THE 2004 AMA DEFINITION OF MARKETING AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO A MARKET ...
Darroch, Jenny;Miles, Morgan P;Jardine, Andrew;Cooke, Ernest F
Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice; Fall 2004; 12, 4; ProQuest Central
pg. 29

THE 2004 AMA DEFINITION OF MARKETING AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO A MARKET ORIENTATION: AN EXTENSION OF COOKE, RAYBURN, & ABERCROMBIE (1992)

Jenny Darroch
Claremont Graduate University

Morgan P. Miles
Georgia Southern University

Andrew Jardine
University of Otago

Ernest F. Cooke
Loyola College in Maryland

Cooke, Rayburn, and Abercrombie (1992) use historical definitions of marketing to define four major schools of marketing thought. These four schools include the (1) economic utility viewpoint, (2) consumer viewpoint, (3) societal viewpoint, and (4) managerial viewpoint. We suggest that the 2004 AMA definition of marketing creates an additional school of marketing thought, the stakeholder viewpoint. In addition, for over four decades, researchers have used market orientation scales to operationalize what it means for a firm to follow the marketing concept. While the conceptualisation of a market orientation has remained static, the definition of marketing has changed quite dramatically. Few authors have revisited original scale properties and none have addressed the central question of what it means for an organization to be market oriented in the context of the 2004 AMA definition of marketing. As a consequence, market orientation scales have been used sometimes with little consideration as to their relevance. Given changes in the AMA definition of marketing, changes to market characteristics, changes in our understanding of competitive behavior and advances in management theory and scale development, this paper calls for a new scale or scales to be developed that more fully captures the market orientation construct in the context of the 2004 AMA definition of marketing and the "stakeholder" perspective of marketing thought.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission. www.manaraa.com

INTRODUCTION

Cooke, Rayburn and Abercrombie's (1992) central thesis is that definitions of marketing need to change to reflect (1) changes to the environment or (2) changes to our knowledge about the environment. Against this backdrop, Cooke, Rayburn and Abercrombie (1992) introduce a number of definitions of marketing, spanning 1920 – 1989, and argue that each definition is a lens through which one can make assertions about the environment prevalent at the time the definition was written. In their analysis, four schools of thought (or viewpoints) are presented: the (1) economic utility viewpoint, (2) consumer viewpoint, (3) societal viewpoint, and (4) managerial viewpoint. Based on characteristics indicative of the four schools of thought and a content analysis of representative definitions of marketing, Cooke, Rayburn and Abercrombie (1992) conclude that aspects of the economic utility viewpoint were prevalent through the 1920s and have been prevalent in every decade since. The consumer viewpoint emerged in the 1950s and was prevalent during the 1960s and 1970s. The societal viewpoint made small appearances in the 1930s but gained wider acceptance in the 1970s. The managerial viewpoint first appeared in the 1950s and gained rapid acceptance in the 1960s through to the present.

Recently, the AMA has created a new definition of marketing:

> *Marketing is an organizational function and a set of processes for creating, communicating and delivering value to customers and for managing customer relationships in ways that benefit the organization and its stakeholders*

(American Marketing Association's most recent definition of marketing as reported by Keefe 2004: 17).

We suggest that the 2004 AMA definition of marketing creates an additional school of marketing thought, the stakeholder viewpoint. The stakeholder viewpoint differs from the societal perspective by explicitly acknowledging the importance of all of the firm's stakeholders when creating and renewing any competitive advantage. Greenley and Foxall (1998) found that the stakeholder orientation consists of five major dimensions (1) the use of marketing research to discover and define the needs of all stakeholders; (2) top management that understands both the values and the relative importance of the various stakeholder groups; (3) mechanisms and a culture that promotes open discussions between all relevant stakeholder groups; (4) a corporate mission that values the importance of each stakeholder group for the long-term sustainability of corporate performance; and (5) the extent that strategic planning addresses the interests of each stakeholder group. These dimensions all explicitly incorporate stakeholders into the firms' concept of strategy and can be conceptualized into structural and behavioral dimensions of the stakeholder orientation. Behavioral dimensions include the use of marketing research to determine not only customer needs, attitudes, and values, but also the attitudes and values of other stakeholders including employees, the community, and the relevant non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Top management then has the responsibility to absorb and leverage knowledge derived from marketing research on stakeholder issues and utilize this knowledge in strategic conversations with and among stakeholders for strategy making and strategy implementation (for additional insight on strategic conversations see Liedtka & Rosenblum 1996; Chesley & Wenger 1999).

