**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT**

# Reflections from a Collectivist Culture: A Qualitative Analysis on Archetypal Characters

**Safak Sahin**
Instructor, Bahcesehir University, Turkiye

*Abstract:*
*The current study aims to reveal the meanings associated with archetypal characters (Creator, Magician, Sage, Caregiver, Innocent, Lover, Hero, Ruler, Outlaw, Everyman/woman, Explorer, Jester) by the young Turkish consumers. Since they embody potent meanings and values, these images when triggered may provide brands with the short-cuts to create an effective communication with the consumers. However, they are not immune to cultural impacts. Therefore, to have a deeper understanding of the archetypal meanings necessitates looking at other geographies than the West where archetype theories are born. Yet, little is known. This study attempts to expand the literature by exploring the mental associations regarding the 12 archetypal characters from a collectivist culture perspective. The results of the study show that the definitional frameworks of the participants in terms of archetypal characters are distinct from the Western culture.*

*Keywords: Archetypal characters, collectivist culture, young consumers, focus group*

## 1. The Concept of Archetype and Culture

Jung (1968) proposed that human figures can be arranged around similar traits and typical mode of conducts and defined them as archetypes. In his view, archetype is a unifying concept that represents personification of certain behaviors that reside in the collective unconscious of mankind as "motifs, primordial images or types" (Jung 1968, 153) and becomes visible through mythic narratives. In their neo-archetypal theory, Faber and Mayer (2009) describe archetypes as mental models of others represented through generic story characters that generate emotion laden automatic responses in the viewer. They posited that archetypes are not hereditary but acquired through enculturation. Their approach emphasized the impact of learning on people's definition of archetypes and dismissed Jungian universalism and his perception of archetypes as psychic imprints beyond history and geography. Similarly, Rowland (2002: 29) revised Jung's conception of archetype by defining it as a person's "inborn potential for a certain sort of image". Within the confines of her view, an archetypal image (e.g. a story character) is susceptible to environmental influences in the sense that the individual is a subject at the intersection of place, culture and time.

Henderson (1990) coined the term "cultural unconscious" as an intermediary dimension between the collective and the individual unconscious and saw it as the repository of the psychologically potent images called archetypes. Adams (2010) posited that cultural unconscious comprised of stereotypes and stereotypical images embodying values that reflect emotional sensitivities of a culture. These values are subject to change from society to society. In that sense; cultural unconscious is a dynamic field where the meaning of the archetypal images is mediated by the historical memory of a society (Henderson, 1990) and the symbol-sets that a specific culture persistently and coherently reinforces (Wehr, 1987). Therefore, culture is a mediating force shaping individual's perception of archetypes and the symbolic meanings surrounding them.

Currently, Western research dominates the investigation of archetypes and their use in advertisement (Caldwell et al., 2010; Gröppel-Klein et al., 2006; Tsai, 2006; Goodman et al.,2002). However, "cultural distinctions have been demonstrated to have important implications for advertising content, persuasiveness of appeals, consumer motivation, consumer judgment process and consumer response style" (Shavitt et al., 2008: 1103). Hofstede (2001) has defined cultures under two categories as individualistic and collectivist. Some European countries and North America are considered individualistic cultures where individual goals and needs are given priority over the group goals and needs (Zhang and Gelb, 1996). Hence, existent advertisement knowledge on archetypes comes mainly from individualistic cultures. The insights reflecting other geographic regions and cultures are important in terms of the extension of the academic inquiry on the subject. Within this framework; this exploratory study among Turkish consumers who are part of the value systems, beliefs and perception processes of a collectivist culture where people have an interdependent relationship with one another and the interest of the group prevails in shaping behaviors (Hofstede et al., 2010) may present useful implications for further cross-cultural literature on archetypes and contributions for bridging the gap.

## 2. Archetypes as Character Models

Contemporary marketing discussions on archetypes revolve around 12 or 13 character models. These are Creator, Caregiver, Everyman/woman, Explorer, Hero, Innocent, Jester, Lover, Magician, Outlaw, Ruler, Sage and Shadow (Mark and Pearson, 2001; Batey, 2008; Hartwell and Chen, 2012). In today's advertisement environment where the management of meaning that each brand entails becomes more and more vital, archetypes provide the short cuts that marketers need in order to differentiate themselves from competitors and to find ways for effective consumer segmentation. By reflecting particular modes of thinking and behaviors and manifesting specific personality traits archetypes are agents of a brand's worldview. They are the symbolic means for brands to portray how life should be lived.

