

Geraldine Fennell, Consultant

ABSTRACT

Marketing authors have held that the discipline's subject matter is exchange. Apparently many fail to take cognizance of the radically different kinds of exchange that underlie marketing and selling. Often, a "selling" model seems implicit as authors discuss "marketing," leading to errors of omission and commission; the latter in focus here. Until remedied, authors deny conceptual development to marketers' central question, and daily real-world task: What shall we produce? How shall we use resources for human satisfaction?

WHY IS THE MARKETING-SELLING DISTINCTION A SECRET?

Moving from a selling to a marketing orientation is a natural progression for producers interested in their organization's survival in a competitive environment. A very few experiences of being left with unwanted output can prompt a producer to ask if there is not a better way. Specifically, before committing productive resources, is it not better to learn the kind of output that prospective customers seek? Accordingly, selling appears as a developmental stage that some major firms passed through in their ongoing quest to substitute strategic planning for happenstance as an ingredient of corporate success. Figure 1 shows highlights of the multifaceted distinction between marketing and selling, discussed elsewhere (e.g., Fennell 1983, 1985a,b,c).

Moving from a selling to a marketing orientation, business neglected to bring the general public along, and the public and social critics seem unaware of the marketing-selling distinction. If pressed to state a difference, some may say that marketing compared to selling is a more genteel, or sophisticated, or cunning, or scientific, bag of tricks for getting you to do what a salesperson wants you to do.

At one level, academic marketers know better. Probably all textbooks that marketing academics read and teach from devote a few paragraphs to the "marketing concept." But when they write about "marketing," their words give them away. Marketing authors still think "selling." In at least two respects, the confusion has grave consequences for our discipline: (1) When two mutually incompatible forms of exchange are confused one, in this case marketing, is shortchanged in obtaining its share of the discipline's creative mind; (2) Largely unconscious, the confusion is self-perpetuating, and it has implications beyond academe. Compared to a quarter century ago, more future marketers today are acquiring business degrees and, if they study marketing, are exposed to a selling orientation packaged as "marketing." Previously, many people came to careers in marketing with an educational background in other subjects. From the realities of a competitive environment, they readily absorbed experience that leads to progressing from selling to a marketing orientation. In contrast, from their "marketing" courses, today's entry level folk bring concepts and a general orientation that are antithetical to marketing's essential function in business and society.

Motivated by the troubling real-world implications of this state of affairs, we want to draw attention to the implicit selling orientation that permeates much marketing writing. Our plan is to present statements from the literature that

purportedly refer to marketing, show that they reflect, in fact, a selling orientation, and discuss the essential marketing perspective in each instance. First, a broader context for the present discussion is briefly outlined, to be taken up again in the paper's final section.

Errors of Omission and Commission

Absence of a marketing orientation in the academic literature is manifest in errors of omission and commission: Elements necessary to accurately represent marketing are missing from so-called marketing models, and statements purportedly about marketing are erroneous.

Among the errors of omission, let us mention just two here. (1) Declaring exchange (relationships) to be marketing's subject matter, authors have failed to differentiate two forms of exchange: The interrole exchange that underlies marketing activity (i.e., exchange between the user and producer roles of a single individual), and the interpersonal exchange that characterizes selling. This omission is probably at the source of one of the errors of commission discussed later i.e., purportedly addressing themselves to some facet of marketing, many authors wrongly construe the essential dyad as seller-buyer rather than producer-user.

(2) Authors fail to represent that marketers define the system of interest to include the conditions that determine features of the offering or message ("Make what the customer wants to buy"). This omission has many ramifications. Correcting it requires marketing scientists to construct representations of the conditions that both allocate people's resources to doing what they do, and lead them to want certain kinds of things. Once division of labor exists, so too does the reason for marketing as a function of society and of business i.e., users are no longer their own producers. Users' resources are still allocated by conditions to which their nature and individual structure make them susceptible. But producers, no longer users also, lack direct personal access to experiencing those circumstances. They look to marketing scientists to model the conditions, and to marketing practitioners to use the resulting models to help describe characteristics of the contexts in which goods/services will be used.

