
Special Issue Paper

Marketing and market マーケティングと市場

A. Fuat FIRAT

University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, Professor

In this paper, a contradiction that has developed between the key economic institution of modernity, the market, and its institutionalized practices, marketing, is explored. This paper makes observations beyond earlier discussions of this contradiction based on the history of perspectival developments in the orientations of the discipline and in marketing practices. Specifically, separation of marketing practice from consumers resulting in its conceptualization as a provisional set of activities, and the turn from a focus on needs to a focus on exchange resulting in an emphasis on the health of the market rather than on the health of the people are articulated. It is observed that these developments in marketing orientations signal a reversal of ends and means. It is argued that the modern market, its growth and prosperity, which was originally conceptualized as a means, as one institution to serve humanity's needs, is now an end, and that human beings are now in the service of the economic goals of the market. Based on these observations, the paper proposes that to develop solutions for the problems arising from the historical growth of the marketing discipline and practices in modernity, a new perspective needs to be adopted, one that conceptualizes marketing as cultural practices embedded in communities and involving consumers and organizations as partners in being mutually involved in the construction and fulfillment of human desires.

Key Words : modernity, modern market's origins, modern marketing, marketing's future

本稿では、近代の重要な経済制度である市場と、その制度化された実践であるマーケティングとの間に生じた矛盾について検討する。本稿は、マーケティング論の方向性とマーケティング実践に関するパースペクティブの展開史を基礎に、この矛盾について、これまでの議論を超えた考察を行う。具体的には、マーケティングの実践が消費者から切り離されたために、その概念化が諸活動の暫定的なセットとしてなされたこと、また、ニーズから交換へと焦点が転換されたことによって、人間の健康よりも市場の健全性が強調されるようになったことが明らかにされる。マーケティングの方向性に関するこうした展開は、目的と手段が逆転している印であることが述べられる。近代市場、およびその成長と繁栄は、本来、手段、すなわち人間のニーズに対応するためのひとつの制度として概念化されたのであるが、今や市場が目的となり、人間は市場の経済目標に奉仕する存在になっていると論じられる。こうした考察から、本稿は、近代におけるマーケティング論と実践の歴史的な発展から生じる問題を解決するために、新たなパースペクティブが必要であると提案する。それは、すなわち、マーケティングをコミュニティに埋め込まれた文化的諸活動であると概念化し、消費者と組織の関係を、人間の欲望の構築と充足に相互にかかわるパートナーとして概念化するというものである。

キーワード：モダニティ、近代市場の起源、近代マーケティング、マーケティングの未来

(翻訳：薄井和夫)

Introduction

Modern marketing, throughout its history, has been known and assumed to be a practice of the modern market. In this article, I intend to illustrate that modern marketing, as the institutionalized practices of the market, has nevertheless increasingly adopted practices contrary to the ideals of the modern market as conceptualized by the

original architects of modern economic thought. With the advent of greater emphasis on relationship marketing and the service dominant (S-D) logic, specifically at the beginning of the 21st Century, it can be argued that marketing may have become principally anti-market. I intend to advance this thesis by studying the history of the conception and growth of the idea(1) of the modern market, thus exposing the principles that guided it. Then I explore the

* Author contact: fuat.firat@utrgv.edu

aims and practices of modern marketing to illustrate why it is antithetical to the idea (1) of the modern market.

Modernity

Often, the beginnings of marketing have been considered to be in early 20th Century. Although this may be true for the discipline that we now know as marketing, the practices and underlying structures that constitute the body of marketing can be argued to be as old as the beginnings of human culture. The 'marketing' recognized as such in the discipline can be called *modern* marketing since this disciplinary conceptualization of the body of structures and practices are very much a product of modernist thought. As Fullerton (1988) exposed, practices compiled under the marketing umbrella have existed possibly as early as the birth of the market as economists articulating modern economics conceptualized it.

