CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Understanding the ethical legitimacy of tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship in Indonesia in the context of increased government regulation: a legitimacy-as-perception perspective
Authors	Tjandra, Nathalia Christiani;Garavan, Thomas N.;Aroean, Lukman;Prabandari, Yayi Suryo
Publication date	2022-04-07
Original Citation	Tjandra, N. C., Garavan, T. N., Aroean, L. and Prabandari, Y. S. (2022) 'Understanding the ethical legitimacy of tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship in Indonesia in the context of increased government regulation: a legitimacy-as-perception perspective', European Journal of Marketing, 56(4), pp. 1042-1064. doi: 10.1108/EJM-06-2019-0512
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	10.1108/EJM-06-2019-0512
Rights	© 2022, Emerald Publishing Limited. All rights reserved. - https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/
Download date	2026-10-13 13:25:43
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/13356

UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Understanding the ethical legitimacy of tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship in Indonesia in the context of increased government regulation: a legitimacy-as-perception perspective

Abstract

Purpose – We explore the metaphors people from Indonesia use to describe their propriety beliefs about the ethical legitimacy of tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship (TAPS). We aim to understand why there is consensus of propriety beliefs about the ethical legitimacy of TAPS in the face of increased government regulations and international criticism of such marketing practices.

Design/methodology/approach – We collected data from 71 participants: six focus groups with 41 study participants and 30 semi-structured interviews using an in-depth photo-elicitation technique.

Findings – The participants use three sets of metaphors to describe propriety beliefs. First, participants used metaphors that described the centrality of TAPS and smoking in Indonesian society. Second, they used metaphors that described TAPS regulations and regulators and third they used metaphors that described the activities of tobacco firms. Participants' photographs revealed strong collective validity of TAPS within Indonesia and strong propriety beliefs consensus.

Practical implications – The findings have important implications for tobacco control regulators to curtail TAPS in a country with strong collective validity and consensus of propriety beliefs. The level of consensus is currently too high for government regulations to gain traction and bring about change.

Originality/value – This study is one of the first to use a legitimacy perspective to understand the ethical legitimacy of TAPS in marketing literature. It is also the first to use the three legitimacy-as-perception constructs: propriety beliefs, collective validity and consensus of propriety beliefs. We show that despite increased government regulations and international disapproval, TAPS continues to be considered ethically legitimate in Indonesia.

Keywords Tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship, TAPS, Ethical legitimacy, Legitimacy-as-perception theory, Qualitative research, Indonesia

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

Ethical legitimacy is a major topic of interest for researchers, company strategists and society as a whole. In the case of organisations, they strive to gain and maintain legitimacy and to ensure that their marketing activities are legitimate in the eyes of the public and consumers of their products (Debenedetti *et al.*, 2021). Ethical legitimacy, which is increasingly considered a strategic goal for organisations (Payne *et al.*, 2018), reflects the perception that an organisation's actions should be ethically desirable, proper and/or appropriate within a socially constructed system of norms, values and beliefs (Suchman, 1995). The tobacco industry and its marketing activities, often referred to as TAPS (tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship), represent one context in which to understand propriety beliefs about ethical legitimacy. Many consumers consider the tobacco industry unethical (Blum, 1991); however, Indonesia appears to be an exception to this. Overall, the industry has responded to increased regulations by connecting itself with event and sport sponsorship, educational scholarships and community activities (Ahlstrom and Bruton, 2001; Grant-Braham and Britton, 2012). This is also the case in Indonesia, which is described as the 'Disneyland' of the tobacco industry in terms of the use of tobacco marketing (Tjandra, 2018). These so-called corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities of tobacco firms are designed to ensure that TAPS continue to be ethically legitimate. Research has described TAPS as a form of decoupling strategy in which the core activity is still considered ethically illegitimate through a policy of giving back to the community (Miller and Michelson, 2013).

The development and sustainment of ethical legitimacy is of paramount importance to the Indonesian tobacco industry and TAPS. Unlike many other countries where TAPS are considered illegitimate, the opposite appears to be the case in Indonesia. The Indonesian tobacco industry is the fifth largest in the world (Andoko, 2019) and the second largest market for cigarettes after China, selling more than 316 billion cigarettes in 2016 (Campaign

for Tobacco-Free Kids, 2017). Evidence suggests that in Indonesia, the public and consumers of tobacco consider TAPS ethically legitimate, even though the Indonesian tobacco industry has been subjected to increased criticism by the World Health Organization (WHO) and increased regulation of TAPS by the Indonesian government. Research suggests that TAPS are both positive and socially acceptable (Arli *et al.*, 2015; Ng *et al.*, 2007; Nichter *et al.*, 2009; Schewe, 2017). This apparent contradiction leads us to ask: How can public propriety beliefs in the ethical legitimacy of TAPS be explained in the face of increased regulation domestically and the widespread worldwide criticism that such activities are not ethically legitimate? To answer this question, we draw on a legitimacy-as-perception perspective (Tost, 2011), which suggests that when propriety beliefs are strong, collective validity is high, and consensus in these beliefs is high, regulation efforts and interventions to change public perception of ethical legitimacy will fail. We selected a legitimacy-as-perception perspective to frame our study because it emphasises the multi-level nature of ethical legitimacy. In addition, we operationalise the key constructs of propriety beliefs, collective validity and collective consensus using data gathered from members of the public. This perspective allows us to pose an important 'why' question related to the continued legitimacy of TAPS. Specifically, and consistent with Hoefer and Green (2016), acceptance of TAPS activities of Indonesian tobacco firms is linked to propriety beliefs about the ethical legitimacy of these practices. Thus, the level of consensus of these beliefs will help us understand the extent to which existing institutional arrangements can change, or not, and how individual micro-level beliefs contribute to institutional change (Tost, 2011).

A wealth of research considers the legitimacy process either a collective- (Suchman, 1995) or individual-level (Ashforth and Gibbs, 1990) process. However, a legitimacy-as-perception approach (Bitektine and Haack, 2015; Tost, 2011) integrates both perspectives and introduces the concepts of propriety and validity. Propriety refers to an individual's beliefs

that a particular set of organisational practices, in this case TAPS, is ethically legitimate in a social context. Validity emphasises the institutionalised, collective aspects of ethical legitimacy and highlights the extent to which society considers TAPS ethically legitimate. Recently, Haack *et al.* (2020) added a third dimension labelled 'consensus' and defined it as a collective-level phenomenon emphasising the extent to which individuals share propriety beliefs. They differentiate consensus from collective validity in that the latter may hide underlying disagreement. Therefore, consensus captures the extent to which individuals disclose or hide divergent beliefs in highly collective validity contexts.

Our approach to the issue of legitimacy and TAPS in Indonesia is underpinned by a socio-cognitive perspective that has, as its central idea, the notion of legitimacy as a property emphasising the perceptions and judgements of the public (Bitektine, 2011). Therefore, we examine the legitimacy of TAPS from the perspective of the beholder or, in our case, members of the public who make judgements based on changing social norms (Siebert *et al.*, 2020) and the influence of others. Our question is therefore at the micro level: *How do Indonesian citizens use metaphors to describe their propriety beliefs about TAPS, and what do these metaphors convey about the consensus around propriety beliefs about TAPS?* Consistent with the theoretical perspective, these perceptions or propriety beliefs can vary from one person to the next and from situation to situation (Suddaby *et al.*, 2017); however, for such beliefs to translate into macro-level legitimacy, both widespread consensus and isomorphism are required. To unpack these propriety beliefs, we highlight the metaphors that the public uses to describe its propriety beliefs. Metaphors are devices that serve as rhetorical resources and give members of the public ways to present their ideas about the legitimacy of TAPS and go beyond literal accounts of legitimacy (Haack and Scherer, 2014).

In examining the legitimacy of TAPS in Indonesia through a legitimacy-as-perception perspective, we make several important contributions to institutional change, the TAPS

literature and the use of novel methodological approaches. First, we find that a high level of consensus of propriety beliefs about TAPS exists in Indonesia, which suggests that these activities are highly institutionalised and will be difficult to change. Therefore, despite government efforts to regulate the tobacco industry, high levels of consensus result in the perpetuation of the status quo (Suddaby *et al.*, 2017). We suggest that this finding is also applicable to understanding institutional change in other controversial marketing areas, such as betting, gambling, alcohol and firearms, in which strong consensus around propriety beliefs exist. Second, we make a specific contribution to the TAPS literature, which to date has focused on the impact of TAPS on smoking behaviour and its negative impacts on different socio-economic groups. We shift the focus and specifically unpack the institutional processes that explain the continued effectiveness of TAPS despite both government regulations and international criticism of these activities. Third, we build on previous investigations using a legitimacy-as-perception perspective using both metaphors and a photo-elicitation technique. According to Haack and Scherer (2014, p. 226), the use of metaphors can help uncover the "deeper conceptual structure underlying" the propriety beliefs of the public when it comes to TAPS. We specifically focus on metaphors in the construction of propriety beliefs by members of the public. The use of photo-elicitation interviews (Coulter and Zaltman, 1994) provide us with a proxy measure of the collective validity of TAPS in Indonesia, in that the types of photos study participants brought to the interviews were important metaphorical representations of the collective validity of TAPS (Meo, 2010).

