

Goldsmiths Research Online

*Goldsmiths Research Online (GRO)
is the institutional research repository for
Goldsmiths, University of London*

Citation

El-Shamandi Ahmed, Khaled; Ambika, Anupama and Belk, Russell. 2023. Augmented reality magic mirror in the service sector: experiential consumption and the self. *Journal of Service Management*, 34(1), pp. 56-77. ISSN 1757-5818 [Article]

Persistent URL

<https://research.gold.ac.uk/id/eprint/31873/>

Versions

The version presented here may differ from the published, performed or presented work. Please go to the persistent GRO record above for more information.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Goldsmiths, University of London via the following email address: gro@gold.ac.uk.

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated. For more information, please contact the GRO team: gro@gold.ac.uk



**Augmented Reality Magic Mirror in the Service Sector:
Experiential Consumption and the Self**

| | |
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal: | <i>Journal of Service Management</i> |
| Manuscript ID | JOSM-12-2021-0484.R2 |
| Manuscript Type: | Research Paper |
| Keywords: | Augmented Reality, Experiential consumption, Digital Extended Self, Possible Selves |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Augmented Reality Magic Mirror in the Service Sector: Experiential Consumption and the Self

Abstract

Purpose: This paper examines what the use of an augmented reality makeup mirror means to consumers, focusing on experiential consumption and the extended self.

Design/methodology/approach: We employed a multimethod approach involving netnography and semi-structured interviews with participants in India and the UK (n=30).

Findings: Two main themes emerged from the data: 1) the importance of imagination and fantasy and 2) the (in)authenticity of the self and the surrounding “reality.”

Research limitations/implications: This research focuses on Augmented Reality magic makeup mirror. We call for further research on different AR contexts.

Practical implications: We provide service managers with insights on addressing gaps between the perceived service (i.e., AR contexts and the makeup consumption journey) and the conceived service (i.e., fantasies and the extended self).

Originality/value – We examine the lived fantasy experiences of AR experiential consumption. In addition, we reveal a novel understanding of the extended self as temporarily re-envisioned through the AR mirror.

Keywords: Augmented Reality Services, Experiential Consumption, Digital Extended Self, Possible Selves.

Paper type: Research paper

1 Introduction

It is one thing to look at beauty bloggers or micro-celebrities applying makeup on their faces and quite another to try on different makeup options using a live mirror image of *self* through augmented reality (AR). Mirrors have long played a role in imagining ourselves, from Narcissus to Snow White to the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles (Pendergast, 2009). Recently, mirrors in retail service have been supplemented or replaced by Augmented Reality (AR), both in-store and via computer and mobile apps. AR is defined as a smart technology that can enhance the online service experience by mixing the digital world with the real world (Javornik, 2016a; Hilken *et al.*, 2018). Today AR integrated marketing and service strategies are thought to be vital for creating customer engagement (Buhalis *et al.*, 2019). The essence of experiential consumption involves fantasies, feelings, fun, and memorable experiences for consumers (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982; Pine and Gilmore, 1998). AR tools have been deployed across multiple service sectors such as furniture, apparel, jewelry, and makeup. Make-up AR tools and filters are among the most popular applications and are considered an “early technical success” (Deloitte, 2020). Consumers try out virtual products superimposed on their faces, bodies, and rooms. AR makeup tools are mainly accessed via mobile apps and social media filters. While real makeup is mostly regarded as an act of self-enhancement (Smith *et al.*, 2021), consumers use AR makeup to identify potential transformed selves (Javornik *et al.*, 2022). The AR mirror images from the makeup apps can represent an imagined version of the extended self (Belk, 1988, 2013; Schouten 1991).

Scholars have detailed the role of AR in several contexts, such as service experience (Hilken *et al.*, 2017), customer dining experience (Javornik, 2016b; Batat, 2021), and intimate self with makeup brands (Scholz and Duffy, 2018). The experience has been characterized as involving escapism (Liao and Humphreys, 2015) and imagination (Huang and Liu, 2014; Beck and Crié, 2018). However, despite the extant research in AR, the

1
2
3 technology has not yet become a popular shopping medium (Liao, 2018; Qin *et al.*, 2021;
4 Rauschnabel *et al.*, 2022). Several researchers have indicated the need for more in-depth
5 explorations to understand the implications of consumer AR behaviors (Dacko, 2017;
6 Chylinski *et al.*, 2020; de Ruyter *et al.*, 2020). Hence, this study attempts to understand AR
7 experiential consumption and self-perception in the service context of AR-enabled virtual
8 makeup. Our research is built on the recent work of Scholz and Duffy (2018) and Batat
9 (2021) for two reasons. First, the two studies tackle AR experiential consumption. Second,
10 Scholz and Duffy (2018) provide a good grounding to explore AR self in the makeup context.
11 We address the following research questions: 1) What is the nature of consumer AR makeup
12 experiences? 2) How do consumers experience their *possible selves* using an AR mirror?
13
14

15 We employed mixed qualitative methods by conducting thirty in-depth semi-
16 structured interviews and a netnography in the UK and India. Emergent findings uncovered
17 two main themes: 1) imagination and fantasy 2) the (in)authentic self. Participants felt that
18 that the AR mirror can enhance their imaginations by allowing them to fantasize themselves
19 as celebrities, to adopt a fantasy look, or to travel back in time. This normally led to an
20 enjoyable lived fantasy experience. However, users also expressed concerns about the ability
21 of AR mirrors to represent their imagined selves. They found the experience dehumanizing
22 and preferred in-store makeup shopping and watching videos of celebrities and makeup
23 influencers to gain a better sense of self-transformation and social acceptance.
24
25

26 **2 Review of theory and literature**

27 **2.1 Service Consumption Experience**

28 Today, providing memorable experiences is regarded as a key strategy for organizations
29 vying for sustainable competitive advantage (Pine and Gilmore, 1998; Teixeira *et al.*, 2012).
30 Service experience has recently emerged as a focal phenomenon in research and practice
31 (Jaakkola *et al.*, 2015). Specific to the service context, Jaakkola *et al.* (2015, p. 186) define
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 experience as “An actor’s subjective response to or interpretation of the elements of the
4 service, emerging during the process of purchase and/or use, or through imagination or
5 memory.” Further, according to the tenets of Service-Dominant Logic, service experience
6 becomes the foundation of all businesses (Vargo and Lusch, 2008). Service experience has
7 been conceptualized as a multifaceted process associated with experiential learning and an
8 outcome of multiple situational factors (Helkkula, 2011).
9

10
11 According to Enrique Bigné *et al.* (2008), pleasure from the service experience is
12 intrinsically connected to customer satisfaction and long-term loyalty. Hence, enjoyable
13 hedonic experiences involving consumer interactions with objects, services, and contexts
14 (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982, Holbrook, 1999) lead to positive outcomes for both
15 consumers and service providers. The experiential perspective highlights the relevance of
16 fantasies, feelings, and fun in consumer behavior (Xu and Chan, 2010). Several scholars have
17 explored consumption practices and the symbolic meanings accompanying various
18 consumption experiences (Chaney *et al.*, 2018), including extraordinary experiences
19 (Arnould and Price, 1993), risky leisure consumption experiences (Celsi *et al.*, 1993),
20 nostalgic experiences (Schindler and Holbrook, 2003), passionate experiences (Belk *et al.*,
21 2003), ludic experiences (Seregina and Weijo, 2017), and painful experiences (Scott *et al.*,
22 2017).
23
24

25
26 Further, service providers have increasingly adopted digitization to provide
27 technology-infused interactions and to enhance the overall service experience (Ha and Stoel,
28 2012; Holmqvist *et al.*, 2020). Studies indicate that in the case of many online shopping
29 scenarios with self-enhancement products such as fashion, the hedonic component of
30 experiences is becoming more vital for consumers (Ha and Stoel, 2012). Moreover, these
31 consumption experiences are seen to offer avenues for the expression of consumer identities
32 (Blazevic *et al.*, 2013). Such experiences allow consumers to engage virtually with the
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 product and services across different stages of consumption. Digitally experienced
4
5 possessions can become meaningful to the consumers within their interactions and
6
7 engagement with Digital Virtual Consumption (Belk, 2013).
8
9

10 **2.2 Augmented Reality and Service Experiences**

11
12 Augmented Reality (AR) is a technology that facilitates the seamless layering of
13
14 digital objects upon the real-world contexts, leading to a digitally enhanced perception of
15
16 reality (Azuma, 1997), without detaching the consumers from their surroundings (Bonetti *et*
17
18 *al.*, 2016). Consumers access AR through wearables (e.g., Microsoft HoloLens), handheld
19
20 devices (e.g., mobile app-based makeup mirrors as shown in Figure 1), or fixed systems in
21
22 the retail outlets. AR tools can be integrated at multiple points within customer journeys
23
24 across online and offline touchpoints (Javornik, 2016a). Therefore, service providers are
25
26 adopting AR as a part of their service strategies in order to enhance consumers' digital service
27
28 experiences (Hilken *et al.*, 2017).
29
30
31
32

33
34 **Insert Figure 1 here**

35
36 In the online service scenario (e.g., online shopping), AR allows consumers to
37
38 manage a virtual product with similar physical gestures to those they would use to handle the
39
40 actual product, leading to a digitally embodied service experience (Hilken *et al.*, 2017; Rosa
41
42 and Malter; 2003). For example, Sephora's AR app, allows consumers to try out virtual
43
44 makeup via mobile apps, enabling novel service experiences. AR-based services assimilate
45
46 the sensory feel of touch in the digital marketplace (Brynjolfsson *et al.*, 2013), which can be
47
48 highly personalized and embedded in the environment (Chylinski *et al.*, 2020). Hence, AR
49
50 offers the feeling of "presence," in which the consumer feels that the virtual object is
51
52 'actually there' (Hilken *et al.*, 2017). Marinova *et al.* (2017) argue that the inclusion of AR
53
54 into the service strategy makes the online service experience more enjoyable and productive
55
56 for the consumers. But to date there have been few studies that explore the actual AR
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 consumption experiences. Hence, this study endeavors to explore actual AR consumption
4 experiences by adopting the AR virtual try-on tools and the popular category of makeup.
5
6