FIGURE 1 HIGHLIGHTS OF MARKETING-SELLING DISTINCTION

ELEMENTS	MARKETING	SELLING
EXCHANGE MODEL	Interrole i.e., between user & producer roles of an individual	Interpersonal
WHERE FEATURES OF OFFERING DETERMINED	Within system, reflecting conditions that allocate (some) users' resources	Outside system
ESSENTIAL DYAD	Producer-User	Seller-Buyer
DOMAIN OF BEHAVIORAL STUDY	Features of contexts of use i.e., conditions that allocate users' resources	Interpersonal influence
MANAGERIAL OBJECTIVE	Participate in ongoing exchanges	Dispose of existing offerings
RESPONSIBLE FOR OUTPUT	Marketing management	Production management

1 Further manifestations are presented of the differing paradigms of practitioners and academics (Fennell 1982a), now identified as marketing and selling, respectively.

Marketing scientists have barely begun to address the task of constructing representations appropriate to marketing .e., to an activity meant to bridge the gap that opened when division of labor removed want-satisfaction from the realm of individuals and families to that of society. Following up an earlier treatment of these issues as reflecting the differing paradigms of marketing practitioners and academics (Fennell 1982a), it is appropriate here to focus on the errors of commission, i.e., instances where authors may believe they are describing marketing but, operating within a selling paradigm, give voice instead to selling.

EXAMPLES OF SELLING LABELED AS MARKETING

In this section instances are discussed where authors claim with apparent sincerity to refer to marketing, yet what they say is erroneous so far as marketing is concerned and congruent with selling. The contexts are of three kinds: (1) Explication: The first few are taken from a formal treatment of "marketing" (specifically, "what a general theory of marketing would attempt to explain and predict," p. 10), for which the author (Hunt 1983) received the 1983 Harold H. Maynard Award (1984); (2) Application: Authors discuss, in "marketing" contexts, concepts developed elsewhere; (3) Juxtaposition: Authors juxtapose "marketing" and some other domain for mutual elaboration.

(1) Explicating — Essential Dyad

The distinction between marketing and selling is stated in the marketing concept: Don't sell what you happen to make; make what the customer wants to buy" (Figure 3). From these words, it is clear that marketing has to do with productive decisions, namely, What shall we produce? or, more broadly, What shall we offer? (The answer is unambiguous: Be guided by the customer's wants). Marketing's essential dyad, then, is producer-user. More often than not, the "marketing" literature takes "seller-buyer" as the dyad of interest. In a rare instance where an author reflects on his choice of dyad, Hunt considers only that choosing "buyer-seller" is

"arbitrary" (1983, p. 13). Buying and selling, on the one hand, and using and producing, on the other, are different kinds of activity that implicate distinctly different issues. Other indications in Hunt's paper show that he is not unaware that productive decisions fall within marketing's scope yet, in choosing "buyer-seller" to characterize marketing's dyad of interest, Hunt seems to accord primacy to buying and selling over using and producing. Such favoring of the interacting seller-buyer over producer-user permeates his presentation, as indicated below. Yet, it is the primacy of the producer-user relationship that distinguishes marketing from selling, as the words of the marketing concept make abundantly clear (Figure 3).

Interrole Exchange: Resources for Changed State of Being

Some of the ramifications of thinking "seller-buyer" rather than "producer-user" become apparent in Hunt's presentation of "marketing's fundamental explananda." Viewing marketing science as the "behavioral science that seeks to explain exchange relationships," Hunt considers that four sets of fundamental explananda may be logically derived. He elaborates each set by means of a series of "guiding research questions." For purposes of brief discussion here, one set of explananda and its guiding research questions are included in Figure 2 (upper portion), where row headings and entries in the column titled "Selling Orientation" follow closely, or quote from, Hunt's paper. Reading across the rows, entries in the second column permit the reader to consider Hunt's statements edited (see underscoring) to substitute "user" for "buyer" (producer/seller); entries under "Marketing Orientation" show the outcome of more drastic editing to bring Hunt's statements in line with marketing thinking rather than selling.