The remainder of this study proceeds as follows: we first define the legitimacy-as-perception approach and the role of metaphor in the context of understanding ethical legitimacy. Then, we describe our methodological approach and present the findings on the different categories of metaphor that emerged from our analysis. We conclude with a

discussion of the theoretical contributions of our research, the practice implications, study limitations and avenues for future research.

Conceptual background

Research on TAPS

The literature on TAPS is relatively nascent and has primarily focused on investigating the impact of such activities on the consumption of cigarettes (Braverman and Aarø, 2004; Chido-Amajuoyi *et al.*, 2017; English *et al.*, 2016; Septiono *et al.*, 2021). In general, research agrees that TAPS are effective when it comes to consumers' purchase of tobacco (English *et al.*, 2016). In a similar vein, the advertising industry frequently notes that tobacco advertising campaigns are effective (Davis *et al.*, 2008). The ethical dimensions of TAPS have also been evaluated, with research revealing that not only does TAPS encourage children to take up smoking, but children are also likely to smoke the most heavily promoted tobacco brands (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (US), 2012). Research has also paid attention to how the legal regulation of TAPS affects the behaviour of consumers and tobacco firms (Davis *et al.*, 2008). With regard to consumers, evidence indicates that a comprehensive ban is required to reduce the consumption of tobacco products and that consumption decreases rapidly under such regulations (Cancer Research UK, 2017). Literature also shows that the impact of TAPS regulation is paradoxical, and it suggests that tobacco firms are highly opportunistic. Tobacco firms have responded to the strict implementation of regulatory policies on TAPS in high-income countries by targeting their marketing efforts to low- and middle-income countries with lenient tobacco control regulations (Chido-Amajuoyi *et al.*, 2017; English *et al.*, 2016). In addition, tobacco firms are likely to continue with TAPS by combining them with other marketing activities and targeting a wider audience (Astuti, 2020). To date, insights into the public's perceptions of TAPS in situations when there is

regulation and situations when this regulation is weak and ineffective are lacking. To what extent do propriety beliefs about TAPS continue to support such activities as legitimate? Answers to this question are important motivations behind this study.

Legitimacy-as-perception: a multi-level construct

The concept of legitimacy has its origins in institutional theory (Humphreys, 2010; Scott, 1995), and a wealth of research in marketing and management follows this institutional approach (Chaney *et al.*, 2016; Ragland *et al.*, 2015; Slimane *et al.*, 2019; Yang and Su, 2014). Scholars have used three approaches to assess legitimacy: legitimacy (a) as a property, (b) as a process and (c) as perception (Suddaby *et al.*, 2017). The third approach puts emphasis on the role of individuals in the social construction of legitimacy (Hoefer and Green, 2016) and gives centrality to the notion that legitimacy is a multi-level process (Bitektine and Haack, 2015). Legitimacy is therefore perceptual or socio-cognitive, such that individuals will make their own judgements or adopt those of others (Tost, 2011). Both Bitektine and Haack (2015) and Tost (2011) proposed two cross-level components that are central to multi-level legitimacy evaluations: propriety and validity. Propriety, which is a micro-level phenomenon, captures the extent to which individuals approve of the legitimacy object—in this case, TAPS. Validity, which is a macro-level construct, refers to the extent to which a society agrees that TAPS is legitimate. Validity plays an important function in the case of TAPS, in that it is the institutionalised component that gives these activities status within a society.

When investigating legitimacy from this perspective, the individual evaluator—in our case, members of the public—is considered central. Individuals can perceive macro-level properties of an activity or organisation, render their judgements and then act on these judgements, thus exerting macro-level effects (Bitektine and Haack, 2015). The legitimacy-

as-perception perspective acknowledges that there will be considerable diversity in legitimacy judgements at the micro level (Lamin and Zaheer, 2012). Scholars have also observed that while individuals may consider an object such as TAPS valid at the collective level, they may withhold their propriety beliefs when, at a societal level, the activity or practice has validity. They may be unwilling to voice their true perceptions because of societal pressures and other situational factors. This observation led Haack *et al.* (2020) to propose a third dimension of the legitimacy-as-perception perspective, which they called 'consensus'. They define consensus as the extent to which members of the public share propriety beliefs. They argue that at the individual level, there may be disagreements about the legitimacy of activities, such as TAPS, in terms of propriety. Thus, activities such as increased legal regulations and global disapproval of TAPS may trigger debate within a society such as Indonesia. In other words, hidden fractures in propriety beliefs may sow the seeds for longer-term institutional change.

In the context of TAPS, the legitimacy-as-perception perspective therefore brings to the fore a set of micro-level cognitive processes that lead members of the public to form legitimacy judgements about TAPS and engage in a set of collective processes that result in the aggregation of individual judgements that then lead to the emergence of a collective consensus judgement or validity about TAPS. Thus, in line with Haack *et al.*'s (2020) recent insights, we argue that though there is potential for the public to have differences in propriety judgements about TAPS, these activities will have validity at the macro level. In addition, we theorise that the macro-validity beliefs about TAPS will influence individual propriety beliefs because of pressures to conform to these beliefs. Given that societal pressures and norms emanate from collective validity beliefs, members of the public are unlikely to express these negative views because they are at odds with the general perception or validity. Finally, we theorise that increased regulations, the use of legal sanctions and communication highlighting

the negative aspects of smoking may have led to the emergence of greater heterogeneity in individual-level propriety beliefs about the ethical legitimacy of TAPS. The public, when faced with these external events and information, may begin to question the status quo, leading to differences in propriety beliefs and creating a situation of high validity but low consensus.

Metaphors and legitimacy

To understand the public's perception of the ethical legitimacy of TAPS, we use metaphors, which is common in both marketing (Madhavaram *et al.*, 2019) and organisational research (Boxenbaum and Rouleau, 2011). For example, Semino (2008, p. 11) describes metaphors as "phenomenon whereby we talk and, potentially, think about something in terms of something else". Cornelissen and Kafouros (2008) propose that metaphors have an explanatory impact that is a core component of cognitive processing and essentially involves the superimposition of a source domain on a target domain. The process of transfer helps the public understand complex issues and enhance understanding of already-known phenomena. We can therefore use metaphors to understand what the public believes about the ethical legitimacy of TAPS. Metaphors may help the public reduce the complexity around the ethical legitimacy of TAPS because they make things simpler and more easily understood. Therefore, members of the public will reproduce these metaphors in everyday discourse and deploy metaphors to describe their propriety beliefs about TAPS. We are not aware of any studies that have examined the metaphors members of the public use to describe their propriety beliefs about the ethical legitimacy of TAPS. We therefore set out to remedy this situation by exploring how Indonesian citizens employ metaphors to make sense of the ethical legitimacy of TAPS and to describe their propriety beliefs. The use of the legitimacy-as-perception perspective thus helps us develop important insights into the relationships between a macro-level conceptualisation of legitimacy and its micro-level underpinnings in the context of TAPS.

Context: TAPS in Indonesia

We set our study within the context of the use of TAPS in Indonesia and specifically in Yogyakarta city in Java, the most populated Indonesian island, as well as the largest Indonesian producer of cigarettes. The tobacco industry and TAPS have a long history in Indonesia, which has the highest number of male smokers in Southeast Asia, with 67.4% of males aged 15 years and older using tobacco (WHO, 2018). Smoking prevalence among Indonesian adolescents has increased (Prabandari and Dewi, 2016), and estimates show that 36.4% of male adolescents aged 13–15 years are tobacco users (WHO, 2018). Furthermore, 19.8% of adolescents tried a cigarette before the age of 10, and nearly 88.6% tried a cigarette before the age of 13 (Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, 2017). The tobacco companies have creatively used the role of smoking in the Indonesian culture in its advertisement themes and other marketing activities to target Indonesian men and adolescents (Nichter *et al.*, 2009; Tjandra, 2018).

