



[HOME](#) / [ARCHIVES](#) / [VOL. 2 NO. 1 \(2021\)](#) / [Articles](#)

## Historical development of marketing and its implications to the future of marketing discipline

**Osman Wechuli Chesula**

[cowechuli@gmail.com](mailto:cowechuli@gmail.com)

School of Business and Economics, Kenya Methodist University, Kenya

**Stephen Ntuara Kiriinya**

School of Business and Management Studies, Technical University of Kenya, Kenya

**Ann Rintari**

School of Business and Economics, Kenya Methodist University, Kenya

**Keywords:** Development, Era, Evolution, Marketing, Relationship Marketing, Trends

### ABSTRACT

This paper sought to examine the development of marketing (theory, scholarship and practice) and accounted for that evolution. It also sought to determine the implications that the developments have for the marketing theory, scholarship and practice in future. The paper is based on the empirical analysis of important literature from scholarly articles. From its findings, it is evident that marketing activities are as old as humanity and the development of marketing discipline is gradual having had less attention in early centuries. However; attention to marketing as an important function emerged in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. It is also evident that marketing theory borrows a lot from other disciplines and it's still not clear which topics comprehensively constitute marketing theory. The insights from the analysis bring out the contribution of marketing theory to marketing scholarship and practice. A lot is expected to change in the marketing field owing to globalization, consumer preferences, inventions and innovations in information and communication technology and importance of relationship building. Marketing research is one of the areas that are expected to see significant changes over the years as new approaches emerge.

### DIMENSIONS

PUBLISHED

2021-05-10

HOW TO CITE

Chesula, O. W., Kiriinya, S. N., & Rintari, A. (2021). Historical development of marketing and its implications to the future of marketing discipline. *Research Journal in Advanced Social Sciences*, 2(1). Retrieved from <https://royalliteglobal.com/rjass/article/view/611>

More Citation Formats ▾

ISSUE

[Vol. 2 No. 1 \(2021\)](#)

SECTION

Articles

COPYRIGHT & LICENSING

Copyright (c) 2021 Osman Wechuli Chesula, Stephen Ntuara Kiriinya, Ann Rintari



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

# **HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF MARKETING AND ITS IMPLICATIONS TO THE FUTURE OF MARKETING DISCIPLINE.**

## **AUTHORS:**

Osman Wechuli Chesula (Corresponding author)  
School of Business and Economics, Kenya Methodist University  
P.O. Box 39-30218, Tongaren, Kenya  
Tel: +254722291073 E-mail: [cowechuli@gmail.com](mailto:cowechuli@gmail.com)

Stephen Ntuara Kiriinya  
School of Business and Management Studies, Technical University of Kenya  
P.O. Box 52428-00200, Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: +254722763843 E-mail: [sntuara@yahoo.com](mailto:sntuara@yahoo.com)

Ann Rintari  
School of Business and Economics, Kenya Methodist University  
P.O. Box 45240-00100, Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: +254725912274 E-mail: [Ann.rintari@kemu.ac.ke](mailto:Ann.rintari@kemu.ac.ke)

## **Abstract**

This paper sought to examine the development of marketing (theory, scholarship and practice) and accounted for that evolution. It also sought to determine the implications that the developments have for the marketing theory, scholarship and practice in future. The paper is based on the empirical analysis of important literature from scholarly articles. From its findings, it is evident that marketing activities are as old as humanity and the development of marketing discipline is gradual having had less attention in early centuries. However; attention to marketing as an important function emerged in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. It is also evident that marketing theory borrows a lot from other disciplines and it's still not clear which topics comprehensively constitute marketing theory. The insights from the analysis bring out the contribution of marketing theory to marketing scholarship and practice. A lot is expected to change in the marketing field owing to globalization, consumer preferences, inventions and innovations in information and communication technology and importance of relationship building. Marketing research is one of the areas that are expected to see significant changes over the years as new approaches emerge.