Definitions of each archetype based on the characteristics they represent are provided in Table 1. Mark and Pearson (2001) asserted that these 12 archetypes cluster around four motivational factors that govern people's lives: Belonging, independence, stability and mastery. Each archetype is identified according to the need that it fulfills. Creator, Caregiver and Ruler are linked with people's need for stability and security whereas Hero, Outlaw and Magician are associated with risk taking and mastery. Jester, Everyman/woman and Lover reflect the desire to belong either by pleasing others or by conforming. Conversely; the longing for independence is manifested in Innocent, Explorer and Sage archetypes.

| Archetype | Definition |
|---|---|
| Caregiver | A devoted, sacrificing, and nurturing person: Compassionate, generous, protective, and parental. One who is benevolent, friendly, helping, and trusting. |
| Creator | An innovative and artistic person; perhaps a dreamer, looking for novelty and a standard of aesthetic beauty. Emphasizes quality (over quantity), highly internally driven and inventive. |
| Everyman/Everywoman | The common person; the underdog; the working class. One who is persevering, ordered, wholesome, and candid. Self-deprecating; perhaps cynical but realistic. |
| Explorer | An independent, free-willed adventurer. One who seeks self-discovery: Solitary but strong-willed; an observer of the environment. Constantly moving; a "wanderer". |
| Hero | A courageous warrior or crusader undertaking arduous tasks to prove themselves and become an inspiration. A symbol of redemption and human strength. |
| Innocent | A pure, faithful, childlike character. Humble and tranquil; longing for happiness and simplicity. A traditionalist; perhaps naïve but symbolizing renewal. |
| Jester | Living for fun and amusement; a playful and mischievous comedian. One who is sometimes irresponsible; a prankster. Enjoys most a good time and diversion from care. |
| Lover | An intimate, sensual and passionate person. Seeking mainly pleasure, delightful, but often jelous and impulsive. A warm, erotic and enthusiastic partner. |
| Magician | A fundementalist; a visionary scientist or physicist. One who seeks principles of development and how things work; a performer in natural forces and transformations. |
| Outlaw | A rebellious rule-breaker, misfit or iconoclast. May be angry and vengeful. Can be wild, destructive and provoking from a long time spent surviving, struggling or injured. |
| Ruler | A highly influential leader, boss or judge. Possessing a strong sense of power and control: Stubborn, even tyrannical. Highly dominant, as an administrator or a manager of others. |
| Sage | One who values enlightenment, truth and understanding. A wise guide and counselor: scholarly, philosophical, intelligent; perhaps a bit pretentious. |

*Table 1: Archetype Definitions*
*Faber (2009)*

Alternatively, Faber and Mayer (2009) provided a 5-factor model to categorize 12 archetypes based on their shared personality traits: (1) The Knower (Creator, Magician, Sage), (2) The Carer (Caregiver, Innocent, Lover), (3) The Striver (Hero, Ruler), (4) The Conflictor (Outlaw), (5) The Everyperson (Everyman/woman, Explorer, Jester). However, different cultural meanings and values associated with these archetypes may generate dissimilar factor models. This study aims also to shed light on such divergences by revealing cultural connotations of each archetype in the minds of the young consumers in Turkey. In that sense, it represents a first in Turkey.

## 3. Methodology

5 focus groups with a total of 32 participants were held in Istanbul between 1 November and 15 December, 2014. The objective of the focus groups was to generate an understanding of the cultural meanings associated with archetypes as character typologies. Participants in the focus groups were selected with convenient sampling method. They were recruited and conducted in a private university. The overall makeup of the participants was relatively homogenous with respect to age, marital status and education. All of the participants were private university students, single (never married) and between the ranges of 18 to 22 years old.

The participants in focus groups were asked questions derived from the research aim of the study and the previous literature on the topic. The focus group interviews were comprised of three phases. In the first phase, questions aimed to reveal the mental frame of reference of the participants regarding 12 archetype categories. In the next phase, participants were prompted to define the underlying personality traits of each archetype. In the final phase, participants' interpretation of the diverging and converging features of the archetypes was explored.

Focus group discussions were video and audio-recorded and transcripts were transcribed by two senior university students in exchange for extra credit. Data were analyzed by open coding, during which specific themes regarding 12 archetypes were identified within each transcript. Quotations included in this study were compiled from responses to the same question across the focus groups.

Several issues, however, should be kept in mind in evaluating the findings. These focus groups were drawn from a single university. The sample size and choice of group participants may not be viewed as fully representative of the youth in Turkey. Results may only apply to primarily young urban consumers and not to their rural counterparts. These limitations can be eliminated by using larger and random sample sizes in the forthcoming researches.

