897). An example of a deliberate strategy might be the way in which the craft brewery advertises itself. For example, the design of their labels, the size of their bottles, where it sells its products, or its visibility within the community. "The emergent nature of authenticity [can be seen in] [...] how authenticity evolves and changes over time, requiring the feedback of and interaction among interdependent participants" (Jones et al. 2005: 897). In the case of craft breweries, these interdependent participants may include
consumers, bar and restaurant managers, as well as panel judges serving at craft beer festivals and competitions.

A second dilemma pertaining to “authenticity” identified by the authors is the management of categories of understanding. "An important direction for future research is when and how artists, producers, and gatekeepers [or brewers and managers] are able to transcend categories without being punished by key audiences, versus when artists can successfully play within categories" (Jones et al. 2005: 897). This applies to breweries producing barley wines, meads, and ciders in addition to various types of beer. The production of cider by breweries is particularly interesting, as cider has traditionally been far less popular in this country. However, it seems to be experiencing an increased desirability, most likely due to the increase in demand for craft beers and consumers' increasingly diverse and sophisticated palates.

Finally, the third dilemma that the authors Jones et al. identify is whether “authenticity” is the product of an individual or a social phenomenon (Jones et al. 2005: 898). There is no doubt that the individual holds an important role in the creation of a product's identity and “authenticity.” However, what would this amount to without the social aspect? In the case of many cultural industries, “authenticity” is socially constructed rather than inherent within the product. Additionally, the social nature of “authenticity” can be seen in the way a product and its creativity become anchored in a national or local geography (Jones et al. 2005: 898). This idea of "local" is very important in the craft beer industry. Often, one can find on restaurant menus a boastful message claiming to sell only locally brewed beers. Most beer lists include the location
of the brewery, which is also always visible on the label. When talking about beers, often the first question one might ask is: "where was this brewed?" In addition, breweries are usually visible within their communities.

Of the cultural industries similar to beer that have been studied so far, it is safe to say that wine has received the most attention. Several works have been published about the ways in which luxury wineries have created a specific, marketable identity for themselves. An example of such work is "Crafting brand authority: the case of luxury wines," (2005) by M.B. Beverland. In this piece, Beverland suggests that wine producers establish “authenticity” by protecting their status. They do so by projecting a sincere story and stressing quality and maintenance of tradition--rather than the adoption of new technologies (Beverland, 2005). It is apparent through Beverland's work, that craftsmanship is important among wine producers. This has also been seen among craft brewers, and is a way for them to differentiate themselves from large-scale industrial breweries.

While wine may have received the most attention as of yet, there has recently been some work published on the specific case of beer. These works include, but are not limited to "Why the Microbrewery Movement? Organizational Dynamics of Resource Partitioning in the U.S. Brewing Industry" (2000), by Glenn Carroll and Anand Swaminathan, and "The Configuration of Organizational Images Among Firms in the Canadian Beer Brewing Industry" (2005), by Kai Lamertz, et al.

In the first article listed, Carroll and Swaminathan attempt to uncover the reasons for why the microbrewery movement has been able to flourish despite the near monopoly
industrial breweries have on the beer market. As they explain, the year 1997 represented a symbolic marker in the U.S. brewing industry: the number of breweries in this country exceeded that of Germany, the country with the richest beer culture (Carroll & Swaminathan 2000: 715-716). This expansion happened quickly: in the year 1983, there were only 43 operating breweries in the United States, compared to 1,414 by 1999. "Collectively, these [new] breweries have introduced and reintroduced to the American market a wide variety of new malt beverage products. Individually, the breweries tend to be small and specialized in their product offerings and target markets" (Carroll & Swaminathan 2000: 716). The authors use the resource-partitioning model, established within the organizational ecology field, in order to explain the emergence of late-stage specialist breweries (despite the previous consolidation of large generalist organizations—in 1910 the four largest breweries controlled 10% of the market; by 1990, they controlled 90%). They explain that this model can be used to analyze the patterns occurring during the contemporary period of the U.S. brewing industry, which began when national prohibition was repealed in 1933 (Carroll & Swaminathan 2000: 717-718).
According to Carroll and Swaminathan, as large generalist organizations begin to take over the market, mid-sized and smaller generalist organizations are pushed out; in turn making their target markets free resources. "Generalists occupying adjacent regions hold the best positions for securing these newly available areas, and they typically are successful in doing so. The surviving generalist thus becomes larger and more general. However, because of the wide range of the generalist's target area, it is difficult to secure the entire free area; doing so might prove more costly than it is worth or entail loss of some of the firm's existing target area" (Carroll & Swaminathan 2000: 719). It is at this point that specialist viability increases (Carroll & Swaminathan 2000: 720).

Craft brewers capture this free target area by putting forth a specific, well-defined
identity. "Using identity-based strategies, microbreweries and brewpubs have attempted to define cognitively the specialty beer segment in ways that exclude brewers and contract brewers [contract brewers being more interested in selling beer, rather than creating new beers]" (Carroll & Swaminathan 2000: 731). Additionally, Carroll and Swaminathan liken the microbrewery movement to a social movement in that craft brewers, consumers, and even home brewers create a community of "experts," in which information flows quickly through a network. Because of this, any false claims of "authenticity" would be quickly discovered (Carroll & Swaminathan 2000: 731). An example of such "inauthenticity" would be an industrial-style brewery masquerading one of its products as a craft beer. They may do so by giving it a new label and omitting their name from such label. Red Hook and Blue Moon are excellent examples of this—being distributed by Anheuser-Busch and MillerCoors respectively.