Since the introduction and operationalisation of the market orientation construct as the organizational adoption of the marketing concept (e.g., Hise 1965; Barksdale and Darden 1971; McNamara 1972; Lawton and Parasuraman 1980; Parasuraman 1983; Morris and Paul 1987; Narver and Slater 1990; Kohli and Jaworski 1990; Miles and Arnold 1991; Kohli and Jaworski, and Kumar 1993), there has been much work done to examine the antecedents, consequences, and correlates of an organizational adoption of the market orientation (see for example Naver and Slater 1990; Hooley, Lynch, and Shepherd 1990; Hurley and Hult 1998; Jaworski and Kohli 1993; Nobel, Sinha, and Kumar 2002). This body of work has been instrumental in enhancing our understanding of the performance outcomes and managerial implications of marketing and business orientations. In the spirit of further advancing marketing knowledge, this paper suggests how future research might progress in the context of the 2004 AMA definition of marketing. In particular, we recommend revisiting what it means to be market oriented in light of the 2004 definition of marketing adopted by the American Marketing Association (AMA).

The paper proceeds as follows. First, a brief overview and history of the AMA definition of marketing, schools of marketing thought, strategic orientations, and the market orientation construct are provided. This is followed by a brief summary of the strands of research that have emerged using the market orientation construct. Next, reasons for reconsidering the market orientation construct are expanded upon before the paper closes by reemphasizing the need for a new stream of research that revisits what it means for a firm to be MO given how we define marketing in a globally connected, technology intensive new economy.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Definitions of marketing

Recently the American Marketing Association charged Robert Lusch to lead a group of marketing scholars in the revision of the official definition of marketing (Keefe 2004). This is the third version of the American Marketing Association's definition of marketing since the 1935 definition was adopted in 1948, and refocuses marketing towards the creation of value for customers and organizational stakeholders that enhance long term relationships (Cooke, Rayburn and Abercrombie 1992; Keefe 2004). Table 1 illustrates how the official definition of marketing has changed over time.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission. www.manaraa.com

Schools of marketing thought

The concept of schools of marketing thought was introduced by Bartels (1962) and greatly clarified and enhanced by Sheth and Gardner (1982) who suggested that the development of schools of marketing thought occur as the discipline's concept of marketing changes. While Cooke, Rayburn and Abercrombie (1992) suggest that marketing thought can be classified into four schools, Hills and LaForge (1992) suggest a nine-category framework adapted from Sheth, Gardner and Garrett's (1988) twelve-school schema. The most recent 2004 AMA definition of marketing forces the consideration of a new stakeholder school of marketing thought which supports Greenley and Foxall's (1998) development of a "stakeholder" orientation. Table 2 extends Cooke, Rayburn, and Abercrombie's (1992) to better reflect the 2004 AMA definition of marketing by the addition of a stakeholder viewpoint or school of marketing thought.

TABLE 1
AMERICAN MARKETING ASSOCIATIONS'S OFFICIAL DEFINITION OF MARKETING AND HOW IT HAS CHANGED OVER TIME

AMERICAN MARKETING ASSOCIATION'S DEFINITION[1]	FOCUS OF DEFINITION
Marketing is the performance of business activities that direct the flow of goods, and services from producers to consumers. AMA 1935	1. The managerial function of coordinating demand and supply 2. Production of goods and services 3. Marketing is a business activity
Marketing is the process of planning and executing the conception, pricing, promotion, and distribution of ideas, goods, and services to create exchanges that satisfy individual and organizational objectives. AMA 1985	1. Marketing as a managerial function 2. Purpose of marketing is objective satisfying exchanges 3. Marketing is both an individual and organizational function
Marketing is an organizational function and a set of processes for creating, communicating and delivering value to customers and for managing customer relationships in ways that benefit the organization and its stakeholders	1. Marketing is once again an organizational function, not an individual function 2. Marketing's purpose is to create value 3. The importance of managing relationships with all stakeholders

[1]: Keefe. (2004)

TABLE 2
ADAPTING COOKE, RAYBURN, AND ABERCROMBIE'S (1992) FOUR SCHOOLS OF MARKETING THOUGHT TO THE 2004 AMA DEFINITION OF MARKETING

SCHOOL OF MARKETING	KEY WORDS[1]
ECONOMIC UTILITIES VIEWPOINT[1]	Flow of goods/services; transactions; distribution[1]
CONSUMERS' (BUYERS') VIEWPOINT[1]	Satisfaction; wants; needs; target markets and customers; consumer[1]
SOCIETAL VIEWPOINT[1]	Relationships; societal impact of marketing activities; society; exchanges; standard of living[1]
MANAGERIAL VIEWPOINT[1]	Demand management; organizational objectives; strategy; profits[1]
STAKEHOLDER VIEWPOINT	Knowledge management; stakeholder priority; strategic conversations; open entrepreneurial strategy making and strategy implementation

[1]Cooke, Rayburn, and Abercrombie (1992)

Strategic orientations

Organizational cultures emphasize and de-emphasize certain behaviours and practices in the workplace that, if measured, might represent a common core characteristic of a particular strategic orientation (Narver and Slater 1990). By adopting a strategic orientation, organizations are likely to acquire specific resources that can be used to underpin the creation of capabilities and competencies, which in turn enable the development of competitive advantages (Andrews 1980).