7 8 **2.3 Theoretical Foundation of AR and Self** 9

10 AR beauty apps and filters influence consumers' self-concept through augmented (AR-
11 generated) images (Javornik *et al.*, 2021; Scholz and Duffy, 2018). Consumers consider their
12 augmented images to represent themselves, as a part of their extended selves (Belk, 1988;
13 Scholz and Duffy, 2018). Explaining the concept of *extended self*, Belk (1988, p.139)
14 contended that "knowingly or unknowingly, intentionally or unintentionally, we regard our
15 possessions as parts of ourselves." He further theorized that an individual's extended self
16 entails the mind, body, material belongings, family, friends, and environment. This
17 conceptualization of extended self provides the foundation for exploring the role of
18 possessions and consumption in developing, maintaining, and expressing the consumers'
19 identity narratives (Ahuvia 2005; Bahl and Milne, 2010). Further, Belk (2013) adapted the
20 tenets of extended self to the digitized world. As the digital era has transformed the way
21 people live and present themselves to the external world, they develop a sense of attachment
22 to the dematerialized and embodied possessions such as their online images, co-created with
23 technology and peers. In the service context, as Caic, *et al.* (2018) elaborate, consumers
24 perceive technology (e.g., a service robot) to be valuable when it merges with the extended
25 self by truly enhancing the users' abilities.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Though the digital world has brought many changes, the unique affordances of AR
47 tools reduce the frontiers between physical and virtual experiences. For instance, AR virtual
48 try-on tools permit consumers to add digital wearable products (e.g., cosmetics, jewelry) to
49 their live images and develop their *possible selves* (Huang, 2019). Consumer behavior studies
50 have reckoned possible selves as a motivational factor for adoption and rejection
51 consumption behaviors (Patrick *et al.*, 2002).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 According to Markus and Nurius (1986, p.954), "Possible selves represent
4 individuals' ideas of what they might become, what they would like to become, and what they
5 are afraid of becoming, and thus provide a conceptual link between cognition and
6 motivation." Individuals' arsenal of possible selves represents the cognitive embodiment of
7 their goals, desires, motives, concerns, and intimidations (Markus and Nurius, 1986). As
8 outlined by James (1890/1950) earlier, though individuals may incorporate diverse
9 possibilities into their self-concept, they will have to choose some of them and let go of
10 others in the course of life (Lindemann, 2014). Consumers engage with their life futures and
11 identities on a continuous basis through these possible selves. Hence, as the self is fluid and
12 malleable, possible selves manifest and vanish based on specific life circumstances and
13 motivate consumers towards specific actions (Cross and Markus, 1991; Oyserman and
14 Fryberg, 2006). Erikson (2007) indicates that possible selves can vary from material to
15 abstract contexts, for instance from imagining wearing a new pair of shoes to visualizing
16 oneself as a good student (Belk, 2003). Familiar social contexts and other individuals with
17 whom we interact significantly influence the formation of our possible selves (Oyserman and
18 Fryberg, 2006). Schouten (1991) also explains that in transformative procedures such as
19 plastic surgery, consumers engage in evaluating post-procedure possible selves, with the help
20 of mirror images, mental conceptualizations, and other self-representations.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 However, the digital space provides consumers with the canvas and the tools to create
46 their personalized versions of their good selves, their wicked selves, their desired selves, their
47 dreaded selves, their ideal selves, even their quirky selves (Jin, 2012). Thus, AR mirror
48 functions as a lens with which consumers may explore themselves, and is closely aligned to
49 the mirror metaphor of identity construction (Kavoori, 2011). Just as the actual mirror
50 reflection is not exactly the person who looks into it due to the change in dimensions (three to
51 two), image reversal, and lack of inner reflection, the AR mirror is also only a reflection of
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 both possible and impossible selves. For consumers, the AR images allow visualizing their
4
5 selves (aspirations, fears, dreams, and others) far beyond the reflected images (Marcengo *et*
6
7 *al.*, 2014). AR mirrors contrast with Cooley's (1902) symbolic interactionist looking glass
8
9 self. According to Cooley, individuals use other people as their mirrors and employ their
10
11 judgments to ascertain how they appear to others and to modify their self-concepts
12
13 accordingly. This social and judgmental context is largely absent in the private im(possible)
14
15 selves generated via AR. The exception is when the person clicks a button to capture and
16
17 send the AR image to someone else, thereby seeking approval and positive reinforcement
18
19 more than sober judgments.
20
21
22
23

24 Earlier studies on consumers' possible selves involved selves generated in reference
25
26 to individuals' past experiences and social contexts OR the selves generated via computer
27
28 avatars (e.g., Jin, 2012). However, in the case of AR, the possible selves have higher fidelity
29
30 self-reference and embodiment (Smink *et al.*, 2019), as the virtual objects are transposed to
31
32 live self-images and their fantasy images oscillate between real possibilities and impossible
33
34 forms. Although the dialectic between positive and negative possible selves (Banister and
35
36 Hogg, 2003), or desirable and undesirable selves (Oysterman *et al.*, 2015), has been
37
38 discussed in the past, the interplay between the possibilities and impossibilities and their
39
40 interconnections to the self-concept in the context of 'AR mirroring' needs further
41
42 exploration. Accordingly, this study focused on the experiences from the lens of a range of
43
44 AR-generated possible selves. In this context, we also bring forth the role of AR virtual try-
45
46 on tools, as a 'mirror' or a 'looking glass' reflecting consumers' possible selves.
47
48
49
50
51

52 **3 Methodology**

53
54
55 The main objective of this study was to capture the perspectives of experiential
56
57 consumption and the self in the service context with an emphasis on AR makeup apps. To
58
59 this end, we adopted depth interviews and netnography. The semi-structured in-depth
60

1
2
3 interviews were conducted in the UK and India. This format is flexible and can facilitate
4
5 fundamental inquiries or explorations (Abdulrazak and Quoquab, 2018). The participants
6
7 were selected through purposive sampling to ensure that they had some experience with AR
8
9 makeup apps. Qualification criteria included cosmetic usage and experience using AR
10
11 makeup apps and filters. We conducted 30 semi-structured in-depth interviews with
12
13 participants living in the UK (18) and India (12). Most participants are female except one
14
15 male participant who is based in the UK and two leading practitioners in the AR service
16
17 sector. UK participants included different nationalities living primarily in the UK and in
18
19 some cases in Europe or India as well (see Table I for participant information). Consistent
20
21 with the interview protocol suggested by (Belk *et al.*, 2013), participants were asked to
22
23 describe moments related to experiential consumption (e.g., fun and fantasy) and their self-
24
25 perceptions when looking in AR mirrors. To further enrich the discussion, the AR apps
26
27 Makeup Genius, Perfect 365, and Artistry were used during the interviews. The interviews
28
29 lasted between 45 minutes to 1 hour and 45 minutes. Due to pandemic-related restrictions,
30
31 interviews were conducted via a mix of face-to-face, Zoom, and Skype.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Insert Table I here

39
40 For triangulation, in the second phase, the author in India conducted a netnography a
41
42 few months before conducting the interviews to broaden the understanding of the research
43
44 phenomenon. Further, based on the insights from the interviews, the netnographic approach
45
46 was applied to further triangulate by analyzing consumers' AR based self-expressions in the
47
48 digital space. Netnography is a technique for deciphering consumer behavior and experiences
49
50 by examining internet communication in consumption communities using online data
51
52 (Kozinets, 2002). In the past, service researchers have adopted netnography to understand the
53
54 user experiences unobstructively (Zhao *et al.*, 2015). We followed the key steps: planning,
55
56 entrée, data collection, analysis, and insight generation, based on ethical guidelines
57
58
59
60

(Kozinets, 2002). We adopted a passive and unobstructed approach (Kozinets, 2010) by analyzing consumer reviews of AR apps and their social media posts about their AR experiences. To be consistent, we chose the same apps used in the interview discussion (Perfect 365 and Artistry) which were among the top 50 popular apps as rated by App Annie in 2020. For these apps, the authors collected and analyzed 342 customer reviews in the English language from December 2019 to December 2020 with a specific length of up to 50 words (Singh, 2019). Additionally, 153 Instagram posts in English from January 2019 and December 2020 were collected and analyzed. On all of the platforms the researchers created profiles that included the role and research interests (entrée). To find AR relevant posts, keywords were searched with the tags #arfilters, #arbeautyfilters, #perfect365, #perfect365app, #perfect365apps, #artistryapp, #artistryvirtualbeautyap, #artistryvirtualbeauty. In total, 495 online reviews and posts were collected and analyzed in the netnography phase. Only publicly available data was collated, and user permission was sought before using names and pictures, adhering to ethical guidelines. Table II below summarizes the different steps in methodology design.