In recent years, TAPS and the activities of the tobacco industry have been severely criticised, and the government has made some efforts to curtail such activities, though from an international perspective, much more is required. The complex political structure and hierarchy, high levels of bureaucracy and corruption and unclear roles and responsibilities of policy makers have all affected the progress of the policy (Astuti *et al.*, 2020). TAPS are allowed with some restrictions. The law specifies that tobacco advertising on television and radio can only be broadcast between 9:30 P.M. and 5:00 A.M. local time. The advertisements show cigarettes, the shape of cigarettes, tobacco product branding or smoking. Distributing free and discounted tobacco products, giving tobacco products as prizes, and brand stretching of tobacco products (i.e. using the tobacco brand names for unrelated products) are prohibited. Tobacco sponsorship and its publicity are allowed with some restrictions (Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, 2019). Since 2019, tobacco advertisements on the internet

have been banned (The Jakarta Post, 2019). The partial ban of TAPS enables tobacco companies to exploit loopholes, circumvent regulations and use less regulated channels (Astuti and Freeman, 2017). The Indonesian government has also carried out anti-smoking campaigns to reduce smoking, but the messages of these campaigns are not persuasive enough to encourage smokers to quit smoking (Selamet, 2019). The campaigns, which are presented as public service announcements on television and digital media, focus on the harmful effects and disapproval of smoking. This type of message is unlikely to be effective when competing with the more creative messages in tobacco advertisements.

Moreover, TAPS regulations are complicated by economic issues. Stricter tobacco control would cause economic harm through loss of revenue and by preventing tobacco farmers and industry workers from earning a living (Astuti *et al.*, 2020). In 2016, the Indonesian House of Representatives proposed a Tobacco Bill, intended to replace the Tobacco Control Law 2009, that would have favoured the tobacco industry over the health and social interests of Indonesian citizens (Danubrata and Reinard, 2017). Although the bill was defeated in 2017, the debate on the issue made clear that a stricter tobacco control policy would be detrimental to the industry, especially for farmers and other associated tobacco workers. Indonesian tobacco companies present themselves as ethical corporations that contribute to government revenue and society through their CSR activities and sponsorships (Assunta and Jirathanapiwat, 2015).

Method

Study approach and participants

We collected data in eight *kelurahan* (urban villages) in the city of Yogyakarta in Java island. We recruited 71 adults to participate in the study. To recruit potential participants, the first author contacted community leaders from these districts. No incentives were given to the participants, but their transportation costs to attend the focus groups and interviews were

reimbursed. Our sample consisted of 50 men and 21 women aged between 18 to 72 years; 35 were smokers and 36 non-smokers. The sample reflects differences in education/qualification status (junior high school to master's degree), marital status (single, married, widowed and divorced), occupation (student, private sector employee, civil servant, self-employed and unemployed) and monthly income (below IDR 1,000,000 to above IDR 10, 000,000 per month). Of the 71 participants, only four female smokers participated in the study, reflecting the small number (4.5%) of female smokers in Indonesia (WHO, 2018). The social taboo surrounding female smokers in Indonesia may have deterred them from participating in the study. That is, smoking has been traditionally viewed as inappropriate for women (Nichter *et al.*, 2009). This view is attributed to cultural values, which stigmatise women who smoke as morally flawed (Barraclough, 1999). Consequently, tobacco companies have been actively persuading Indonesian women to smoke as part of being a modern woman through their marketing activities. However, despite a gradual increase, the number of daily female smokers remains low (1–2%) in comparison with daily male smokers (47%) (Hardesty *et al.*, 2019). Table I presents the profile of the study participants.

Insert Table I here

Data collection

To collect data, we used photo-elicitation interviews with 30 participants and six focus groups with 41 participants. The use of both methods enabled triangulation and enhanced the richness of the data (Lambert and Loiselle, 2008). In addition, prior studies have stressed that gathering data on ethical perceptions is complex because these reflect not only how people perceive particular situations but also their ability to recognise the morally significant elements embedded in these situations (Blum, 1991; VanSandt *et al*., 2006). While photo-elicitation interviews can uncover personal perceptions and experiences, focus groups can

yield community-level viewpoints about a phenomenon (Kantrowitz-Gordon and Vandermause, 2016; Michel, 1999). Therefore, both methods can provide complementary views and contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the legitimacy of TAPS in Indonesia. All photo-elicitation interviews and focus groups took place within three weeks.

Photo-elicitation interviews. We employed an interview approach that is less frequently used in the literature: photo-elicitation interviews. We conducted 30 individual photo-elicitation interviews with 15 smokers and 15 non-smokers, as data saturation can be achieved after 10–25 photo-elicitation interviews (Coulter and Zaltman, 1994). "Photo-elicitation is based on the simple idea of inserting a photograph into a research interview" (Harper, 2002, p.13). However, elicitation studies are not limited to photographs but can use any visual image (Harper, 2002). We deemed photo-elicitation interviews appropriate for our study because they can promote rapport and generate richer conversations and reflections about the topic, given people's familiarity with taking and talking about photos (Meo, 2010). Photo-elicitation is empowering because participants are required to choose, explain and reflect upon their photo choices on the topic without a pre-defined set of interview questions (Bates *et al.*, 2019). As such, photo-elicitation is a powerful research tool to collect and analyse data on sensitive and complex topics (Kantrowitz-Gordon and Vandermause, 2016) because it conveys a deeper reflection than conventional interviews (Harper, 2002). During photo-elicitation interviews, the photographs function as metaphors across different stages of a participant's narratives and reflections. However, the photographs are not the only focus of the data, as they are balanced by the text of the elicited interviews (Kantrowitz-Gordon and Vandermause, 2016). Therefore, when using photo-elicitation interviews, both text and visual metaphors conveyed during the interviews are equally important.

To ensure the consistency of meaning, we provided the following definition in the interview invitation: ethical marketing is "the practices that emphasize transparent,

trustworthy, and responsible personal and/or organizational marketing policies and actions that exhibit integrity as well as fairness to consumers and other stakeholders" (Murphy *et al*., 2005, p. xviii). We asked study participants to bring to the interview eight to 10 images from magazines, newspapers, pieces of artwork, or the internet or photographs that reflected their perceptions of tobacco marketing ethics, specifically in the areas of TAPS. We stipulated that we were interested in their thoughts and feelings and that the images should not be an actual tobacco advertisement. When participants did not or could not bring pictures, we asked them to select pictures from an image bank we created with more than 100 pictures randomly selected from three magazines. We asked participants to describe how each picture or image reflected their perceptions of tobacco marketing ethics. The use of images during the interviews helped facilitate interview dialogue, by enabling longer and more comprehensive interviews (Tinkler, 2013). Throughout the interviews, the first author probed topics that arose and asked for more elaboration. As the participants had the opportunity to think about and reflect on the topic when gathering the images, they came to the interview with a story to tell, which resulted in richer and more comprehensive conversations. The average length of each interview was 75 minutes.

Focus groups. Focus groups are a particularly useful method to explore individuals' beliefs and knowledge about a particular phenomenon (Krueger and Casey, 2000). The main purpose of the focus groups herein was to increase the depth of the research and uncover more data from the discussion among participants. Therefore, we designed the focus groups in an interactive setting to allow participants to talk with one another freely. While participants can have different demographic backgrounds, they must be similar in some way, which becomes the nature of a study (Morgan, 1997). Therefore, we categorised the participants into three groups of smokers and three groups of non-smokers. We considered three focus groups adequate to uncover all important themes within the data set (Guest *et al.*,

2017). The recommended number of participants for each focus group is between six and eight participants (Krueger and Casey, 2000). Therefore, we aimed to have seven participants in each focus group. One participant was unable to attend the focus group; thus, one group consisted of six participants and five groups seven participants.

The first author served as the focus group moderator and was assisted by an experienced research assistant who took notes during each focus group and identified individual participants in the notes and transcriptions. The average length of each focus group was 60 minutes. Each focus group began with a description of the research project and team, followed by an introduction of individual participants' names. The same definition of ethical marketing (Murphy *et al*., 2005) as used in the photo-elicitation interviews was given at the beginning of the focus groups to ensure consistency of meaning by the research team and participants.

To guide the discussion, we asked a broad question, 'How do you perceive the ethics of tobacco marketing in Indonesia'? We encouraged participants to discuss how they perceived the ethics of TAPS activities that they had witnessed or experienced. We used a series of probing questions to explore the ethics of tobacco smoking in more detail. These included whether participants' perceptions of the ethics of tobacco marketing differed depending on the age of the target market, the social-economic circumstances of the target market and their education level. In addition, we probed issues related to the role of tobacco company CSR activities, the impact of tobacco regulations and the importance of Indonesian cultural norms in tobacco marketing activities.