The principal architects of the idea of the modern market are the classical economists, including Adam Smith (1776 / 1776), David Ricardo (1817), John Stuart Mill (1815), and Jean-Baptiste Say (1817 / 1843). Economics as a discipline developed during the relatively early stages of modernity the beginnings of which is considered to be in the Enlightenment (Harvey, 1989). Yet, Enlightenment was able to flourish in the Western World largely thanks to the Renaissance that originally raised the stature of the human individual to a *subject* worthy of focus of attention and study (Campbell, 2019). Economics appeared, resulting from modern culture's eventual separation into domains, as the discipline that studied one of the three key practical domains of modernity – the political, the social, and the economic – conceptualized as the means of exercising the principles that would liberate the human individual from all oppression to be able to participate in building modern humanity's vision of a grand future based on her/his free and independent will. All leaders of social disciplines trying to develop the key principles of modern culture to accomplish its key ideal – to control nature and produce the grand future society through scientific knowledge to emancipate all individual human beings from all forms of oppression, whether from nature or from other humans, to follow their own individual free wills to fulfill the potential of each (Angus, 1989) – sought to establish principles and institutions to help this vision to occur.

The nation-state of the political domain is the institution to exercise the principle of the domain, democracy. The nuclear family, among others such as public education, is the premier institution for the exercise of civility in the so-

cial domain. These principles and institutions were envisioned as ways of providing the foundations for emancipating human individuals from all oppression and obligations in order to free them to equally participate in social and political choices made and, thus, become able to act solely on the basis of their own will, hopefully informed by scientific knowledge. Modernist thinkers concentrating on the economic domain were also keen to discover principles and institutions that would achieve the same in the economic domain.

Origins of the Market

Possibly inspired by institutions such as the bazaar and the agora, where interactions beyond economic exchanges also took place, modern classical economists who essentially observed such institutions as 'marketplaces' developed their theories regarding the economic principle and the institution through which it would be exercised. When the idea of meeting to exchange resources in marketplaces was principally extended to the abstract concept of 'the market', where exchanges could take place not only among people who knew each other or inhabited the same localities but among those who never knew each other beyond the moment of exchange, modern economists saw a principle that would free people who exchanged with each other from any obligation to each other once they exchanged resources. The seller need not know the hardships the buyer had to endure to get the resource s/he exchanged and the buyer need not know the hardships the seller went through to obtain or produce what s/he exchanged. Once the exchange was made, neither party would have any obligations toward the other, thus feel no pressure to think of anything else but one's own will as s/he made decisions about life. The only concern for the parties in exchange would then be receiving the equivalent of the economic value that s/he paid for the exchange. Thus, economic value became the core principle of the economic domain, because its equalization in exchanges would assure efficiency of allocation of material resources as well as maximize market and economic growth, and the modern market became the modern institution through which the principle would be practiced in the economic domain.

The brief history of the constitution of the market above illustrates that the original architects of modern economy envisioned, along with other modernist thinkers, a cultural construction that would realize, in the economic domain, the ideal of modernity – expressed above

– as did other modernist thinkers of the other domains of modern culture. Marketing developed as the institutionalized practices of the market. However, eventually marketing practices have developed in ways that counter the original purposes of the market.

A Brief History of the Development of Marketing

Practices such as informational and persuasive communication that later came to be considered as part of modern marketing existed long before modernity. The ‘market’ as the core of the concept of marketing is largely an institutionalization of modern culture, when production of things became oriented not towards what one’s own homestead and community needed to maintain life, but oriented towards an estimation of what others desired. That is, production largely ceased to be for one’s own; production was now for the market; production and consumption were separated in time, space, and purpose. This meant that methods of gauging what the market needed, procuring things to accomplish the production of things that would satisfy these needs, improving the methods of communicating the existence of these things that would satisfy the needs (products) to the market, and developing the means to move the products to the markets where they were needed, among other practices, all became skills that had to be developed and utilized.

Originally, these skills were practiced to facilitate buyers and sellers finding each other. Yet, inherent in the development of these skills were traits that could thwart the original aims in the development of the modern concept of the market. Indeed, marketers could use these skills to promote long-term relationships with buyers to assure longevity of their existence, rather than simply facilitate one-time exchanges. These inherent traits became trends as marketing developed, producing the currently highly popular practices of relationship marketing and the service-dominant logic. Creating relationships are integral to these later marketing strategies, but they are contrary to the original idea(1) of the market; that of freeing all individuals involved in exchange from obligations or loyalty to each other so that each can act only on the basis of her/his own free and independent will.