**Keywords:** Marketing, Development, Era, Evolution, trends, Relationship Marketing

## **1. Introduction**

Prior to the definition of marketing formulated in 1985, the American Marketing Association (AMA) defined marketing as “the performance of business activities that direct the flow of goods and services from producer to consumer or user.” This position came under attack from various quarters as being too restrictive. Specifically, a position paper by the Marketing Staff of the Ohio State University in 1965 suggested that marketing be considered “the process in a society by which the demand structure for economic goods and services is anticipated or enlarged and satisfied through the conception, promotion, exchange, and physical distribution of goods and services.” Unlike the previous definition there was conspicuous absence of the notion that marketing consists of a set of business activities. Rather, marketing is viewed as a societal process (Hunt, 2002).

In an updated definition by the American Marketing Association (2004), 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. This definition appears to generalize organizations that undertake marketing function as it also includes non-business organizations (Gundlach & Wilkie, 2009; Rownd & Heath, 2008). This concept has been supported by Kotler and Levy (1969) in their book broadening the concept of marketing. Summing up all the above definitions, we get that the definitions of marketing appropriately: (1) acknowledge (a) the activity of marketing, (b) the institutions of marketing, and (c) the processes in marketing, (2) recognizes the role of marketing in (a) creating, (b) communicating, (c) distributing, and (d) exchanging market offerings, and (3) points out how the normal, everyday, ethical, and responsible practice of marketing benefits (a) customers, (b) clients, (c) partners, and (d) society.

### **1.1 Scope of marketing**

According to Coulter (2016) as well as the Hunt (1976), the scope of marketing is unquestionably broad. Often included are diverse subject areas such as consumer behaviour, pricing, purchasing, sales management, product management, marketing communications, comparative marketing, social marketing, the efficiency/ productivity of marketing systems, marketing ethics, the role of marketing in economic development, packaging, channels of distribution, relationship marketing, marketing research, societal issues in marketing, retailing, wholesaling, the social responsibility of marketing, international marketing, brand equity, commodity marketing, and physical distribution. Hunt (2014) noted that not all writers would include all of the topics under the marketing caption. However, majority would disagree as to which topics should be excluded.

Another important contribution of understanding the scope of marketing is the understanding of marketing as both an art and a science. Extensive debate on whether marketing is an art or a science continues to elicit mixed responses to date. Brown (1996)

in his book “fifty years of marketing debate” delves on the issue and gives justifications as to why marketing is both an art and a science. Marketing scholars have given different opinions on the reasons as to why marketing portrays both characteristics and hence must be viewed as both an art and a science. In justifying why marketing is both an art and science, Dowling and Dowling (2004) observed that to achieve best results managers usually require a subtle blend of marketing’s art and science.

## **2. Historical development of marketing theory**

The evolution of theory is essential for any discipline (Baker & Saren, 2016; Cohen & Lloyd, 2014). This assertion is re-emphasized in an applied social science like marketing. All academic disciplines build their own bodies of theory and apply their own unique lens to particular phenomena (Gołębiewski, 2015). Marketing however takes many of its theories from other disciplines, such as psychology and economics (Mittelstaedt, 1990; Varadarajan, 2020). The challenge for marketing as a relatively young discipline is to build its own distinct body of theory as observed by Baker and Saren (2016) from the work of Murray, Evers, and Janda (1995) “marketing, theory borrowing, and critical reflection”.

Marketing scholars cannot agree on a common definition for theory just like they cannot have a common definition of marketing. This is because each definition is dependent on philosophical orientation. According to Baker and Saren (2016) the term theory is sometimes used to refer to a set of propositions or an abstract conceptualization of the relationship between entities. At other times it can be a general principle that is used to explain or predict facts or events. Often ‘theory’ conveys verification of facts, systems of organization, law like generalizations and tested hypotheses. Consequently, it is frequently associated with the production of scientific knowledge and the notion of an objective, explanatory lens upon the world.