Insert Table II here

Since the data were collected over different periods and in different countries, the data was analyzed separately among the first two authors. To develop the overarching themes, the two researchers coded and analyzed the data using open, axial, and selective coding (Strauss and Corbin, 1998) with the help of Nvivo software. First, the data was broken down into basic code, and then ideas were connected to each other to form categories. Finally, the categories were compared and contrasted to develop relevant themes. We were guided by theories of experiential consumption (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982) and the extended self (Belk, 1988, 2013). But the connection to the theory of extended self emerged as a “puzzle” during the analysis stage. To further explore this puzzle involving both desired and feared

1
2
3 selves, we used an abductive approach using the data and literature as suggested by Belk and
4
5 Sobh (2019). We held meetings among the authors to reach an agreement on the findings and
6
7 the narrative discussed in the following section.
8
9

10 11 **4 Findings**

12
13 We unearthed two major themes: consumer digital engagement with fantasy imagined
14
15 selves and concerns about the inauthenticity of augmented selves. Table III summarizes the
16
17 findings of the two themes.
18
19

20
21 Insert Table III here
22

23 24 **4.1 Fantasy and Imagination**

25
26 Consumers' AR experiences are formed by an amalgam of reality, virtuality,
27
28 imagination, and fantasy. Our study reveals that consumers from both India and UK have a
29
30 penchant for digitally exploring their fantasies and imaginations. On many occasions,
31
32 consumers were more interested in digitally creating styles based on their fantasies than in
33
34 understanding what products suited them best. Such experience is known as fantasy imagery
35
36 (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982) where consumers create fantasy images which do not stem
37
38 from their prior experience. For instance, Merina describes how she uses AR to try out
39
40 celebrity-inspired fantasy looks:
41
42
43

44 "See I have these curls and I often drool on the African style box braids. Not so
45
46 popular here, but I am a hardcore Rihanna fan too. Some of these apps have so many
47
48 celebrity looks, from specific movies and shows and I keep trying them at random
49
50 for fun. But this Rihanna one, I did a search and created the look. That was
51
52 something which I really wanted." (Merina)
53
54
55

56 Merina had no intentions to try this look in the real world, but she was able to
57
58 reconfigure the hair on her image online to become "Rihanna's Indian twin." These AR looks
59
60

1
2
3 are not only limited to celebrities but can also include themes like devils and fairies as shown
4
5 in Figure 2.
6
7

8 Insert Figure 2 here 9

10
11 Participants also explained how they revisited the styles from a different era with the
12 help of AR mirrors, enacting a form of ‘time travel.’ Shaarika fondly elaborated on her
13 mothers’ AR experiences:
14
15

16
17 “...She [her mom] searched and found the oldies... Mommy used to have the slick
18 waves, then there was this puffed at the top style for weddings. We had a good retro
19 travel.” (Shaarika)
20
21
22
23

24
25 Shaarika’s mom was referring to Sadhana who was a popular Bollywood actress in the
26 1960-1980 period. She popularized the ‘Sadhana cut’ hairstyle inspired by the Hollywood
27 actress Audrey Hepburn. The Sadhana cut was quite popular among young adults of that era.
28 Like Merina, Shaarika, and Shaarika’s mother, many consumers were content to only engage
29 with their imaginary/fantasy (i.e., creating fantasy imagery; see Hirschman and Holbrook,
30 1982) styles in the digital AR space without adopting them or trying them out in real life.
31 That is, AR was seen by many as a fun place to visit, but it only sustained their fantasies
32 online. They had reservations about adopting fantasy styles in real life and doubted their
33 skills to apply the actual makeup products to achieve the digital look. Saakshi recounted
34 having tried several makeup styles where shades of blue predominate:
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47
48 “After imagining so much, the only bluish makeup I had was blue eyeliner, blue
49 bindi. [Why did I never buy anything?] I am also wondering now. I think I was
50 afraid if reality will ruin my imagination... ha (laughs for a minute). If I try to apply
51 all these [makeup looks] in real [life], I won’t be this perfect.” (Saakshi)
52
53
54
55
56

57 Overall, consistent with the premises of Service Dominant-Logic (SDL) (Vargo and
58 Lusch, 2008), participants demonstrated that they play an active role in value co-creation of
59
60

1
2
3 fantasies by searching for and creating fun looks (e.g., Rhianna's look). In addition,
4
5 participants enjoyed living in their fantasy worlds, but when facing the reality, they expressed
6
7 concerns about the authenticity of their augmented selves, our next major finding.
8
9

10 **4.2 (In)Authentic-Self and Reality**

11
12 Consumers feel authentic when seeing themselves in ways that seem to be consistent
13
14 with their self-concepts (Sloan, 2007). When they perceive a discrepancy, they experience
15
16 incongruence and inauthenticity (Burke, 1991). Experiencing their AR virtual images of
17
18 themselves, many participants expressed concern over the inconsistencies with their realities.
19
20 Apparently, it is one thing to envision yourself with a smaller nose (Schouten, 1991), and
21
22 quite another to envision yourself with black lipstick or blue hair. This is evident in
23
24 participants' resistance to AR makeup looks and their reactive desire for "real" makeup
25
26 shopping experiences.
27
28
29

30 *4.2.1 AR versus human experience*

31
32 Disembodiment and re-embodiment are important to how we extended our version of
33
34 selves in the digital world (Belk, 2013). In this study, participants felt that AR technology
35
36 failed to either disembody or reembody their version of selves due to the complexity of the
37
38 "real" human skin. For instance, AR does not respect or understand human skin, ethnicity, or
39
40 feelings when applying color on skin, particularly with luxury makeup brands. Misun and
41
42 Dea had tried the AR Magic Mirror inside Charlotte Tilbury makeup store in London. They
43
44 both agreed that while lips can have different colors, some AR colors look exaggerated. They
45
46 are both Asian, and Misun feels shy and uncomfortable trying exaggerated AR colors and
47
48 looks (e.g., dark red) which are primarily designed for Western women. Similarly, Dea
49
50 believes that colors are temperamental, and makeup must complement skin colors. For this
51
52 reason, AR makeup cannot be trusted because AR colors are not real and can change the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 physical look of her face in a bad way, which negatively affects her mood. The two women
4
5 explained:

6
7
8 “...The color really matters...our lips already has different colors itself...So I really
9
10 needed to try by myself ... I have Asian face and all of them [women in UK] they’re
11
12 Western ladies...I don’t see myself look like someone with really red cheeks, red lips,
13
14 very exaggerated.” (Misun)

15
16
17 “...[The] colors are more temperamental...I might have a yellow (cast) on my skin
18
19 and the color you use affects how it compliments your skin...looking at the iPad
20
21 [means AR], it just looks like it painted a color on her face and it’s not
22
23 multidimensional.” (Dea)

24
25
26
27 Belk (2013) explains the importance of the aggregate-self to extend the version of the
28
29 digital self. Mario is a gay male who works as a makeup artist in London and wears makeup
30
31 on a regular basis. He explains the aggregate-self of makeup as a process which starts by self-
32
33 acceptance because makeup for women is self-transformative and an emotional and personal
34
35 experience “...It’s [makeup] like the action before the feeling...the first step of the day that
36
37 you know It’s going right or wrong [laughing]...It can be stressful as well if you’re doing
38
39 something outside of your comfort zone” Mario said. In addition, Mario also believes that
40
41 AR does not respect human shape or color (e.g., lip perimeters and lips sizes), because trying
42
43 the product in person is a different experience. For example, darker colors can make a facial
44
45 feature look smaller, and if someone who has a thin lip wants to wear dark makeup, an AR
46
47 app can make their lips look very large. For this reason, AR can be unrealistic and even
48
49 “childish.” Further, Mario placed emphasis on the importance of 1) multisensorial experience
50
51 in consumption contexts (e.g., feeling, seeing, and touching); 2) the trust element in person-
52
53 to-person human interaction versus the machine (i.e., AR); and 3) the broken emotions
54
55 between AR and human. Mario’s opinion extends Belk’s (2013) view on the aggregate-self
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 by showing the importance of human emotions and senses in co-constructing the AR self as
4
5 he explains:

6
7
8 “...It [AR] can’t give you a real perspective of the product...I’m quite sure once they
9
10 [consumers] try the real thing is probably going to look really different. It's not
11
12 realistic enough and it's almost childlike. Certain jobs can’t be done by a machine,
13
14 like a doctor, of course, the makeup is not as important [laughing]. But I still think
15
16 people will trust more a person rather than an app telling them what could work for
17
18 them.” (Mario)

19
20
21 Although Belk (2013) explains that consumers accept a certain leeway in their look in
22
23 the digital sphere, participants rejected that leeway and felt embarrassed when they looked at
24
25 themselves in AR makeup apps. Participants were not interested in creating an ideal,
26
27 possible, inspirational, or alternative selves. One reason for this is the desire for “real
28
29 embodiment” and the desire to look real instead of accepting AR makeup looks and
30
31 suggestions. For example, when Sophie looked at herself through L’Oréal makeup AR app,
32
33 she felt a mix of shame and surprise. On the one hand, she felt ashamed that the suggestive
34
35 AR makeup did not look real, and it is not how the makeup will look in reality (e.g., it does
36
37 not show how to properly apply blush on the cheeks). On the other hand, she felt surprised at
38
39 such a look, and she started to laugh because she believed she looked like “a clown.”
40
41 Similarly, during Xintian’s visit to the Charlotte Tilbury store in London, she felt completely
42
43 ashamed of her AR look because the AR mirror made her look “stupid” by creating a “dead”
44
45 look, and she described AR as “robotley” and fake. They add:

46
47
48 “...You see [surprised tone] I wouldn’t buy this lipstick...let’s try the eyeliner [she is
49
50 laughing] it is funny...the blush on the cheeks you would apply it in a lot more
51
52 natural way and it will blend in your skin so it doesn’t look like that. Here it sorts of
53
54 look like a clown [laughing].” (Sophie)

1
2
3 “...I dislike the Magic Mirror because the look is very dead, it is like a dead look,
4 because you can see the contour overhead and it doesn’t really blend in, you can see
5 the very sharp line overhead and that’s fake, that’s not real...there is a difference
6 between look and real product...I think the Magic Mirror is very “robotley” [fake]...
7 This thing makes me so stupid.” (Xintian)