## 4. Findings and Discussion

### 4.1. The Knower: Creator, Sage, Magician

#### 4.1.1. Creator
The archetypes Creator, Magician and Sage are the representatives of a category that stands for the act of knowing (Faber and Mayer, 2009). The participants have defined the archetype Creator as someone intelligent who can come up with innovative, different and original ideas, and see the connections that are invisible to others. From this perspective, the Creator is the person who can reveal new relationships among different types of information in the eye of the participants.

 ➢ "Building connections, establishing relationships among the information acquired… The originality emerges from these very connections…"
 ➢ "For example when I look here I see a sandwich but perhaps someone who is creative will see something completely different when s/he looks at the same spot."

An inseparable component of creativity is intelligence. Departing from here, the image of the Creator corresponds with the example of Steve Jobs. In the minds of the participants he represents the inventor.

 ➢ "It could be Steve Jobs. He is the one who introduced the concept of touch screens. What started with shuffling became something that allows us to listen to music online at reasonable costs. Later, he combined this technology with mobile phones, which again allowed us to listen to music or, watch videos online on smartphones. Touch screen is in our lives due to him. He has made it possible for us to communicate with the act of touching."

In short, the archetype Creator is defined as someone who can transform knowledge by establishing new connections.

#### 4.1.2. Sage
The archetype Sage corresponds with such adjectives as experienced, learned, mystical and (almost) holy. Thus, sagacity expresses a state that results from the accumulation of knowledge and experience. From this perspective, the type of knowledge possessed by the Sage does not relate with the academic type of knowledge as exemplified in the cases of Einstein and Socrates within the western culture (Batey, 2008).

 ➢ "I don't think we can define someone at the age of 35 a Sage; life experience is a prerequisite for such definitions."
 ➢ "Those who can be tagged as Sages are generally old and have a learned quality to themselves regardless of whether this 'learnedness' comes from formal education, or not. They have more knowledge than younger ones due to experience."
 ➢ "A Sage might not have been exposed to formal education and yet, s/he is someone who has come in touch with, or earned a certain type of knowledge that relates to the meaning of this world and also of the afterworld."

Other qualities that the participants associated (in an emphasized fashion) with the archetype Sage is the ability to provide guidance and show direction. Similar associations regarding the Sage can also be found in the literature (Vogler, 2007; Mark and Pearson, 2001). The Sage is a mentor that offers advice to the participants - with the use of his/her knowledge and experience - in overcoming the obstacles they may encounter in their lives.

 ➢ "The Sage offers advice… We can say that s/he offers advice in situations whereby you find yourself in trouble and need help on certain topics…"
 ➢ "The Sage does not grant knowledge to people directly, but assists them in discovering the knowledge on their own by making them think. Thus, having a look at the examples around, Mevlana and his similars seem to be more rationally fitting for this role…"

What is particularly striking here is that as different from Western oriented literature (Hartwell and Chen, 2012; Mark and Pearson, 2001) the Sage is not perceived as a figure who is distilled from emotions, objective and a representative of pragmatism. The Sage represents an intuitional mind rather than a rational one, and is related more to metaphysics than science. S/he is considered as an equal of the mystic than of the pundit. S/he carries information that belongs to a world beyond ours – i.e. the one we can observe and experience. According to Mark and Pearson (2001) the type of knowledge in the possession of the archetype Sage is the one that relates to the highest levels of experience.

 ➢ "Someone who has divorced himself from the world as we know it, someone who has given up on worldly affairs…"

> ➤ "The word Sage brings the Tibetan monks to my mind."

In the participants' definitions, the archetype Sage also appears as a character that has given up on worldly pleasures. The Sage represents the heart as opposed to the wisdom. Therefore, such concepts as intelligence, scientificity and others in relation to these are associated more with the archetype Creator than the Sage.

### 4.1.3. Magician

The Magician, which is the last figure within the category of the Knower, is perhaps the most problematic of all. In view of the participants, the Magician represents an occupation rather than a character. The participants were offered such concepts from the existing literature on archetypes as the alchemist, the visionary and the shaman (Hartwell and Chen, 2012) as clues to excavating the relevant images in their minds. However, it was observed that none of these concepts were associated with the archetype Magician by the participants. Evaluations made were limited to the denotative meaning of the Magician. Images with respect to this archetype do not go beyond such terms as illusion and/or the illusionist.

