We would like to thank the editor, the associate editor and all three reviewers who have so clearly communicated their concerns and suggestions. Your work helped us significantly improve this paper. We hope that this revision shows our dedication, interest and seriousness in getting this paper to publishable form. The summary of the changes is below:

1. We revised our theory based on the suggestions by the review team. The contribution of our revised paper is focused around the practice of taste and aims to link theories of practice with theories of taste. To bridge the two, we introduce the concept of taste regime. Our key argument is that a taste regime orchestrates daily practice through the alignment of aesthetic norms with objects, meanings, and doings.

2. We revised our analysis of the research context to better locate Apartment Therapy in a broader taste regime of soft modernism. We discuss the historical construction of soft modernism in this revision in order to more precisely demarcate the boundaries of Apartment Therapy.

3. We conducted additional data analysis. In this version, we have stronger representation of interviews and blog data to substantiate our assertions. Additionally, we undertook an innovative quantitative data analysis technique to map the contents of the blog data with our constructs.

4. We realized that even though our title suggested otherwise, the discussion of practice was very limited in our earlier submission. We expanded our literature review to address reviewer comments and build a stronger foundation for a practice-based theorization.

5. We elaborated on our methodology and made clarifications regarding the concerns raised by the editorial team.

6. We revised our conceptual figure and built a new table summarizing the blog content in a way that better overlaps with our theoretical positioning.

7. We reduced the authorial voice in the text and now use more data (both interview and blog data) to illustrate our assertions. We also simplified the writing to reduce the possibility of confusion.

8. We linked our analytic categories better with the existing theories of consumer research in our empirical discussion.

9. We included a contribution statement with our resubmission. While we understand that this was required only for new submissions, we took this as an exercise for ourselves to clarify the main contribution we are seeking to make.

In the following pages, we address the specific concerns raised in our earlier submission.
**Suggestion from the AE: Explicate/explore the taste regime construct more fully**

We refined our taste regime construct utilizing a more practice-based approach. This helped us differentiate our work from earlier studies of taste. This repositioning also aligned our contribution better with our original criticism that taste is a matter of daily practice as much as a system of distinction. We extended our literature review to incorporate practice theory, practice-inflected theories of taste and recent consumer research work (suggested by reviewer A,B and C). We now heavily build on Magaudda and Schatzki as well as Schau Arnould and Muniz’s JM work on practice and brand communities (suggested by reviewers A and C). We are especially appreciative of reviewer C’s observation that the AT community shows all markers of brand communities. Therefore we were able to better connect our work with Schau et al’s theory and identify our contribution.

We incorporated Schatzki’s (1996) differentiation between distributed and integrative practices in our analysis of the operating mechanism of the taste regime. Building on existing research on practice we further reframed the categorical components of the practice in terms of objects, doings and meanings. In so doing, we reworked the earlier thematic categories to show how three distributed practices orchestrate objects, doings and meanings in the taste regime.

In our new conceptualization, we took out the Bennett, Emmison and Frow (1999) reference (as suggested by reviewer C). We realize that “value regime” also could be conflated with Apparaduau’s “regime of value” (which is completely irrelevant to taste, but rather looks at exchange systems. We are grateful for this comment because it prevented us from confusing many readers.

We agree with you (and reviewer A and C) that table 1 (in the original submission) was a poor representation of the regime and thank you for the constructive criticism. Upon further reflection it became clear that blogger defined tags were an unreliable method to depict the content of a large amount of text. Therefore, to better represent the data, we conducted additional quantitative analysis utilizing a semantic parsing of blog text. We explain this technique in our methodology section. We qualitatively coded the result of this parsing, which contributed additional insights to our analysis. This process also inspired us to map the content into the three components of the regime in a more data and theory driven manner: objects, doings and meanings. As a result of this analysis, we were both able to address your concerns about a more systematic and tabular representation of the blog data while also further honing our theoretical contribution. In this table, we categorize not only the blog post topics themselves, but also the content of the practice that the blog regulates.

Both the AE and reviewer C asked us to address the issues regarding the origins, symbolic boundaries and heterogeneity within the AT regime. We now make a clarification that this regime is an extension of a broader cultural movement of soft modernism, which also addresses a criticism made by reviewer B. Therefore, we revised the section now titled “Apartment Therapy as an Expression of Soft Modernism” to locate AT in a broader sociocultural history and show how it become a central manifestation of a much broader movement of soft modernism. We also agree with reviewer A that AT indeed reflects a mainstream marketplace. We hope our discussion on the rise of soft modernism resolves this concern.
Additionally we discuss the issues regarding the boundaries of the regime and contestations thereof in a separate section titled “Practicing Soft Modernism through Apartment Therapy.” Our resolution to the question of whether AT is monolithic (reviewer A) was to revisit the various theorizations of cultures of consumption in JCR literature. Reviewer C’s question about macramé further inspired a new discussion on AT’s intersection with craft consumerism. In this section, we further discuss how certain types of crafts such as macramé are excluded from the AT, not just because of their aesthetic qualities but their incongruence with the “doings” and “meanings” components of the practice. We also incorporated a brief discussion on indulgence and how certain types of indulgence (such as the fresh flowers that reviewer C inquired about) are normalized as necessity within the regime.