The second article, by Lamertz, Heugens, and Calmet, also explores the importance of image for breweries. Specifically, they studied the online communication of thirty-six firms in the Canadian brewing industry, in order to discover the ways in which organizations create their own distinctive image (Lamertz et al. 2005: 817).

"Organizational image is [...] more than a targeted communication about discrete events, attributes or behaviors, because the perceptions third parties have of the organization cannot be separated completely from the organization's notion of self" (Lamertz et al. 2005: 820). This is true in the case of small craft breweries attempting to differentiate themselves from industrial-style breweries in order to reach their target market.

"The objective of this paper was to investigate a balanced approach of how
organizations [in the case of Canadian breweries] routinely represent aggregate, positive images of themselves to their constituents" (Lamertz et al. 2005: 834). The thirty-six breweries studied ended up being clustered by the different types of images they put forth: ranging from more industrial-scientific to stressing craftsmanship. Some were hybrid type organizations, claiming both parts of the spectrum. Through the authors' work, it can be seen that these breweries self-categorize themselves, while also making links to other similar breweries—they try to connect their image to that of others. "Our results indicate that image positions associate a given brewery (1) with competitive peer groups in its industry and (2) with societal stakeholders in the field at large (Lamertz et al. 2005: 836). This research is particularly applicable to the question of whether or not once created, “authenticity” can be retained? However, before tackling this question, it is important to review the ways in which “authenticity” is created in practice.

Until this point, it has been implied that “authenticity” is not a real thing, but rather a socially constructed phenomenon—which explains the quotation marks. Writing about “authenticity” is not easy, when a specific definition of the concept has not been agreed upon. However, what can be assumed for the purposes of this paper, is that as Zukin, Lloyd, and Sherman have established, “authenticity” is not a tangible object found in a product, but rather something intangible, created through social interaction, and displayed through agreed upon symbols and signs.

The following sections explore the ways in which “authenticity” is created within the realm of the craft brewery world. Through twenty-two visits to and field notes taken at six local craft breweries in the Boston area, the major two variables I found to be used
in creating “authenticity” among craft breweries, are place (as in location) and space (the space in which patrons are welcomed).

Methods:

This research is based on one year of participant observation of the goings-on of six local craft breweries in the Boston metropolitan area. All twenty-two visits to breweries consisted of both tours whenever possible and tastings. I chose to participate as a “tourist” and consumer in order to observe the ways in which both brewery employees and patrons work together to create an authentic product and experience. The specific goal in being a participant observer was to be able to watch the interactions taking place, as well as the ways in which brewery employees present themselves and the brewery. Because “authenticity” is socially constructed, I did not want to disturb this process by announcing myself. I believed that observing it’s creation would be far more beneficial to my research than to question brewers and consumers during an interview.

Each brewery was observed at least twice, some, particularly the larger breweries, as many as six times. This allowed for greater reliability in understanding the ways in which each brewery presents itself to the public. Observations occurred primarily on weekend days when breweries experience the highest volumes of visitors. However, I observed each brewery on a weekday as well in order to focus on the location and space in which these breweries are found. Because craft beer aficionados visit breweries in order to be a part of the scene and to thoroughly enjoy the beer offerings, I often found myself alone, or with only one or two other people during these weekday visits.
Typically, observations lasted between one to two hours. The longer visits took place at breweries offering tours, while the shorter ones occurred at breweries only offering tastings.

My research was conducted inductively. There were many preliminary visits to breweries before official observations took place, and any specific research questions about the process of “authenticity” creation were generated. The setting did however prove difficult at times. Breweries tend to be very crowded and quite noisy. [Another reason quieter weekday visits were beneficial to data collection.] Because of these particular characteristics, it was often difficult to hear conversations among patrons and brewery employees, and even at times tour guides. At times, it was so crowded I was unable to stay near the bar—a very important location for observing the interactions between employees and patrons.

Another challenge particular to breweries, or any setting serving alcohol, was the need to fit in as a participant by drinking the breweries product—beer. Not only is it important to taste the brews, it is common practice at breweries to make sure you have tasted each offering available. After all, any “true” craft beer connoisseur has a refined palate and will want to experience the subtleties between one IPA and the other. Not only is enjoying each offering a part of the “craft beer culture,” it was important for me to do so in order to be a part of the interactions considered necessary in creating an “authentic” experience. Not only did I observe interactions between patrons and brewers, but I was able to experience them first-hand. All this being said, I believe an interesting methodology paper could be written on the experience of “researching under the
Finally, in order to become a seamless participant observer, I did not want to take field notes during observations. Doing so would have violated the unwritten rules of the space and have attracted unwanted attention. Instead, I had to write my field notes from memory after observations were completed. However, at times, I excused myself from the scene to quickly jot down some notes in private.