Data analysis

We decided to make use of metaphors in the first stage of the qualitative coding process. We adopted thematic analysis (Clarke and Braun, 2016) to analyse the data (i.e. the photos and transcriptions), focusing on both the linguistic and conceptual metaphors the participants used

to make sense of and explain their views. We used NVivo to analyse the data and engaged in data familiarisation in the first step, in which we read and re-read the transcriptions to understand their semantic and obvious meanings. In a second step, we switched to a systematic process of working through the data and developing codes for each data segment. In a third step, we developed themes from the generated codes. Here, we stepped back from the details of the data and identified a general patterning of meaning. To identify the potential themes, we clustered related codes together. After identifying potential themes, we checked them against all coded data relevant to each theme as well as the entire data set to ensure a good fit between the data and themes. This review process was iterative; it involved discarding, combining, refining and splitting themes. The iterative process of returning to the research questions and the data segments in a recursive manner ensured a degree of quality control (Terry, 2016). We then undertook detailed analysis to develop a narrative that illustrated the findings. Our analyses resulted in three thematic categories: the centrality of smoking in society metaphors, TAPS regulations and regulators metaphors, and activities of tobacco firms' metaphors. To identify these categories, we searched for systematic patterns in metaphor use that appeared to play an important role in the social construction of participants' propriety beliefs.

Given that the data analysis occurred in Indonesia, the second stage involved selecting quotations and translating them into English. When translating quotations, we followed three principles: "(a) [they] make sense, (b) [they convey] the spirit and manner of the original and (c) [they have] a natural and easy form of expression" (Halai, 2007, p. 351). To ensure that the meanings the participants expressed were not lost in translation and misinterpreted, the first author compared the English translation with the Indonesian transcription, back-translated the quotations and discussed the accuracy of the translation. Concurrently, when

conducting the data analysis, we reviewed the legitimacy-as-perception literature and selected it as an appropriate framework in which to understand our study findings.

Findings

In Tables 2-4 we identify the three categories of metaphors and provide illustrative examples of each metaphor found within each category. We then unpack the categories in detail in the following subsections.

The centrality of smoking in society metaphors

The most common set of metaphors the participants used to describe their propriety beliefs emphasised the centrality of smoking in Indonesian society (Table II). Three specific metaphors emerged under this category: *keeping up with boys/men*, *let's get together*, and *we are doing what our forefathers did.* The first metaphor captures the extent to which smoking is a central component of Indonesian society. In some cases, participants used a type of categorical comparison (see Table II). For example, some participants described non-smokers as 'sissies' and stated 'if you don't smoke you are not a man'. We also found evidence of categorical conflation, in which smokers were not compared with anyone else but simply conflated as a male. The *keeping up with the boys/men metaphor* was also revealed in pictures of successful men wearing business suits, a man and a horse, men playing football and a man carrying a travelling backpack. The pictures of men and masculinity associations were represented in all interviews, indicating that participants associated smoking and TAPS with male masculinity. The participants also often indicated that the pictures they selected reminded them of images in tobacco advertisements. This suggests that tobacco advertising intensifies the belief that smoking is a symbol of masculinity.

Insert Table II here

The *let's get together* metaphor suggests that smoking is central to socialising in Indonesian society and that TAPS activities play a role in this socialising dimension. This metaphor is strongly linked to Indonesian cultural and the importance of socialising in Indonesian society. This metaphor was also illustrated in the pictures the participants selected, such as people clubbing, people socialising on a veranda and people attending a business meeting. Through these pictures, the participants expressed the idea that smoking is an integral part of socialisation among Indonesia men. Some participants recognised that tobacco companies use advertising themes such as togetherness and friendship to illustrate that smoking is part of social ritual that can enhance friendship. This metaphor also stresses that TAPS is opportunistic in that it plays on socialising themes especially in the case of young people.

The third metaphor type, *we are doing what our forefathers did*, suggests that smoking is central to Indonesia and therefore TAPS activities are legitimate. In the case of this metaphor, participants explained that smoking is 'in our culture', 'in our blood', 'embedded in a society' and '[part of] our tradition'. These metaphors presented TAPS as something linked to an important ritual in Indonesian society—smoking. The participants used pictures such as Balinese women, *joglo* (Javanese traditional house), traditional theatrical performances and historical buildings to express their belief that smoking was part of the Indonesian culture and tradition. A few participants opined that the tobacco advertisements they considered attractive and interesting were those that integrated the Indonesian culture and heritage themes. Together, they generate images of TAPS as ethically legitimate because they spring from societal rituals, beliefs and something that is part of everyday life; in turn, these dimensions are reflected in participants' propriety beliefs. These findings indicate that the normative and cultural -cognitive pillars of legitimacy as reflected in collective validity

has a profound influence on the metaphors members of the public use to demonstrate their individual propriety beliefs.

TAPS regulations and regulators metaphors

The second most frequently used set of metaphors to describe propriety beliefs focuses on both TAPS regulations and regulators (Table III). Three specific metaphors emerged here: regulations and regulators as (a) *having feet of clay*, (b) *acting as bystanders* and (c) *being paper tigers*. The first metaphor of *having feet of clay* captures the idea that regulators are very weak and flawed. Participants discussed TAPS regulations and regulators as going through the motions, being toothless and ignoring the situation. A few interviewees used pictures of cars to illustrate that TAPS were everywhere and that their existence could not be controlled.

Insert Table III here

The *acting as bystanders'* metaphor reflects the idea that regulators allow regulation breaches to occur on a daily basis. One interviewee used a picture of a police officer statue to explain that 'the tobacco control regulations are there to be broken'. The interviewees also used pictures of people playing football and attending a concert to share their experience with events sponsored by tobacco companies. They witnessed the free distribution of cigarettes to adults and children, which breached tobacco control regulations. Other participants used the pictures of smiling children and a father and son to explain that, while selling cigarettes to those under 18 years was illegal, they had witnessed sales to children for their own or parents' consumption.

The third metaphor in this category characterises TAPS regulations and regulators as paper tigers. This metaphor suggests that while regulators may talk a good game, they are essentially powerless in controlling TAPS. Participants expressed this by indicating that

though regulators promise to ban TAPS, they do the opposite or have no intention of actually banning these activities. Regulators are compromised because of the centrality of the tobacco industry in Indonesia and its impact on government revenue.

Activities of tobacco firm's metaphors

The third most frequently reported set of metaphors to describe propriety beliefs focuses on describing tobacco firms as saviours (Table IV). A cluster of positive terms is associated with these metaphors, including 'doing good', 'sustaining and promoting enjoyment' and 'community', but negative terms are mentioned as well, such as 'villains' and 'opportunists'. Interview participants used pictures of high school students in uniform, children, destroyed houses, people playing football and music concerts to describe the dual role of tobacco firms.

Insert Table IV here

Two metaphors emerged in this third category: *tobacco firms as white knights* and *tobacco firms as wolves in sheep's clothing*. The first metaphor suggests that tobacco firms are important for the economy, for cultural events, and for sports and sponsorship of these activities. For example, participants used descriptions that focused on helping schools in the community and supporting the existence of small shops. The second metaphor in this category characterises tobacco firms as wolves in sheep's clothing. Participants described them as revelling in the misfortune of others. They create situations in which young people come together to smoke, they have hidden agendas and they promote their brands during natural disasters. These two metaphors describing tobacco firms contrast each other, with the first metaphor characterising them as forces for good and the second emphasising their opportunistic behaviour to the detriment of society. Therefore, in contrast with the other two categories, we find evidence of fractures in propriety beliefs and collective consensus, which may act as a springboard for institutional change.

Discussion

Our study attempts to understand the legitimacy of TAPS using a legitimacy-as-perception perspective (Bitektine and Haack, 2015; Tost, 2011). This perspective gives primacy to the views of individuals or, in our case, members of the public. We posed the following research question: *How do Indonesian citizens use metaphors to describe their proprietary beliefs about TAPS, and what do these metaphors convey about the consensus around propriety beliefs about TAPS*? The study offers new insights into TAPS by expanding the discussion to address why TAPS continues to be legitimate in a context in which attempts have been made to regulate these activities and in which significant international disapproval exists. Our study uncovered three sets of metaphors that members of the public use to describe their propriety beliefs about TAPS. These metaphors reveal that smoking and TAPS activities are central to Indonesian society; tobacco firms are viewed as either white knights of wolves in sheep's clothing, and efforts to regulate TAPS are perceived to be ineffectual, with regulations and regulators described as having feet of clay, acting as bystanders and being paper tigers. These metaphors in many ways are self-reinforcing and point to the difficulties involved in changing propriety beliefs and allowing for cracks in consensus. For example, the metaphors emphasising the centrality of smoking and TAPS in Indonesian society in many ways give licence to tobacco firms and help to elevate their status within the country where they are described as white knights. These metaphors that describe the cultural embeddedness of smoking and TAPS potentially also explain the metaphors describing the ineffectual nature of regulation with regulators. These cultural embeddedness metaphors point to the significant challenges that regulators encounter and provide an explanation for metaphors such as having feet of clay, bystanders and paper tigers. It is possible to view the culture embeddedness metaphors that emphasize masculinity, socialising and modernity as a superordinate metaphor category within which the two other sets are nested.

