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As linchpin disciplines, marketing and anthropology afford each other some distinct opportunities for intellectual cooperation. Growing through entitlement and arrogation, the evolution of marketing thought has been shaped by a kind of eminent domain which promises to engulf all of the disciplines bordering political economy. The revival of interest in and reappraisal of the concept of political economy gathering pace in anthropology (Gregory 1982), reminds us too that anthropology has grown by merger and acquisition. In this article, both marketing and consumer behavior are viewed as sociocultural systems amenable to anthropological scrutiny. Among marketing theorists, who have watched the discipline move from myopic viewpoint (Levitt 1964) to a perspective verging on the hyperopic, the fear that in broadening the concept of marketing its scope has been narrowed, has become almost tangible (Bartels 1983). Such concern challenges the anthropological imagination, for if Koestler (1964) is right, even self-conscious, satirical assays of definition (Lutz 1984) can provoke new insight into marketing and consumer behaviors.

The developmental perspective of concepts of marketing, culminating in an ecological view of marketing, propounded by
Thorelli (1980; 1983), enlarged upon Day and Wensley (1983a; 1983b) and by Burnett (1983), and rooted ultimately in the exchange principle elaborated by Bagozzi (1974, 1975, 1979), is most compatible with an anthropological approach to marketing. From an initial conception of marketing as "custom-tailoring" by craftsman for consumers, the field has shifted from a producer-oriented view (selling what a firm makes) through a consumer-oriented view, to an interactive view of the marketing process (aiming at only those consumer needs that the firm can enjoy a differential advantage in satisfying). This last, or "open ecosystems" perspective, encompasses each of the others (Thorelli 1980; 1983), and is a useful construct for researchers as well as practitioners. In Thorelli's ecosystem we witness strategic interaction between and among actors and environments through which change is negotiated. Thus, marketing behavior (as well as consumer behavior) is essentially an adaptive strategy by which resources affecting the life chances of actors and environments are exchanged. It is a cultural system which at base is inescapably political. One of the advantages of an anthropological approach to marketing would be to (re)legitimate all potential areas of inquiry, ending the hegemony of such topics as decision-making, and heightening the value of focusing on process and context.

The "Three Dichotomies" model of marketing proposed by Hunt (1983a) as a general paradigm for the discipline is a useful framework for comprehending the evolution of marketing thought. More appropriately to the thrust of this article, it imparts some direction to future research which might properly be termed anthropological. Hunt's model classifies marketing phenomena according to three categorial dichotomies--profit/nonprofit, micro/macro, and positive/normative--into eight schematic cells. The first dichotomy contrasts the presence or absence of pecuniary gain as a formal objective of an actor. The second dichotomy contrasts market behavior at individual and systematic levels. The third dichotomy contrasts actual with ideal market behavior. Among his fundamental explananda of marketing, Hunt (1983b) includes the behaviors of buyers, sellers and institutional frameworks directed at consummating exchange, along with the social impact of these
While marketers are able to identify this paradigm, they differ widely in its interpretation. The paradigm provides anthropologists with an accessible point of entry into a complex cultural system. Hunt's model is reproduced in Table 1. The core concepts emerging from this model provide the skeletal structure of the marketing enterprise. This structure broadly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Profit Sector</th>
<th>Normative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Problems, issues, theories, and research concerning:</td>
<td>2. Problems, issues, normative models, and research concerning how firms should:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Individual consumer buyer behavior</td>
<td>a. Determine the marketing mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How firms determine prices</td>
<td>b. Make pricing decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. How firms determine products</td>
<td>c. Make product decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. How firms determine promotion</td>
<td>d. Make promotion decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. How firms determine channels of distribution</td>
<td>e. Make packaging decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Case studies of marketing practices</td>
<td>f. Make purchasing decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. Make international marketing decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. Organize their marketing departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Control their marketing efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j. Plan their marketing strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k. Apply systems theory to marketing problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l. Manage retail establishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m. Manage wholesale establishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n. Implement the marketing concept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
describes phenomena which have engaged the attention of people called marketers, and which lend themselves to being understood through anthropological method and perspective. The core concepts include: actor[s] (Levy 1978b; Hunt 1983a); resource[s] (Woods 1981); motivation (Ferber and Wales 1958; Van Raiij and Wandwossen 1978); exchange (Bagozzi 1974, 1975, 1979);
relationship management (Levitt 1983); social context (Zielinski and Robertson 1982; Nicosia and Mayer 1976; Wallendorf and Zaltman 1983; Belk 1975); feedback (Bettman 1979; Sternthal and Craig 1983). A variant of this structure has been used effectively in interpreting gift giving behavior (Sherry 1983).