In row 1: Changing only "buyers" to "users" (column 2) effects a substantial change in meaning. Is "behaviors of users directed at consummating exchanges" what a marketer must explain about "users?" The answer is yes, only if "consummating exchanges" is understood in the special sense that is appropriate to marketing, where the fundamental

FIGURE 1 EXAMPLES OF SELLING ORIENTATION LABELED AS MARKETING

	SELLING ORIENTATION	SUBSTITUTING: USER for BUYER PRODUCER for SELLER	MARKETING ORIENTATION
FUNDAMENTAL EXPLANANDA	"BEHAVIORS OF BUYERS DIRECTED AT CONSUMMATING EXCHANGES"	BEHAVIORS OF <u>USERS</u> DIRECTED AT CONSUMMATING EXCHANGES	BEHAVIORS OF <u>USERS</u> DIRECTED AT <u>EXCHANGING RESOURCES FOR CHANGED STATE OF BEING</u>
GUIDING RESEARCH QUESTION (1)	"WHY DO WHICH BUYERS PURCHASE WHAT THEY DO, WHERE THEY DO, WHEN THEY DO, AND HOW THEY DO?"	WHY DO WHICH <u>USERS</u> <u>USE</u> WHAT THEY DO, WHERE THEY DO, WHEN THEY DO, AND HOW THEY DO?	WHY DO () <u>USERS</u> <u>USE</u> WHAT THEY DO, WHERE THEY DO, WHEN THEY DO, AND HOW THEY DO, <u>ALONE OR WITH HELP, SPENDING HOW MUCH, WHICH OF THEIR RESOURCES?</u>
GUIDING RESEARCH QUESTION (2)	"WHY DO WHICH SELLERS PRODUCE, PRICE, PROMOTE, AND DISTRIBUTE WHAT THEY DO, WHERE THEY DO, WHEN THEY DO, AND HOW THEY DO?"	WHY DO WHICH <u>PRODUCERS</u> PRODUCE, PRICE, PROMOTE, AND DISTRIBUTE WHAT THEY DO, WHERE THEY DO, WHEN THEY DO, AND HOW THEY DO?	WHY DO () <u>PRODUCERS</u> PRODUCE, PRICE, PROMOTE, AND DISTRIBUTE WHAT THEY DO, WHERE THEY DO, WHEN THEY DO, HOW THEY DO, AND TO WHOM?

exchange is interrole i.e., a transaction in which an individual, who is both user and producer, exchanges resources for an improved state. One who uses his or her resources — of time, energy, mind — may, but does not necessarily, engage in interpersonal exchange. As a societal function, marketing arises because, in delegating to others the task of producing much of what we use, we need an institution charged with ensuring that producers make what we would want to make for ourselves. The nature of the fundamental exchange that is at issue in marketing should be stated: Exchanging resources for a changed state of being (col. 3).

Participating in Exchanges Already Underway

Corresponding to his first set of explananda, Hunt states the "guiding research questions" as "Why do which buyers purchase what they do, where they do, when they do, and how they do?" A few variants of this question, edited to approach a marketing orientation, are shown in Figure 2. Reading row 2: Again, replacing "buyers" with "users" changes context and meaning materially. Under "Marketing Orientation," further editing drops the word "which," so that differentiating among users may be treated within the system.² Moreover, once "user" is the focus of interest, it is not a foregone conclusion that another individual is involved in the exchange. Users may employ some part of their body, or a tool made by themselves or others, or may ask another for help. One may brush a fly off one's foot using hand, leaf, newspaper or fly swatter, or ask a friend to chase it away. Users, in fact, may employ only mind and time. They may decide the fly's gentle tickling is preferable to the effort involved in trying to keep it from alighting. Producers' societally-assigned role is to make the goods/services that people would make for themselves. Moreover, in a competitive environment, the route to staying in business is to participate in exchanges that are already in progress i.e., try to obtain a share of resources earmarked for spending. Societal task and self-interest combine, then, to render producers profoundly interested in how people use their resources, not merely in what they buy.

Producers expect users to offer some of their resources, usually in the form of money, in exchange for goods/services (row 2, final column). We may say that producers are interested in participating in those exchanges for which people are willing to give up some part of their resources for another's help. That places some limit on the ongoing exchanges in which a producer participates. It is an ever-changing boundary that reflects human ingenuity in replacing self-help with the output of the productive enterprise.

Choosing the Characteristics of Brands

Another aspect of the marketing version of Hunt's "guiding research question" warrants comment. For Hunt, "what" they purchase refers to the fact that "different buyers have different product/service mixes that they purchase" (1983, p. 13), leaving no place for the fact that people choose specific versions of goods/services (i.e., brands). It is characteristic of an implicit selling orientation to fail to appreciate the systematic difference between "product," essentially an abstraction, an analytic category (e.g., dog food), and the real-world manifestations of that category in the form of home-made versions (e.g., scraps from the dinner table) or manufactured brands whose characteristics a producer must choose. Obtaining a competitively good fit

² The point at issue is linked to technical problems in Hunt's presentation including his casting these in the form of "why" rather than "how" questions; under "how," equating "processes" with "stages in consumer decision making;" under "when," switching from a cross-sectional to a longitudinal analysis. It suffices for now to show that, within Hunt's own structure, a marketing orientation leads to a presentation materially different from his.

between the characteristics of brands and of user-circumstances i.e., the brand positioning decision, is the central issue in marketing — the quintessential marketing act (Fennell 1982a). In row 2, final column, "from whom they purchase" (i.e., ultimately, brand management) revises Hunt's version to reflect the brand level of analysis.