14 4.2.2 *Resisting AR reality and the desire for real experience*

15 Digital devices can disembody and reembody our visual self-presentation online via
16 videos, photos, and avatars where consumers accept the psycho-physiological changes of
17 their looks (Belk, 2013). Although the use of an avatar can represent a different version of the
18 self (e.g., ideal, possible, aspirational, and alternative selves), participants in this study
19 resisted their AR extended selves. Unlike Belk’s (2013) views on reembodiment, participants
20 did not feel a sense of attachment to their avatar self, and did not experience an avatar proteus
21 effect or multiple characters. In fact, our data shows a sense disconnection between skin,
22 body, and eyes which we call “AR Disembodiment.” For Natalia, the issues with AR
23 disembodiment are the inconsistency of the makeup color and the shape of her lips. When
24 one researcher opened the L’Oréal app with Natalia she expressed concerns about her lips
25 size showing on the app and said she prefers to try the real product in-store “...I’ll never buy
26 things from L’Oréal [AR app] [laughing] until I go to the store and try on my skin...it’s still
27 not believable. Like you see my lips doesn’t look like the AR app [referring to the L’Oréal
28 app].” Similarly, Maria also expressed her love for in-store makeup shopping and described it
29 as “Disneyland” as she continues:
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 “...I find it [in-store shopping] like Disneyland for me...I don’t find it [AR makeup]
52 trustworthy because every person skin is different, it will look different with the
53 lighting. So, no, I wouldn’t use it [AR makeup]. ... Maybe you are using a very nice
54 color that makes your eyes cry...makes your skin look very dry...you’re too
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 bright...it's something that you will not know in an iPad screen it's impossible to
4
5 know... A painter will tell you the same...every same color can look totally
6
7 different on your skin.” (Maria)
8
9

10 As Maria explains, makeup is a complex tool that can simultaneously connect the
11 body, skin, and eyes. Therefore, she was not convinced that she could trust AR for makeup
12 because human skins are different, and the same color from two different brands will produce
13 different looks. So, it is almost impossible to figure out the difference unless she tries the
14 product in person. Learning the subtle differences is a skill both a painter and a makeup artist
15 would understand. Another important element for Maria is whether a woman's body is
16 allergic to certain chemical products; she usually tries to use the makeup for a couple of days
17 to ensure no allergic reaction, which is impossible to know online.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 4.2.3 *Self-acceptance versus social acceptance*

31 Here we see the interplay between the co-construction of self (Belk, 2013) and service
32 co-creation (Vargo and Lusch, 2008). As online app reviews indicated, consumers resist AR
33 attempts to suggest looks (i.e., construct their look) and expressed a desire for greater control
34 over their look (i.e., co-creation of the look). One online review says “I have a distinct mole
35 on my face and now every time I upload my picture, it automatically edits it out completely
36 before applying the makeup!! I'd like to have to choose to color my face how I want to”
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 (Online review from Google Play Store).
47

48 Unlike the importance of sharing to extend the version of self (Belk, 2013), we
49 witnessed that participants did not share the images they created with just anyone. Although
50 participants expressed enjoyment of their new AR looks, they also feared a lack of social
51 acceptance, embarrassment, and shameful surprise. Their AR photos were shared “*privately*”
52 with very close friends and relatives in some cases, and only a small fraction of pictures made
53 it to social media channels. For instance, although Merina felt excited about her “different but
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 beautiful” “glam glam” new AR look, it took her some time to accept and believe that she
4 could look that beautiful. She did not want to share the picture with anyone, even though it
5 was a “glam glam” picture. She managed to share it with her mom but did *not* dare to share it
6 with her friends because they would think she is crazy:
7
8
9
10

11
12 “...Took me some time to first digest that this glam glam girl is actually me ha ha...first
13 shared the AR photos with mom, she was like what did you do to yourself!! Then she
14 was like, ah this seems good...but the radically different ones, I don’t share with
15 anyone. They will think I am crazy.” (Merina)
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Here, we can see a different view of the aggregate-self (Belk, 2013). Merina accepts
23 her AR image, but she feels unsure that her new image is so radically different. This can fall
24 under the ‘latitude of rejection’ of her peers just as it falls in her own latitude of rejection in
25 terms of social judgment theory (Sherif 1963). Hence, the images are most likely to be shared
26 or adopted based on her perception of their acceptability or unacceptability to different
27 people.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 4.2.4 *Makeup as a journey (reflexivity) and self-appreciation*

36 Building on the idea that the consumer journey is self-reflexive in nature (Schau and
37 Akaka, 2021), participants suggested that makeup is an emotional and reflexive self-
38 appreciation journey. Dea believes makeup is an emotional experience which can empower
39 how women feel about themselves, and mask their “ugliness” if the woman is experiencing a
40 bad day that affects the state of their skin. Such feeling cannot be replaced by AR makeup,
41 especially if the makeup is for a luxury brand. Consumers visit luxury makeup stores for the
42 experience (i.e., enjoying the luxury product and interacting with the staff). Dea says:
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 “...As women, we know what an emotional process it is to find the right makeup, it’s
55 a journey...it is a very emotional process [laughing]...I don’t think AR will ever
56 replace the emotional experience of buying luxury makeup like CT because you’re
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 investing so much money, you want to go you want to see the packaging, you want to
4
5 sit down you want the sales[person] to be nice to you, it's the experience.” (Dea)

7
8 Fernanda has constantly expressed her self-appreciation towards her “face” and how
9
10 she and her face enjoy a strong intimate relationship. She values her face and how she looks
11
12 and enjoys the feel of wearing makeup on her face inside the store and seeing the combined
13
14 effects of products as she explains:

16
17 “...It's my face. I want it. I want to feel it. I want to try it [makeup products] on. I
18
19 want to see the consistency...with something like makeup it's not something that I
20
21 can trust any kind of virtual augmented anything for a decision like what I'm putting
22
23 on my face.” (Fernanda)

24 25 26 4.2.5 *Authentic self and proxy-self*

27
28 Belk (2013) discusses how the aggregate-self is used to co-construct the version of
29
30 self. In this study, we found that when consumers search for makeup, they search for their
31
32 authentic self via the proxy-self process. Proxy-self means watching people who do not
33
34 necessarily share the same look, but rather share similarities in their look, body shape, and
35
36 skin type. This is not only limited to watching celebrities, but it can also include photos of
37
38 friends and different type of makeup influencers on different social media platforms. William
39
40 is the founder of a renowned AR agency which created the magic mirror for Charlotte
41
42 Tilbury. During the interview, he implicitly suggested the “heuristic customer journey” which
43
44 is a concept that has emerged during his conversation with the head of digital at Coty
45
46 makeup. Due to the rise of social media influencers and celebrities on social media, the
47
48 consumer journey in cosmetics has become far more complex than just looking for makeup.
49
50 The complexity of the journey lies in the fact that women might not be looking for makeup
51
52 specifically but are instead flicking through photos of friends, influencers, or celebrities. So,
53
54 in return, women might like the outfit of the person in the photo or a specific makeup look
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 which will trigger the need to try or search for a similar item to the one they saw in the photo.
4

5 This process might be called the search for a proxy-self, possible self as he explains:
6

7
8 “...the ex-head of digital from Coti was saying that no one is going to buy a Max
9
10 factor or *Cover Girl* lipstick, by going onto Google, typing in lipstick, finding the
11
12 *Cover Girl* website, going onto the *Cover Girl* website, looking through various
13
14 products, then buying a product. They’re going to be flicking through Instagram.
15
16 They’re going to see an image that they like. It may be nothing to do with lipstick
17
18 whatsoever...could just be a neighbor or a friend or Kim Kardashian coming out of a
19
20 nightclub or just an image of someone, but you go, I really like that look, or I like
21
22 what they’re wearing, or I like that lipstick, you’ll click on that. Go straight to a *Cover*
23
24 *Girl* page where you can see the same type of products, try that on just as a kind of
25
26 what do I look like? ‘Yeah, I look quite good’ or ‘Well, no, I don’t look good.’”
27
28
29

30 (William, founder of AR agency)
31
32

33 Building on William’s view, Dea explained how she searches for her proxy-self
34
35 online before buying instore “...I would personally go online and say I need a red lipstick for
36
37 Asian skin color see what other people have used blogger, reviewers, magazines, and then I
38
39 would go to the store and try it on myself” Dea said. In addition, Natalia explained that when
40
41 she buys makeup, she goes on Instagram first, checks bloggers’ profiles, and reads reviews.
42
43 In the meantime, she acknowledges her ambivalence and the discrepancy between the look of
44
45 makeup influencers online versus *their* look in real life. However, her aim is not to look like
46
47 one of the makeup online influencers, but instead, is to find a proxy for her real look coupled
48
49 with positive word of mouth for the product from both influencers and followers. Even then,
50
51 she will not necessarily buy the product but will buy something closer to her skin tone, which
52
53 will suit her better. For this reason, she strongly believes that online influencers outperform
54
55 AR technology as she explains:
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 “...I’m like Instagram addict so I believe in word of mouth. If three people I’m
4 following talking this specific product, I then would want to go and buy it...that’s
5
6 why I’ll never actually download an app to try it [AR app]. I think Instagram
7
8 bloggers really outperform AR because it is easier than going through all these
9
10 efforts of the L’Oréal app, VR, AR whatever, it doesn’t really portray how it looks.
11
12 It gives you the shape, it gives you the color, but everything is going to be different
13
14 in real life.” (Natalia)
15
16
17
18
19