Our findings are important in three additional ways. First, propriety beliefs of members of the public reveal a mix of perceptions about smoking and TAPS, indicating that beliefs about TAPS are inextricably linked to beliefs about smoking. This meshing of propriety beliefs about smoking and TAPS is perhaps relatively unique to Indonesia, given that the tobacco industry is so central to economic life and country prosperity. As such, efforts to change the collective consensus will be considerably more difficult and intractable. This perhaps explains the less-than-wholehearted approach of the government to regulate this industry, which critics have described as essentially policy washing to pacify them rather than change the institutions.

Second, for the three sets of metaphors, we found a high level of collective consensus around propriety beliefs, which is consistent with our theorizing, though we also uncovered evidence of dissenting voices, especially against TAPS activities. Consensus was strongest on the centrality of tobacco and TAPS in Indonesian society and the ineffectual nature of regulation and regulators.

Third, our findings show that both the normative and cultural-cognitive pillars of legitimacy are particularly strong in their support for smoking and TAPS while the regulative pillar is weak, with ineffective rules and sanctions. For example, the public perceives TAPS activities as having strong cultural appropriateness. This is in stark contrast with the regulative pillar in which legal sanctions are compromised, with a blind eye turned to the implementation of TAPS regulations.

Theoretical contributions

As a first contribution, we draw on the legitimacy-as-perception perspective to help explain the apparent tolerance and legitimacy of TAPS in Indonesia despite increased government regulations and international disapproval. This theory enables us to take a multi-level

perspective on the factors that shape the legitimacy of TAPS. In particular, it captures two collective concepts—validity and consensus—and one individual-level construct—propriety beliefs. The theory highlights the important role of micro-level perceptions in creating a collective-level phenomenon and suggests that change in institutions will happen only by addressing these individual-level perceptions (Tost, 2011). At the individual level, our findings show that the public has strong propriety beliefs that TAPS is legitimate; at the collective level, we find both strong collective validity and a high level of collective consensus on propriety beliefs. These dimensions of legitimacy help explain why TAPS activities have thrived in Indonesia and that government regulation has not fundamentally changed the public's propriety beliefs. Furthermore, our findings suggest that organisations can apply the legitimacy-as-perception theory in conjunction with metaphors to a variety of marketing practices and that it is not limited to our setting. In the context of marketing activities, the theory is applicable to activities such as the marketing of online gambling (Miller and Michelson, 2013; Vaz, 2015), alcohol (Sama and Hiilamo, 2019; Vaz, 2015) and fast-fashion products (Miotto and Vilajoana-Alejandre, 2019; Miotto and Youn, 2020). We used it in a situation in which members of the public choose to disclose their priority beliefs in a direct way; however, this may not be possible in the context of other countries.

Second, our study extends the literature on TAPS that, to date, has focused on the effectiveness of these activities and their influence on consumer behaviour (Braverman and Aarø, 2004; Chido-Amajuoyi *et al.*, 2017; English *et al.*, 2016; Septiono *et al.*, 2021). We shifted the focus to investigate a topic not given priority in the literature—namely, TAPS continued use despite attempts to regulate them and regardless of international disapproval. We show that TAPS will persist when they are supported by strong normative and cultural-cognitive pillars and a weak regulative pillar. Our findings also suggest that when there is a strong level of consensus around propriety beliefs and strong macro-level validity, any

opportunities for change will be limited. Institutional change is most likely when a high level of collective validity is associated with low levels of collective consensus. In this case, the public will be more likely to voice beliefs, through judgement validation institutions such as the media, that TAPS are not legitimate; only then will institutional change occur. Our findings support the idea that high levels of collective validity and consensus around TAPS can promote stability in institutional arrangements in Indonesia. This idea finds support in institutional theory (Walker, 2014). That is, for change to happen, some important event would need to occur such that the national government bans TAPS outright or greatly curtails these activities, but this will only be likely with a lower level of consensus than what currently prevails. Both Haack *et al.* (2020) and Tost (2011) argue that particular contextual circumstances are required for proprietary beliefs to change. The media can play an important role in making this happen. However, the role of the media and public discourse in shaping the propriety beliefs currently prevailing in Indonesia is beyond the scope of our study.

Finally, the study makes a methodological contribution to research on the ethical legitimacy of TAPS by combining photo-elicitation interviews and focus groups, to examine both individual perceptions and the community's views. Photo-elicitation interviews (Coulter and Zaltman, 1994; Harper, 2002; Kantrowitz-Gordon and Vandermause, 2016; Meo, 2010) are particularly valuable in this context because the pictures participants brought to the interviews themselves suggest metaphors, and these pictures give insight into the collective validity of TAPS in Indonesia. The visual metaphors are enriched by the text metaphors in the interview and focus group transcripts. As TAPS in Indonesia is a complex phenomenon, the photo-elicitation interviews facilitated a deeper reflection that can be difficult to extract from conventional interviews.

Policy implications

Our exploratory findings have important policy implications. To work, any policy initiative to change public propriety beliefs around TAPS must account for both the strong collective validity and the high level of collective consensus. We suggest that so far, the government has failed to design regulatory mechanisms, resulting in a strong validation of the status quo. The weak efforts of the government in Indonesia have, in effect, perpetuated tacit approval by the public of this status quo (Tost, 2011). The government has not taken actions to destabilize current institutional arrangements, nor has it caused a powerful exogenous shock to bring about institutional change. According to our findings, policy makers need to address policies to change individual-level propriety beliefs. To lessen the collective consensus around these propriety beliefs, they must continue to focus efforts on highlighting vulnerable groups and emphasising the villainous nature of tobacco firms. Regulators must also realise that one size does not fit all and that, given the many metaphors revealed in this study, they will need customized policies to address communities, schools, educators and the entertainment industry. In terms of implementation, the government must do more to ceremonially adopt regulations. One of the most resonant metaphors to emerge in our study was the portrayal of TAPS regulations and regulators as paper tigers. To shift or change the collective validity of TAPS and lessen consensus around propriety beliefs, the government should enforce a penalty for the breach of tobacco control regulations to prove that tobacco control regulations are legitimate and must be obeyed. Our findings also show that there is some dissent with regard to the vulnerable in society (e.g. children). Therefore, the Indonesian government must ban TAPS activities that directly and indirectly target these groups.

Limitations and future research avenues

This research has several limitations that open avenues for future research. First, we examined legitimacy in a unique industry and country context. In many other contexts, TAPS

are considered illegitimate. We suggest that our findings point to important future research questions.

First, we can develop deeper insights concerning the different pillars of legitimacy and how they impact on legitimacy perceptions for example amongst consumers and manufacturers. What for example are the most significant pillars? Are they the normative or cultural pill as our findings suggest?

Second, we can develop insights into how and why legitimacy perceptions or propriety beliefs change over time? What role do cracks in consensus play? How long does it take for change to occur? How can government institutions and regulators capitalise on cracks in consensus? What role does the media and other institutional actors such a schools play in bringing about change? What is required to destabilise institutional arrangements? What types of types of institutional arrangements will be more effective in situations of high collective validity and high consensus?

Third, there is scope to undertake comparative research that investigates propriety beliefs in respect of TAPS and advertising in other areas such as gambling in countries with a different mix of institutional pillars. This type of research has the potential to generate important insights on institutional change and the role of the regulative institutional pillar for example. Researchers can also generate important insights into propriety beliefs, consensus and validity in both loose and tight TAPS regulation regimes.

Finally, there is scope for methodological enhancements that counteract the weaknesses of our study. For example, we need to generate larger samples to develop insights into how smokers and non-smokers differ in terms of legitimacy perceptions. In our sampling we focused on members of the public however there is value in having data source triangulation to investigate how perceptions might differ for example amongst regulators, tobacco activists,

tobacco marketers and retailers. There is also value in method triangulation including the use of media sources to investigate the media framing of legitimacy perceptions. The latter component has the potential to capture the temporal nature of legitimacy perceptions and consensus.

References

Ahlstrom, D. and Bruton, G.D. (2001), "Learning from successful local private firms in China: establishing legitimacy", *Academy of Management Executive*, Academy of Management, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 72–83.

Andoko, E. (2019), "The analysis of Indonesian tobacco industry: regulations and government strategic development", *FFTC Agricultural Policy Platform*, available at: http://ap.fftc.agnet.org/ap_db.php?id=999 (accessed 4 May 2020).