A glance at Table 1 will verify that, despite the enormous range of issues that traditionally would inflame holistic research fervor, anthropologists have confined their study of marketplace behavior, where such study has actually occurred in contemporary
industrial society, to just a few cells, specifically, cells 3, 4, 7, and 8, are most likely to appeal to traditional anthropologists. The tension between local and universal, particular and general, and idiographic and nomothetic, which animates much anthropological inquiry, has not been nearly as vital in the study of contemporary marketplace behavior. The macrolevel orientation of

**Table I Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro 7. Problems, issues, theories and research concerning:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The institutional framework for public goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Whether television advertising influences elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Whether public service advertising influences behavior (e.g., Smokie the Bear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Whether existing distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. How public goods are recycled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro 8. Problems, issues, normative models, and research concerning:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Whether society should allow politicians to be &quot;sold&quot; like toothpaste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Whether the demand for public goods should be stimulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Whether &quot;low informational content&quot; political advertising is socially desirable (e.g., 10 second &quot;spot&quot; commercials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Whether the U.S. Army should be allowed to advertise for recruits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

anthropological research into marketing is less difficult to fathom (or condone) than is the paradoxical normative bias displayed by much of this work. Being virtually reflexively critical of business practices has led many anthropologists to abandon the quest for comprehensive knowledge before it is effectively mounted; this abandonment precludes enlightened intervention into marketing practices, including those decried by critics. Other anthropologists,
unable or unwilling to tolerate this tunnel vision, conduct proprietary studies or "go native" by becoming practitioners themselves. In either scenario, the discipline of marketing and anthropology are impoverished.

Simply put, it is time for anthropologists to embed their studies of the structural components mentioned earlier in a comprehensive paradigm such as the Three Dichotomies Model. Conceptions of rationality vary widely across time and place; so also do conceptions of morality. Armed with this awareness, an untraditional tool kit of methods, an affinity for extended case study at the local level, and a penchant for cultural criticism, anthropologists will find the contemporary industrial marketplace to be a most hospitable fieldsite.

**INTRAMURAL CRITICISM AND ADVOCACY OF NEW DIRECTIONS**

Within the past decade, marketing academics and practitioners have created a sizable literature of discontent which is as bold in its identification of frontier issues as it is critical of received wisdom. Much of the ferment originates in the relatively young subdisciplines of consumer behavior and international marketing, and in the volatile practice of strategic marketing. Anthropological perspective and methods may be especially helpful in examining these issues.

**Consumer Behavior**

A substantial among of insightful criticism generated by consumer researchers can be recast in terms applicable to the entire discipline of marketing. Especially useful is the evaluative framework developed by Sheth (1982), which permits us to identify shortages and surpluses in the understanding of three critical dimensions of the craft: focus, process and purpose. According to Sheth, researchers have focused on the individual consumer and on rational decision making to the detriment of both group and non-
problem solving behavior. The process of theorizing and researching has been guided primarily by descriptive constructs borrowed from other disciplines rather than by normative constructs generated from within marketing. Finally, theory and research have served primarily a managerial rather than a disciplinary purpose. While differing in the particulars, Zielinski and Robertson (1982) amplify Sheth's criticism in their advocacy of a sociological perspective (against the dominant psychological orientation) of consumer behavior. Central to their insight is that the conceptualization of this behavior is incomplete largely as a result of a failure to interdisciplinary and integrative in approaches to theory and research. "Fragmented" is the term Kassarjian (1982) uses to characterize this state of affairs in his plea for integration of the field's various topics into some comprehensive perspective.

As a capstone criticism of the field at large, Belk (1984b) indicts consumer researchers for treating the activities of the buyer to the virtual exclusion of those of the consumer. Recalling Tucker's (1974) lament that marketers study the consumer as if they were fishermen (rather than say, marine biologists) studying fish, Belk (1984b) reminds researchers of the need to explore the contextual dimensions of consumer behavior. These dimensions constitute a domain far more subtle and pervasive than is typically recognized. Among such critical issues traditionally neglected are the impact of materialism on psychosocial health, the making of tradeoffs between money, durables and discretionary nondurables, the role of consumption objects in interpersonal relations, the effect of consumption upon the identity, maintenance and enhancement of self, and the influence of marketing on materialism and life satisfaction (Belk 1984b). Components of marketing behavior which are processual, experiential and communicative appear to have eluded mainstream consumer researchers with several notable exceptions (Holbrook and Hirschman 1982). Jacoby's (1982) satirical state-of-the-art review of the consumer behavior literature reinforces these criticisms.