20 In contrast to Natalia, Amina’s attitude toward the use of AR is positive within her
21 proxy-self search. Her attitude toward online color delusions is negative. She even finds
22 trying real makeup on her hands to check the color is not helpful because her real undertone
23 color does not show unless she puts the makeup on her face. Amina also relies on male and
24 female makeup influencers when buying makeup products to compliment her AR trials. Like
25 Natalia, Amina does not aspire to look like an online makeup influencer but rather wants to
26 find a proxy for her face shade, skin color, and skin tone. For example, she follows a black
27 woman makeup influencer (Jackie Aina) and a white British male makeup influencer (Robert
28 Welsh) because they share similar oily skin, face shape, and proportions. She trusts these
29 influencers’ recommendations because she believes what works for their skin will work for
30 her. She explains:
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 “...I follow professional makeup like Jackie Aina. There is a man his name is Robert
47 Welsh...I follow Robert because Robert and I have a very similar skin type, like some
48 of the proportions of his face are dry so I also have dry bits there as well and my skin
49 is oily as his so I know if that product works for him, it will probably work for me.
50 Jackie as well got a very oily skin like me so I know that the products she is wearing
51 will help me.” (Amina)
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Overall, our findings show strong emotions when we are dealing with the self. Our body,
4 face, and eyes are some of the most central features of the extended self (Belk 1987, 1988).
5
6
7 When we change makeup, we change the self, and we are no longer the same person. In
8
9
10 addition, the findings show that consumers are active in co-creating fun experiences with AR
11
12 apps. However, consumers (in)authentic-selves show the importance of the co-creation gap
13
14 between the service provider and consumer. Therefore, we urge putting consumers at the
15
16 forefront of service co-creation as suggested by Vargo and Lusch (2008) to improve future
17
18 AR experiences.
19
20
21

22 **5 Discussion and Theoretical Contribution**

23
24
25 Our research explores experiential consumption and the extended self in the context
26
27 of AR for makeup, in response to recent calls for research on the experiential aspects of AR
28
29 (Chylinski *et al.*, 2020; Hilken *et al.*, 2018; Javornik, 2016a) and the perception of self when
30
31 using AR for makeup (Javornik *et al.*, 2021). We have introduced two main themes:
32
33 imagination and fantasy; and (in)authentic self and reality. These two themes show that, as
34
35 much as consumers enjoyed the virtual makeup try-on and considered it “fun,” they also
36
37 expressed major concerns about the authenticity of their selves generated through AR.
38
39
40

41
42 Other participants in recent AR research also emphasized the importance of
43
44 imagination and fantasy when using AR technology (Dacko, 2017; Olsson *et al.*, 2013;
45
46 Scholz and Duffy, 2018). Although we knew AR media are rich and enhance fantasies
47
48 (Javornik, 2016), our findings provide an in-depth understanding of imagination and fantasy
49
50 when using AR for makeup. For example, when participants tried celebrity makeup looks
51
52 (e.g., Rihanna’s look), they experienced a high level of imaginative fantasy, and to a certain
53
54 extent, they believed they shared celebrities’ looks. In other words, AR imagination created a
55
56 sense of “a dream come true” which led to a strong desire to possess the celebrity’s look. The
57
58 concept of desire in consumer research means an intense feeling or passion for acquiring
59
60

1
2
3 something (Belk *et al.*, 2003). Our participants disclosed their wishes to share celebrities'
4 looks. Such feelings of pleasure are consistent with AR food experiences (Batat, 2021;
5 Kozinets, *et al.*, 2017) when participants enjoy the multisensory and pleasurable affective
6 experience in an AR restaurant setting. In addition, fantasy can also be extended to the travel
7 back in time, triggering a sense of nostalgia (e.g., Shaarika and her mother). Other
8 participants acknowledged that AR looks are fun and they also wanted to believe that these
9 AR looks are real. That is, they wanted their lived fantasy experience (Thompson *et al.*,
10 1989) of the AR makeup look to become a reality. Overall, our findings for imagination and
11 fantasy extend findings (e.g., Scholz and Duffy, 2018) and go beyond connecting the self to
12 the image. They show a brand relationship that includes self-imagination of being celebrities,
13 nostalgia for the past, and the desire for an extended fantasy experience.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 The second theme of the (in)authentic self draws attention to an under-researched area
29 in AR makeup: authenticity of self-representation. Our participants expressed concerns about
30 the importance of human-to-human experience, inauthentic AR, and appetite for real in-store
31 makeup experience. Christ-Brendemühl and Schaarschmidt (2021) compared AR to actual in-
32 store trials and found that AR generates lower engagement. The in-store co-construction of a
33 new self is only a start. The next step is social acceptance, which is an imagined constraint on
34 possible selves. In this makeup-centered reflexive journey of self-appreciation, we ultimately
35 face the looking glass of others' reactions (Cooley 1902).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Although prior research over the last decade shows that early adopters expect that AR
48 technology is likely to play a key role in their everyday lives (Dacko, 2017; Liao and
49 Humphreys, 2015; Olsson *et al.*, 2013), we show that AR technology is still
50 underperforming. Participants in Scholz and Duffy's (2018) and Batat's (2021) studies hinted
51 at potential areas of a clash between the inauthentic self and reality. For instance, Diana in
52 Scholz and Duffy (2018) expressed concerns about her inauthentic look "this is so fake...it
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 does not look realistic,” whereas Maddison expressed a feeling of relief when using AR
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

does not look realistic,” whereas Maddison expressed a feeling of relief when using AR
makeup at home because it can take away the pressure of how people will think of her.
Similarly, one participant in Batat’s (2021) study explained how her AR look in-store made
her feel “...it made me feel sick, I was literally sick.” These studies reported the feeling of
inauthentic self as a matter of quality issues, but our study provides a deeper explanation of
such feelings. Our participants expressed concerns about how AR can create a sense of
broken emotions when using AR for holograms. Similar findings were portrayed in Batat’s
(2021) finding that AR sound and music experiences in a restaurant setting should enhance
the interplay between guests and staff. Furthermore, Javornik *et al.* (2021) identified
consumers’ self-esteem, the importance of physical appearance, and self-awareness as
important factors limiting acceptance of AR for makeup. Our study further elaborates on
these factors and emphasizes the importance of human-to-human experience, social
acceptance, and how makeup is a journey of self-appreciation. Our key insights contribute to
understanding the reflexive consumption journey (Schau and Akaka, 2021) by showing that
applying makeup in real life cannot be easily replaced by AR technology. Further, our
findings agree with Denegri-Knott and Molesworth (2010), who found that AR apps can
facilitate certain facets of actual consumer experiences. However, the unique affordances of
AR (simultaneous reality and virtuality) and the try-on apps implicate the perception of self
as the central point, much more than other forms of digital virtual consumption such as video
games or digital Avatars.

Over two decades ago, Azuma *et al.* (2001) pointed out that one of AR’s primary
challenges is social acceptance. Our findings show that social acceptance is still a challenging
issue for AR, but self-acceptance is also a challenging emergent area in AR. Although Belk
(2013) anticipated that new technology could extend our version of self, our findings show
that consumers resist extending their version of self for several reasons. First, consumers

1
2
3 should be able to co-construct and share their version of self and their memories through the
4
5 aggregate self and thereby seek affirmation (Belk, 2013). However, our findings show that
6
7 participants are hesitant to share most of their AR makeup looks online because of their fears
8
9 of social rejection and their very conscious perceptions of their look. Here, we also see the
10
11 application of social judgment theory. Before sharing, consumers evaluate if the image will
12
13 be within the latitude of acceptance or rejection not only for them but also for others. Even
14
15 the pictures that the consumers like may not be shared with others. Second, as Belk (2013)
16
17 empathizes, the co-construction of self requires an effort of collaborative-self-building. Our
18
19 participants show that their acceptance of AR makeup looks is dependent on online makeup
20
21 influencers as a “makeup glass” (Zhao, 2005). Furthermore, there is a cycle between online
22
23 makeup influencers and offline store visits. Third, re-embodiment is an important element of
24
25 the extended online self (Belk, 2013). However, our participants constantly expressed their
26
27 preference for humanized experience and were not highly optimistic about the digital makeup
28
29 experience becoming part of their reflective-self journey involving possible makeup-
30
31 enhanced selves (Markus and Nurius 1986; Schau and Akaka, 2021). Nevertheless, they did
32
33 enjoy some components, involving fun and imagination. Overall, despite recent research on
34
35 AR and recent calls for further research (Chylinski *et al.*, 2020; de Ruyter *et al.*, 2020), we
36
37 still know little about AR. It remains an innovation whose potential is difficult to achieve
38
39 with current technology.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 Based on the literature of consumer culture theory (CCT), and the service experience
48
49 literature, our findings contribute to understanding experiential consumption (Bolton *et al.*,
50
51 2014; Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982) and the extended self in digital service contexts (Belk,
52
53 2013). This further supports the synthesis and alliance between CCT research and service-
54
55 dominant logic (SDL) research (Vargo and Lusch, 2017). Further, we extend the recent AR
56
57 work of Batat (2021) by showing the importance of the lived fantasy experience when using
58
59
60

1
2
3 AR mirrors. We also show that AR images are perceived to connect to a potential self
4
5 (Markus and Nurius, 1986; Scholz and Duffy, 2018), but they can also create a feeling of
6
7 inauthenticity.
8
9