Arli, D., Rundle-Thiele, S. and Lasmono, H. (2015), "Consumers' evaluation toward tobacco companies: implications for social marketing", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 276–291.

Ashforth, B.E. and Gibbs, B.W. (1990), "The double-edge of organizational legitimation", *Organization Science*, Institute for Operations Research and the Management Sciences (INFORMS), Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 177–194.

Assunta, M. and Jirathanapiwat, W. (2015), *End Tobacco Industry Corporate Giving: A Review of CSR in Southeast Asia*, available at: https://seatca.org/dmdocuments/CSR_End Corporate Giving_Aug 2015_F_Nov 2015.pdf.

Astuti, A.S.A. (2020), *Tobacco Advertising, Promotion and Sponsorship (TAPS) Regulation in Indonesia: Current and Future Challenges*, available at: https://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/handle/2123/22448.

Astuti, P.A.S., Assunta, M. and Freeman, B. (2020), "Why is tobacco control progress in

Indonesia stalled? - a qualitative analysis of interviews with tobacco control experts", *BMC Public Health*, BioMed Central Ltd., Vol. 20 No. 527, available at:https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-08640-6.

Astuti, P.A.S. and Freeman, B. (2017), "'It is merely a paper tiger.' Battle for increased tobacco advertising regulation in Indonesia: content analysis of news articles", *BMJ Open*, Vol. 7 No. 9, pp. 1–9.

Barraclough, S. (1999), "Women and tobacco in Indonesia", *Tobacco Control*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 327–32.

Bates, E.A., Kaye, L.K. and McCann, J.J. (2019), "A snapshot of the student experience: exploring student satisfaction through the use of photographic elicitation", *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, Routledge, Vol. 43 No. 3, pp. 291–304.

Bitektine, A. (2011), "Toward a theory of social judgments of organizations: the case of legitimacy, reputation, and status", *Academy of Management Review*, Academy of Management, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 151–179.

Bitektine, A. and Haack, P. (2015), "The 'macro' and the 'micro' of legitimacy", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 49–75.

Blum, L. (1991), "Moral perception and particularity", *Ethics*, Vol. 101 No. 4, pp. 701–725.

Boxenbaum, E. and Rouleau, L. (2011), "New knowledge products as bricolage: metaphors and scripts in organizational theory", *Academy of Management Review*, Academy of Management, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 272–296.

Braverman, M.T. and Aarø, L.E. (2004), "Adolescent smoking and exposure to tobacco marketing under a tobacco advertising ban: findings from 2 Norwegian national samples.", *American Journal of Public Health*, American Public Health Association, Vol. 94 No. 7, pp. 1230–1238.

Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids. (2017), "The toll of tobacco in Indonesia", available at:

https://www.tobaccofreekids.org/problem/toll-global/asia/indonesia (accessed 26 January 2019).

Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids. (2019), "Indonesia tobacco control policies", *Tobacco Control Laws*, available at: https://www.tobaccocontrollaws.org/legislation/factsheet/policy_status/indonesia (accessed 15 November 2020).

Cancer Research UK. (2017), "This is the end of tobacco advertising", available at: https://scienceblog.cancerresearchuk.org/2017/05/19/this-is-the-end-of-tobacco-advertising/ (accessed 24 January 2021).

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (US). (2012), *Preventing Tobacco Use among Youth and Young Adults: A Report of the Surgeon General*, Atlanta, GA, available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK99238/ (accessed 3 June 2021).

Chaney, D., Ben Slimane, K. and Humphreys, A. (2016), "Megamarketing expanded by neo-institutional theory", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Routledge, Vol. 24 No. 6, pp. 470–483.

Chido-Amajuoyi, O.G., Mantey, D.S., Clendennen, S.L. and Pérez, A. (2017), "Association of tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship (TAPS) exposure and cigarette use among Nigerian adolescents: implications for current practices, products and policies", *BMJ Global Health*, Vol. 2 No. 3, p. e000357.

Clarke, V. and Braun, V. (2016), "Thematic analysis", in Lyons, E. and Coyle, A. (Eds.), *Analysing Qualitative Data in Psychology*, 2nd ed., Sage Publications, London, pp. 84–102.

Cornelissen, J.P. and Kafouros, M. (2008), "Metaphors and theory building in organization theory: what determines the impact of a metaphor on theory?", *British Journal of Management*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 365–379.

Coulter, R.H. and Zaltman, G. (1994), "Using the Zaltman Metaphor Elicitation Technique to understand brand images", in Allen, C.T. and John, D.R. (Eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research Volume 21*, Association for Consumer Research, Provo, UT, pp. 501–507.

Danubrata, E. and Reinard, S. (2017), "Indonesia tobacco bill would open tap for ads aimed at kids, health official says", *Reuter*, available at: https://www.reuters.com/article/us-indonesia-tobacco/indonesia-tobacco-bill-would-open-tap-for-ads-aimed-at-kids-health-official-says-idUSKBN18S47O (accessed 2 July 2018).

Davis, R.M., Gilpin, E.A., Barbara Loken, M., Viswanath, K. and Wakefi eld, M.A. (2008), *Monograph 19: The Role of the Media in Promoting and Reducing Tobacco Use*, Bethesda, MD.

Debenedetti, A., Philippe, D., Chaney, D. and Humphreys, A. (2021), "Maintaining legitimacy in contested mature markets through discursive strategies: the case of corporate environmentalism in the French automotive industry", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 92, pp. 332–343.

English, L.M., Hsia, J. and Malarcher, A. (2016), "Tobacco advertising, promotion, and sponsorship (TAPS) exposure, anti-TAPS policies, and students' smoking behavior in Botswana and South Africa", *Preventive Medicine*.

Grant-Braham, B. and Britton, J. (2012), "Motor racing, tobacco company sponsorship, barcodes and alibi marketing", *Tobacco Control*, BMJ Publishing Group Ltd, Vol. 21 No. 6, pp. 529–535.

Guest, G., Namey, E. and McKenna, K. (2017), "How many focus groups are enough? Building an evidence base for nonprobability sample sizes", *Field Methods*, SAGE PublicationsSage CA: Los Angeles, CA, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 3–22.

Haack, P. and Scherer, A.G. (2014), "Why sparing the rod does not spoil the child: A critique of the 'Strict Father' model in transnational governance", *Journal of Business Ethics*,

Vol. 122 No. 2, pp. 225–240.

Haack, P., Schilke, O. and Zucker, L. (2020), "Legitimacy Revisited: Disentangling Propriety, Validity, and Consensus", *Journal of Management Studies*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, p. joms.12615.

Halai, N. (2007), "Making use of bilingual interview data: Some experiences from the field", *The Qualitative Report*, Vol. 12 No. September, pp. 344–355.

Hardesty, J.J., Kaplan, B., Martini, S., Megatsari, H., Kennedy, R.D. and Cohen, J.E. (2019), "Smoking among female daily smokers in Surabaya, Indonesia", *Public Health*, available at:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2019.03.007.

Harper, D. (2002), "Talking about pictures: A case for photo elicitation", *Visual Studies*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 13–26.

Hoefer, R.L. and Green, S.E. (2016), "A rhetorical model of institutional decision making: The role of rhetoric in the formation and change of legitimacy judgments", *Academy of Management Review*, Academy of Management, 1 January.

Humphreys, A. (2010), "Semiotic Structure and the Legitimation of Consumption Practices: The Case of Casino Gambling", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 490–510.

Kantrowitz-Gordon, I. and Vandermause, R. (2016), "Metaphors of distress: Photo-elicitation enhances a discourse analysis of parents' accounts", *Qualitative Health Research*, SAGE Publications Inc., Vol. 26 No. 8, pp. 1031–1043.

Krueger, R.A. and Casey, M.A. (2000), *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Lambert, S.D. and Loiselle, C.G. (2008), "Combining individual interviews and focus groups to enhance data richness", *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol. 62 No. 2, pp. 228–237.

Lamin, A. and Zaheer, S. (2012), "Wall street vs. main street: Firm strategies for defending

legitimacy and their impact on different stakeholders", *Organization Science*, INFORMS Inst.for Operations Res.and the Management Sciences, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 47–66.

Madhavaram, S., Bolton, D. and Badrinarayanan, V. (2019), "Implications of the Developments in Metaphors Research for Marketing Communications: A Review and Research Agenda: An Abstract", in Wu, S., Pantoja, F. and Krey, N. (Eds.), *AMSAC 2019: Marketing Opportunities and Challenges in a Changing Global Marketplace*, Springer, Cham, Vancouver, pp. 179–180.