Selling's Sway Denies Expression to Marketing

In marketing practice, exploratory qualitative research, which is conducted as the first of many stages leading to a brand positioning decision, routinely reflects the last two columns of row 2. Yet, a quarter century after the distinction between marketing and selling was made explicit in the marketing concept, the formal representation of marketing in our discipline's literature is misleading. The grip that a "selling" orientation appears to retain is troubling because of the misinformation it generates, and because it prevents scholars and scientists from addressing marketing, properly understood. As we see here, the kind of projects that professional marketers regularly undertake find no place in discussions of the nature of marketing. Many professional marketers do excellent empirical work along the lines indicated in Figure 2 and, through on-the-job training, junior marketers may acquire professional expertise. But marketing practitioners want to be able to turn to the literature to see the broader contexts of our daily tasks. We want to find there conceptual frameworks and discussion within which we can locate the various projects that come our way. We do not see our work in Hunt's presentation.

Ensuring Productive Output Reflects User-Circumstances

Hunt's "guiding research question" as stated for "sellers" is also of interest here. It is shown at the bottom of Figure 2, along with a revision that reflects a marketing orientation. Paralleling the earlier omission of the product-brand distinction, Hunt's formulation fails to reflect the fact that, corresponding to their own domain of expertise, producers not only select prospects from a naturally-occurring population (actually a universe of person-activity occasions, Fennell 1982b) but further determine which prospects to target ("and to whom," in Figure 2) in accordance with their ability to do so competitively.³ Another opportunity is missed to bring science and scholarship to bear in addressing society's charge to marketing: Ensure that user-circumstances affect producers' decisions.

(2) Misapplying Learning Concepts

To illustrate another domain where authors claim to discuss marketing yet reveal an implicit selling model, let us consider papers that purport to show the relevance to marketing of certain concepts of learning found in psychology.

"Although there are few examples of negative reinforcement in marketing, one illustration is the situation where a customer purchases a product primarily to avoid the high pressure tactics of an overzealous salesperson" (Nord and Peter 1980 p. 38).

"Marketing" again evokes the image of a dyad comprising seller-buyer, not user-producer, and the marketing application remains unstated.

Negative reinforcement is the strengthening of behavior by removing aversive stimulation. Much of the productive enterprise is devoted to providing negative reinforcement e.g., to removing aversive stimulation associated with headache, various forms of minor pain, cold, dirt on fabrics and surfaces, wear and tear caused by mechanical

³ Management answers Hunt's "guiding questions" stated for producers based on data answering the "guiding questions" stated for users. This is what we mean when we say we take "the user's perspective." We intend no claim of altruism.

friction and the elements, various kinds of anxiety — in a word, the unpleasant stimulation that is the daily lot of humans and for the control or avoidance of which people allocate some substantial portion of their resources. Marketers identify aversive conditions through the usual forms of marketing research and participate in developing goods/services to deal with them. To say that few examples of negative reinforcement are found in marketing is simply inaccurate. The true state of affairs is that much marketing activity is directed to developing a productive response to conditions that users want to escape or avoid — the two classic paradigms of negative reinforcement.

(3) Juxtaposing — Scientific Creativity and Marketing

Consider a paper that explores parallels between doing marketing and doing science (Peter and Olson 1983) and that fails to discuss what it would mean, in doing science, to make (sic) what the customer wants to buy. The totally admirable purpose of juxtaposing marketing and science, promised in the paper's title, "Is science marketing?" was thwarted inasmuch as the authors, in the grip of a selling paradigm, in fact inquire about the extent to which scientists must sell their theoretical products: "Our R/C (relativistic/constructionist) view of science as the marketing (sic) of ideas conflicts sharply with the ... P/E (positivistic/empiricist) view . . ." (p. 122). The authors do less than justice to science and to marketing, and for the same reason. Their discussion reaches only to the point where the scientific idea or the product already exists. The domain upstream from that point, whose inclusion within the system of interest is marketing's hallmark, remains unexplored. Repeatedly using "market" as a transitive verb — an apparent synonym for "promote," "gain acceptance for," "publicize," or "sell" — they never address the topic their title promises.