> ➤ "Illusion is more about tricking someone into thinking in a certain way than creating something out of nothing but I do not mean this in a bad way – nor do I imply that the Magician is a charlatan… Yet I do think that the Magician is someone who manipulates your perception by tricking your vision and thus, tricks you with the use of illusion."
> ➤ "I am thinking of magicians performing an act, or certain characters in cartoon films – such as the Gargamel…"

The archetype Magician narrates the ability to cross the boundaries of thinking, emotions and existence with the use of inner-awarenesses and new experiences (Pearson, 1998). Such concepts as the shaman, the wizard, the alchemist, the healer and the mystic appear to relate more to the archetype Sage -as mentioned earlier- than to the Magician as defining terms in the minds of the participants. These terms activate images and thoughts in relation to the archetype Sage than the Magician. The defining framework provided in the literature with respect to the archetype Magician does not correspond with the mental repertoire of the participants. The Magician is a figure that entertains people by manipulating their perceptions, thus unworthy of trust.

> ➤ "The Magician, I think, is a deceiver…"
> ➤ "Someone who is able to flabbergast others."

### 4.2. The Striver: Hero

### 4.2.1. Hero

Distinct characteristics that define the Hero figure –as uttered by the participants- seem to be in parallel with the concepts provided in the literature (Hartwell and Chen, 2012; Faber and Mayer, 2009). Within the given context, the archetype Hero is defined as someone who is a savior and an enemy of the evil with the qualities of being altruistic, brave and fearless.

> ➤ "The Hero must be fearless. S/he should be able to sacrifice himself for others."
> ➤ "A Hero needs to be brave, and to take it one step further, s/he needs to be brave enough to offer his/her life for others."

When asked to exemplify the Hero, some of the initial names uttered by the participants included Atatürk and Ghandi. Both figures are conventionally described as 'national heroes' who led movements of freedom in their respective countries. The essential power of the Hero who sacrifices himself for collective good lies in his/her ability to transform the society that s/he has sacrificed himself/herself for (Hartwell and Chen, 2012). Among the most powerful trigger effects of the archetype Hero is its aptitude for realizing societal transformation. In this respect, the Hero is a savior - and in fact, more a liberator than a rescuer.

### 4.3. Ruler

The Ruler represents such skills as strength and the power to control (Hartwell ve Chen, 2012). Some of the concepts that come in the minds of the participants when the Hero is mentioned are control, authority and power. This confirms that the archetype Ruler matches with its definition in the literature (Faber, 2009).

> ➤ "For it to control the people it needs authority."
> ➤ "At the end of the day, s/he needs people to abide with his/her words to be able to become the ruler. You need power to achieve all of this."

However, as the definitions of the participants get deeper regarding the Ruler figure, darker aspects of the archetype become visible. In the definitions of the participants, devotion gets replaced by egoism; leadership gets replaced by tyranny, and the acts of governance get replaced by the act of domination.

> ➤ "When we use the word Ruler, it is inevitable that we also imply dictatorship."
> ➤ "What the term Ruler directly brings to my mind is an obsessed love of power. When you think about the Ottoman rule too, we know of rulers who massacred, or suffocated their own sons just so they could remain on the throne; the ruler cares for himself more than the others."
> ➤ "The ruler does not want to lose, or give anything. S/he is an egoist; totally inept in making sacrifices."

Other qualities that stand for the more positive aspects of the Ruler figure such as leadership, devotion and bravery appear as concepts that relate with and activate the archetype Ruler on the imagery maps of the participants.

*4.4. The Carer: Innocent, Caregiver, Lover*

4.4.1. Innocent
The Innocent is an archetype that represents the hope for a better world and the trust for life (Pearson, 1998). It tends to appear in the images of childish and naïve youth. Those figures, which represent the Innocent in the imageries of the participants are babies, animals and the elderly.
   ➢   "For me, babies are those who have not yet been tainted by bad feelings."
Innocence is not considered as a concept that belongs to the adult world. It is only achieved when one does not sought after the offerings of the material world and this is an almost impossible mission to be accomplished by adults. From this perspective, whereas infancy –symbolizing the beginning of man's life cycle- is related with a state that is not marked by an awareness of the material world, senility –symbolizing the end- is related with a state that has overcome the offerings of the same material world. Therefore, in the eyes of the participants, the Innocent is a utopic figure that cannot exist in-between these transitional states.
   ➢   "Because when you get old, you no longer have a goal to achieve; you are already there."
   ➢   "I can only think of the lunatics and kids… Those who cannot be considered as properly sane."
Mark and Pearson (2001) demonstrate how the various layers of archetype Innocent range from a childish simplicity to a mystic integrity. The participants' impressions of the archetype Innocent induce such sensations as naivety, trust and a heavenly sense of peace that are characteristic of the first layer of the archetype.