While the situational analysis proposed by Boyd and Levy (1963) in which marketing phenomena are considered in situ in the
"layers" of "systems" in which they unfold seems well-suited to exploring these consumer research issues, it has not attracted many adherents, despite its overtly psychological cast (Levy 1978b). That both the issues and the method are more implicitly anthropological in character, and hence less accessible to the temperament of traditional consumer researchers, may readily account for their neglect. It is, in fact, the broader initial scope of inquiry that makes an anthropological perspective of consumer researchers (Heskel and Semenik 1983). Among the areas of consumer behavior to which such a perspective might make an immediate contribution are information exchange, diffusion of innovations, needs, sociocultural change, gender roles, the role of goods, symbolizing behaviors and social stratification (Heskel and Semenik 1983). The paucity of research in cross-cultural consumer behavior (Eroglu 1983; Sheth and Sethi 1977; Camprieu 1980; Karp and Gorlick 1974; Wallendorf and Reilly 1983) might be rectified as well. Finally, an anthropological approach should facilitate the recognition and exorcism of cultural bias in consumer behavior theory development (Rexeisen 1984).

**International Marketing**

Of all the subfields of marketing, the international dimension has long been the most amenable to anthropological method and perspective. Work in this domain helps researchers establish construct validity, aids managers in framing segmentation, adaptation/standardization, and development strategies, and provides each camp with unique methodological tools (Eroglu 1983). Of the few pioneer attempts to translate anthropology into terms meaningful to marketers, Terpstra's (1978) collaborative effort is the most ambitious. While his dissection of the cultural environment into eight functional sectors (language, religion, values and attitudes, social organization, education, technology and material culture, politics, and law) and five dimensions of contrast (variability, complexity, hostility, heterogeneity, and interdependence) is the most instructive, the ahistorical, anecdotal, cookbook-like
presentation prohibits the material from attaining a coherent theoretical or strategic significance. The revised edition of this pioneering effort (Terpstra and David 1985), attempts to remedy this flaw. Conversely, models by Sheth and Sethi (1977) and Camprieu (1980) whose theoretical potentials are great, suffer from an insufficiency of detail which makes operationalization problematic. Most of the major textbooks (Cateora 1983; Terpstra 1983; Keegan 1983; Kahler 1983; Jain 1984) reflect this tension between descriptive inventories and generalizeable frameworks in their treatment of marketing issues. Finally, it is the methodological promise of cross-cultural research that is most significant to some scholars (Douglas and Craig 1983; Eroglu 1983).

International marketing researchers of anthropological bent have several avenues of exploration open to them. One of the most challenging, although tangential to their immediate purpose, is to transfer insight gained in the international arena to domestic marketing issues (Wind and Perlmutter 1977). Operationalizing the concept of culture, distinguishing local from universal typologies of consumer needs, developing relativistic (i.e., non-ethnocentric) concepts and theories reflective of native intuition, and improving research design (Eroglu 1983) are necessary tasks. Reformulating our notion of the ways in which innovations are adopted and diffused in such a manner as to insure that long-term sociocultural integration is not sacrificed to expedience is another critical challenge (Sheth and Sethi 1977). The new international division of labor resulting from an expanding world capitalist system (Nash 1981) should be a pressing concern of scholars interested in the transfer of labor, management, and technology. Framing studies in terms of comprehensive conceptual frameworks, and using these frameworks to identify neglected or insufficiently developed marketing issues is a final research impetus. Cavusgil and Nevin (1981) have meticulously itemized dozens of topical gaps in the international marketing research literature which are amenable to this strategy. Hanssens (1980), Serpenci (1981) and Cavusgil and Nevin (1983) have facilitated the entry of interested researchers into this increasingly important domain.
Strategic Marketing

Marketing strategies developed and implemented as recently as five years ago are often not merely anachronistic. They can be maladaptive responses to a changing marketing environment (Wind 1980; Sheth 1983; Business Week 1983). In recognition of this threat, the Marketing Science Institute has advocated research in the following areas: the role of marketing in the corporation; optimal organizational designs for the marketing function; management in an environment of limited growth; competitive strategies of foreign vs. domestic firms; innovation in a climate of consumerism and regulation (MSI 1983). To these areas, Wind (1980) has added several others: critical reappraisal (and reformulation) of current concepts, models, theories, and methods; development of marketing knowledge based upon empirical generalizations explained by a set of theories. These research priorities promise to generate findings of use to both academics and practitioners.