Various strategic orientations have been identified in the literature, including a market orientation, entrepreneurial orientation, quality orientation, customer orientation, brand orientation, competitor orientation, finance orientation, profit orientation, production orientation and technology orientation (e.g., Berthon, Hulbert, and Pitt 1999; Covin and Slevin 1989; Deng and Dart 1994; Fritz 1996; Gatignon and Xuereb 1997; Kohli and Jaworski 1990; Lumpkin and Dess 1996, Mavondo 1999; Miles, Russell, and Arnold 1995; Naver and Slater 1990; Urde 1999). Each orientation is supported by a constellation of certain behaviours and practices, which tend to indicate an organization's adoption and implementation of the orientation (McNamara 1972). For example, a firm emphasizing a customer orientation is likely to accentuate the acquisition and use of resources enabling those within the firm to understand and develop strong relationships with customers, ultimately increasing customer satisfaction and retention. Similarly, a firm emphasizing a finance orientation is likely to accentuate the acquisition and use of resources to support a well-developed financial reporting system that provides full and timely information on the cost of activities performed within the firm, the costs of products offered by the firm and the costs of servicing customers. Therefore, for the purposes of this paper we assume that strategic orientations are present in the workplace, pervasive throughout the firm, are evidenced by a constellation of behaviours, processes, and structures, and most saliently tend to have significant impact on the firm and its performance outcomes (see for example Morgan and Strong 1998).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission. www.manaraa.com

Marketing concept, definition of marketing and a market orientation

It is generally accepted that an organization that has adopted the marketing concept will place customers at the top of the corporate organizational chart and focus on capturing and satisfying customers needs and wants in order to maximize profits (Day 1994; Ruekert 1992). For a firm to follow the marketing concept, a customer orientation must permeate its entire culture, so that the customer is central to the way in which the firm considers its strategy and operations (Deshpandé, Farley and Webster 1993). Therefore, the marketing concept becomes part of the culture that guides organizational decision making (Deshpandé, Farley and Webster 1993; Hunt and Morgan 1995). Hunt and Morgan (1995) suggest that the marketing concept should not be considered a strategy because managers generally decide which strategy or strategies to select. By contrast, a culture, business philosophy or business orientation, is a more permanent and intrinsic part of the organization that can be hard to select and even more difficult to change. For example, Foxall (1984) notes that the marketing orientation is an implicit, integrated, organizational philosophy that colors the "attitudes and behavior of all members of the company."

Once an organization is focused on its customers, programs are put in place to implement the marketing concept. A firm implementing the marketing concept is said to have a market orientation (Atuahene-Gima 1996; Hunt and Morgan 1995; Kohli and Jaworski 1990). There are several seminal articles that define a market orientation. These will be dealt with in turn. First is Hise's (1965) empirical assessment of the adoption of the marketing concept by manufacturers. Hise (1965) found that the adoption of the marketing concept, a firm's MO, is a largely a function of (1) its focus on customers, market research, and product development, and (2) the structure, status, and strategic importance of the marketing department with in the overall organization. Subsequent work by Bell and Emery (1971) added to Hise's (1965) work the notion that the degree of integration of the marketing function throughout the firm is an indicator of MO.

McNamara (1972) proposed that for a firm to adopt an MO it must exhibit both processes and structures designed to enhance customer satisfaction and long-term profits. Lawton and Parasuraman (1980) operationalized MO to consist of (1) a customer focus, (2) coordinated marketing, (3) marketing impact on strategy, and (4) status and professionalism of the marketing function. Parasuraman (1983) augmented the Lawton and Parasuraman (1980) MO metric with items designed to capture structural and staffing issues that pertain to the use and strategic importance of marketing research. Morris and Paul (1987) extended the body of work by Hise (1965), Bell and Emery (1971), McNamara (1972), Lawton and Pasuraman (1980), and Pasuraman (1983) to develop a measure for a marketing orientation that included items that measured structure and process, customer communications and feedback mechanisms, and organizational attitudes of marketing.

Kohli and Jaworski (1990) building on much of the work described above suggest that a firm with a market orientation will exhibit three organizational behaviours: an organization-wide generation of market intelligence pertaining to current and future customer needs, the dissemination of that intelligence across departments and finally, an organization-wide responsiveness to that intelligence. It is suggested that the core of Kohli and Jaworski's definition of a market orientation is that of information processing (Cadogan, Diamantopoulos and Pahud de Mortanges 1999; Tuominen et al. 1999). Kohli and Jaworski's (1990) scale has gained acceptance as one of two scales typically used by marketing scholars as a valid and useful metric that captures a firm's market orientation.