It is also arguable that assumptions made regarding the complete liberation of human individuals from all obligations were historically illusory. That is, human beings are largely symbolic, thus cultural, therefore communal beings (Cassirer, 1955 ; Lévy-Strauss, 1963); they develop and get into relationships with others. These relationships

– which take multiple forms, such as kinship, friendship, marital, power, legitimacy, and the like – come with obligations and dependencies as well as emotional bonds arising from love, admiration, etc. Consequently, the human individual is always in a network of limits to her/his independence. The possibilities of the individual’s effective participation in humanity’s actions toward its future, therefore, have to be conceptualized with recognition of this necessary condition, not through its denial.

Implications

Under the circumstance of this contradiction between the concept of the modern market, aimed at realizing the purpose of modernity, and modern marketing practices, we are left with a complex problem. Is it the market as it was conceptualized by modernist thinkers or marketing as it has developed that deserves recognition? Is the ideal of the market to individualize and disband and detach humans realizable or is it a human imperative to form relationships, thereby obligations and loyalties? Is the pursuit of free and independent wills illusory or possible within limits when relations among humans are institutionalized and structured in accommodating designs?

Recognizing the contradiction and asking questions such as above and similar ones is the first step to better understand our institutions and the condition of humanity. Paradoxically, while marketing scholars often do not show much interest in these issues, they may be in the best position to respond to the call of such issues that seem to be most significant in contemporary society; after all they should be the ones most knowledgeable about markets and marketing.

Further Observations

At the same time that marketing may thus have moved away from the original ideal of the market, its discourses have reinforced the separation between producers and consumers. The disciplinary conceptualizations and philosophies of marketing have gone through several iterations as indicated by a multiplicity of studies (see, e.g., Bartels, 1976; Hollander et al., 2005; Jones and Monieson, 1990 ; Wilkie and Moore, 2003) . A focus on functions served by marketing institutions (Alderson and Martin, 1965; Smalley and Fraedrich, 1995) developed into a managerial focus (McCarthy, 1960) . The broadening of the concept of marketing (Kotler and Levy, 1969) further led to a focus on the core concept of marketing (Bagozzi,

1975; Kotler, 1972).

With facilitation, creation, orchestration, and promotion of exchanges constituting the core purpose of marketing, several fundamental philosophical orientations that existed earlier were reinforced (Spratlen, 1972). Marketing is seen as a practice of provisioning for the needs or desires expressed by consumer units or discovered through marketing research. Consumer units' being in control of and generators of their needs or desires is largely taken for granted. Marketing's role is, then, to find out what the needs are and provide for them. This seems a lofty and democratic role for marketing until we recognize that needs are not so independently formed or generated, but that consumers are under constant influence of and dependent on others and life circumstances. Thus, few attempts were made by marketing scholars to recognize that what needs are expressed might not necessarily be healthy for consumers themselves or for society (Kotler and Levy, 1971 ; Kotler and Zaltman, 1971). Yet, such attempts at recognizing the contrarities between the micro and macro rationales of consumption were largely drowned by the interests of mainstream marketing.

Although exchange is still considered to be the core concept of marketing, newer perspectives have also appeared. Among these relationship marketing (e.g., Aijo, 1996), service-dominant logic (e.g., Vargo and Lusch, 2004), and co-creation/co-production (e.g., Grönroos, 2011) perspectives may have been the most influential. Despite their appearance as new perspectives, the key orientations of prior marketing perspectives have remained intact. Consumers are owners of their own desires and marketing is a practice performed by organizations that are separated from consumer units that they meet in the market. What is provided may no longer be conceived as finished product, but resources or process (Firat et al., 1995) that the consumer can engage with to complete the product and its consumption.