Of the recent articles which treat strategic marketing, a study by Webster (1981) is most closely aligned with the substance and tenor of the present paper. In his selection of informants, method, and topics, Webster employs the theory-in-use approach to marketing phenomena which Zaltman and Bonoma (1979) have termed "anthropological", and which is congenial to our present purpose. Webster has provided us with a fascinating qualitative account of the manner in which top management views the marketing function. Moreover, the account has clear implications for executives, marketers, and academics. Webster (1981) found that Chief Executive Officers/Chief Operating Officers identify marketing as the critical strategic business function in an increasingly competitive, uncertain environment and doubt the ability of contemporary marketing managers to meet arising challenges. The short-term, risk-averse mentality of marketers impairs any innovative, entrepreneurial outlook, especially in the areas of financial decision making and product conception. Ambiguity at the interface of marketing and sales functions produces confusion and
conflict within the firm. Employees with MBA degrees are valued more for their potential rather than for their traditional performance, and will be perceived as truly useful only when they are able to "take the broadest possible viewpoint and think creatively and entrepreneurially but with a more analytical discipline."

A summary of the limitations in the theoretical base which has fueled the emergence of a strategic marketing perspective is provided by Wind and Robertson (1983) in their marketing-oriented approach to strategy formulation and evaluation. These limitations include: a fixation with the brand as the unit of analysis; the interdisciplinary isolation of marketing; the failure to examine synergy in the design of the marketing program; a short run orientation; the lack of vigorous competitive analysis; the lack of an international orientation; the lack of an integrated strategic framework. The combined findings of these studies indicate that a general overhaul of marketing performance appraisal systems, academic curricula, and, ultimately, research priorities, is essential to ensure the viability of the profession. Clearly, a global perspective is necessary (Davidson 1982).

Of final strategic interest is the spate of literature in both popular (Hurst 1984; Kanter 1983; Deal and Kennedy 1982; Peters and Waterman 1982; Ouchi 1981, 1984) and academic (Martin 1982; Wilkins 1983; Schein 1983; Smircich 1983; Pondy et al. 1983; Sathe 1983) circles which has given the concept of "organizational culture" much currency. Despite the fact that entire issues of journals such as Administrative Science Quarterly and Organizational Dynamics have been devoted to its examination, the concept remains illusive. Much of the literature on the topic--and action plans predicated upon it--is as spurious in nature as it is furious in its production (Pfeiffer 1984; Uttal 1983). While a digression on the use and abuse of "corporate culture" will not be attempted in this article, it must be noted that the risks inherent in working naively with such a concept are as great as the opportunities it promises and thus might be best approached as a joint venture, with scholars from anthropology and management working alongside corporate informants. Such a
proposition is nascent in Bouvier's (1982) suggestions for reforming graduate education in management, and in Harris' and Moran's (1979) scheme of human resource development. Beck and Morris (1983, 1984) have forged just such a productive partnership.

Deshpande (1982) has demonstrated the impact of organizational culture on the use of research information by marketing managers, and argues persuasively for the need to ensure the effective functioning of internal marketing operations prior to considering company market transactions. A cognitive anthropological approach to organization design can be used to identify the cultures of marketing organizations (or, by extension, the marketing subcultures within organizations) and to enhance managerial effectiveness (Deshpande and Parasuraman 1984). A research agenda relating to "marketing culture" proposed by Deshpande and Parasuraman (1984) includes operationalizing and typologizing the concept, and examining the influence of culture on marketing performance (between and within strategies). Suggestions for implementing just such an agenda are contained in anthropological studies of formal organizations (Britan and Cohen 1980), especially those dealing with power and ideology (Nader, Lomnitz and Bailey 1983). The "diagnostic research" advocated by Whyte (1978) is most amenable to joint execution, as it couples the interest of the marketer with the perspective of the anthropologist. Whatever organizational cultural approach is adopted should facilitate Greyser's (1980) call for "integrating of marketing and strategic planning within a company wide marketing orientation."