4.4.2. Caregiver
The Caregiver, which represents one of the archetypes of the Carer category, is a figure that is quite familiar to the participants. One of the reasons that explain this familiarity is the rich experiences of the participants that relate to the archetype. Among the initial images that appear in the minds of the participants as an example for the Caregiver are family and the mother figure. Such concepts as devotion, compassion, and unconditional love and support, which define the archetype, find their reflections in the family institution and mother figure.
   ➢   "What comes to my mind is the mother because she is always there for you. They support, stand by and protect you even if you make mistakes."
   ➢   "Our families are those who are there for us from the first moment that we open our eyes to this world."
   ➢   "The Caregiver must protect you without seeking any interests. That's what mothers do, whatever the issue may be."

4.4.3. Lover
When the term Lover was mentioned, some of the first words uttered by the participants were "naïve, troubled, depressive, sensitive, and illogical". It was argued that the state of being in love triggers selfishness and jealousy. These descriptions reflect the dark side of romantic love (Mark and Pearson, 2001).
   ➢   "It brings selfishness to my mind; jealousy."
   ➢   "Love is some sort of an obsession."
In addition to these definitions, the Lover is forgetful and careless, almost to the point of not knowing himself.
   ➢   "Love forges things like this… A state of not knowing what to do, or what to say."
          Wertime (2008) refers to the archetype Lover as Siren and emphasizes that this archetype represents sexual attraction. Although archetype Lover shows parallels with the literature, it also diverges from it when it comes to the issue of sexual attraction. Hedonist definitions that include physical or sexual matters of attraction do not seem to appear in the mental repertoires of the participants. In their view, the Lover figure corresponds more with Mecnun who sacrifices himself for Laila than with Don Juan who mesmerizes women with his charm. The Aphrodite, who is a fundamental figure identified closely with love in Western mythology, uses her beauty to seduce and represents a character that bases her actions on lust and desire (Schmidt, 2001). However, archetype Lover is not a figure that symbolizes physical love in the views of the participants. It predominantly relates with romantic love, expressed through such emotions as longing and pain, than with erotic love that is marked by lust and desire.
   ➢   "The Lover is naïve, weak, and often troubled, especially when there is no return to his/her loves."

*4.5. The Conflictor: Outlaw*

4.5.1. Outlaw
The Outlaw initially brings such defining terms as someone who does not abide with the order of things, or independent in the minds of the participants. Alongside these, the name of the football fans' organization Çarşı is also uttered.
   ➢   "Çarşı is against all. Wherever there may be an incident – with only as little as five people involved - you sure know Çarşı is going to be there."
The participants define the archetype as a person who stands against the system, fights against taboos and does whatever s/he wants.
   ➢   "It's about rejecting the system that is imposed on you, or in other words, being rebellious…"
   ➢   "My sister… She doesn't do much of the stuff that majority of people around here do. That includes me too: Following the latest trends in fashion, buying something, showing interest in technology etc. She refuses all of that, and anything to do with money in general."

What activates the archetype Outlaw seems to be in parallel with what the literature suggests, that is some sort of anger towards life and prejudices (Batey, 2008; Mark and Pearson, 2001). The Outlaw is someone who is otherized and/or stigmatized by the society in which s/he lives.

- ➤ "When people start talking about the Outlaw, I find that prejudices get in the way. It is almost as though we are insulting someone when we use the word Outlaw - like, the person in question thinks in the wrong way by being rebellious."
- ➤ "The Outlaw is a distinct person with a distinct character and way of thinking. Those who are quickly tagged as Outlaws are usually the people who are distinct from others. These kinds of judgements are rarely based on actions."

The Outlaw appears as one of the few archetypes that correspond almost completely with the literature and demonstrates a strong presence in the mental repertoires of the participants.

*4.6. The Every Person: Everyman/woman, Explorer, Jester*

4.6.1. Everyman/woman
The Everyman/woman is an archetype that is both familiar to the participants and demonstrates strong presence in their cultural memory. Prior to moving on to the questions, a discussion was held on the concept of 'ordinariness' which lends its meaning to the archetype as it appears in the literature. In the mental maps of the participants, such terms as "monotonous, plain, easy, mainstream, majority, just-like-anybody, uninteresting, conservative, and undesirable" were presented as the equals of ordinariness. According to Hartwell and Chen (2012), the 'commonness' that is represented by Everyman/woman and presented by the state of being a human is a positive aspect of the archetype. However, in view of the participants, the "commonness" in question narrates a state of "melting among the majority" and a story that belongs to the man/woman on the street more than being a positive feature.

- ➤ "We are not talking about a minority here, it's a crowd. Who are these people? All of us. Those who appear in the metrobus, metro, minibus."
- ➤ "Majority. Us. All of us."
- ➤ "Ordinariness has something to do with being average."