These developments in the history of marketing have reinforced its position as a business or management discipline, yet its impact is widely social and cultural. Furthermore, as the discipline's interest has distanced itself from understanding how needs are fulfilled through a network of institutions and practices to focus on the facilitation and promotion of exchanges, it has increasingly aligned itself with the economic interest of the market instead of the interests of people in fulfilling their wide range of goals in life. Consequently, as a discipline, marketing became complicit in the turn from liberalism, as modernity's dominant ideology, to neoliberalism as the dominant ideology in

market society (Harvey, 2005 ; Slater and Tonkiss, 2001) as modern culture culminated into consumer culture.

Some Beginnings

It is interesting that a contradiction has developed between the key economic institution of modernity, the market, and its institutionalized practices, marketing (Atik and Firat, 2013). The tension between the two has been earlier recognized (Benton 1987 ; Cochoy, 1998). In this essay some further observations based on the history of perspectival developments in the orientations of the discipline have been made. Specifically, separation of marketing from consumers resulting in its conceptualization as a provisional set of activities, and the turn from a focus on needs to a focus on exchange resulting in an emphasis on the health of the market rather than on the health of the people have been mentioned. In effect, in these developments in marketing orientations a reversal of ends and means is observed. The modern market, its growth and prosperity, which was originally conceptualized as a means, one institution to serve humanity's needs, has now become an end. Human beings are now in the service of the economic goals of the market (Chomsky, 1999).

Any proposal for the resolution of these issues needs to begin by accepting the fact that neither the market nor modern marketing as it has developed can provide an answer to the complex issues their history of development has raised. Novel and original thinking is required. Specifically, two conditions may have to be recognized to move forward toward a resolution. One condition to recognize is that the idea that individual human beings can completely free themselves from all relations, obligations, and influences to achieve total free and independent wills is illusory. A second condition to recognize is that any form of marketing that separates organizations that provide for needs and the people who have the needs is doomed to inherently contain a conflict between the interests of organizations and the people, because their interests will be inherently different.

In a 2006 article, Firat and Dholakia (2006) suggested some potential transformations that could overcome the issues recognized above. One of their suggestion is the possibility that marketing could transform from being conceptualized and practiced as a set of business or organizational activities to an embedded cultural practice. This would mean that marketing would become "part of the community to facilitate the efforts of consumer communities to mutually construct their desires and the products"

(Firat and Dholakia, 2006 : 148) to fulfill the desires so constructed. This transformation would be an acceptance that human desires are inescapably cultural constructions, therefore, the concern becomes one of balancing influences to enable a decent level of community participation in this cultural construction. This would also tend to remove people from a simple consumer role of making choices among alternatives available in the market to having a voice, through their communities, in what alternatives will be available.

Other suggestions by Firat and Dholakia for a transformation of the marketing orientation, and its core philosophy, that complement embedded marketing includes adoption of a mode of collaboration with communities rather than consider marketing as a management practice, a move to a diffused rather than centralized practice to enable everyone to become involved in 'embedded marketing', and the recognition of the complex nature of the construction and fulfillment of desires requiring a 'constant (re) (de)construction' of community networks rather than insist on imposing *an* order onto a naturally fluid existence.

Solutions to be sought, therefore, require original thinking and institutionalizations, and maybe most urgently, new concepts through which potential alternative organizations of life can be envisioned (Firat and Dholakia, 2017). Concepts that we currently use to organize our understandings of relations among people, societies, politics, and the economy, in general, culture, are too heavy with baggage carried over from modern organizations of life and the institutionalizations they allowed to be constituted.