POLITICAL DIMENSIONS: SOCIAL, SECONDARY AND ILLICIT MARKETING

The final principle--at once most subtle yet ultimately most significant--of reconceptualization to be addressed in this paper is the political dimension of marketing. Building of Thorelli's (1983; 1984) observation, "politics" is largely synonymous with "influence", and therefore may range from the macrodomain of public policy issues (Aacker and Day 1982) to the microdomain of individual
integrity. Influence is predicated upon power, which is defined for our purposes as control over life chances; in constricting choice, power assures differential access to resources, and hence always affects the quality of life. A political field is the totality of relationships between actors oriented to the same prizes or values. Because political fields overlap, and because some are organized and purposive while others are arbitrary and accidental, ambiguity can be manipulated to successful effect (Turner 1974). Thus, relationship management (Levitt 1983) is an appropriate strategy for the marketing practitioner as political actor (Pearce 1983). Frameworks which function as settings for antagonistic interaction geared toward producing publicly recognized decisions regarding these prizes or values are called arenas (Turner 1974).

Within the arena of the marketing environment, any number of political fields can be discerned. Thorelli (1984) has suggested that we explore the flow of power, information, money and utilities along the links of networks binding firms mediating between the individual firm and the market. By substituting the notion of "stakeholder" (especially in Pearce's [1983] sense of an interest group) for "firm" in Thorelli's model, a more comprehensive understanding of the interaction within and between political fields can be gained. As researchers such as Thorelli (1984), Pearce (1983), and Gerlach (1980) have shown, power and information flows can become more important than either money or utility flows in understanding the configuration of networks, as the recent social drama of the Nestlé boycott suggests. Until marketers view their transactions as occurring within political fields composed of networks of varying density, their capacity for vigilance, and in turn for accurate prediction of and appropriate response to conflict inherent in transaction, will be severely impaired. Gauging "the nature and extent of impact of various marketing practices and institutions on our society" (Pearce 1983) is a vital, yet neglected, aspect of marketing research.

Several marketing arenas in particular are amenable to political scrutiny. The first, social marketing, has been controversial topic since first proposed by Kotler and Zaltman (1971). Its potential
has been linked to the ability to produce hybrid scholars (who of necessity are also practitioners) who can negotiate the transitions and bridge the dislocations inherent in contemporary culture change (Fox and Kotler 1980). Because this proactive posture will alter relationships between social groups and be perceived as a threat to the status quo, the currently indistinct ethical dimensions of social marketing must be rigorously examined (Laczniak, Lusch and Murphy 1979). The challenge of operationalizing and implementing "cause" campaigns in an arena characterized by extreme differentials in marketing competence and vision among interest groups may act alternately to hamper or hasten the promise of social marketing (Bloom and Novelli 1981).

The second marketing arena with pronounced political dimensions is that of secondary or second-order marketing systems. Whether economic pressure, backlash against increasing dependence on institutions, divestiture, altruism, or hedonic impulse are adduced as motives, the incidence of phenomena such as garage sales, flea markets, labor exchanges, and barter (on individual, corporate and international levels) appears to be increasing. Our understanding of such phenomena is entirely tentative (Dovel and Healy 1977; Rucker et al. 1984), but should improve as we expand our scope of inquiry (Jacoby et al. 1977; Belk 1984). Clearly, second-order systems impact on both the primary marketing system and on individual consumer behavior.

The third arena to which a political viewpoint is relevant is that of illicit markets. Limited vision and perceived problems of access have hampered the study (although, unfortunately, as the recent DeLorean debacle demonstrates, not the practice) of black market activity by those perhaps most uniquely suited to the task - marketers themselves. Despite the fact that entire regional domestic economies are undergirded by illicit drug trade, and that this same trade has fueled ethnocide at local production sites, the significance of illicit marketing is rarely noted in the marketing literature (Redlinger 1975; Manning and Redlinger 1983). The illegal distribution of ethical drugs, and the consumption-use systems facilitating this traffic, is similarly neglected (Silverman, Lee and
Lydecker 1982; Van der Geest 1982; 1984). The dynamics of "piracy" in a high-tech society, of product counterfeiting in a consumer society, of human capital (e.g., black market adoption, prostitution, illegal alien labor, etc.) in an alienated society, and of distribution in general in underworld society might best be understood from a marketing perspective. As a transitional focus intermediate to second-order and illicit marketing systems, "grey markets" (Rogers and Larsen 1984) and the "Shadow" economy (Illich 1981) seem especially amenable to a marketing perspective. Given both their eclectic dispositions and their interests in the margins of industrial society, anthropologists should be among the most likely researchers to appropriate, adapt and employ such a marketing perspective.