Faber (2009) defines the Everyman/woman as a person who is critical yet grounded as s/he comes up with criticism. Hartwell and Chen (2012) explain this statement with a willingness to accept life as it is. The expressions of the participants, however, indicate that "the willingness to accept life as it is" results from a certain passivism rather than realism. Thus, they are interpreted as being more conformist than critical.

- ➤ "For example, men attend the university. Then they join the army. Then they get married. This is a standard model presented to men by Turkish families. I know that once I hit 26, my family will start insisting that I get married. The day I accept this, I will become ordinary."
- ➤ "Abiding with what is considered conventional or mainstream..."

In previous studies, the Everyman/woman is defined as an individual who is who s/he appears to be and sincere. Such positive features of the archetype as non-artificial, authentic (Hartwell and Chen, 2012) were not uttered by the participants. The Everyman/woman does not stand as a non-artificial and authentic person in their mental repertoires. The archetype makes reference to an individual that melts among the society rather than someone who makes a contribution to the workings of the society. Although the participants are aware that ordinariness is among the common denominators of human beings, it is not considered as a desirable element of personal character.

- ➤ "Someone who thinks and acts rigidly. People who conform with social structures. They remind me of the herd mentality."
- ➤ "Someone who can be convinced very easily…"

The archetype is corresponded with a very specific class structure in the literature: The working class (Faber, 2009; Mark and Pearson, 2001) Yet, according to the participants, the Everyman/woman does not belong to specific class structures. Instead, it points at a 'situation' relating to an individual.

- ➤ "I could make class statements regarding this figure but it would not necessarily be a low class structure. I see ordinariness in people of higher classes too."

Among the positive features of Everyman/woman, the participants count no-risk-taking, relaxed, passivism, conformism. However, these positive features correspond more with the challenges of the archetype in the literature – such as ignorance, adaptation to life's routine (Hartwell and Chen, 2012).

- ➤ "Someone who cannot be bothered to move a step, rather than someone who is grounded."

4.6.2. Explorer
The archetype Explorer is a figure that aims to accomplish himself/herself by exploring the world (Mark and Pearson, 2001). According to the participants, though, the Explorer is an adventurer that is interested in gaining new experiences through his/her travels rather than accomplishing himself.

- ➤ "Curious. Someone who is energetic, knowledgeable and curious about the world and other cultures."

In the literature, the archetype represents a process through which one gets to know himself/herself by stepping away from social roles, taboos and norms (Mark and Pearson, 2001). What activates the Explorer –which intersects with the Outlaw when it comes to the tendency to escape from the order and taboos - is not anger but the will to accomplish himself/herself. The Explorer appears in parallel with what the literature narrates in the mental repertoires of the participants – i.e. curious, free, brave, adventurous, and knowledgeable.

#### 4.6.3. Jester

The archetype Jester is defined as a person who is funny, joyous, prankster, childish and anti-heroic with a tendency of cunningness (Hartwell and Chen, 2012; Mark and Pearson, 2001). The Jester makes one laugh either with his/her wisdom, or stupidity. For the participants, the most striking feature of the Jester is his/her 'funniness'. Therefore, prior to moving on to questions regarding the archetype, the term funny was discussed in an attempt to clarify its meaning for the participants. The need for such discussion comes from the fact that the term funny will differ from one cultural perspective to another. Departing from here, it was assessed whether any such element deriving from cultural background is in effect in the identification of what is funny. When the participants were asked what they find funny, such comedians as Cem Yılmaz, Tolga Çevik, Şafak Sezer, Ferhan Şensoy, Kemal Sunal, Şener Şen, Ellen de Generes, and Adam Sandler; movie characters as Recep İvedik, and sit-coms as Seinfield, Friends, Two&A Half Man, The Big Bang Theory, Leyla ile Mecnun and Kardeş Payı were uttered. Within the specific context of Turkey, the most popular answer to who the funniest person is turned out to be Cem Yılmaz.

> ➢ "Cem Yılmaz talks about the things that he experiences in real life and that is exactly how he attracts his audience."
> ➢ "The humour needs to derive from our lives. It needs to be something from the neighbourhood, something real."
> ➢ "I think it is because he caricaturizes what we see in normal life that we laugh at them. We find it funny because he makes real life experiences funny."

The Jester, in the expressions of the participants, is described as a real life character and one-of-us. In these respects, it intersects with the archetype Everyman/woman.

When the participants are asked what they laugh about Cem Yılmaz, it can be observed that one of the defining features of archetype Jester - that is, provocative reasoning (Hartwell and Chen, 2012) - is perceived as one of the fundamental elements of comedy by the participants. They propose that comedy needs to be different and creative, and that it also requires intelligence.

> ➢ "If there is no intelligence, then there is no humor."