References

- Aijo, Toivo (1996), "The Theoretical and Philosophical Underpinnings of Relationship Marketing," *European Journal of Marketing*, 30, 2, 8-18.
- Alderson, Wroe and Miles W. Martin (1965), "Toward a Formal Theory of Transactions and Transvections," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 2 (May), 117-127.
- Angus, Ian (1989), "Circumscribing Postmodern Culture," in I. Angus and S. Jhally, eds., *Cultural Politics in Contemporary America*, New York: Routledge, 96-107.
- Atik, Deniz and A. Fuat Firat (2013), "Fashion Creation and Diffusion: The Institution of Marketing," *Journal of Marketing Management*, 29, 7-8, 836-860.
- Bagozzi, Richard P. (1975), "Marketing as Exchange," *Journal of Marketing*, 39 October), 32-39.
- Bartels, Robert (1976), *The History of Marketing Thought*, Columbus, OH: Grid Publishing, Inc. (2nd edition).
- Benton, Raymond, Jr. (1987), "The Practical Domain of Marketing: The Notion of a 'Free' Enterprise Market Economy as a Guise for Institutionalized Marketing Power," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 46, 4, 415-430.
- Campbell, Gordon, ed. (2019), *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Renaissance*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Cassirer, Ernst (1955), *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, New Haven, NJ: Yale University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (1999), *Profit Over People: Neoliberalism and Global Order*, New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Cochoy, Franck (1998), "Another Discipline for the Market Economy: Marketing as a Performative Knowledge and Know-How for Capitalism," *The Sociological Review*, 46, 194-221.
- Firat, A. Fuat and Nikhilesh Dholakia (2006), "Theoretical and Philosophical Implications of Postmodern Debates: Some Challenges to Modern Marketing," *Marketing Theory*, 6, 2, 123-162.
- Firat, A. Fuat and Nikhilesh Dholakia (2017), "From Consumer to Construer: Travels in Human Subjectivity," *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 17, 3, 504-522.
- Firat, A. Fuat, Nikhilesh Dholakia and Alladi Venkatesh (1995), "Marketing in a Postmodern World," *European Journal of Marketing*, 29, 1, 40-56.
- Fullerton, Ronald A. (1988), "How Modern is Modern Marketing? Marketing's Evolution and the Myth of the "Production Era"," *Journal of Marketing*, 52 (January), 108-125.
- Grönroos, Christian (2011), "Value Co-creation in Service-Logic: A Critical Analysis," *Marketing Theory*, 11, 3, 279-301.
- Harvey, David (1989), *The Condition of Modernity: An Inquiry into the Origin of Cultural Change*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Harvey, David (2005), *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hollander, Stanley C., Kathleen M. Rassuli, D.G. Brian Jones, and Laura F. Dix (2005), "Periodization in Marketing History," *Journal of Macromarketing*, 25 (June), 32-41.
- Jones, D.G. Brian and David D. Monieson (1990), "Early Development of the Philosophy of Marketing Thought," *Journal of Marketing*, 24, 1, 137-142.
- Kotler, Philip (1972), "A Generic Concept of Marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, 36 (April), 46-54.

- Kotler, Philip and Sidney Levy (1969), "Broadening the Concept of Marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, 33 (January), 10-15.
- Kotler, Philip and Sidney Levy (1971), "Demarketing, yes, Demarketing," *Harvard Business Review*, 49, 6, 74-80.
- Kotler, Philip and Gerald Zaltman (1971), "Social Marketing: An Approach to Planned Social Change," *Journal of Marketing*, 35, 3, 3-12
- Lévy-Strauss, Claude (1963), *Structural Anthropology*, New York: Basic Books.
- McCarthy, E. Jerome (1960), *Basic Marketing: A Managerial Approach*, Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Mill, John Stuart (2015), *On Liberty, Utilitarianism, and Other Essays*, M. Philp and F. Rosen, eds., Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ricardo, David (1817), *The Principles of Political Economy, and Taxation*, London, UK: John Murray, Albermarle-Street.
- Say, Jean-Baptiste (2017/1843), *A Treatise on Political Economy; or the Production, Distribution, and Consumption of Wealth*, Miami, FL: HardPress.
- Slater, Don and Fran Tonkiss (2001), *Market Society*, Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Smalley, Roger and John Fraedrich (1995), "Aldersonian Functionalism: An Enduring Theory in Marketing," *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 3, 4, 1-16.
- Smith, Adam (1779/1776), *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Oxford, UK: Clarendon.
- Spratlen, Thaddeus H. (1972), "The Challenge of a Humanist Value Orientation in Marketing," in *Society and Marketing: An Unconventional View*, N. Kangun, ed., New York, Harper and Row.
- Vargo, Stephen L. and Robert F. Lusch (2004), "Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, 68 (January), 1-17.
- Wilkie, William L. and Elisabeth S. Moore (2003), "Scholarly Research in Marketing: Exploring the "4 Eras" of Thought Development," *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 22, 2, 116-146.