SOME MARKETING ESSAYS CONGENIAL TO ANTHROPOLOGY

A cursory content analysis of articles appearing in major marketing journals (e.g., Journal of Marketing, Journal of Marketing Research, Journal of Consumer Research, etc.) or in marketing readers and source books (e.g., Boone 1977; Kassarjian and Robertson 1983; Lutz 1983; Thompson 1981; Jain and Tucker 1979; Wallendorf and Zaltman 1984, etc.) reveals the slight impact that anthropological perspective has had on traditional marketing thought. Aside from the comprehensive modeling attempts of marketing theorists sensitive to cultural context (Engel and Blackwell 1983; Sheth and Sethi 1977), and anthropological theorists alive to practical applications (Barnett 1983; Hall 1957), little cross-fertilization has occurred. Recent and forthcoming conference proceedings (Hirschman and Holbrook 1985; Kinnear 1984), however, portend a shift in the discipline to more sociocultural investigations. So also does the mounting emphasis on international trade by academics and practitioners alike suggest change. In addition to the literature cited in other sections of the present paper, a group of recent articles is especially noteworthy for its compatibility with the thesis of the present paper. These articles are either conceptual and
programmatic in nature, or are empirical treatments of such topics as socialization, ethnicity, symbolism, and exchange.

Conceptual Pieces

The prolegomenon for constructing an anthropological interpretation of marketing behavior was written by Nicosia and Mayer (1976), who proposed that a sociology of consumption be advanced as a complement to the disciplinary fixation on individual decision-making. In that seminal work, the authors stressed the need to view consumption in the context of other social behaviors in which it is embedded, to understand the interactions among consumption and other societal characteristics, to apply a social view of consumption in the management of long term, crucial, social problems, and to understand (and manage toward humane ends) the role of consumption in economic development. Despite the cogency of the argument—and the practicality of their position as set forth in a subsequent paper (Mayer and Nicosia 1981)—the call has gone virtually unheeded. Perhaps the ambiguity attached to defining and operationalizing the concept of consumption activity, rather than enfranchising speculation and promoting creative, insightful exploratory forays, has hampered researchers in accepting the challenge. Even in narrowly circumscribing their focus, Nicosia and Mayer (1976) have provided researchers with a framework for conducting systematic inquiries into the social bases of consumption in affluent societies. In the constructs chosen for examination (values, institutions and their norms, and consumption activities), in the processual orientation used in generating research proposals (especially into the relationship between consumption and social change), and in the advocacy spirit in which suggestions for future research are couched (in support of consumerism and the social responsibility of marketing), their essay is germane to an anthropology of marketing.

The other seminal argument for a sociological view of consumer behavior, posing equally significant research questions, has been advanced by Robertson and Zielinski (1982). These authors have
extracted "key perspectives" from subject areas in recent sociological literature--ethnomethodology, impression management, subcultures, status inconsistency, and institutions--and, using a Parsonian framework, have applied them to the realm of consumer behavior with the intention of generating research proposals. Viewing consumer behavior as an adaptive strategy at a variety of levels of sociocultural integration, the authors have proposed a structural functional classification of consumption modes which is useful in identifying lacunae in the consumer behavior literature. The strategic use of consumer behavior, the methodological innovations proposed by sociological subdisciplines, the broaching of unconventional ("deviant") modes of consumption as legitimate topics of inquiry, and the specification of various units of analysis of consumption activity with intent to demonstrate integration of these unit activities are issues treated by Zielinski and Robertson (1982) which are inherent in an anthropology of marketing.

In a little-quoted study which bridges the conceptual and empirical domains of consumer research, Mott (1978, 1980, 1981) has presented a sociological profile of the American consumer. Although dated, Mott's discussion of the categories of consumption units (cast largely in terms of demographic, economic and psychological market segments) and of consumer goods (based on an elusive primary and secondary budgetary itemization) provides a point of departure for researchers interested in interpreting the meaning of synchronic statistical data or of changes or trends in consumption patterns for any particular consumption unit. This melange of description, prediction and evaluation might be shifted to yield some testable hypotheses or some insight into consumption activities that might be examined in a "real world" context among consumers in their native settings.