*The Creation of an “Authentic” Identity Among Craft Breweries*

*Place:*

On average, each American citizen lives no more than ten miles away from a craft brewery. However, it is important to note that the majority of these breweries are located in urban areas. Not only urban, but within the once industrially focused urban core. Whether craft brewers seek out currently gentrifying neighborhoods, or are actually early agents of gentrification and revitalization, is a question that would beckon much more research and its own paper. However, there is no doubt that craft breweries add a great deal of vibrancy to evolving urban centers. As we have already seen, one of the core principles embraced by craft breweries, is involvement “in their communities through philanthropy, product donations, volunteerism, and sponsorship for events” (Brewers Association website, 02/02/2013). A craft brewery is sure to become not only a tourist destination, but also a site where local inhabitants can gather for regular tastings or special events hosted by the brewery.

Craft breweries are prime examples of the types of businesses that Lloyd and Clark
argue have turned hollowed out urban cores into Entertainment Machines in this post-Fordist era (Clark et al., 2011). "Entertainment" has been loosely defined by City Officials in this country as: "tourism, conventions, restaurants, hotels, and related economic activities" (Clark et al., 2011). I believe it is safe to say, craft breweries fit this definition. What is revolutionary about the idea of cities as Entertainment Machines, is that for the first time, urban cores are being defined by their ability to turn out symbolic and expressive products (Zukin, 1999). Not only are these products created in these areas, but they are simultaneously being consumed (Clark et al., 2011).

"Studies of the city traditionally have presumed a division between the economy of cities and their culture, with culture subordinate in explanatory power to the 'work' of the city. However, categories of production and labor in the urban context have been severely impacted by post-industrial and globalizing trends; cultural activities are increasingly crucial to urban economic vitality" (Clark et al., 2011).

As the authors explain, even the most derelict formerly industrial spaces are being re-valorized as sites of consumption and even knowledge production. As is often the case in these urban areas, not only restaurants, coffee shops, and breweries can be found, but also new tech industry offices as well (Clark et al., 2011).

An example of such a neighborhood here in Boston, is that of Fort Point. Both Harpoon and Trillium, two craft breweries, are located in this currently gentrifying neighborhood. Harpoon, located directly on the waterfront, is found near a working fishing harbor, as well as a large convention center and many brand new restaurants catering to business men and women in the area for conferences. But also next door, one can find a small fisherman's shack type building selling the freshest of lobster rolls and
beer—the lobster “supposedly” coming straight from the harbor to the left and the beer coming directly from the brewery to its right. Trillium, on the other hand, is located at the other end of the Fort Point area, closest to the Financial District of Boston. Here, one finds the brewery among new upscale restaurants run by the 'hippest' of chefs, as well as brand new offices for a handful of new tech companies. There is no doubt that Fort Point fits the bill when it comes to Clark and Florida’s idea of the city's once industrial area turned into Entertainment Machine. The neighborhood achieves at once, "a mix of industrial grit, high tech, and exotic consumption," all within an urban setting (Clark et al., 2011).

As has been touched upon several times now, gentrification is a key process in creating an Entertainment Machine.

Gentrification is a key aspect of the Entertainment Machine, creating amenity-rich neighborhoods for affluent urban residence. It is spurred by the residential patterns of individuals with distinct attributes, often a group identified by the popular shorthand Yuppies. Yuppies presumably share 1. Relative youth, 2. High education, 3. The absence of children, and 4. Relatively high disposable income (Clark et al., 2011).

These are, for the most part, exactly the types of people one sees frequenting craft breweries in areas such as Fort Point.

The following is a passage pulled from my field notes describing the scene, specifically the people, at one of the breweries I observed:

After purchasing my beer, I set myself at a table near the window of the recently renovated beer hall. I waited for my friend, an employee at the brewery to join me. Observing the scene, I noticed the type of people surrounding me. After a brief scan and a quick estimation, it was clear that the great
majority of people there (I would guess around seventy individuals), were in their twenties and thirties. In terms of clothing, the majority of people were dressed casually, wearing jeans and sweaters. However, I noticed that many patrons were carrying or wearing brand-name accessories and clothing. […]

To my right was the event space. On the chalkboard painted next the door was written: “Welcome Upstatement.” [Upstatement is a recently created web design startup.] I peaked inside the room, in which I saw a couple dozen young professionals, mainly men and for the most part bespectacled (wearing the latest trends in eyewear) (Harpoon, 02/22/2014).

While these people enjoy the amenities gentrification has brought to such neighborhoods, they also search for a sense of “authenticity.” The types of people frequenting breweries such as Harpoon, Trillium, and Samuel Adams [all located in gentrified/-ying neighborhoods] fetishize whatever might harp back to a simpler time, when products were crafted by hand and imbued with artisan qualities.

[At the same brewery as described in the above field notes:] The table I sat at is made to look as if it were made from slabs of tree trunks, with live edges. The floors are hardwood. I noticed that all the light sources in the room are Edison bulbs. Between each window, is a chalkboard on which is written the daily offerings of brews. The font in which the list is written is quite ornate. [I later found out that the brewery hires local artists to write the lists on the chalkboards.] (Harpoon, 02/22/2014).