Popper (2013) in his book “Realism and the aim of science: From the postscript to the logic of scientific discovery” metaphorically suggests that theories are “nets to catch what we call ‘the world’: to rationalize, to explain, and to master it. We endeavour to make the mesh finer and finer.” Marketing theoretician Wroe Alderson proposes that a theory is a set of propositions which are consistent among themselves and which are relevant to some aspect of the factual world (Shaw, 2014). According to Richard Rudner, a theory is a systematically related set of statements, including some law like generalizations that is empirically testable. It is widely agreed however that the purpose of theory is to increase scientific understanding through a systematized structure capable of both explaining and predicting phenomena (Seth & Zinkhan, 1991).

It is believed that marketing practice dates as back as 7000 B.C. with marketing thought as a distinct discipline also being initiated out of economics around the same period (Sheth & Parvatiyar, 1995). It is possible to begin an analysis of marketing theory at the end of the Middle Ages, and at the beginning of the 16th century. Although

rudimentary forms of marketing can already be traced to earlier periods, for example in ancient Greece and Rome, the market for artistic artefacts acquired a specific structure and evolved exponentially during the Renaissance (is a period in the history of Europe beginning in about 1400, and following the Medieval period). This period was one of the richest artistic periods in the history of humankind, closely reflecting the changes and developments of the societies in which it was embedded (Minniti, 2015).

## **2.1 Schools of marketing theory**

The concept of having schools of marketing thought has been credited to the work of Bartels, Shaw, and Tamilia (1962) and as observed by the American marketing association enhanced by Sheth and Gardner (1982) who clarified that analysing or tracking marketing changes is indeed the development of schools of marketing thought (Darroch, Miles, Jardine, & Cooke, 2004). According to Jones, Shaw, and McLean (2009), a school should represent a substantial resource of knowledge, it should have been developed by a number of scholars and it should describe or explain at least one aspect of marketing activities. The basic task of a school of marketing is thus to define what marketing is and what is decisive for its identity or a dominant similarity of views, referring to the basic issues characterising the phenomenon of marketing.

Scholars have come up with different classifications of marketing schools of thought that explain marketing theory. Shaw and Jones (2005) noted that it is only during the 20th century that marketing ideas evolved into an academic discipline in its own right. Most concepts, issues and problems of marketing thought have coalesced into one of several schools or approaches to understanding marketing. Sheth, Sheth, Gardner, Garrett, and Garrett (1988) outlined twelve schools, thus; commodity, functional, functionalist, regional, institutional, and managerial, buyer behaviour, activist, macro marketing, organisational dynamics, systems and social exchange. The authors present the rationale behind the evolution of marketing through all the twelve schools. They also develop a list of concepts and axioms useful in generating a practical theory of marketing.

Sheth and Gardner (1982) identified six schools of thought, thus; the microeconomic, persuasion/attitude change, conflict resolution, and generalist system, functional and social exchange. Boone and Kurtz (2005) explained four eras of marketing development which just like Stanton, Etzel, Walker, Báez, and Martínez (2004) who observed marketing as an economic science explain the development of marketing from an economic point of view. Thus; Production (pre-1925), sales (1920s–1950s), marketing (1950s–1990s) and relationship (1990s–present). In addition, other four eras of the development of marketing thought were identified by Wilkie and Moore (2003). These are: 1900–1920 (Founding the field), 1920–1950 (Formalizing the field), 1950–1980 (A paradigm shift – marketing, management and the science), 1980 – present (The shift intensifies – fragmentation of the mainstream).

## **2.2 Four eras of marketing development by Wilkie and Moore**

The four eras of marketing development were significantly distinguishable with respect to marketing thought and societal issues were treated differently at each level as well. The four eras were preceded by pre marketing (before 1900) where there was no distinguishing field of study; issues were embedded within the field of economics (Wilkie & Moore, 2003).