The field of macromarketing provides a final example of the conceptual compatibility of marketing and anthropological thought. In an important review article, Fisk and White (1981) have described large patterns of exchange relationships in terms of marketing constituencies (internal stakeholders), marketing publics (external subjects) and the sanctions which obtain between them.
Further, they have instructively described the transformation of micromarketing practices into macromarketing processes, and the resultant consequences for both constituencies and publics. These large patterns can be international in scope. The authors have identified the issues of ethics, social effectiveness, economic efficiency and learning science as critical to the discussion of macromarketing. Their discussion of the practical applications and rationales for the study of macromarketing in relation to major stakeholders—managers, regulators, activists and academics—is an excellent summary of researchable topics in large scale exchange behavior. In short, Fisk and White (1981) have provided researchers of an anthropological bent a comprehensive framework with which to interpret relationships attendant upon marketing transactions, and into which they can insert (or draft for insertion) their local level understandings of specific marketing phenomena, in keeping with a canon of holism. The polythetic taxonomical model subsequently developed by Hunt and Burnett (1982) in which three criteria—levels of aggregation of unit of analysis, perspective (social or individual) from which the unit of analysis is viewed, and consequences of one unit of analysis for another unit—are employed to distinguish between micro- and macromarketing domains, is an excellent vehicle for drafting one such holistic study.

**Empirical Treatments**

Increasingly, researchers in the field of marketing are addressing issues of perennial interest to anthropologists. While an exhaustive listing of such issues is precluded by space limitations, several topical treatments can be adduced in support of this convergence. Moschis (1981) has traced the evaluation of marketers' interest in consumer socialization from a reactive period of needing to defend communication practices against critics, through a proactive period of inducing consumer satisfaction while reducing governmental interference, to the present period of understanding preadult consumer behavior as it impacts on decision making at other times and on other persons. The socialization approach is
typically more complex in its apprehension of consumer behavior than are other approaches, treating as it does the variables of content, agent learning processes, social structural constraints and life-cycle position. Recent studies of intergenerational transfer of consumer behavior (Lutz, forthcoming; Miller 1974; Woodson, Childers and Winn 1976) are of inherent anthropological interest, as are those which deal with the effects of changing form and function of household and family groupings on consumption patterns (Davis 1974; Netting, Wilk and Arnould 1984).

Ethnicity has been the focus of a number of recent marketing investigations. Norvell (1983) has explored the phenomenon of "ethnodomination" in the distribution channels of developing nations. The impact of assimilation on food consumption patterns of Mexican Americans (Reilly and Wallendorf 1984; Wallendorf and Reilly 1983) has provided both a topical focus--the mediation of culture change by consumption patterns--and a methodological alternative--a historical archaeological technique dubbed "garbology" (Rathje 1974)--to marketing researchers interested in cultural dimensions. The influence of ethnicity on consumer cognitive structure for the constructs of novelty seeking and information transfer has been illustrated in a comparative study by Hirschman (1983c). Whether ethnicity is considered a situationally invoked adaptive strategy of a territorially based identity marker, the work by Andreasen (1975, 1978, 1982) is critical to understanding the dynamics of consumer behavior among the disadvantaged and to setting a research agenda with appropriate public policy implications. Finally, research on the consumption patterns of particular ethnic groups appears to be gathering momentum (Gibson 1978; Guernica 1982; Schewe 1984; Smith and Moschis 1984; Wilkes and Valencia 1984), with the result that both formerly unquestioned assumptions are being challenged, and equally questionable assumptions arising from the rush to topicality are being generated to take their place. Ironically, the subject which produced the earliest flirtation with things anthropological among marketers--ethnic segmentation (Marcus 1956)--may prove to be the most amenable of marketing concerns to applied anthropological research.
A recent body of literature within marketing that articulates well with some of the most long standing and venerated concerns of anthropological research—the role of symbols in sacred and secular ritual, as well as in the social construction of reality—addresses the topic of symbolic or hedonic consumer behavior. [A similar trend toward examining expressive cultural concerns is clearly afoot in the management and organizational behavior literatures.] Briefly sketched, this re-emerging interest in the expressive dimension of marketing behavior assumes several shapes. Interest in symbolism per se has considerable time depth, bounded on each end appropriately enough by Levy's (1959, 1981) concern for the meaning consumers impute to goods and the ways in which that meaning is communicated. A similar approach has been taken by Belk (1984a) and Sherry (1984). Researchers interested in symbolism have explored such diverse topics as apparel (Holman 1980, 1981), brands and trademarks (Levy and Rook 1981), innovation (Hirschman 1980a), ritual (Rook 1984; Rook and Levy 1983), socialization (Belk, Bahn and Mayer 1982), the persuasive effect of metaphor (Sternthal, personal communication), and the self-concept (Sirgy 1982). Hirschman (1980b) has attempted to impose a theoretical structure on this field by setting forth some basic epistemic requirements. A second equally expansive stream of research within the area has addressed the experiential dimension of consumption (Holbrook and Hirschman 1982; Hirschman and Holbrook 1982). Topics explored in this domain include leisure (Unger and Kernan 1983), time perception (Graburn 1981) and variety seeking behavior (McAlister and Pessemier 1982; Hirschman 1980a). More focused in nature but perhaps more controversial in character is the third domain of aesthetics and creativity. Once again, Hirschman (1983a, 1983b) has attempted to provide theoretical guidance and suggest practical applications for researchers in the field. The topics explored in this third domain include aesthetic response (Holbrook and Moore 1980; Olson 1980), co-patronage patterns (Belk, Semenik and Andreasen 1980), cognitive complexity (Wallendorf, Zinkman, and Zinkman 1980), product imagery (Holbrook 1983) and televiewing (Hirsch 1980).
The final domain to be considered has taken the continuum from elite to popular expressive culture as a locus of inquiry. This domain might be labelled colloquially as the consumption of culture. Researchers have examined patronage of musical events (Levy, Czepiel and Rook 1980), museums (Kelly 1983, 1984), historical romance novels (Schiffman and Schnaars 1980) and retail institutions (Hirschman and Wallendorf 1982).