The Jester is also represented as an idiot and a fool who can be tricked easily in the folkloric narratives (Jung, 1959). The participants stated that as much as they laugh at intelligent jokes, they also laugh at difficult situations that one may fall in, certain types of idiocities, or comments that derive from ignorance. These statements seem to confirm some of the expressions in Jung's definition of the archetype Jester, which reads "his extraordinary clumsiness and lack of instinct" (1959, s.264).

> ➢ "We laugh at embarrassing moments and statements of ignorance. For example, the vox pop interviews. We randomly ask people on the street where China is in the world and then we laugh at the answers because they contain mistakes of ignorance; we laugh at and make fun of them. We say, "Oh I cannot believe s/he thinks China is in America.""

The participants see the humorous ways in which situations and people are presented as comedy and they consider those who are the makers of such comedy as comical. They also tend to define some of the characters, given as examples, with such terms as 'repulsive', 'smartass' and 'cunning'. However, what is important for the participants is that these people succeed in revealing the comedy hidden in what we perceive as normal situations.

> ➢ "Not necessarily tragic, but things that relate to everyday life like travelling on the metrobus; what we are really doing there is to stuff ourselves into a vehicle like canned fish. When you start looking at it that way, it becomes funny. When someone touches upon something that we do but not think about, it feels funny…"

When the participants were asked whether they laugh at more naïve characters in the attempt to address other defining features of the archetype, some of the first names that came to minds were Kemal Sunal and Şener Şen. Although archetype Jester does involve childishness and naivety, these terms are only used by the participants when they are reminded of them.

> ➢ "His films are so great, one can never get enough of them; every time it feels like you are watching it for the first time. Those films are so naïve. When I say naïve, I don't mean to say stupid. Instead, they are unspoilt; much more sincere…"

### 5. Conclusion

"Advertising and mass media freely draw from mythic archetypes and plotlines to create compelling stories, characters and promotional appeals" (Thompson, 2004, s.162). Archetypes can be considered as means to trigger the consumers' mental collaboration. This thought may explain why the study of archetypes in advertisement has gained a momentum in the past twenty years (Hartwell and Chen, 2012; Caldwell et al., 2010; Faber and Mayer, 2009; Gröppel-Klein et al., 2006; Tsai, 2006; Hirschman, 2004; Mark and Pearson, 2001). The studies in question were realized upon three main axis that include characters, brand logos and brand personality (Caldwell et al., 2010). Almost all of these studies and those fundamental theories in archetypes, which have become the main sources for these studies, originate from the West. Therefore it has been inevitable that the archetypes in the literature and the defining features of these archetypes also originate from Western cultures. The aim of this study is to take a leading step in revealing the extent to which 12 archetypes representing prototypical characters (Faber and Mayer, 2009) overlap with the archetypical meanings in the minds of young consumers within the context of Turkey – a country that is often shown as an example of collective culture societies (Hofstede et al., 2010).

Departing from this, the results of the study demonstrate that there are four important points of divergence from Western literature. The first is the transitive and overlapping relationship among the archetypes Creator, Sage and Magician under the Knower category of Faber and Mayer (2009). It was observed that the defining boundaries of archetype Sage encompass the archetype Magician in the mental repertoires of the participants. In other words, the Magician melts into the Sage. Some of the most fundamental defining images of the Magician, which include the shaman, wizard, alchemist, healer and mystic, are all associated with the Sage. When we look at the transitive relationship between two archetypes that are the Sage and the Creator, we can see that the Sage - representing the

rational mind- is replaced by the Creator. The Sage represents the intuitional rather than the rational mind in the mental repertoires of the participants.

The second point of divergence, according to the results, originates from the archetype Lover. In previous studies, such defining elements as desire, lust, physical attraction etc. were considered to reflect the way in which the archetype is experienced. In view of this study's participants, however, what represents the archetype Lover is a much higher state of love that is *romantic* love. The participants mentioned the physical aspects of love only when they were reminded of them. Lover, within this framework, is the embodied version of pain, longing born out of having fallen apart, and a state of losing oneself due to longing. Such adjectives as jealous, on the other hand, portray the dark side of the Lover archetype. In short, whereas physical accessibility identifies with archetype Lover in Western literature, it is physical inaccessibility and the pain resulting from it that identifies with the archetype according to this study. That is, the Lover is not the one who gets carried away, but the one who transcends with love. What is of interest is the mystic aspects of love rather than its hedonistic aspects. It was also observed that the most powerful representatives of romantic love in Eastern culture, Mevlana and Mecnun, are still valid images.