Narver and Slater (1990, p. 21) offer a slightly different perspective by including competitor information and inter-functional coordination in the domain of their operationalization of MO. More formally, the Narver and Slater definition suggests that a market oriented firm will exhibit three behavioral components - a customer orientation, a competitor orientation and inter-functional coordination - along with two decision criteria - a long-term focus and profitability. A customer orientation is defined (p. 21) as "the sufficient understanding of one's target buyers to be able to create superior value for them continuously". A competitor orientation implies that "a seller understands the short-term strengths and weaknesses and long term capabilities and strategies of both current and potential competitors" (pp. 21-22). Lastly, inter-functional coordination means "the coordinated utilization of company resources in creating superior value for target customers" (p. 22). The inclusion of inter-functional coordination represents the essence of this definition as it provides a sense of organizational behaviors that might facilitate a market orientation (Hart and Rolender 1999). Like the Kohli, Jaworski, and Kumar (1993) MARKOR scale, the Naver and Slater (1990) operationalization of MO has gained widespread acceptance as a valid and useful measure of MO.

The key differences between these two seminal operationalizations, the Naver and Slater (1990) and Kohli, Jaworski, and Kumar (1993) metrics, of market orientation relate to the type of information the organization collects about the market and whether or not inter-functional coordination is included in the definition. On the first point, a Kotleresque definition of a market would imply a collection of buyers, where an industry is a collection of sellers (Kotler and Armstrong 1996). This Kotleresque view is certainly the interpretation taken by Deshpandé, Farley and Webster (1993) who use market and customer orientation interchangeably and suggest that a customer orientation is the antithesis of a competitor orientation. Seeing the market and customers as the same is defendable if one goes back to the earlier discussion

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission. www.manaraa.com

on the marketing concept and customer sovereignty upon which the market orientation is based. In contrast, Hunt and Morgan (1995) claim that having a market orientation requires firms to consider both customers and competitors since both appear in the marketplace. By focusing on the marketplace, a firm simply has an external emphasis that includes market sensing, customer linking, channel bonding and technology monitoring (Day, 1994). As an aside, and given renewed emphasis by managers and government officials on the significance of technology driven innovations to generate economic growth, it is important to note the inclusion of technology in Day's (1994) description of an externally focused firm. This is important because earlier operationaliztions of a market orientation failed to explicitly include technology in spite of the impact technology can have on the current and future needs of customers.

Recent publications, mostly by writers who have reflected back on their own earlier work, have adopted the view that a market orientation is simply an orientation toward the marketplace. For example, Jaworski, Kohli and Sahay (2000, p. 45) suggest that while there might be differences in the precise definition of a market orientation, the market orientation "philosophy generally means learning about market developments, sharing this information with appropriate personnel, and adapting offerings to a changing market". Jaworski, Kohli and Sahay (2000) continue by proposing that a firm with a market orientation should consider current and future customers, competitors and broader market conditions. Thus, a firm with a market orientation is one that is simply oriented toward the marketplace; to ignore the marketplace would mean being internally oriented (Day 1994).

To conclude, a market orientation is a type of organizational culture (Harris and Ogbonna 1999) that is intensely customer-centric in focus, directing organizational decision making to meet explicit and latent customer needs at a profit (McCarthy and Perreault 1984). The culture is represented by a set of behaviours that characterise the organization (Deshpandé and Webster 1989). These behaviours reflect the ability of an organization to efficiently and effectively collect, disseminate and use information about the marketplace in which it operates. A firm that has a strong market orientation will exhibit a constellation of more market oriented behaviours, processes, and structures. By implication, such a firm is not only capable of collecting, disseminating and using information about the marketplace but is also likely to demonstrate competence in these behaviours.

Research on a market orientation

Research on the market orientation construct can be characterised into one of several groups. The first group comprises studies that revisit scale properties in an attempt to develop a more parsimonious market orientation scale. Siguaw and Diamantopoulos (1995) revisited the Narver and Slater (1990) scale to test for unidimensionality at both a one-factor and three-factor level (i.e., for the market orientation construct and for each component of the market orientation construct: customer orientation, competitor orientation and inter-functional coordination) – something not done by Narver and Slater (1990). Siguaw and Diamantopoulos (1995) then presented their four-dimensional market orientation scale.

Farrell and Oczkowski (1997) examined both the Narver and Slater (1990) and Kohli-Jaworski (1993) measures for unidimensionality. Dobni and Luffman (2000) extracted a 7-factor solution based on original scales by Kohli and Jaworski (1990), Kohli, Jaworski and Kumar (1993), Narver and Slater (1990) and Deng and Dart (1994). Similarly, Gray, Matear, Boshoff and Matheson (1998) extracted a 6-factor solution based on original scales by Kohli and Jaworski (1990), Kohli, Jaworski and Kumar (1993) Narver and Slater (1990) and Deng and Dart (1994). Lastly, Pelham (1993) compared the Narver and Slater (1990) and the Kohli, Jaworski and Kumar (1993) scales and found the former was more reliable than the latter.