We would like to thank reviewer B for raising the concern that we have to clarify the distinction of the process from other cultures of consumption (such as that of a professional or virtual community). This enabled us to better link practices to regimes. In our discussion, we address this issue and suggest that a regime analogy could go beyond tastes, but could be applied to any form of practice.

*Suggestion from the AE: Develop your analysis of the process of taste regime emergence and impact on practices more fully:*

We have realized that our contribution wasn’t made very clear in our previous submission, perhaps due to the skewed literature review that we presented earlier. We do not intend to demonstrate how taste regimes are formed and differentiated—though we discuss this briefly—but rather we are interested in how they are incorporated into daily practice. We hope the revision brings more clarity regarding this issue and that it satisfies reviewer B’s concerns.

We believe the theoretical overhaul simultaneously clarified some of the issues raised under this subheading. We now have a new figure showing the connection between the three components of practice (objects, doings and meanings) and the dispersed practices that regulate the integrated system of domestic consumption. We agree that our initial figure was more of a list than an actual figure. We hope that the revised version will alleviate your concerns by showing clearly how the three distributed practices mediate the relationship between objects, doings and meanings.

Our strengthened analysis is inspired from the six empirical categories we have provided earlier, but has gone beyond this earlier conceptualization. As a result, we removed some of the discussion such as the “We constructs”. We have dropped the argument around “We” because relatively recently AT has become inconsistent in its use of “we.” Additionally, this argument, while interesting, has become tangential to the practice aspect of the discussion and added length. We decided to save the idea for another paper where we hope to relate the changes in the use of “we” to collective identity. In other cases we combined categories into higher level ones. For example, we realized Materialization could be discussed as a part of Instrumentalization. Additionally, we expanded our theoretical interpretations. Rather than “storylining,” for example, we show how the broader system of practice makes the taste regime hang together. Based on your suggestion that we should further explore the ritual aspects in the data, we also introduce the dispersed practice of ritualization and have a more developed discussion on the cure. Per reviewer A’s suggestion, we also deepened the discussion on the ritualization of the cure. We now discuss different types of rituals (a lá McCracken’s typology) in this category.
In the text, we also deal with variety (reviewer A) and contention among different participants of AT. We have a new section “Practicing Soft Modernism through Apartment Therapy” that discusses variation within the regime.

We reframed our discussion on the taken for granted quality of taste and on the notion that certain things “feel right” to our participants (reviewer A and C). We now do not argue that the engagement with AT is unconscious. Rather, we develop a more reflexive view inspired by Hennion’s criticism of Bourdieu and our deeper conceptualization of practice. We understand that taken-for-grantedness does not necessarily indicate that a practice has become tacit, but instead that practices are associated with extended familiarity and continuous engagement. We believe a practice based formulation focused on reflexive and conscious engagement with objects is a more appropriate way of framing how our participants relate to AT. We still argue that this reflexivity is bounded by a discursive regime, but we agree with you (and the reviewers) that “tacit” was a somewhat oversimplified portrayal of the practice our participants are involved in.

We also linked our empirical categories better to existing work in consumer research, provided clearer contrast between our conceptualizations and theirs and avoided generic categories (reviewer B). Specifically, we refer to Thompson’s idea of gnosticism (reviewer A), Moisio and Beruchashvili’s work on therapeutic brand communities (reviewers A and C), Solomon’s surrogate consumption (reviewer A), Kopytoff, Miller, Thompson, Belk, Wallendorf and Arnould (reviewer B), along with Lastovicka & Fernandez and Coupland.

We rewrote our conclusion to specifically state our contributions to practice and taste. We now show how we extend and/or refine the existing theories (reviewer A and C). We took reviewer C’s criticism about the representation of gender very seriously. However, upon further analysis of the blog content and participants, we again concluded that AT is a comparatively egalitarian in terms of gender norms. We did however integrate additional data from male participants (Robert, Patrick, Jacques, and Philip’s “House Call” example) and revised our discussion in the limitations regarding our participant selection.

*Suggestion from the AE: Better explain your methodology and make more use of your data.*

Both the AE and reviewers found the methodology unclear. We had made the decision to be very brief in our earlier submission, a decision that proved to make our manuscript less convincing. We have expanded our methodology section (reviewer B and C), explaining the interview process to clarify some misunderstandings about the scope of the interviews (reviewer B). We also explained the diverse range of questions—beyond the context of AT—we asked to our participants throughout the process (reviewer B). We further added clarifications about qualitative and quantitative techniques we utilized in our data analysis.

We also have introduced more data to assert our points (reviewer A), such as a new table derived from quantitative data analysis, additional quotes from interviews, and new excerpts from the blog. We also provide some sources to back up our claims that AT and other design blogs facilitated the closure of some magazines (reviewer A).

Lastly, we simplified the writing as suggested. We have shortened and simplified sentences and broke down our arguments into more manageable components. We also refrained from using phrases like “serve to”, “function to,” and so on (reviewer A).
We would like to thank the reviewer team again for their time, effort and thought put into these helpful and constructive reviews.