10 11 **6 Managerial Implications** 12

13 AR was described by the Ex-Chief Marketing Officer at the AR agency as
14
15 “...crap...it is crap...it's crap.” This expletive can shed light on the complexity of virtual
16
17 makeup in the service sector and shows that as much as technology can enhance the service
18
19 sector, it can also act as a negative disruptor for the consumer (Keating *et al.*, 2018). For a
20
21 long time, managers have used AR solely as a sales tool (i.e., branding, inspiring, convincing,
22
23 and keeping consumers) instead of adding value for consumers. In fact, AR implementation
24
25 lacks strategic planning regarding consumer journeys over the long run (Rauschnabel *et al.*,
26
27 2022). As managers do not possess sufficient knowledge about AR and how to use it
28
29 effectively (Rauschnabel *et al.*, 2022), the findings of this study can guide service providers
30
31 to design efficient AR service experience in several ways. At the service level, the findings
32
33 show the service design gap between the service provider (agencies and companies) and
34
35 consumers. More specifically, there is a problem in the way AR service providers design and
36
37 manage the gap between expected *and* the perceived service by consumers. Thus, we provide
38
39 three different directions for service providers. First, it is important for the service providers
40
41 to balance the fun factor while enabling a realistic service experience. Second, we urge
42
43 service providers to involve consumers in the co-creation process of the AR service
44
45 experience from the very beginning to facilitate the creation of more authentic AR self-
46
47 images. Third, we draw attention to the need for inclusive technology features to cover
48
49 individual differences which can cater for consumers with varying physical characteristics
50
51 (e.g., Asian versus western women).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In summary, we urge managers to 1) better plan AR service design; 2) understand the
4 makeup consumption journey of the consumer-self; and 3) consider the expected versus
5
6 perceived service experience.
7
8
9

10 11 **7 Conclusion** 12

13
14 Contrary to prior work, we found obstacles and challenges to cosmetic AR use in its
15 perceived authenticity, color inaccuracy, and fear of social rejection. Despite the strong
16 experiential role of AR, these challenges may reduce the impact of AR experiential aspects
17 and limit AR success in the service sector. Our study attempted to explore access to possible
18 selves through the tenets of experiential consumption and extended self. Possible selves are
19 only tentatively cathected as part of extended self until 1) the proxy or AR self is
20 experienced, preferably in-store, and 2) the newly tangibilized possible self is accepted by
21 others. Thus, by authenticity of AR makeup look, our participants mean something closer to
22 plausibility. They want the self that others know or a variant of that self that they will at least
23 find to be a plausible facsimile, like the proxy selves they try to find in magazines and blogs.
24
25 In this sense, they want their AR-inspired makeup-enhanced possible self to cohere with the
26 authentic self (Belk 2013).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Jacques Lacan (1966/2006, pp. 75-81) maintains that in the “mirror stage” the infant
42 sees a self-image in a mirror and misrecognizes it as being a whole ideal self rather than the
43 actual floundering infant. According to Lacan, in this mirror stage (which is likely to be
44 digital these days), the infant first realizes a unique self-identity apart from the mother. If the
45 results of the mirror stage are largely positive for the child, we must conclude that, apart from
46 play, in terms of self-concept and self-confidence, the Magic Makeup Mirror experience is
47 largely negative. Like the infant in the mirror stage, our participants misrecognize their face
48 in the mirror as an ideal independent authentic self. But there are two problems with this
49 misrecognition as we have emphasized. First, the ideal image in the mirror is a fantasy that
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 may be fun to play with but cannot be achieved in real life. Second, even if something like
4
5 the image in the mirror could be achieved, they fear that their friends and relatives would not
6
7 accept it as being an authentic self. It is a bridge too far, a look that they cannot pull off as
8
9 being genuine. And going back to the earlier looking glass metaphor of Charles Cooley
10
11 (1902), we find that friends, relatives, and colleagues are the real mirror with which we see
12
13 ourselves.
14
15
16
17

18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

References

- Abdulrazak, S., and Quoquab, F. (2018). "Exploring consumers' motivations for sustainable consumption: a self-deterministic approach," *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, Vol.30 No.1, pp.14-28.
- Ahuvia, A. C. (2005), "Beyond the extended self: Loved objects and consumers' identity narratives," *Journal of consumer research*, Vol.32 No.1, pp.171-184.
- Arnould, E. J., and Price, L. L. (1993), "River Magic: Extraordinary experience and the extended service encounter," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.20 No.1, pp.24-45.
- Azuma, R. T. (1997), "A survey of augmented reality," *Presence: teleoperators and virtual environments*, Vol.6 No.4, pp.355-385.
- Bahl, S., and Milne, G. R. (2010), "Talking to ourselves: A dialogical exploration of consumption experiences," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.37 No.1, pp.176-195.
- Banister, E. N., and Hogg, M. K. (2003), "Possible selves? Identifying dimensions for exploring the dialectic between positive and negative selves in consumer behavior," *ACR North American Advances*, pp. 149-150.
- Batat, W. (2021), "How augmented reality (AR) is transforming the restaurant sector: Investigating the impact of "Le Petit Chef" on customers' dining experiences," *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol. 172 No.20, p.121013.
- Beck, M., Crié, D. (2018), "I virtually try it... I want it! Virtual Fitting Room: A tool to increase online and offline exploratory behavior, patronage and purchase intentions," *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol.40, pp.279-286.
- Belk, R. (1987), "Identity and the Relevance of Market, Personal, and Community Objects," *Marketing and Semiotics: New Directions in the Study of Signs for Sale*, Jean Sebeok ed., Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 151-164
- Belk, R. (1988), "Possessions and the Extended Self," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 15 No.2, pp.139-168.

- 1
2
3
4 Belk, R. (2003), "Shoes and Self," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 29, 27-33
5
6
7 Belk, R.W. (2013), "Extended self in a digital world," *Journal of consumer research*, Vol.40
8 No.3, pp.477-500.
9
10 Belk, R., Fischer, E. and Kozinets, R.V. (2012), *Qualitative consumer and marketing*
11 *research*, Sage.
12
13 Belk, R. W., Ger, G., and Askegaard, S. (2003), "The fire of desire: A multisite inquiry into
14 consumer passion," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.30 No.3, pp.326-351.
15
16
17 Belk, R. and Sobh, R. (2019), No assemblage required: On pursuing original consumer
18 culture theory. *Marketing Theory*, Vol.19 No.4, pp.489-507.
19
20
21 Blazevic, V., Hammedi, W., Garnefeld, I., Rust, R.T., Keiningham, T., Andreassen, T.W.,
22 Donthu, N. and Carl, W. (2013), "Beyond traditional word-of-mouth: An expanded
23 model of customer-driven influence", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 24 No. 3,
24 pp. 294-313.
25
26 N. Bolton, R., Gustafsson, A., McColl-Kennedy, J., J. Sirianni, N. and K. Tse, D. (2014),
27 "Small details that make big differences : A radical approach to consumption
28 experience as a firm's differentiating strategy", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol.
29 25 No. 2, pp. 253-274
30
31
32 Bonetti, F., Warnaby, G., and Quinn, L. (2018), "Augmented reality and virtual reality in
33 physical and online retailing: A review, synthesis and research agenda," *Augmented*
34 *reality and virtual reality*, pp. 119-132.
35
36
37 Brynjolfsson, E., Hu, Y. J., and Rahman, M. S. (2013), "Competing in the age of
38 omnichannel retailing," *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Vol.54 No.4, pp.23–29.
39
40
41 Buhalis, D., Harwood, T., Bogicevic, V., Viglia, G., Beldona, S. and Hofacker, C. (2019),
42 "Technological disruptions in services: lessons from tourism and hospitality," *Journal*
43 *of Service Management*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 484-506.
44
45
46 Burke, P. J. (1991), "Identity Processes and Social Stress," *American Sociological Review*,
47 Vol.56, pp.1103–10.
48
49 Čaić, M., Odekerken-Schröder, G. and Mahr, D. (2018), "Service robots: value co-creation
50 and co-destruction in elderly care networks", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 29
51 No. 2, pp. 178-205.
52
53
54 Celsi, R. L., Rose, R. L., and Leigh, T. W. (1993), "An exploration of high-risk leisure
55 consumption through skydiving," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.20 No.1, pp.1-
56 23.
57
58
59 Chaney, D., Lunardo, R., and Mencarelli, R. (2018), "Consumption experience: past, present,
60 and future," *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 4,
pp. 402-420.