The second group of market orientation studies can be characterised as studies that have applied the Narver and Slater (1990) or Kohli, Jaworski and Kumar (1993) scales to different contexts. Examples include: government departments (Caurana, Ramaseshan and Ewing 1999); Canada (Deng and Dart 1994); UK (Greenley 1995a, 1995b); New Zealand (Gray, Matear, Boshoff and Matheson (1998); and moderating effects on the market orientation construct (e.g., Gray, Greenley, Matear and Matheson 1999; Jaworski and Kohli 1993; Slater and Narver 1994).

The third group of studies has sought to demonstrate a relationship between a market orientation and a range of antecedents and consequences. For example:

- Market orientation and firm performance (Akimova 2000; Appiah-Adu 1997; Baker and Sinkula 1999; Deshpandé, Farley and Webster 1993; Diamantopoulos and Hart 1993; Doyle and Wong 1998; Farrell 2000; Gray Greenley, Matear and Matheson 1999; Greenley 1995b; Grewal and Tansuhaj 2001; Han, Kim and Srivastava 1998; Homburg and Pflesser 2000; Jaworski and Kohli 1993; Kumar, Subramanian and Yauger 1998; Matsuno and Mentzer 2000; Mavondo 1999; Narver and Slater 1990; Noble, Sinha, and Kumar 2002; Pelham and Wilson 1996; Pitt, Carauna and Berthon 1996; Ruekert 1992; Vázquez, Santos and Álvarez 2001).
- Market orientation and innovation (Atuahene-Gima 1996; Atuahene-Gima and Ko 2001; Baker and Sinkula 1999; Berthon, Hulbert, Pitt 1999; Gatignon and Xuereb 1997; Han, Kim and Srivastava 1998; Li and Calantone 1998; Mavondo1999; Slater and Narver 1996; Vázquez, Santos and Álvarez. 2001; Wrenn, Souder and Berkowitz et al. 2000).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission. www.manaraa.com

- Market orientation and employees or human resource practices (Jaworski and Kohli 1993; Mavondo 1999; Ruekert 1992).
- Market orientation and a number of strategic orientations (Morgan and Strong 1998)
- Market orientation and competitive advantage (Akimova 2000).
- The effect of a supplier's market orientation on a distributor's market orientation (Siguaw, Simpson and Baker 1998).
- Market orientation and a learning orientation (Farrell 2000). This relationship has been introduced conceptually in Baker and Sinkula (1999) and Slater and Narver (1995).
- Jaworski and Kohli (1993) provide one of only a few examples of research identifying antecedents of a market orientation including top management support and risk profile, inter-departmental dynamics and organizational systems.

In all cases, the research reported above used existing market orientation scales or hybrid versions of existing scales. Given the results described by researchers such as Siguaw and Diamantopoulos (1995), we are concerned that extant market orientation scales are adopted without question and generally used with little refinement (Hart and Rolender 1999). This is hardly surprising as it is clearly more efficient for researchers to use well recognized and frequently cited scales when establishing a new research project. However, the indiscriminant use of existing market orientation scales to different contexts runs the risk of using a measure without a developed rationale as to why. While a market orientation scale may have been validated for the situation in which it was developed, the assumption that is can directly transfer to other contexts may be naïve. Markets and our understanding of firms' behaviour in markets have changed since the first market orientation scales were developed as the new globally interconnected, technology intensive economy has emerged (see Kotler 2003). Further, the traditional approaches to scale development, as prescribed by Churchill (1979), have led to other problems such as the deletion of conceptually important items in order to ensure factor unidimensionality, the addition of inappropriate items in order to obtain a high alpha reliability scores, and the use of high alphas as solitary evidence of scale validity (Rossiter 2002, pp. 305 – 306). Lastly, and the primary motivation for this paper, the AMA have recently redefined the definition of marketing to include a stakeholder orientation; such a perspective was overlooked in extant market orientation scales.

CONCLUSIONS

The discussion in this paper began by tracing the origins of the definition of marketing, schools of marketing and the market orientation construct. Research on a market orientation was then characterized into one of three groups: (1) research revisiting scale properties; (2) research applying original scales to different contexts; and (3) research examining the antecedents and consequences of following a market orientation. The discussion then moved onto provide reasons why existing market orientation scales are deficient in explaining the behaviour of firms operating in today's environment.

A conclusion of this paper is to encourage researchers to revisit what it means to be market oriented using the 2004 AMA definition of marketing and the emerging stakeholder school of marketing thought to develop scales accordingly. One advantage of developing a new scale or scales is that we will be better placed to understand the antecedents and consequences of market driven and driving market firms operating in macro environment where the importance of stakeholders has become paramount.