Note the following as a presumably authoritative statement in a major journal of the discipline:

"Regardless of the type of idea or theory, it should not be forgotten that the entire theory product is invented or constructed by one or more scientists, just as ideas for consumer products are invented or constructed. Like the ideas for consumer products and the products themselves, substantive and/or methodological theory products must also be marketed" (p. 112).

When "ideas for consumer products" or "substantive/methodological theory products" are given, as they clearly are in the authors' presentation, one may do no more than promote or attempt to "sell" them. The opportunity to engage in marketing has passed. A claim to engage in marketing is established by demonstrating that one has generated the characteristics of one's offering or message to correspond to features of the system being studied e.g., the contexts in which the goods/services are intended to be used. So stated, there are some close parallels between the essential tasks of marketer and scientist.

⁴ Similarly, Rothschild and Gaidis (1981) err in claiming that marketing's sphere of operation is properly restricted to the domain of positive reinforcement. The distinction between negative and positive reinforcement is poorly drawn and controversial among the psychologists who use these terms (Rachlin 1976). Some assert that all reinforcement is negative. None asserts that all reinforcement is positive. Given the controversy surrounding the terms in basic psychology, the reasonable and prudent thing for us to do in marketing is to consider all situations in which reinforcement (positive, negative) may occur. The producer's task may be stated as that of making offerings that users find reinforcing. In doing so, producers must have an eye to providing reinforcement by significantly adding to (e.g., nonnutritive sensory delights), or removing from (examples as above), the user's lived world.

Scientists demonstrate understanding by showing they know how to intervene in some system and arrange for it to operate as it would, left to its own devices (Fennell 1987b). To explore the extent of similarity, at this level, between the scientific and marketing enterprises could be a task worthy of the combined talents of Peter and Olson. It would be an opportunity to introduce a distinction, absent in recent treatments of what it means to do science (e.g., Anderson 1986) between, on the one hand, knowledge used to intervene, as in marketing, to effect by human design the kind of thing the system does left to itself and, on the other hand, knowledge used to try to give effect to a human design that is different in kind. By bringing to bear the essential marketing perspective, the creative potential of juxtaposing would have been mined, enriching our understanding of the activities of science and marketing both.

Artists, Ideologists, and Marketing

Hirschman (1983) discusses the extent to which marketing is relevant in domains of "self-oriented creativity" which are exemplified by the artist and the ideologist. Finding an application for marketing to such domains, Hirschman speaks of a "self-oriented marketer (who) creates a product out of the need for personal expression and, in return, receives a sense of personal satisfaction and fulfillment" (49-50). As a societal and business function, marketing is grounded in division of labor, which locates user and producer roles in separate individuals. Accordingly, when the roles of user and producer are found in the same individual, the issue of marketing does not normally arise. In devoting their energies to producing what satisfies themselves as the paramount criterion, what we have here are in no sense marketers, self-oriented or otherwise, as Hirschman suggests. Rather, we have examples of producers who are, themselves, their intended users. If there is a role for the marketing function here, it is different from Hirschman's construction. Recall that marketers are intermediaries between user and producer, ensuring that producers are responsive to user-circumstances. Marketers would perform their proper function here by intervening to help artists or ideologists produce what they themselves will find most satisfying. It would not be surprising to find some artists and ideologists hoping to avail themselves of marketing-type services during visits to their therapist.

With regard to the output of artists and ideologists, some people in the rest of society appear to want very much to have the products of self-oriented creativity available for their possible enjoyment, to judge, praise, and spurn. Heartlessly, or thoughtlessly, reserving to themselves the right to choose among the products of such labor, their selections may show caprice equal to the idiosyncrasy of self-oriented creators. In part, at any rate, what users want here is the very activity of honing one's discernment while reviewing such offerings. It could be argued, then, that they should support self-oriented creators for the privilege of choosing among, and rejecting, their works.

MAKE CLEAR THE MARKETING-SELLING DISTINCTION!

Let us hope for two things, the sooner the better: (1) Separate treatment of marketing and selling in the discipline's literature; (2) Some scholars and scientists doing basic science in marketing. This final section includes reasons for, and impediments to, realizing such outcomes.