To the consumers at the brewery, that is “authenticity,” or at least it is what brewery managers hope consumers find to be “authentic” (Arsel & Thompson, 2010; Carfagna et al., 2014; Grazian, 2005; Johnston et al., 2009; Lloyd, 2006; Martin, 2014; Spooner, 1986).

A city [or in this case a brewery] is authentic if it can create the experience of origins. This is done by preserving historic buildings and districts, encouraging development of small-
scale boutiques and cafes, and branding neighborhoods in terms of distinctive cultural identities (Zukin, 1991, p. 3).

Catering to consumers' desires, "downtown developers derive a theme from former economic uses—the harbor, the marketplace, the factory—and offer consumers the opportunity to combine shopping with touristic voyeurism into the city's past" (Zukin 1991: 51). As Zukin explains, people come to these gentrifying neighborhoods because they want to experience "a historic 'authenticity'", which can be achieved through the places and products found in these locations (Zukin 1991: 121).

But what happens when gentrification has taken such a hold in a neighborhood that burgeoning companies are priced out? This has certainly taken place in neighborhoods such as Jamaica Plain, where Samuel Adams can be found, and Fort Point.

During a visit to a new small brewery in the Fort Point area of the city, I spoke with the founder, asking him about the location of the brewery and the decision to fit into such a small space. The brewery is located at the corner of a main street and a narrow alley. It is barely noticeable it is so small [unlike other breweries that take up a full city block or have their own parking lots, large enough for a hundred vehicles]. In speaking with the manager, I learned that he liked the idea of a small brewery, but that rent was a definite concern. He made the decision to stay small in order to afford the rent of an urban location (Trillium, 07/26/2013).

Not all breweries make this same decision though. During my visit to a brewery located in Canton, Massachusetts, a suburb of Boston, I spoke with an employee of the brewery and friend of the founder. The location is very different then those of the other breweries I visited. In fact when my GPS told me I had arrived, I was shocked to find myself at a strip mall.
While sitting at the bar between tastings of the breweries offerings, I started to talk with one of the employees. He explained that he was a good friend of the owner of the brewery. [...] I asked him why they decided to open the brewery in a suburb of the city rather than in the city center. He simply responded: “The rent over there is way too expensive. We’d never be able to grow if we put all the money into rent. Yeah, this place is kind of far out and not totally ‘hip,’ but we get people passing through enough and our beers sell well. And we can afford to buy the office next to us and tear down the wall” (Blue Hills Brewery, 04/19/2014).

The only options for new breweries are to stay small or to find somewhere else to settle.

However, just because new brewery founders and managers need to find a new location does not mean they want to seek out a new set of customers. Breweries that are located outside the city center still strive to attract the same "Yuppies" that flock to the urban core looking for Zukin's "experience of origins" (Zukin, 1991). The question is how can breweries attract these same consumers when they are faced with a complete lack of "old-world charm," deserted factories begging to be repurposed, and the automatic sense of “authenticity” that comes with these characteristics? The answer lies within the brewery itself—a space that has been carefully planned to create a still “authentic experience.” However, it is important to note that this is a different sense of “authenticity”. Not one that is borrowed from the cobble-stoned streets or red brick buildings, but rather one that is created through carefully staged spaces, their appreciation by consumers, and very importantly, social interaction. This is a type of “authenticity” reliant on both producers and consumers for its creation (Sherman, 2007; Grazian, 2003; Zukin, 2008; Duggan & Fitzmaurice, 2014).
Space:

As suggested in the previous section, the actual physical and aesthetic appearance of a craft brewery is important in setting a tone of “authenticity.” For those breweries fortunate enough to have grown with their neighborhood, the actual building they reside in can be a great source of “authenticity.” Referencing back to Zukin's idea of experienced origins, breweries found in refurbished factory warehouses have a leg up (Zukin, 1991). They're physical building blocks remind consumers of a time past, in which the ideals of tradition and artisanship that breweries put forth were at the forefront. This is the case for Trillium and Harpoon. Trillium is itself located in an old warehouse, while Harpoon is completely surrounded by such edifices. It is Samuel Adams however that has achieved the optimum experience of origins. The brewery is located in the Jamaica Plain neighborhood in Boston, Massachusetts, which has under gone a large amount of transformation and gentrification in the past decades since the brewery established itself there (Samuel Adams website, 08/02/2014). Additionally, the brand name "Samuel Adams," is a reference to the Boston patriot who fought for American independence, and according to several historical sources, was himself a brewer. Finally, the actual building that houses the brewery, was at one time, home to the no-longer existing Haffenreffer Brewery (Samuel Adams website, 08/01/2014).

For those breweries not fortunate enough to find themselves in gentrified areas of the urban core (or the so-called Entertainment Machine), they must find a suitable location they believe will attract the same clientele. For the Night Shift and Idle Hands breweries, this was Everett, Massachusetts, a city located on the North Eastern edge of
Boston. It has been titled by many local periodicals and online blogs, “Boston’s Next Somerville.” (For those who do not know the area, Somerville, just north of Cambridge, Massachusetts, has over the last several decades undergone huge transformations, attracting breweries of its own, high-end restaurants, and rapidly increasing property values. It seems as though it is now Everett's turn to do just that.) This begs the aforementioned question once more: are craft breweries agents of, or simply symptoms of gentrification? Or could they be both?