REFERENCES

Akimova, I. 2000. "Development of market orientation and competitiveness of Ukrainian firms", *European Journal of Marketing*. 34(9/10): 1128-1148.

Andrews, K. 1980. *The concept of corporate strategy*. Ill: Irwin.

Appiah-Adu, K. 1997. "Market orientation and performance: do findings established in large firms hold in the small business sector?" *Journal of Euro-Marketing*, 6(3): 1-26.

Atuahene-Gima, K. 1996. "Market orientation and innovation", *Journal of Business Research*, 35: 93-103.

Atuahene-Gima, K., and A. Ko. 2001. "An empirical investigation of the effect of market orientation and entrepreneurship orientation alignment on product innovation," *Organization Science*, 12(3): 54-74.

Baker, W. E., and J. M. Sinkula. 1999. "The synergistic effect of market orientation and learning orientation on organizational performance", *Academy of Marketing Science*, 27(4): 411-427.

Barksdale, H.C. and B. Darden. 1971. "Marketers' attitude toward the marketing concept," *Journal of Marketing*, 35(4): 29-36.

Bartels, R. 1965. in Schwartz, G. ed., *Science in Marketing*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission. www.manaraa.com

Bell, M.L. and C.W. Emory. 1971. "The faltering marketing concept," *Journal of Marketing,* 35(4): 37-42.

Berthon, P., Hulbert, J.M., and L.F. Pitt. 1999. "To serve or create? Strategic orientations toward customers and innovation," *California Management Review,* 42(1): 37-58.

Cadogan, J. W., A. Diamantopoulos, and C. Pahud de Mortanges. 1999. "A measure of export market orientation: scale development and cross-cultural validation," *Journal of International Business Studies*, 30(4): 689-707.

Caurana, A., B. Ramaseshan, and M. T. Ewing. 1999. "Market orientation and performance in the public sector: the role of organizational commitment" *Journal of Global Marketing*, 12(3). 59-79.

Chesley, J.A. and M.S. Wenger. 1999. "Transforming an organization: Using models to foster a strategic conversation", *California Management Review,* 41(3):54-73.

Churchill Jr, G. A. 1979. "A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16: 64-73.

Cooke, E.F., J.M. Rayburn, & C.L. Abercrombie. 1992. "The history of marketing thought as reflected in the definitions of marketing", *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice,* 1(1): 10-20.

Covin, J. G. and D. P. Slevin. 1989. "Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments", *Strategic Management Journal*, 10: 75-87.

Day, G. 1994. "The capabilities of market-driven organizations", *Journal of Marketing,* 58(October): 37-52.

Deng, S., and J. Dart. 1994. "Measuring market orientation: a multi-factor, multi-item approach", *Journal of Marketing Management*, 10: 725-742.

Deshpandé, R., J. U. Farley and F. E. Webster Jr. 1993. "Corporate culture, customer orientation, and innovativeness in Japanese firms: a quadrad analysis", *Journal of Marketing,* 57(January): 23-37.

Deshpandé, R., and F. E. Webster Jr. 1989. "Organizational culture and marketing: defining a research agenda", *Journal of Marketing*, 53 (January): 3-15.

Diamantopoulos, A., and S. Hart. 1993. "Linking market orientation and company performance: preliminary evidence on Kohli and Jaworski's framework", *Journal of Strategic Marketing,* 1: 93-121.

Dobni, C. B., and G. Luffman. 2000. "Implementing marketing strategy through a market orientation", *Journal of Marketing Management*, 16(8): 895-916.

Dove, R. 1999. "Knowledge management, response ability, and the agile enterprise", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 3(1): 18-35.

Doyle, P., and V. Wong. 1998. "Marketing and competitive performance: an empirical study", *European Journal of Marketing,* 32(5/6): 514-535.

Farrell, M. A. 2000. "Developing a market oriented learning organisation", *Australian Management Journal,* 25(2): 201-233.

Farrell, M. A., and E. Oczkowski. 1997. "An analysis of the MKTOR and MARKOR measures of market orientation: an Australian perspective", *Marketing Bulletin,* 8: 30-40.

Foxall, G. 1984. *Corporate Innovation: Marketing and Strategy,* New York: St. Martins Press.

Fritz, W. 1996. "Market orientation and corporate success: findings from Germany", *European Journal of Marketing*, 30(8): 59-67.

Gatignon, H., and J.-M. Xuereb. 1997. "Strategic orientation of the firm and new product performance", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(February): 77-90.

Gray, B., G. E. Greenley, S. M. Matear and P. K. Matheson. 1999. "Thriving on turbulence", *Journal of Market Focused Management,* 4: 231-257.

Gray, B., S. Matear, C. Boshoff and P. Matheson. 1998. "Developing a better measure of market orientation", *European Journal of Marketing*, 32(9/10): 864-903.