Marketing and Selling are Different Models of Exchange

Marketing and selling implicate very different models of exchange and approaches to behavioral influence (e.g., Figure 1, and Fennell 1985a, b, 1987a). A crucial difference, to which all the others are related, is captured in the words of the marketing concept (Figure 3). Within broad limits, producers are free to choose not only a proposed offering's ingredients and design but ultimate users,

FIGURE 3 THE MARKETING CONCEPT

**DON'T SELL WHAT YOU HAPPEN TO MAKE; MAKE
WHAT THE CUSTOMER WANTS TO BUY.**

focal activity and, within activity, specific use-contexts served. They are, then, truly in a position to participate in actions to which users' resources are already allocated. In principle, they have no offering to promote; if one exists, its design may be changed. They look to marketers to: Describe the characteristics of prospective contexts of use; help them choose one or more in which to compete for a share of users' resources; design an offering accordingly (i.e., the positioning decision); inform targeted users of the offering's existence and conditions of sale; and ensure its availability as promised. In trying to beat the competition to a share of exchanges, the form of behavioral influence they employ is to participate in bringing about, rather than try to change, the kind of outcome individuals would have effected left to their own devices. The significant behavioral influence is already in place. It exists in the conditions that allocate individuals' resources to doing the kinds of things they do. In other words, marketers help producers to tap into ongoing systems.

Clearly, a selling model cannot be grounded in a similar manner. The offering exists, a given whose features are not known to bear any orderly relation to elements within the system of interest. It remains for proponents of advocacy models to outline how selling or advocacy may be presumed to operate. Basic psychology provides no legitimate grounds for confidence that, relying on mass media of communication and operating in a competitive environment, producers may succeed in selling output that they produce without regard to user-circumstances (what you "happen" to make). It is troubling that the present literature fails to communicate the true state of behavioral science in this regard.

Blurring the Distinction is Counterproductive

Given the complexity of a marketing analysis, it makes no sense to blur the distinction between the marketing and selling models. Only consider the differing implications of each model in discussing the five ps of the marketing mix, and the positioning decision (Fennell 1982a). As managerial strategies, marketing and selling implicate sharply differing orientations within the firm to the functions of marketing and production/R&D, and to their managements' relative status. Blurring leaves practitioners concept-poor in taking the lead answering the producer's question: What shall we make? On many levels, it does a disservice to all parties -- students, practitioners, top management, producers, users, society, and the global community (Figure 4).

Equally important, scholars and scientists need to be aware of the distinction so that they no longer deny treatment to the prototypical marketing case: An individual/organization with some productive expertise (or, more broadly, an entrepreneur or central planner able to acquire productive expertise) intends to engage in exchanges with some users, and seeks guidance from marketing. Entrepreneurs/central planners need help in identifying demand already present in the circumstances of users' lives. The task requires not only empirical sophistication but conceptualizations of relevant aspects of the natural world.

The bread and butter function of marketing scientists is to do basic science in domains dictated by the task of designing goods and services to respond to user wants. In marketing practice, there is in place a well developed empiri-

cal process that starts with exploratory qualitative research, and follows through with subsequent stages of quantified survey and product development research. What we have lacked, and society expects marketing scientists to provide, are conceptualizations to guide us as we conduct our investigations. That means: (1) Creating certain kinds of models (e.g., Fennell 1986); (2) Studying the psychological process of resource allocation (Fennell 1987b,c); (3) In place of a dominant orientation toward hypothesis-testing, providing critical reflection relative to marketing's task of describing the state of the relevant world (Fennell 1982a, 1985c); (4) Describing or, at least, providing exemplary descriptions of, the basic subject matter of our discipline, i.e., domains of everyday activity, defined to correspond to the specialization that division of labor imposes (Fennell 1985 a,c). Until marketing scientists have work ready to publish in such domains, there is something to be done immediately: Editors/reviewers can ask authors to clarify the domain, marketing or selling, they discuss.

Impediments

Simple logic and the values that marketing academics likely uphold as scientists and educators tend to favor such recommendations. The question arises: What have been -- and still are -- some of the impediments to giving effect to separate treatment of marketing and selling as distinct models of exchange, forms of behavioral influence, and managerial strategies?⁵ The impediments seem to be of two related kinds, called here, The Open Secret, and The Selling Paradigm.