Either way, Night Shift and Idle Hands, as of yet, are unable to benefit from the same neighborhood characteristics as Samuel Adams, Harpoon, and Trillium already do. Blue Hills Brewery, located in Canton, Massachusetts in order to take advantage of even lower rental costs, has even less hope of doing so, as Canton is still seen as nothing more than a typical suburb of Boston. The potential of a 'hip' Canton is something not currently being discussed. So what are these breweries to do in order to attract the same clientele as Samuel Adams, Harpoon, and Trillium? [Which they target by having their beers sold at bars in the city and advertising in periodicals about the beer industry. These beer periodicals can usually be found at trendy restaurants in the city, as well as liquor stores.] How can these breweries create an “authentic” experience without the location? It all has to do with the interior of the brewery itself.

In order to create an “authentic” space for potential customers, breweries pay much attention to the image they present and how this may affect the customers' experiences. It has been established that “authenticity” is a primary trait used by consumers, particularly those of high cultural capital, to form judgments of taste (Bourdieu, 1984; Holt, 1998).
This is particularly important for cultural industries, such as breweries, that claim to provide “authentic” products and services. Breweries do so by de-commercializing any exchanges producers and consumers may have.

When walking into a craft brewery, the first thing that can be noticed is the smell of hops and malt. This is because, if not visible at first, the materials required for brewing (boilers, fermenters, tanks, etc.) are located nearby, where visitors will be able to see the equipment, as well as the labor, necessary to produce beer. Almost always, located near the entrance, will be information on the founding of the brewery. This information is usually presented in a fun, creative way, and always stresses the story and the unique circumstances behind the brewery’s beginnings.

I walked into the brewery and placed a five-dollar bill, the recommended donation to cover the tasting glass and samples given at the end of the tour, into the donation box. The tour was set to start in two minutes. I killed the time by observing the scene and the people about to take the tour with me. […] The first thing we did on the tour was walk through a fermenter that had been laid on its side and made into a display. On the curved inner walls of the fermenter are pictures of the founder, as well as his family harking back several generations (brewing had been a part of the family for ages). The story of the first batch the founder ever brewed can be found on a poster. Additionally, there are many other mementoes and “artifacts” exhibited (Samuel Adams, 02/15/2014).

The story behind the brewery’s foundation is a key part to the de-commercialization of the experience. Without fail, the founders of all the breweries I visited are the DIY type, brewing the first batches of their beers over kitchen stovetops or in their basements—emphasizing the craftiness, the imagination, and perseverance necessary to the entire process. At least, this is the image of them projected to the public.
In addition to the sight and smell of the brewing process and the personal stories of the founders, most breweries will display their promotional materials, chronicling the ways in which their logo and image have changed over time. Additionally, vintage black & white images of historical breweries can be found on their walls—reminding visitors that their albeit recently founded brewery, is a part of a long-standing tradition of brewing in this country. Such historical references can also be found in the names of breweries, for instance: Samuel Adams, 21st Amendment, Perennial, Mayflower, and Speakeasy Ales & Lagers. Again, all this is proof that brewers are aiming to provide their solicitors with an experience of origins as explained by Zukin (Zukin, 1991).

An equally important part of providing an authentic experience to brewery visitors is the brewery tour. Brewery tours are offered at larger scale craft breweries, such as Samuel Adams and Harpoon, where the entirety of the brewery can't be seen once you've walked through the front door (as is the case at Night Shift, Idle Hands, Trillium, and Blue Hills Brewery). During such tours, the beginnings of the brewery are once again explained to visitors. Then, visitors are brought to different areas of the brewery. Their experiences are similar to those of tourists in different countries, a case that has been studied by several sociologists.

Accounts of travelers are examined in terms of Erving Goffman's front versus back distinction. It is found that tourists try to enter back regions of the places they visit because these regions are associated with intimacy of relations and authenticity of experiences. It is also found that tourist settings are arranged to produce the impression that a back region has been entered even when it is not the case (MacCannell, 1973:589).
While I believe that brewery tours offer more of a back region view than do more recognizable tourist settings, I do know for a fact that visitors are not shown staff rooms. For instance, at Harpoon, there is a bar located in a staff room where offerings not presented to visitors can be found. Only brewery employees are allowed at this bar, and very occasionally, a close friend or two of a staff member. As will be discussed later, the bar is an important part of the authentic experience, specifically when visitors are able to sample brews that have not appeared on the market yet. Little do they know, this is also taking place among staff in a back stage area from which they are restricted.

While on these tours, visitors are able to walk up to the brewing materials, both ingredients and machinery. They are given a chronological explanation of the brewing process, starting with the search for the perfect ingredients. Many brewers travel the world to find the perfect hops for their creations. For instance, Samuel Adams staff travel to Bavaria every year to pick their hops for the upcoming year (Samuel Adams website, 08/01/2014). Such journeys demonstrate the lengths to which the company is willing to go to create the optimum product. Of course, visitors receive the back story to each ingredient, varying from the water used to a unique ingredient, such as tea leaves from India or the 40lbs of bacon, added to the brew to make something special and never-seen-before. Additionally, visitors are given the opportunity to smell and taste each of these ingredients, as well as specific beers along the brewing process. This all de-commercializes the product, giving the visitor the impression that they are a part of the brewing process, or at least that they know the ins-and-outs of it.