- 1
2
3
4 Christ-Brendemühl, S. and Schaarschmidt, M. (2022), "Customer fairness perceptions in
5 augmented reality-based online services", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 33
6 No. 1, pp. 9-32.
7
8
9 Chylinski, M., Heller, J., Hilken, T., Keeling, D., Mahr, D. and de Ruyter, K. (2020),
10 "Augmented reality marketing: a technology-enabled approach to situated customer
11 experience," *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 374-384.
12
13 Cooley, C. (1902), *Human Nature and the Social Order*, New York: Scribner's.
14
15 Cross, S., and Markus, H. (1991), "Possibles selves accross the life span," *Human*
16 *Development*, pp.230–255.
17
18 Dacko, S. G. (2017), "Enabling smart retail settings via mobile augmented reality shopping
19 apps," *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol. 124, pp. 243-256.
20
21
22 Deloitte. (2020). *Augmented shopping: The quiet revolution*. Deloitte Insights.
23 [https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/topics/emerging-technologies/augmented-](https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/topics/emerging-technologies/augmented-shopping-3d-technology-retail.html)
24 [shopping-3d-technology-retail.html](https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/topics/emerging-technologies/augmented-shopping-3d-technology-retail.html)
25
26
27 Denegri-Knott, J. and Molesworth, M., (2010), "Concepts and practices of digital virtual
28 consumption. Consumption," *Markets and Culture*, Vol.13 No.2, pp.109-132.
29
30
31 De Ruyter, K., Heller, J., Hilken, T., Chylinski, M., Keeling, D. I., and Mahr, D. (2020),
32 "Seeing with the customer's eye: Exploring the challenges and opportunities of AR
33 advertising," *Journal of Advertising*, Vol.49 No.2 pp.109-124.
34
35
36 Enrique Bigné, J., Mattila, A.S. and Andreu, L. (2008), "The impact of experiential
37 consumption cognitions and emotions on behavioral intentions", *Journal of Services*
38 *Marketing*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 303-315.
39
40 Epp, A. M. and Otnes, C. C. (2021) 'High-Quality Qualitative Research: Getting Into
41 Gear', *Journal of Service Research*, 24(2), pp. 163–167.
42
43 Erikson, M. G. (2007), "The meaning of the future: Toward a more specific definition of
44 possible selves," *Review of general psychology*, Vol.11 No.4, pp.348-358.
45
46
47 Flavián, C., Ibáñez-Sánchez, S., and Orús, C. (2019), "The impact of virtual, augmented and
48 mixed reality technologies on the customer experience," *Journal of business research*,
49 Vol.100, No.547-560.
50
51
52 Gómez, M., González-Díaz, B., Martín-Consuegra, D., and Molina, A. (2017), "How do
53 offline and online environments matter in the relational marketing approach?,"
54 *Economic research-Ekonomska istraživanja*, Vol.30 No.1, pp.368-380.
55
56 Helkkula, A. (2011), "Characterising the concept of service experience," *Journal of Service*
57 *Management*, Vol.22 No.3, pp.367-389;
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Ha, S., and Stoel, L. (2012), "Online apparel retailing: roles of e-shopping quality and
4 experiential e-shopping motives," *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp.
5 197-215.
6
7
8 Hilken, T., Heller, J., Chylinski, M., Keeling, D. I., Mahr, D., and de Ruyter, K. (2018),
9 "Making omnichannel an augmented reality: the current and future state of the art,"
10 *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 509-523.
11
12 Hilken, T., de Ruyter, K., Chylinski, M., Mahr, D., and Keeling, D. I. (2017), "Augmenting
13 the eye of the beholder: exploring the strategic potential of augmented reality to
14 enhance online service experiences," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*,
15 Vol.45 No.6, pp.884-905.
16
17
18 Hirschman, E.C. and Holbrook, M.B., 1982. Hedonic consumption: emerging concepts,
19 methods and propositions. *Journal of marketing*, 46(3), pp.92-101.
20
21
22 Holbrook, M. B. (Ed.). (1999), *Consumer value: a framework for analysis and research*,
23 Psychology Press.
24
25 Holmqvist, J., Wirtz, J., and Fritze, M. P. (2020), "Luxury in the digital age: A multi-actor
26 service encounter perspective," *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 121, pp. 747-756.
27
28
29 Huang, T. L. (2019), "Psychological mechanisms of brand love and information technology
30 identity in virtual retail environments," *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*,
31 Vol.47, pp. 251-264.
32
33
34 Huang, T.-L. and Hsu Liu, F. (2014), "Formation of augmented-reality interactive
35 technology's persuasive effects from the perspective of experiential value", *Internet
36 Research*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 82-109
37
38 Jaakkola, E., Helkkula, A., and Aarikka-Stenroos, L. (2015), "Service experience co-creation:
39 conceptualization, implications, and future research directions," *Journal of Service
40 Management*," Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 182-205.
41
42
43 James, W. (1890/1950). *The principles of psychology (Vol. 1)*. New York: Dover.
44
45 Javornik, A. (2016a), "Augmented reality: Research agenda for studying the impact of its
46 media characteristics on consumer behavior," *Journal of Retailing and Consumer
47 Services*, Vol.30, pp.252-261.
48
49
50 Javornik, A. (2016b), "It's an illusion, but it looks real! Consumer affective, cognitive and
51 behavioral responses to augmented reality applications," *Journal of Marketing
52 Management*, Vol.32 No.9-10, pp.987-1011.
53
54
55 Javornik, A., Marder, B., Barhorst, J., McLean, G., Rogers, Y., Marshall, P., Warlop, L.
56 (2022), "What lies behind the filter? Uncovering the motivations for using augmented
57 reality (AR) face filters on social media," *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol.128,
58 No.2022, pp.107126.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Javornik, A., Marder, B., Pizzetti, M., and Warlop, L. (2021), "Augmented self-The effects of
4 virtual face augmentation on consumers' self-concept," *Journal of Business Research*,
5 Vol.130, pp.170-187.
6
7
8 Jin, S. A. A. (2012), "The virtual malleable self and the virtual identity discrepancy model:
9 Investigative frameworks for virtual possible selves and others in avatar-based
10 identity construction and social interaction," *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol.28
11 No.6, pp.2160-2168.
12
13 Kavoori, A. (2015), "Making sense of YouTube," *Global Media Journal*, Vol.13 No.24,
14 pp.1-25.
15
16
17 Keating, B. W., McColl-Kennedy, J. R. and Solnet, D. (2018), "Theorizing beyond the
18 horizon: service research in 2050," *Journal of Service Management*, Vol.29 No.5, pp.
19 766–775.
20
21
22 Kozinets, R. V. (2002), "The field behind the screen: Using netnography for marketing
23 research in online communities. *Journal of marketing research*," Vol.39 No.1, pp. 61-
24 72.
25
26 Kozinets, R. V. (2010), *Netnography: Doing ethnographic research online*, Sage
27 publications.
28
29
30 Kozinets, R. V., Patterson, A., and Ashman, R. (2017), "Networks of Desire: How
31 Technology Increases Our Passion to Consume," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 3,
32 659-682.
33
34
35 Lacan, J. (1996/2006), *Écrits*, Bruce Fink, trans., New York: W, W. Norton.
36
37 Liao, T. (2018), "Future directions for mobile augmented reality research: Understanding
38 relationships between augmented reality users, nonusers, content, devices, and
39 industry," *Mobile, Media, and Communication*, Vol.7 No.1, pp.131-149.
40
41
42 Liao, T., Humphreys, L. (2015), "Layered places: Using mobile augmented reality to
43 tactically reengage, reproduce, and re-appropriate public space," *New Media and
44 Society*, Vol.17 No.9, pp.1418-1435.
45
46
47 Lindemann, H. (2014), *Holding and Letting Go: The Social Practice of Personal Identities*,
48 Oxford" Oxford University Press.
49
50
51 Marcengo, A., Buriano, L., and Geymonat, M. (2014), "Speech.io: A personal QS mirror for
52 life patterns discovery and" self" reshaping," in *International Conference on
53 Universal Access in Human-Computer Interaction* (pp. 215-226). Springer, Cham.
54
55
56 Markus, H., Nurius, P. (1986). "Possible selves," *American Psychologist*, Vol.41 No.9, pp.
57 954-969.
58
59
60 Marinova, D., de Ruyter, K., Huang, M. H., Meuter, M. L., and Challagalla, G. (2017).
Getting smart: Learning from technology-empowered frontline interactions. *Journal
of Service Research*, 20(1), 29-42.

- 1
2
3
4 Olsson, T., Lagerstam, E., Kärkkäinen, T. and Väänänen-Vainio-Mattila, K., 2013. Expected
5 user experience of mobile augmented reality services: a user study in the context of
6 shopping centres. *Personal and ubiquitous computing*, 17(2), pp.287-304.
7
8
9 Oyserman, D., and Fryberg, S. (2006), "The possible selves of diverse adolescents: Content
10 and function across gender, race and national origin," In, *Possible Selves: Theory,*
11 *Research, and Applications* Editors: Curtis Dunkel and Jennifer Kerpelman, pp. 17-
12 39.
13
14 Patrick, V. M., MacInnis, D. J., and Folkes, V. S. (2002), "Approaching what we hope for
15 and avoiding what we fear: The role of possible selves in consumer behavior," *ACR*
16 *North American Advances.* , in NA - Advances in Consumer Research Volume 29,
17 eds. Susan M. Broniarczyk and Kent Nakamoto, Valdosta, GA : Association for
18 Consumer Research, Pages: 270-276.
19
20
21 Pendergast, M. (2009), *Mirror, mirror: A history of the human love affair with reflection,*
22 Basic Books.
23
24
25 Pine, B. J., and Gilmore, J. (1998), "Welcome to the experience economy," *Harvard business*
26 *review*, Vol.76 No.4, pp. 97-105.
27
28
29 Qin, H., Peak, D. A., and Prybutok, V. (2021), "A virtual market in your pocket: How does
30 mobile augmented reality (MAR) influence consumer decision making?" *Journal of*
31 *Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol.58, No.102337.
32
33 Rauschnabel, P.A., Babin, B.J., tom Dieck, M.C., Krey, N. and Jung, T., 2022. What is
34 augmented reality marketing? Its definition, complexity, and future. *Journal of*
35 *Business Research*, 142, pp.1140-1150.
36
37
38 Rauschnabel, P. A., Felix, R., and Hinsch, C. (2019), "Augmented reality marketing: How
39 mobile AR-apps can improve brands through inspiration," *Journal of Retailing and*
40 *Consumer Services*, Vol.49, pp.43-53.
41
42
43 Rosa, J. A., and Malter, A. J. (2003). E-(embodied) knowledge and e-commerce: How
44 physiological factors affect online sales of experiential products. *Journal of Consumer*
45 *Psychology*, 13(1-2), 63-73.
46
47
48 Schau, H. J., and Akaka, M. A. (2021), "From customer journeys to consumption journeys: a
49 consumer culture approach to investigating value creation in practice-embedded
50 consumption," *AMS Review*, pp. 1-14.
51
52
53 Schindler, R. M., and Holbrook, M. B. (2003), "Nostalgia for early experience as a
54 determinant of consumer preferences, *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol.20 No.4,
55 pp.275-302.
56
57
58 Scholz, J., and Duffy, K. (2018), "We are at home: How augmented reality reshapes mobile
59 marketing and consumer-brand relationships," *Journal of Retailing and Consumer*
60 *Services*, Vol.44, pp.11-23.