The Open Secret. Some academic marketers have "known," it seems, that one is not supposed to take the marketing concept seriously. The marketing concept's presence in the literature is "pure rhetoric," "window-dressing in response to the consumerist movement," a "sunday-school," bowdlerized, view of a world that adult people know to be base and mercenary. Such characterizations seemed to have two solid supports: (1) The mistaken belief that the marketing concept implies managerial altruism. If one seriously believed that such a claim was being made, one might be excused for suspecting window dressing, even though the papers that placed the marketing concept in the academic literature in the post World War II years (e.g., Smith 1956) predate the era of consumerism; (2) The obvious fact that the marketing concept is literally "pure rhetoric," so far as the

FIGURE 4 WHY CLARIFY MARKETING-SELLING DISTINCTION?

GIVEN THAT MARKETING AND SELLING IMPLICATE:
DIFFERENT MODELS OF EXCHANGE & INFLUENCE
DIFFERENT MANAGERIAL STRATEGIES
ACTION IN COMPLEX ENVIRONMENT

CLARIFYING RATHER THAN BLURRING IS DESIRABLE TO:
PROMOTE CLEAR THINKING AMONG STUDENTS
HELP SURFACE UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS
INCULCATE PROFESSIONALISM
FOSTER INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY
FAVOR CONSCIOUS CHOICE OVER MUDDLING ALONG
ADVANCE STRATEGY OVER HAPPENSTANCE
PROVIDE SOLID GRROUNDING FOR THE DISCIPLINE
EXPOSE NEGLECTED DOMAINS TO DISCIPLINE'S
CREATIVE MINDS --

If it is going to be addressed, some scholars/scientists must find the requisite basic work congenial and believe their output will be publishable.

NEEDED CONCEPTUALIZING & RESEARCH e.g.,
REPRESENT RESOURCE-ALLOCATING CONDITIONS
CRITICALLY REFLECT ON ISSUES OF DESCRIPTION
DESCRIBE DISCIPLINE'S SUBJECT MATTER

discipline's literature goes. Models of "marketing" do not contain terms that permit showing the systematic relationship between attributes of offerings and preexisting attributes of contexts of use, which is the essence of marketing. Moreover, the literature has not featured the systematic status of exploratory qualitative work, which practitioners must use without benefit of such models.

The Selling Paradigm. In fact the literature attests to two kinds of omission: Scholars fail to discuss the ramifications of marketing's grounding in division of labor; scientists fail to represent the marketing concept.⁶ A recent treatment in a major journal promises to tell what the marketing concept is, yet the only reference to marketing's grounding in division of labor takes the form of an afterthought about a bootmaker and a king (Houston, 1986, p 86). Where marketing's essence could be plainly discussed in the literature it is not and, instead, the Selling Paradigm appears to hold sway in the minds of its scholars and scientists, as in the examples discussed above.

Common misreadings of the present argument equate "selling" as used here with the activity of personal selling, and then assert that it is wrong to criticize the promotional literature or discussions of personal selling for failing to reflect a marketing orientation. However, engaging in marketing does not preclude using personal communication. Just consider the implications of the marketing concept: Producers may engage in marketing or selling (Figure 3). Those who engage in marketing as distinct from selling may use personal communication to tell targeted prospects that offerings made for their circumstances are available. Given specialization, messages must flow from producers to users. What makes such communication marketing rather than selling is the systematic relationship between attributes of the message and of a naturally-occurring, i.e., unselected, audience, which marketers differentiate as nonprospects, targeted, and nontargeted prospects (Fennell 1985a).

The most impressive evidence, perhaps, of the grip of the Selling Paradigm occurred during the heyday of marketing's "broadening" (e.g., Kotler 1972). Only an equating of marketing and selling could connect marketing with the advocacy of social causes i.e., trying to get people to stop doing something an advocate dislikes (e.g., terminating pregnancy) or start doing something an advocate likes (e.g., campaigning against abortion). For people with marketing expertise, no task is more alien than trying to change behavioral direction as one finds it.

In sum, academics appear to have believed they had good reason not to take the marketing concept seriously. In the literature, moreover, there has been little discernible evidence of marketing as a form of exchange different from selling. What has been present, pervasively, is the Selling Paradigm as an orientation shared in common by the community of "marketing" academics. Whatever about the reasons, the outcome is undeniable: Marketing is scarcely present in the "marketing" literature.