The most important step in the co-creation of “authenticity” comes at the end of
such tours. The tastings. These tastings are an essential part for breweries that do not offer tours as well. It is here that consumers validate the “authenticity” of the product being served, but also have their opinions validated by the producers (Duggan & Fitzmaurice, 2014). The time spent at the bar, sampling different brews and discussing them, is the culmination of the de-commercialization and “authenticity”-creation process. It is at the bar that the cultural work needed to fully de-commercialize the experience takes place. It is also at the bar that one can see consumer-centrism at play (Duggan & Fitzmaurice, 2014). As has already been mentioned, it is in service industries, where production and consumption take place almost simultaneously that the co-creation of “authenticity” takes place.

The case of craft cocktails [or in this case craft breweries] is particularly instructive as it is not only an instance of simultaneous production and consumption of a service, but also results in the production of a tangible—albeit ephemeral—object in which “authenticity” can be made to reside (Duggan & Fitzmaurice, 2014:7).

The uniqueness of such service work, is that consumers not only validate “authenticity,” but also co-create “authenticity” with producers.

The cultural work that I refer to includes: engaging the consumer in conversation, soliciting the consumer's opinions about certain offerings, and validating the consumer's thoughts. The majority of conversation taking place at the bar centers on the products being sampled; however, it is not uncommon to hear conversations going on between consumers that do not apply to the specific brewery, but rather others they may have visited or they believe to have similar products. Simultaneously, conversations having
nothing to do with beer can also be overheard. In this way, the bar becomes a type of "third-space" to which visitors flock in order to find a community of like-minded individuals with whom they can share their experiences, current and past (Oldenburg, 1998; Schouten & McAlexander, 1995).

Such conversations take place over many "free" samples of the breweries current offerings, as well as "test batches." During these samplings, brewery staff ask the opinion of visitors. They may ask questions ranging from: "What do you think of this beer? It's our flagship. Just enough hops to make it an IPA, but few enough so that it's not too bitter and more appealing to a wide range of people." "How do you think this porter stacks up compared to so-and-so's?" A consumer may also be asked if they can pick up on the subtle flavors of certain ingredients. If so, they are applauded for their refined palate. If not, they are given instructions on how to more effectively taste the beer and told what to look out for when trying to recognize certain ingredients.

Additionally, visitors will be asked to articulate their preferences in beers. At which point, the 'bar tender' will say: "I have just the beer for you!" and proceed to bring the consumer a perfectly poured sample or pint—in which the glass is placed at the bottom of the tap spigot at a forty-five degree angle, only made vertical for the final quarter inch of the pour in order to allow for a generous, but not overwhelming foam head. Before serving the next client, the consumer is often asked to let the staff member know what they think of the choice.

Most interestingly, and most successful in de-commercializing the experience, brewery staff requests the reactions of visitors to new brews. Not only are these brewery
visitors receiving special treatment and insider information by being offered options not yet on the market, but their opinions are also validated. Often, brewery staff will solicit honest feedback from brewery visitors, telling them that they will take their opinions into consideration when tweaking recipes or deciding whether or not to place a product on the shelves.

All these tactics, ranging from the location of a brewery, the use of space, the availability of tours, and the all-important samplings at the bar, help to de-commercialize the beer drinker's experience. In turn, these consumers are not only recognizing, valorizing, and reproducing the “authenticity” of the brewery's product, but are actively co-creating the apparent “authenticity” of the products they choose to consume. "In large part, this co-creation of “authenticity” by producers and consumers is made possible by the simultaneous nature of production and consumption in the service experience" (Duggan & Fitzmaurice, 2014:17). The case of craft breweries in particular, is useful in studying this co-creation of “authenticity”—unlike so many other cases in which all that can be observed is the response consumers have to the socially constructed, but objectively experienced determinants of “authenticity” (Duggan & Fitzmaurice, 2014).

_How “Authenticity” is Policed, and Can It be Lost?_

Now that the ways in which “authenticity” is created within the world of craft breweries have been outlined, the question must be asked as to whether or not “authenticity” can be lost? If so, can it be regained? We have seen that consumers are a crucial part in creating “authenticity”, but they obviously play an important role in
reproducing “authenticity” through their consumption choices (Peterson & Anand, 1983; Johnston & Barman, 2007; Jones et al., 2005; Sherman, 2007). However, what role do other craft breweries play in determining whether or not other breweries abide by the regulated determinants of being a true "craft brewery"? In order to answer such a question, one may turn to the literature of Sociology of Social Networks.

As defined by Charles Kadushin, a social network "is simply a set of relations between objects, which could be people, organizations, [etc.]” (Kadushin 2012: page unknown). As Mark Granovetter suggested, none of us act purely as individuals, but are rather affected by our social relationships. This is his idea of 'embeddedness,' in which the actions of individuals and organizations “are so constrained by ongoing social relations that to construe them as independent is a grievous misunderstanding” (Granovetter 1985, 482). The “authenticity” a craft brewery claims to have, is policed by other members of its network: other producers, as well as consumers. In turn, this “authenticity” is either further supported or challenged.