- 1
2
3 Scholz, J., and Smith, A. N. (2016), "Augmented reality: Designing immersive experiences
4 that maximize consumer engagement," *Business Horizons*, Vol.59 No.2, pp.149-161.
5
6
7 Schouten, J. (1991), "Selves in Transition: Symbolic Consumption in Personal Rites of
8 Passage and Identity Reconstruction," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.17 No.4,
9 pp.412-425.
10
11 Scott, R., Cayla, J, and Cova, B. (2017), "Selling pain to the saturated self." *Journal of*
12 *Consumer Research*, Vol.44 No.1, pp. 22-43.
13
14 Seregina, A., and Weijo, H. A. (2017), "Play at any cost: How cosplayers produce and
15 sustain their ludic communal consumption experiences," *Journal of Consumer*
16 *Research*, Vol.44 No.1, pp.139-159.
17
18 Sherif, CW (1963). "Social categorization as a function of latitude of acceptance and series
19 range," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol.67 No.2, pp.148–56.
20
21
22 Singh, R. (2019), "Why do online grocery shoppers switch or stay? An exploratory analysis
23 of consumers' response to online grocery shopping experience," *International*
24 *Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, Vol. 47 No. 12, pp. 1300-1317.
25
26
27 Sloan, M. M. (2007), "The "real self" and inauthenticity: The importance of self-concept
28 anchorage for emotional experiences in the workplace," *Social Psychology Quarterly*,
29 Vol.70 No.3, pp.305-318.
30
31
32 Smink, A. R., Frowijn, S., van Reijmersdal, E. A., van Noort, G., and Neijens, P. C. (2019).
33 "Try online before you buy: How does shopping with augmented reality affect brand
34 responses and personal data disclosure," *Electronic Commerce Research and*
35 *Applications*, 35, 100854.
36
37
38 Smith, R. K., Vandellen, M. R. and Ton, L. A. N. (2021), "Make-up Who You Are: Self-
39 Expression Enhances the Perceived Authenticity and Public Promotion of Beauty
40 Work," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.48, pp. 102–122.
41
42
43 Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1998), *Basics of qualitative research techniques*, Thousand Oaks,
44 CA: Sage publications.
45
46
47 Teixeira, J., Patrício, L., Nunes, N. J., Nóbrega, L., Fisk, R. P., and Constantine, L. (2012).
48 "Customer experience modeling: from customer experience to service design,"
49 *Journal of Service management*, Vol 23 No 3, pp. 362-376.
50
51
52 Thompson, C. J., Locander, W. B., and Pollio, H. R. (1989), "Putting consumer experience
53 back into consumer research: The philosophy and method of existential-
54 phenomenology," *Journal of consumer research*, Vol.16 No.2, pp.133-146.
55
56
57 Vargo, S. L., and Lusch, R. F. (2008). Service-dominant logic: continuing the evolution.
58 *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(1), 1-10.
59
60 Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F., 2017. Service-dominant logic 2025. *International Journal of*
Research in Marketing, 34(1), pp.46-67.

1
2
3
4 Xu, J., and Chan, A. (2010), "Service experience and package tours," *Asia Pacific Journal of*
5 *Tourism Research*, Vol.15 No.2, pp.177-194.
6

7
8 Zhao, S. (2005), "The digital self: Through the looking glass of Telecopresent others,"
9 *Symbolic interaction*, Vol.28 No.3, pp.387-405.
10

11 Zhao, J., Wang, T., and Fan, X. (2015), "Patient value co-creation in online health
12 communities: social identity effects on customer knowledge contributions and
13 membership continuance intentions in online health communities." *Journal of Service*
14 *Management*, Vol.26 No1, pp.72-96.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Figure 1. AR Makeup**
4



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 2. AR Makeup (Fantasy) Instagram Post



Table I. Participants Information

| No | Name (Pseudonym) | Age | Gender | Profession | Nationality/Country of Residence |
|-----|------------------|-----|--------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. | Amina | 20 | F | Student | British/UK |
| 2. | Xintian | 27 | F | Student | Chinese/UK |
| 3. | Misun | 30 | F | Student | Chinese/UK |
| 4. | Mario | 23 | M | Sales Assistant | Italian/UK |
| 5. | Maria | 29 | F | Investor Analyst | Spanish/Spain |
| 6. | Fernanda | 30 | F | Performance Analyst | Portuguese/UK |
| 7. | Natalia | 29 | F | Student | Russian/UK |
| 8. | Antonella | 27 | F | Sales Representative | Italian/Ireland |
| 9. | Dea | 35 | F | Events Manager | British/UK |
| 10. | Sophie | 20 | F | Student | German/UK |
| 11. | Fiona | 33 | F | Business Development Manager | British/UK |
| 12. | Melanie | 31 | F | Work Coach | Italian/UK |
| 13. | Melissa | 48 | F | Student | British/UK |
| 14. | Maryna | 33 | F | Student | Iranian/UK |
| 15. | Laura | 31 | F | Teacher | Italian/Italy |
| 16. | Sarah | 35 | F | Teacher | British/France |
| 17. | William | 50 | M | Founder of AR Agency | British/UK |
| 18. | Haci | 55 | M | Ex-CMO at AR Agency | British/UK |
| 19. | Merina | 21 | F | Student | Indian/India |
| 20. | Shaarika | 24 | F | Research Executive | Indian/India |

| | | | | | |
|-----|------------|----|---|-----------------------|--------------|
| 21. | Saakshi | 26 | F | Marketer | Indian/India |
| 22. | Damini | 19 | F | Student | Indian/India |
| 23. | Nadira | 27 | F | Engineer | Indian/India |
| 24. | Sulakshana | 19 | F | Student | Indian/India |
| 25. | Venya | 21 | F | Student | Indian/India |
| 26. | Maryam | 28 | F | Research Executive | Indian/India |
| 27. | Ananya | 28 | F | Home Maker | Indian/India |
| 28. | Aneeta | 21 | F | Student | Indian/India |
| 29. | Diya | 30 | F | Home Maker | Indian/India |
| 30. | Sargam | 24 | F | Freelancer | Indian/India |

Table II Summary of Research Design and Data Collection

| Method | Country | Period | Data volume | AR familiarity | AR makeup platforms |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Interviews | UK | November 2019 – November 2020 | 18 interviews | Light to heavy | Makeup mirror at Charlotte Tilbury Makeup Genius app by L'Oréal |
| Netnography | India | December 2019 – December 2020 | 495 reviews (Instagram and app store) | Light to heavy | Perfect 365 and Artistry |
| Interviews | India | June 2020 – April 2021 | 12 interviews | Light to heavy | Perfect 365 and Artistry |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Table III. Findings Summary

| Theme | Code | Description | Example |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Imagination and Fantasy | Magic Fantasy Memory Dream Illusion | Consumers describe how their AR images enhanced their fantasy and imagination | <p>“...I got to try the box curls with Rihanna’s entire mint-ish green look from that British award show. I really felt like Rihanna’s Indian twin, dream come true really, though minus the music haha.”</p> <p>“...Mom tells me about styles popular in 80s, that [had] Sadhana bangs and all. I got mom to try 80s looks and she was like wowieeee.... so many past memories came up.”</p> |
| (In)Authentic Self and Reality | AR versus human experience | Strong desire for real human experience and the call for humanised AR | <p>“...I don’t think anybody in store would use it [the AR mirror] because if you’re going to the store, you’re already going there for the human interaction...that’s definitely what is missing that human aspect...with makeup, with woman is so important. It’s so emotional.”</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | <p>“...oh you see this is what I was talking about [in a funny laughing tone] oh my god, look I would never wear this [very surprised], it doesn't look real, does it look real? Do you think I will go out like this? [we are both laughing].”</p> |
| | Resisting AR reality and the desire for real experience | In-store shopping experience is unique and difficult to replace using AR to achieve makeup consistency | <p>“...I don't think I would use it no, no, I wouldn't use it. I'm sure I like buying Cosmetics... Cosmetics is something that I enjoy, I enjoy walking in and trying stuff.”</p> <p>“...it's also not only how it looks to me it's also consistency of a product. For example, if it's a lipstick, there's different sort of lipsticks like a lip gloss mad lipstick. It's the consistency of the product that this app can't tell me what it is.”</p> |
| | Self-acceptance versus social acceptance | Resisting AR suggestions and the fear of social rejection when sharing AR makeup photos | <p>“what the hell ya doing every time by whitening my face. I am dusky and I wanna know what is</p> |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | <p>matching my face. Can someone be realistic here for God’s sake!!!”</p> <p>“...I did not share the pics with anyone but saved them on my phone. I looked so different, though beautiful.”</p> |
| | <p>Authentic-self and proxy-self</p> | <p>Online makeup influencers outperform AR where consumers seek a proxy-self in social media platforms and online reviews.</p> | <p>“...I said people on Instagram look like the same as they look in real life, it’s not, so; it’s the same with AR, it’s doesn’t look the same in the real life like it looks on the app. ... I’m going to pick up the same color the influencer has, it’s probably going to look different on me because we’re all different.”</p> <p>“...I usually go on YouTube...first see what it looks like on them [influencers] and then I’ll go and try those specific colors on myself...Because someone might say oh, this is a very nice deep red, but my skin tone is different to theirs...I don’t believe that it [AR]</p> |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

| | | | |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | takes into account your undertone, what your skin tone does, or the tone of your lips.” |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Journal of Service Management

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Journal of Service Management