Meo, A.I. (2010), "Picturing Students' Habitus: The Advantages and Limitations of Photo-Elicitation Interviewing in a Qualitative Study in the City of Buenos Aires", *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 149–171.

Michel, L. (1999), "Combining focus groups and interviews: telling how it is; telling how it feels", in Rosaline S. Barbour and Jenny Kitzinger (Eds.), *Developing Focus Group Research*, Sage Publications, London, pp. 36–46.

Miller, R. and Michelson, G. (2013), "Fixing the game? Legitimacy, morality policy and research in gambling", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Springer, Vol. 116 No. 3, pp. 601–614.

Miotto, G. and Vilajoana-Alejandre, S. (2019), "Gender equality: a tool for legitimacy in the fast fashion industry", *Harvard Deusto Business Research*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 134–147.

Miotto, G. and Youn, S. (2020), "The impact of fast fashion retailers' sustainable collections on corporate legitimacy: examining the mediating role of altruistic attributions", *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol. 19 No. 6, pp. 618–631.

Morgan, D.L. (1997), *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research: Planning and Research Design for Focus Groups*, 2nd ed., Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Murphy, P.E., Laczniak, G.R., Bowie, N.E. and Klein, T.A. (2005), *Ethical Marketing*,

Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Ng, N., Weinehall, L. and Öhman, a. (2007), "'If I don't smoke, I'm not a real man' - Indonesian teenage boys' views about smoking", *Health Education Research*, Vol. 22 No. 6, pp. 794–804.

Nichter, M., Padmawati, S., Danardono, M., Ng, N., Prabandari, Y. and Nichter, M. (2009), "Reading culture from tobacco advertisements in Indonesia", *Tobacco Control*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 98–107.

Payne, G., Cruz-Suarez, A. and Prado-Román, A. (2018), "Legitimacy as competitive advantage: a US airline case study", in Díez-De-Castro, E. and Peris-Orti, M. (Eds.), *Organizational Legitimacy: Challenges and Opportunities for Businesses and Institutions*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 121–140.

Prabandari, Y.S. and Dewi, A. (2016), "How do Indonesian youth perceive cigarette advertising? A cross-sectional study among Indonesian high school students", *Global Health Action*, Vol. 9, pp. 1–14.

Ragland, C.B., Brouthers, L.E. and Widmier, S.M. (2015), "Institutional theory and international market selection for direct selling", *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 538–555.

Sama, T.B. and Hiilamo, H. (2019), "Alcohol industry strategies to influence the reform of the Finnish Alcohol Law", *Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, Vol. 36 No. 6, pp. 556–568.

Schewe, E. (2017), "Why do so many Indonesian men smoke?", *JSTOR Daily*, available at: https://daily.jstor.org/why-do-so-many-indonesian-men-smoke/ (accessed 12 October 2018).

Scott, W.R. (1995), *Institutions and Organizations*, SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Selamet, J. (2019), "How to make anti-smoking campaigns more persuasive", *The*

Conversation, available at: https://theconversation.com/how-to-make-anti-smoking-campaigns-more-persuasive-116819 (accessed 15 November 2020).

Septiono, W., Kuipers, M.A.G., Ng, N. and Kunst, A.E. (2021), "Self-reported exposure of Indonesian adolescents to online and offline tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship (TAPS)", *Tobacco Control*, pp. 1–8.

Siebert, S., Martin, G. and Simpson, G. (2020), "Rhetorical strategies of legitimation in the professional field of banking", *Journal of Professions and Organizations*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 134–155.

Slimane, K.B., Chaney, D., Humphreys, A. and Leca, B. (2019), "Bringing institutional theory to marketing: taking stock and future research directions", *Journal of Business Research*, Elsevier Inc., Vol. 105, pp. 389–394.

Suchman, M.C. (1995), "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches", *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20 No. 3, p. 571.

Suddaby, R., Bitektine, A. and Haack, P. (2017), "Legitimacy", *Academy of Management Annals*, Academy of Management AnnalsBriarcliff Manor, NY, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 451–478.

Terry, G. (2016), "Doing thematic analysis", in Lyons, E. and Coyle, A. (Eds.), *Analysing Qualitative Data in Psychology*, 2nd ed., Sage Publications, London, pp. 104–118.

The Jakarta Post. (2019), "BREAKING: Information ministry bans cigarette ads on internet", *The Jakarta Post*, available at: https://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2019/06/13/breaking-information-ministry-bans-cigarette-ads-on-internet.html#:~:text=The Communications and Information Ministry,request from the Health Ministry. (accessed 15 November 2020).

Tinkler, P. (2013), *Using Photographs in Social and Historical Research*, Sage Publications, London.

Tjandra, N. (2018), "'Disneyland for Big Tobacco': how Indonesia's lax smoking laws are helping next generation to get hooked", *The Conversation*, available at: http://theconversation.com/disneyland-for-big-tobacco-how-indonesias-lax-smoking-laws-are-helping-next-generation-to-get-hooked-97489 (accessed 17 August 2019).

Tost, L.P. (2011), "An integrative model of legitimacy judgments", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 36 No. 4, pp. 686–710.

VanSandt, C. V, Shepard, J.M. and Zappa, S.M. (2006), "An examination of the relationships between ethical work climate and moral awareness", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 68 No. 4, pp. 409–432.

Vaz, M. (2015), "Gambling, legitimacy, and the limits of community", *Journal of Urban History*, Vol. 41 No. 6, pp. 1152–1159.

Walker, H.A. (2014), "Legitimacy and inequality", in McLeod, J.D., Lawler, E.J. and Schwalbe, M. (Eds.), *Handbook of the Social Psychology of Inequality*, Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 353–377.

WHO. (2018), "Factsheet 2018 Indonesia", available at: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/272673/wntd_2018_indonesia_fs.pdf?sequence=1 (accessed 4 March 2020).

Yang, Z. and Su, C. (2014), "Institutional theory in business marketing: a conceptual framework and future directions", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 43 No. 5, pp. 721–725.

Table I. Profile of participants

Characteristics		Focus groups	Interviews
Sex	Male	27	23
	Female	14	7
Marital status	Single	20	7
	Married	19	20
	Widowed	2	2
	Divorced	0	1
Age	18–24	12	4
	25–34	8	11
	35–44	5	3
	45–54	3	8
	55–64	4	2
	65+	5	1
	No answer	1	1
Highest education	No formal education	0	2
	Elementary school	0	0
	Junior high school	1	1
	Senior high school	26	18
	Bachelor’s degree	13	6
	Master’s degree	1	2
	Unemployed	4	1
	Student	9	1

Occupation	Civil servant	1	5
	Private sector employee	9	10
	Self-employed	10	10
	Retired	8	3
Income	Below IDR 1,000,000	13	1
	IDR 1,000,000–2,499,999	15	8
	IDR 2,500,000–4,999,999	7	14
	IDR 5,000,000-9,999,999	1	7
	Above 10,000,000	1	0
	No answer	4	1
Smoking status	Smoker	20	15
	Non-smoker	21	15

Table II. TAPS and centrality of smoking in society metaphors

Metaphor	Illustrative extracts	Interpretation
Keeping up with the boys/men	'My friends teased me and they called me sissy when I was an adolescent because I didn't smoke. They said it was awkward when we gathered with the other boys and I didn't smoke like the others'. (Interview NS11) 'I choose the pictures with many men because men are associated with smoking. I think if a man does not smoke, he is not a masculine man. Showing men in the advertisements are ethical because smoking is a male tradition'. (Interview S4) 'When seeing a tobacco advertisement with a slogan "Men have good taste" [i.e. Gudang Garam International brand], teenagers in their puberty, may think that I want to look like an adult or more	This metaphor captures the idea that smoking and the associated TAPS are central to the status of boys and men and represents a rite of passage in Indonesian society.

	masculine, so I will smoke that cigarette'. (Focus group S3B) 'In my village, when young boys were circumcised, they were given cigarettes to ease the pain. Maybe because when they were being circumcised, they were considered to be an adult, because they were brave for undergoing the circumcision'. (Focus group NS2D) 'Picture number 5 shows a man a horse. Cigarettes like Marlboro and Mustang are associated with horses and cowboy. I think they want to show masculinity. I don't think you can use a picture of a chicken. It has to be horses or bulls'. (Interview S3)	

Let's get together	'Indonesian culture is about gathering and socialising. Usually, when they gather, they will smoke'. (Interview NS3) 'I smoked since I was 17, but I didn't smoke regularly. I only smoked when meeting up with friends or going on a trip with them. I smoked because I wanted to strengthen my relationship with them and enjoy myself. Smoking is on our blood. If smokers meet smokers during this gathering, and we smoke together, it feels great'. (Interview S5) 'I experienced it myself. We socialised all night long. We had a chitchat, drank coffee and smoked in the veranda. It felt amazing. I tried to stop smoking, but if I sat next to my friends who smoked, I didn't dare to say anything'. (Interview S11) 'For example, a tobacco brand [LA Lights] organised a music band	This metaphor suggests that TAPS play into the centrality of smoking for socialising.