According to Nan Lin, there are three explanations as to why social capital and embedded resources within a social network benefit its members.

For one, it facilitates the flow of information. [...] Social ties located in certain strategic locations and/or hierarchical positions [...] can provide an individual with useful information about opportunities and choices otherwise not available. [...] Second, these social ties may exert influence on the agents [...] who play a critical role in decisions [...] involving the actor. [...] Third, social tie resources, and their acknowledged relationships to the individual, may be conceived by the organization or its agents as certifications of the individual’s social credentials, some of which reflect the individual’s accessibility to resources through social networks and relations—his/her social capital (Lin 1999: 31).
This quote is particularly applicable to the brewing industry, especially when looking at claims of “authenticity.” As aforementioned in a prior section of this paper, because the brewing industry in the United States is comprised of a close network of "experts," false claims of “authenticity” are difficult to maintain (Carroll & Swaminathan 2000: 731).

[These experts include other brewers, but also consumers.] It is important to note that these false claims of “authenticity” do not threaten “authenticity” itself, but rather the symbols and characteristics of “authenticity” that have been socially constructed and agreed upon. An example of this would be a brewery claiming to be a craft brewery, but that has aspirations to become much larger and brew more than the 6 million barrels of beer allowed per year by the definition of craft beer agreed upon by the Brewers Association (Brewers Association website, 02/02/2013).

The importance of status within a group of organizations, as discussed by Beverland (2005), as well as in the Lamertz et al. (2005) article on Canadian breweries, is also dependent on the network as a whole. In his book Status Signals, Podolny illustrates several examples of the import of status within a network. In the first chapter of this book, Podolny looks at the issues of status, reputation, and quality within the high-end jewelry industry. Specifically, he used the example of jewelers debating whether or not to sell turquoise in their shops. [Which in turn he likens to the first time we walk into a room of strangers and attempt to navigate the social arena - whose opinion should we value? who should we approach first, or avoid?] "When an actor engages in behavior that can be interpreted by others as an exchange or an association with another actor, the
status of each affects the status of the other" (Podolny 2008: 14).

The interesting situation surrounding the sale of turquoise is that turquoise of exceptional quality can be very expensive, but at the same time, turquoise of lesser quality can be bought off the side of the road in Arizona, or in tourist shops, next to refrigerator magnets and shot glasses. [Think craft brew vs. industrial brew.] The conundrum jewelers in upscale shops face, is whether or not selling turquoise will be good for their image, or whether or not they will be associated with these tourist shops and street vendors.

The problem of high-end jewelers is clearly articulated in the quotes noting that the image of turquoise is tarnished since it is sold along side Arizona highways and in airports, [...]. To the extent that a high-end jeweler trades in turquoise, the jeweler becomes perceptually associated with the low-status purveyors of shot glasses. Consumers--either consciously or unconsciously--start to wonder whether the high-end jeweler is actually a lower-quality merchant than they previously thought, and the high-status jeweler accordingly runs the risk of a loss of status (Podolny 2008: 14).

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.”

What is also important to note when comparing the sale of turquoise by high-end jewelers and the brewing industry, is the fact that the way in which an individual or organization is viewed by others within the same sector is very important. This was touched on in the Lamertz et al. piece on Canadian breweries. In the case of craft
breweries, the individuals and organizations of import include other breweries, consumers, home brewers, and any other potential stakeholders (within the restaurant industry for example). Their trust must be gained, and as Podolny explains, when pursuing market decisions, actors invariably look to status in order to reduce their uncertainties. These sources of uncertainty include: 1) inevitable variance in quality, 2) an inability (cost or time) to collect one's own information as to the quality or reputation of a potential exchange partner, and 3) "that the value of a producer's product may hinge in large part on others' perception of its value" (Podolny, 2008: 17).

Referring back to the Jones et al. piece about cultural industries, the authors cite a 2005 piece by Delmestri, Montanari, and Usai entitled: "Reputation and Strength of Ties in Predicting Commercial Success and Artistic Merit of Independents in the Italian Feature Film Industry." This case exemplifies what scholars of cultural industries have previously focused on: that in such industries, “authenticity” relies on two different domains. The first domain is economic. In the case of the Italian film industry, this would be measured by box office performance. The second domain is artistic, which can be measured through critical acclaim and awards. In the case of craft beers, the economic domain would be measured by sales, while the so-called artistic domain might be measured through popularity and awards.

Delmestri et al. "suggest that these two domains require different kinds of networks: vertical relations with producers and distributors for commercial success versus horizontal relations with screenwriters, directors of photography and actors for artistic merit. By examining the ties of Italian independent film directors, they found that
a director’s strength of vertical ties predicts commercial success whereas a director’s strength of horizontal ties and artistic reputation predict artistic merit" (Jones et al. 2005: 895). Again, to apply this to the case of craft beers, one could assume that breweries attain commercial success through ties with potential distributors, and "artistic," or creative reputation through ties with other members of the sector: other breweries, consumers, and critics. These ties would also follow the vertical and horizontal model. The research produced by Delmestri et al. shows that the success of an organization or individual within a cultural industry is not only based on the attributes of the organization or individual, but also their relationships within the network.