The topic with perhaps the most immediate relevance to anthropological inquiry, and the final illustrative example of the interface between the two disciplines to be invoked in this section, is exchange behavior. Bagozzi (1974, 1975, 1979) catalyzed the use of exchange paradigms to understand contemporary marketing systems at both the macro- and micro-levels of analysis. Several topics in particular lend themselves to exchange-centered interpretations. Gift giving (Belk 1979; Sherry 1983) and its allied behaviors are the most susceptible to such applications. The notion of behavior exchange (Gergen, Greenberg and Willis 1980), while potentially useful in enlarging our understanding of such domestic marketing phenomena as the establishment of rapport (Coan 1984) or of bargaining behavior (Allen 1971) in personal sales, might be as effectively applied in the international realm to explore and facilitate such processes as synergy (Moran and Harris 1982), human resource development (Harris and Moran 1979) and technology transfer (Robock 1980). Ultimately the exchange paradigm will be used to refine more sophisticated ecological models of marketing (Henion and Kinnear 1979; Thorelli 1983).

**Anthropological Praxis and Marketing Practice**

That marketing in industrial societies is a fascinating complex of utilitarian and expressive behaviors has too long been ignored by anthropologists. The reflexively critical posture toward marketing practices assumed by many anthropologists, which is premature at best and ethnocentric at worst, has paralyzed our understanding and retarded the improvement of these very practices. The traditional anthropological antidote to this condition—long-term field immersion
in the native element—is clearly indicated. While access to individual consumers, consumption units and consumption sites is relatively unimpeded, the ability to interact with entrepreneurs, managers and regulators is considerably restricted. Managerial perceptions of anthropology as a village-level enterprise similarly retard the bridging of domains. A need exists for mechanisms to bring managers, market researchers and anthropologists together in a joint venture. One obvious alternative is the use of collegial networks either at the level of collaborative academic research, or of the professional association (such as American Marketing Association, the Association for Consumer Research, or the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology). The Marketing Science Institute is clearly the preeminent organization through which such collaborative activities might be coordinated. Research appointments and internships within marketing organizations or regulatory agencies are other alternatives.

This paper has identified a number of research issues to which anthropologists can make significant contributions by bringing the perspectives and methods of their discipline to bear upon the contemporary industrial marketplace. These contributions may go beyond fundamental research to influence the behavior of managers, public policy makers and consumers alike. Toward these ends, this paper has sought to open some windows of opportunity for anthropologists by facilitating entry into some of the basic disciplinary business concerns. Consumption and marketing are contemporary arenas in which the applications of anthropology are too vital to overlook.
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