	competition [LA Lights Meet the Label]. I "liked" one of the music bands in that competition. Automatically all of my friends would know that I 'liked' the band as well as the tobacco brand. My teenage brother [who is on Facebook] could also see that I "liked" that band and the brand too. Although he could not see the product, he could remember and recognise who organised the competition and when he grows up he probably would use that brand'. (Focus group S2D)	
We are doing what our forefathers did	'Smoking is embedded in society. Truly embedded in society. Usually, in a gathering you have one or two people who don't smoke, they would move away from the smokers. In fact, if they don't smoke, they are considered not normal'. (Interview NS11) 'Smoking is our culture. More people smoke than not. Our ancestors were smokers. They mixed tobacco leaves,	This metaphor suggests that smoking is central to Indonesian society.

	cloves and traditional ingredients and smoked them. Nowadays, cigarettes produced by tobacco companies are better and healthier, they have a filter. If we close down the tobacco factories, we may end up producing cigarettes using the traditional method'. (Interview NS2) 'The first picture shows Balinese women, so it's about Balinese culture. Tobacco advertisements that are attractive to me are those that are related to the Indonesian culture and heritage, because smoking is part of our tradition. It's embedded in our society…. The second picture is a traditional Chinse opera performance. This also portrays that smoking is part of our history'. (Interview NS8)	

Table III. TAPS regulations and regulators metaphors

Metaphor	Illustrative extracts	Interpretation
Feet of clay	'From the health perspective, it's definitely harmful. My question is if it's harmful why is it still being produced? The health authority is going everywhere telling everyone not to smoke. But in reality, cigarettes are everywhere, even flourished'. (Focus group NS2D) 'I don't think the government can stop tobacco marketing. They have been paid by tobacco companies. So, what can they do? Perhaps the government can make cigarettes more expensive. Like in other countries, cigarettes are really expensive. So, people can think twice before buying cigarettes'. (Interview S5)	This metaphor stresses the idea that both TAPS regulations and regulators are weak.
Bystanders	'People are free to buy cigarettes. Both children and adults are free to buy cigarettes. Children can buy cigarettes and say they are for their dad. So, the law is not fully enforced'. (Focus group S3B)	This metaphor suggests that both regulations and regulators stand back and let TAPS activities flourish.

	‘This is a police officer statue. I think in Indonesia, most tobacco control regulations are breached. The tobacco control regulations are there to be broken. Like people smoking in an air-conditioned room or in public places. I think maybe because smoking is part of the society. It is truly the part of our society. So, even if this or that were banned, if the rules were broken, people just accepted them’. (Interviewee NS3) ‘Within the school environment, the stricter the regulations, the better. However, in the *kampung* [village] environment, it is more difficult. Strict regulations on selling cigarettes to children will not work. One child could buy one cigarette and share it with the other children’. (Focus group S1D)	

Paper tigers	'Picture number 6 shows a picture of drugs. I think tobacco should be perceived to be as dangerous as drugs. So, the government needs to be very concerned. But, I also realise that there are conflicting interests between the government and tobacco companies and tobacco industries. Because the tobacco industry is responsible for the livelihood of many people. So, if the government wants to implement stricter regulations, it's difficult, but they are also aware that the danger is similar to drugs. I consider cigarettes as drugs'. (Interview NS7) 'They keep saying about banning cigarettes but there is no actual intention of banning them. If smoking is not allowed, why do they allow tobacco companies to keep going and market their products? They're just bullshitting'. (Interviewee S5) 'If tobacco companies were closed down, what would happen to tobacco farmers. I pity them. The country's income will also	This metaphor emphasises the idea that while on the face of it, both TAPS regulations and regulators look strong, they are weak.

	be reduced. So, it is very dilemmatic. On one hand, we want our society to be healthy, their health is guaranteed. But, on the other hand, tobacco company closure would disturb the economy. For example, when the government was introducing stricter tobacco control regulations, the people of Temanggung, where they grow tobacco, protested. They protested on the stricter regulations. It's very dilemmatic for the government. On one hand, it's about protecting people's health, on the other hand, it's about the economy'. (Interviewee NS11) 'Picture number 10 shows people playing football. Smoking and sports are conflicting one another. We are told that smoking is bad for our health, but tobacco factories are still open. If they want us to quit smoking, they should close down all tobacco factories. If nobody sells cigarettes, nobody will smoke. I feel really sorry for the tobacco employees. But, if they want us to quit	

	smoking, they should close down the tobacco factories'. (Interview S12)	

Table IV. tobacco firms' activities metaphors

Metaphor	Illustrative extracts	Interpretation
White Knights	'I don't sympathise with tobacco advertisements, because they are just for fun, they are funny. But I do sympathise with the social help that they [tobacco companies] provide. For example, in *kampung* [small village] people were asked to create groups. The groups were given money by tobacco companies to start a business, to grow the economy'. (Interviewee S2) 'Picture number 2 shows people playing football. Tobacco companies usually sponsor football and other sports. They usually give the most money and prizes. For examples, Gudang Garam and Djarum, both sponsor sports. Djarum also sponsors sports scholarships and badminton. Sports are seen by a lot of people. People will see cigarette brands, so they use them to promote their products. It's OK, if they	This metaphor stresses the idea that tobacco firms are doing good for society, the economy and the community.

	stop who is going to sponsor sports?' (Interviewee S3) 'Tobacco companies are aiming at *warung-warung* [small shops]. For example, we can find *warung* [a small shop] next to a school being supplied by cigarettes. The community doesn't see anything wrong with it. So, when students go out of their school, they see tobacco advertising in front of their school gate. They could buy cigarettes easily. I think, even though it's allowed and legal, it's not ethical because they are selling cigarettes in the school environment'. (Focus group NS3D) 'Pocari Sweat can sponsor small sporting event, but they are not able to sponsor big sporting events, such as badminton. Badminton is a global event. Who will be able to sponsor a global event like badminton? For big events, only cigarette companies are able to sponsor them'. (Focus Group S1B)	

Wolves in sheep's clothing	'If you look closer, I think tobacco it's [tobacco companies helping natural disaster victims] an evil practice. It's like they revel in someone else's misfortune. They're enemies in blankets'. (Interviewee NS14) 'When there were natural disasters, like a volcano explosion, the biggest donators were tobacco companies…. When there was a volcano explosion recently, the main banner at the rescue area was Djarum 76…. They promoted their brand during a disaster. They gave out a lot of money. Their sales promotion girls were also there. They sold three packs of cigarettes for the price of two. When the Red Cross team knew that they were selling cigarettes, they were told off. They were allowed to help out but not selling. You would shudder if you saw that. This is trying to revel in somebody else's misfortune. How come victims who don't have money were asked to buy cigarettes? You gave them food and	

	you asked them to buy cigarettes in return'. (Interviewee NS14) 'Tobacco companies sponsoring scholarship, is against the purpose of education. But I think it happens because tobacco companies have money. My university [has] a library corner sponsored by a tobacco company. The corner has business-related books. That's students' favourite place. The corner has the coolest temperature and fastest Wi-Fi…. I am worried that students will think that there is nothing wrong with tobacco companies'. (Interviewee NS1) 'When tobacco companies organise events, the purpose of these events is to gather young people. Usually the events will be sponsored by companies. In a way, it is ethical because you don't have to organise it on your own. They will say, let's organise dangdutan [folk music event], we will sponsor you…. It's like using one bomb to kill many people, do	

	you know what I mean?' (Interviewee NS14) 'Tobacco companies are like a wolf in sheep's clothing. They appear good only to find support. What they do is legal, people even defended them. They would say we won't be able to go to school without tobacco companies. Tobacco companies created pro-smoking activities and covering it up with scholarships'. (Focus group NS3F) 'Picture number 6 [four smiling little boys] reminds me of the CSR activities of tobacco companies. They help during natural disaster. They also help orphans. I think it's deceptive. We need to evaluate their intention. If they sincerely and continuously provide help to the society, and not only to build their brand image, that's good. But if they only help once with the purpose of popularising their brand, that's not good. We must not mix what tobacco companies do, the effect of	

	smoking and their CSR activities. Whilst smoking is not good for health but they also use their money to help the society, so that's good. What's wrong is if their CSR target children and they also give children cigarettes to enhance the company's success. If tobacco companies want to help, they must do it without frills'. (Interview NS5)	