However, it is important for brewers to keep in mind that too much commercial success would pose a real threat to their perceived “authenticity.” Samuel Adams is the perfect example of this. The Samuel Adams brewery is the largest of breweries in this country categorized as "craft" rather than "industrial." In fact, it was Sam Koch, founder of Samuel Adams that pushed for the current 6 million barrel limit. Originally, craft breweries could only be deemed so if they produced no more than 2 million barrels a year (Chang, 2013).

While many consumers argue that Samuel Adams, the pioneering craft brewery label, will always deserve to be referred to as "craft"—no matter how many barrels are produced. Other consumers disagree.

Sitting at the bar of the very small brewery located in the trendy Fort Point neighborhood, I struck up a conversation with the young man, perhaps in his mid-twenties, sitting next to me. At first we only talked about the beer selections at hand and what we thought of them. However, we then started talking
more about the craft beer industry as a whole. [...] When I asked him about what he thought of Samuel Adams, he scoffed and said: “Are they really even a craft brewery anymore? Don’t they have huge breweries out in Pennsylvania or something?” I confirmed that indeed they do, and he went on to say: “They only show you their test batches at their brewery in JP [Jamaica Plain.] That’s not where they brew all their beers (Harpoon, 06/05/2014).

Despite it's use of traditional ingredients and techniques, many consumers see Samuel Adams as an industrial brewery, no better than MillerCoors or Anheuser-Busch. This is because they believe the brewery to be too commercial. Samuel Adams has simply expanded too much (including annex breweries around the country) in order to be an “authentic” craft brewery.

Samuel Adams, as a company does take steps to hold on to its “authentic” appearance. During a Samuel Adams tour, visitors are told about not only the history of the brewery itself, but are introduced the brewery as the oldest craft brewery in the nation—playing on the importance of origins. They explain how they still conform to all the regulations around the "craft beer" appellation. But most importantly, a visitor is told how Samuel Adams has paved the way for other craft breweries to enjoy success. In a commercial sense, by having the maximum number of barrels increased, Samuel Adams has ensured that craft breweries can avoid being taxed more. However, what they stress the most is how the brewery has been able to lend a helping hand to other smaller breweries. Because Samuel Adams has had contracts in place for hops purchasing for quite a while now, they are allowed to enjoy relatively low rates, especially during hop shortages. During such shortages, through the Samuel Adams Hop Share program, the
bend every sells hops to smaller breweries for the same price they acquired them—only adding a small shipping fee.

Through such tactics, Samuel Adams has maintained a large contingency of consumers among the "craft beer snobs," who are normally so set on regulations. Of particular interest to me is the direction Harpoon is taking. It too has become very large and for the first time in the brewery's history, the manager has had no former brewing experience, but rather has a background in business management. This information is not shared with the public during tours, but is rather, in keeping with the brewery’s performance of “authenticity,” something I heard from a friend working at the brewery (Peterson, 2005). It seems as though Harpoon is seeking more brand recognition than ever, extending the distances in which they sell their product. I wonder how long it will be before Harpoon enthusiasts begin to question the brand's “authenticity.”

Conclusion

While many studies have been conducted on the social interactions necessary for the creation of “authenticity”, the case of service industries such as craft breweries, offer the fairly unique opportunity to observe the co-creation of “authenticity.” In such cases, consumers are given far more agency in defining and labeling what is or should be considered “authentic.”

The “authenticity” co-created by producers and consumers within the craft beer world, is one that “authentically” represents the old—the truly “authentic” (Peterson 2005: 1084). In an increasingly competitive market, such as that of craft beer, a brewery
cannot afford to only recreate traditional brews. Instead, brewers must be at once creative, while retaining truly “authentic” notes in their creations. “Over time the continual quest in any field for ‘creative voice’ has the effect of destabilizing the image of the authentic, so that the idea of authenticity continually evolves” (Peterson 2005: 1093). However, it is important to remember that the evolving state of “authenticity” is always being co-created and defined by the different actors in the field.

The case of craft breweries is also of great importance due to the trend of these breweries being located in what used to be hollowed out urban cores. As these areas transition into cites of simultaneous production and consumption, the study of such service industries will be of greater and greater import. Equally important is the study of the ways in which smaller breweries (or cultural and service industries) compensate for not being able to locate themselves in the ever-increasingly expensive Entertainment Machine areas of the city. Craft breweries offer a case in which Urban and Community Sociology, as well and Cultural and Economic Sociology collide.

Of particular interest to me in terms of further research on the subject of craft breweries, is first their role as agents, or simply signs or gentrification. Additionally, a look at their reception by original inhabitants of certain neighborhoods would be interesting. In terms of consumers, I would hope to study the types of consumers frequenting craft breweries in greater depth. From my visits to craft breweries, I can already see that there are the true connoisseurs and the novices. How one can make the transition from one category to the next would be interesting to study and particularly relevant to both Cultural and Community literatures. Further, as the craft beer industry
evolves, and increases in size and economic importance, it would be of great interest to see if the industry loses its apparent “authenticity.”
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