CONCLUSION

More than a quarter century after the marketing concept was articulated, it is disappointing that it has received so little conceptual development. The bright, creative, energetic minds of our discipline devote their resources to developing models that reflect a selling orientation, or to looking outside marketing for new lands to conquer. Meanwhile, our discipline's central questions remain unaddressed: What shall we produce? What shall we offer? How shall we use the resources of the earth and beyond for human satisfaction? The unexamined assumption that marke-

ting and selling are indistinguishable as approaches to exchange diverts attention from the scientific/empirical and ethical issues that mindless production raises: What justification is there for using humankind's limited resources to produce offerings, without substantial grounds for believing the output is responsive to known features of certain contexts of use?

REFERENCES

- Anderson, P. F. (1986), "On Method in Consumer Research: A Critical Relativist Perspective," Journal of Consumer Research, vol. 13, September, 155-173.
- Fennell, G. (1987a), "A Radical Agenda for Marketing Science: Represent the Marketing Concept!" in Philosophical and Radical Thought in Marketing, A. Fuat Firat, N. K. Dholakia, and R. Baggozzi, eds., Lexington: Heath.
- (1987b), "Reculer Pour Mieux Sauter or, Why Consumer Psychologists Need a Model of Action," in Proceedings, Division 23, American Psychological Association, J. Saegert, ed.
- (1987c), "Basic Science for Marketing: Route to a Managerially-Relevant Marketing Science," in Proceeding of 1987 AMA Winter Educators' Conference, R. Belk and G. Zaltman, eds., Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- (1986), "Extending the Thinkable: Consumer Research for Marketing Practice," in Advances in Consumer Research, vol. XIII, R. Lutz, ed.
- (1985a), "Finally, Let's Model Marketing Communications," in Marketing Communications: Theory and Research, R. Lutz and M. Houston, eds., Chicago: AMA.
- (1985b), "Persuasion: Marketing as Behavioral Science in Business and Nonbusiness Contexts: in Advances in Nonprofit Marketing, R. Belk, ed., Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- (1985c), "Things of Heaven and Earth, Phenomenology, Consumer Research, and Marketing," in Advances in Consumer Research, XII, E. Hirschman & M. Holbrook, eds.
- (1983), "Persuasion: Planning for Behavioral Change," in Nonprofit Marketing: Conceptual and Empirical Research, F.K. Shuptrine & P. H. Reingen eds., Tempe: ASU
- (1982a), "Terms v. Concepts: Market Segmentation, Brand Positioning, and Other Aspects of the Academic-Practitioner Gap," in Marketing Theory: Philosophy of Science Perspectives, R. Bush and S. Hunt, eds., Chicago: AMA. [Entire paper (12 pp) available from R. Bush, ed.]
- (1982b), "The Unit to be Classified: Persons v. Behaviors," in Consumer Classification: A Need to Rethink, Brugge, Belgium, ESOMAR.
- Hirschman, E. C. (1983), "Aesthetics, Ideologies and the Limits of the Marketing Concept," Journal of Marketing, 47 (Summer), 45-55.
- Houston, F. S. (1986), "The Marketing Concept: What It Is and What It Is Not," Journal of Marketing, 50 (April), 81-7.
- Hunt, S. (1983), "General Theories and the Fundamental Explananda of Marketing," Journal of Marketing, 47 (Fall), 9-17.
- Journal of Marketing (1984), Award Announcement, vol. 48 (Spring) p. 7.
- Kotler, P. (1972), "A Generic Concept of Marketing," Journal of Marketing, 36 (April), 46-54.
- Nord, W and J. Peter (1980), "A Behavior Modification Perspective on Marketing," Journal of Marketing, 44 (Spring), 36-47.
- Peter, J. and J. Olson (1983), "Is Science Marketing?" Journal of Marketing, 47 (Fall), 111-125.
- Rachlin, H. (1976), Introduction to Modern Behaviorism, 2d edition, San Francisco: Freeman.
- Rothschild, M. and W. Gaidis (1981), "Behavioral Learning Theory: Its Relevance to Marketing and Promotion," Journal of Marketing, 45 (Spring), 70-78.
- Smith, W. R. (1956), "Product Differentiation and Market Segmentation as Alternative Marketing Strategies," Journal of Marketing, vol. 21 (July), 3-8.

⁶ Reviewer comment suggests some misread these words to mean scientists should "practise" the marketing concept