Greenley, G. E. 1995a. "Forms of market orientation in UK companies", *Journal of Management Studies*, 32(1): 47-66.

Greenley, G. E. 1995b. "Market orientation and company performance: empirical evidence from UK companies", *British Journal of Management*, 6: 1-13.

Greenley, G. E. and G.R. Foxall. 1998. "External moderation of associations among stakeholder orientations and company performance", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*. 15: 51-69.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission. www.manaraa.com

Grewal, R., and R. Tansuhaj. 2001. "Building organizational capabilities for managing economic crisis: the role of market orientation and strategic flexibility", *Journal of Marketing,* 65(April): 67-80.

Han, J. K., N. Kim and R. K. Srivastava. 1998, "Market orientation and organizational performance: is innovation a missing link?" *Journal of Marketing,* 62(October): 30-45.

Harris, L. C., and E. Ogbonna. 1999. "Developing a market oriented culture: a critical evaluation", *Journal of Management Studies,* 36(2): 177-196.

Hart, S., and R. Rolender. 1999. *Working with the enemy: target cost management and the search for market orientation,* Glasgow: University of Strathclyde, 1999/5.

Hills, G.E. & LaForge, R.W. 1992. "Research at the Marketing Interface to Advance Entrepreneurship Theory", *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice,* 16(3), pp. 33-59.

Hise, R.T. 1965. "How manufacturing firms adopted the marketing concept," *Journal of Marketing,* 29: 9-12.

Homburg, C., and C. Pflesser. 2000. "A multiple-layer model of market oriented organizational culture: measurement issues and performance outcomes", *Journal of Marketing Research,* 37(November): 449-462.

Hooley, G.J., Lynch, J.E., and J. Shepherd. 1990. "The marketing concept: Putting the theory into practice," *European Journal of Marketing,* 24(9): 7-23.

Hunt, S. D., and R. M. Morgan. 1995. "The comparative advantage theory of competition", *Journal of Marketing,* 59(April): 1-15.

Hurley, R.F. and T.M. Hult. 1998. "Innovation, market orientation, and organizational learning: An integration and empirical examination", *Journal of Marketing,* 62(3): 42-54.

Jaworski, B. J., and A. K. Kohli. 1993. "Market orientation: antecedents and consequences", *Journal of Marketing,* 57July: 53-70.

Jaworski, B., A. K. Kohli, and A. Sahay. 2000. "Market-driven versus driving markets", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science,* 28(1): 45-54.

Keefe, L. (2004), "What is the meaning of 'marketing'?" *Marketing News,* September 15, American Marketing Association, Chicago, 17-18.

Kohli, A. K., and B. J. Jaworski. 1990. "Market orientation the construct, research propositions and managerial implications", *Journal of Marketing,* 54: 1-18.

Kohli, A. K., B. J. Jaworski and A. Kumar. 1993. "MARKOR: a measure of market orientation", *Journal of Marketing Research,* 30(November): 467-477.

Kotler, P., and G. Armstrong. 1996. *Principles of marketing* (7th ed.). NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kotler, P. 2003. *Marketing Management,* (11th ed.). NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kumar, K., R. Subramanian and C. Yauger. 1998. "Examining the market orientation - performance relationship: a context specific study", *Journal of Management,* 24: 201-233.

Lawton, L and A. Parasuraman. 1980. "The impact of the marketing concept on new product planning," *Journal of Marketing,* 44: 19-25.

Li, T., and R. J. Calantone. 1998. "The impact of market knowledge competence on new product advantage: conceptualization and empirical examination", *Journal of Marketing,* 62(October): 13-29.

Liedtka, J.M. and J.W. Rosenblum. 1996. "Shaping conversations: Making strategy, managing change", *California Management Review,* 39: 141-157.

Lumpkin, G. and G.G. Dess. 1996. "Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance," *Academy of Management Journal,* 21(1): 135-172..

McCarthy, E.J. and W.D. Perreault. 1984. *Basic Marketing* Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

McNamara, C.P. 1972. "The present status of the marketing concept," *Journal of Marketing,* 36(1): 50-57.

Matsuno, K., and J. T. Mentzer. 2000. "The effects of strategy type on the market orientation-performance relationship", *Journal of Marketing,* 64: 1-16.

Mavondo, F. T.1999. "Environment and strategy as antecedents for marketing effectiveness and organizational performance", *Journal of Strategic Marketing,* 7: 237-250.

Miles, M.P. and D.R.Arnold. 1991. "The relationship between marketing orientation and entrepreneurial oreintation," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* 15(4): 49-65.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission. www.manaraa.com

Miles, M.P., Russell, G.R. and D.R. Arnold. 1995. "The quality orientation: An emerging business philosophy," *Reveiw of Business*, 17(1): 7-15.

Morgan, R. E., and C. A. Strong. 1998. "Market orientation and dimensions of strategic orientation", *European Journal of Marketing*, 32(11/12): 1051-1073.