The third point of divergence shows that the defining elements of archetype Ruler reflect only the darker aspects of the archetype (Mark and Pearson, 2001). The figure in the mental maps of participants is limited to the authoritarian features of the Ruler. It is not a leader that guides the way; instead, it is a tyrant that accepts his path as the truest and demands absolute obedience from his/her followers.

The final point of divergence relates to the way in which the archetype Everyman/woman is represented in the minds of youngsters in Turkey. When Mark and Pearson (2001) define the existential state of Everyman/woman, they address the ordinariness and the pleasure of melting among crowds (due to this quality) as a benefit. The emphasis here is placed on a potential confidence provided by the possibility of becoming ordinary by melting into crowds. From the point of view of the participants, 'becoming common' symbolizes a certain state of disappearance whereas it is considered as a positive feature of Everyman/woman in the literature.

Results of this study demonstrate that there are differences between the definitions of archetypes used in Western and earlier research in advertisement and the perception of meanings attached to these archetypes by youngsters in Turkey. However, there is need for more extensive research in order to find out whether these differences are caused by factors in relation to the distinctions between collective and individual cultures. Within the given respects, this study should be considered as a first step both for the literature, and for Turkey.

## 6. References

i. Adams, M. V. (2010).The Mythological Unconscious. Putnam, CT: Spring.
ii. Batey, M. (2008).Brand Meaning. New York, London: Routledge.
iii. Caldwell, M., Henry, P. and Alman, A. (2010)."Constructing audio-visual representations of consumer archetypes".Qualitative Market Research13(1): 84-96.
iv. Faber, M. A.,(2009)"Understanding Personality Through Preferences in Popular Mass Media: An Archetypal Approach". PhD diss., University of New Hampshire.
v. Faber, M. A., and Mayer, J. D. (2009)."Resonance to archetypes in media: There's some accounting for taste". Journal of Research in Personality 43(3): 307-322.
vi. Goodman, J. R., Duke, L. L., and Sutherland, J. (2002)."Olympic athletes and heroism in advertising: Gendered concept of valor?".Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly 79(2): 374-393.
vii. Gröppel-Klein, A., Domke, A., and Bartmann, B. (2006). "Pretty woman or Erin Brockovich? Unconscious and conscious reactions to commercials and movies shaped by fairytale archetypes – results from two experimental studies". In: Advances in Consumer Research, edited by C. Pechmann and L. Price, 33: 163-174. Duluth, MN: Association for Consumer Research.
viii. Hartwell, M., and Chen, J. C. (2012).Archetypes in Branding: A Toolkit for Creatives and Strategists. Blue Ash: How Books.
ix. Henderson, J. L. (1990).Shadow and Self: Selected Papers in Analytical Psychology. Wilmette: Chiron.
x. Hirshman, E. C. (2004)."The interplay between archetypes and autobiography in mass media preferences". In: Advances in Consumer Research, edited by B. E. Kahn and M. F. Luce,31: 168-173. Valdosta, GA: Association for Consumer Research.
xi. Hofstede, G. (2001).Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations(2$^{nd}$ Edition). Thousand Oaks, London: Sage.
xii. Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., and Minkov, M. (2010).Cultures and Organizations. New York, Chicago: McGraw Hill.
xiii. Jung, C. G. (1968). Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious (2$^{nd}$Edition). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
xiv. Mark, M., and Pearson, C. S. (2001).The Hero and The Outlaw: Building Extraordinary Brands Through the Power of Archetypes. New York: McGraw-Hill.
xv. Pearson, C. S. (1998).The Hero Within: Six Archetypes We Live By. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
xvi. Rowland, S. 2002.Jung: A Feminist Revision. Cambridge: Polity.
xvii. Schmidt, V. L. (2001). 45 Master Characters. Ontario: Writer's Digest Books.
xviii. Shavitt, S., Lee, A. Y., and Johnson, T. P. 2008."Cross-cultural consumer psychology". In: Handbook of Consumer Psychology, edited byC. Haugtvedt, P. Herr and F. Kardes, 1103-1131. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
xix. Thompson, C. J. (2004)."Marketplace mythology and discourses of power". Journal of Consumer Research 31(1): 162-180.
xx. Tsai, S. (2006). "Investigating archetype-icon transformation in brand marketing". Marketing Intelligence and Planning 24(6): 648-663.
xxi. Vogler, C. (2007).The Writer's Journey(3$^{rd}$ Edition). Studio City: Michael Wiese Productions.
xxii. Wehr, W. D. (1987).Jung and Feminism: Liberating Archetypes. Boston: Beacon Press.
xxiii. Zhang, Y., and Gelb, B. D. (1996)."Matching advertising appeals to culture: The influence of products' useconditions". Journal of Advertising 25(3): 29-46.