Morris, M.H. and G.W. Paul. 1987. "The relationship between entrepreneurship and marketing in established firms," Journal of *Business Venturing*, 2(3): 247-259.

Narver, J. C., and S. F. Slater. 1990. "The effect of a market orientation on business profitability", *Journal of Marketing*, 54(October): 20-35.

Nobel, C.H., Sinha, R.V. and A. Kumar. 2002. "Market orientation and alternative strategic orientations: A longitudinal assessment of performance implications," *Journal of Marketing*, 66: 25-39.

Parasuraman, A. 1983. "Marketing-orientation of industrial vs. consumer goods firms," *Akron Business and Economic Review*, 14(2): 41-44.

Pelham, A. M. 1993. *Mediating and moderating influences on the relationship between market orientation and performance*, Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University.

Pelham, A. M., and D. T. Wilson. 1996. "A longitudinal study of the impact of market structure, firm structure, strategy, and market orientation culture on dimensions of small firm performance", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 24(1): 27-43.

Pitt, L., A. Caurana and P. R. Berthon. 1996. "Market orientation and business performance: some European evidence", *Industrial Marketing Review*, 13(1): 5-18.

Rossiter, J. 2002. "The C-OAR-SE procedure for scale development in marketing", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 19(4): 305 - 335.

Ruekert, R. W. 1992. "Developing a market orientation: an organizational strategy perspective", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 9: 225-245.

Shapiro, B. P. 1988. "What the hell is 'market oriented'?" *Harvard Business Review*, 66: 119-125.

Sheth, J.N. and D.M. Gardner. 1982. in Bush, R. and S. Hunt eds., *Marketing Theory: Philosophy of Science Perspectives*. Chicago: American Marketing Association.

Sheth, J.N., D.M. Gardner, and D.E. Garrett. 1988. *Marketing Theory: Evolution and evaluations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Siguaw, J. A., and A. Diamantopoulos. 1995. "Measuring market orientation: some evidence on Narver and Slater's three-component scale", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 3: 77-88.

Siguaw, J. A., P. M. Simpson and T. L. Baker. 1998. "Effects if supplier market orientation on distributor market orientation and the channel relationship: the distributor perspective", *Journal of Marketing*, 62(July): 99-111.

Slater, S. F., and J. C. Narver. 1994. "Does competitive environment moderate the market orientation-performance relationship?" *Journal of Marketing*, 58(January): 46-55.

Slater, S. F., and J. C. Narver. 1995. "Market orientation and the learning organization", *Journal of Marketing*, 59(July): 63-74.

Slater, S. F., and J. C. Narver. 1996. "The challenge of sustaining competitive advantage", *Industrial Marketing Management*, 25: 79-86.

Urde, M. 1999. "Brand orientation: a mindset for building brands into strategic assets", *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15: 117-133.

Vázquez, R., M. L. Santos and L. I. Álvarez. 2001. "Market orientation, innovation and competitive strategies in industrial firms", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 9: 69-90.

Wrenn, B. M., W. E. Souder and D. Berkowitz. 2000. "Market orientation and new product development in global industrial firms", *Industrial Marketing Management*, 29:601-611.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission. www.manaraa.com

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Jenny Darroch (Ph.D., Otago) is assistant professor of marketing at the Peter Drucker and Masatoshi Ito Graduate School of Management at Claremont Graduate University. Her current research focuses on the interface between marketing and entrepreneurship, in particular the comparison between market driven and driving markets firm behavior. Earlier research looked at the antecedents of innovation within firms. Prior to joining Claremont Graduate University, Jenny was the Director of Entrepreneurship and senior lecturer in Marketing at the University of Otago in New Zealand.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Morgan P. Miles (DBA, Mississippi State) is professor of marketing at Georgia Southern University. His research interests include the interface between marketing, ethics, and corporate entrepreneurship. He has been a senior research associate for the Judge Institute of Management, Cambridge University, a visiting professor of Marketing, at the University of Stockholm, and most recently a visiting professor of entrepreneurship at the University of Otago where much of the work for this manuscript was completed.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Andrew Jardine is a doctoral candidate with the Department of Marketing at the University of Otago. His research and teaching interests are consumer behavior and qualitative research. Andrew has a Masters degree in Social Psychology and through this training developed expertise in interpretataive research, in particular the application of discourse analysis to consumption and advertising.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Ernest F. Cooke (Ph.D., Case Western Reserve University) is a professor of marketing. He has taught fulltime at Case Western Reserve University in Baltimore, Memphis State University, and Loyola College in Maryland. At Memphis State University he held an endowed chair. His business experience includees over eighteen years at Reliance Electric Co. He has over one hundred papers in a variety of journals and conference proceedings on marketing, economics, and electrical engineering.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission. www.manaraa.com