The first era referred to as the “founding of the field of marketing” from 1900 to 1920, characterised by the development of first courses titled marketing. A lot of emphasis was put on defining purview of marketing’s activities as economic institution and some focus on marketing as distribution. Technological innovations in the fields of transport and logistics were changing market place rapidly which necessitated scholars to develop marketing courses to explain these changes hence marketing began to take its own identity. For example, the “marketing of products” by professors from University of Pennsylvania (Maynard, 1941). At this stage there was no elaborate marketing theory, data, or structure, the authors only attempted to provide non empirical but relatively objective answers about social issues that reflected their evolving marketing system (Wilkie & Moore, 2003). The progression of era I between 1910-1915 saw the introduction of articles in economics journals and free-standing books which helped establish marketing concepts that were propelling marketing towards a distinct field of knowledge (Bussiere, 2000). Developments of this era later came to be classified into three approaches. Thus, the commodity approach which focused on all marketing actions which were involved in a particular product category, the second approach being the institutional approach which concentrated on describing the operations of a specialized type of marketing agency, such as a wholesaler or a broker and lastly the functional approach whose focus was on the purposes served by various marketing activities (Wilkie & Moore, 2003).

The second era occurred from 1920 to 1950. It was referred to as the formalizing the field era. It was characterised by the development of generally accepted foundations or principles of marketing, establishment of knowledge development infrastructure for the marketing field which included establishment of professional associations like the American Marketing society in 1930, American Marketing Association in 1937, marketing conferences and marketing journals like the Journal of Retailing in 1925 and Journal of Marketing 1937 (Bussiere, 2000) Within this period, established marketing textbooks serve as the primary repositories of academic marketing knowledge. Successful textbooks ran through numerous editions, preserving main lines of thought. And due to this development, towards the end of the period there was an emerging interest toward theorizing systems and scientific approach with emphasis being put on the generally acceptable marketing principles (Bartels, 1988; Kerin, 1996).

Worldly inventions and innovations during this period brought challenges to the marketing field. For example, sophisticated tools for mass production required more

complex and varied distribution systems, as well as more sophisticated understanding of tools to influence mass consumer demand. In addition, introduction of new products courtesy of technological developments meant that consumer choices expanded culminating into consumer Movements to counter frustrations with lack of product information, prices and quality of some products (Allen, 1954; Bussiere, 2000; Cross & Gary, 2000; Lebergott, 2014). All these challenges necessitated additional thought in the field and with academic infrastructure in place, the marketing discipline was formalized.

The third era referred to as a paradigm shift in the marketing mainstream marketing, management, and the sciences. This occurred between 1950 and 1980. Era III was very much built on the arrival of mass marketing dominance and a period of booming growth in the U.S. marketing system. The infrastructure and body of marketing thought likewise expanded geometrically (Wilkie & Moore, 2012). Marketing scholars and practitioners increased due to growth in university education and demand for marketing professors also increased. Within this period, a turn to managerial perspective was established as a new marketing thought. Science was vied as the basis for marketing thought development in order to help them undertake successful marketing programs (Myers, Massy, & Greyser, 1980) With managerial perspective of marketing coming into shape during this era, a lot of new marketing concepts that are important to marketing profession to date were born. For example; the concept of marketing by (McKitterick, 1957), market segmentation as a managerial strategy by (Smith, 1956), the marketing mix by (Borden, 1964), the 4 P's by Perreault and McCarthy (1990), brand image by (Gardner & Levy, 1955), marketing management as analysis, planning, and control by Kotler (1967), the hierarchy of effects by (Lavidge & Steiner, 1961), marketing myopia by (Levitt, 1960) and the wheel of retailing by (Hollander, 1960). Scholars like Alderson and Shapiro (1957); Howard (1957); McCarthy (1960) also contributed through establishment of important managerial test books (Jones & Shaw, 2002; Wilkie & Moore, 2003).

The last era, thus era IV referred to as “The Shift Intensifies. A Fragmentation of the Mainstream” stated in 1980 to Present. Being simply a continuation of the developments experienced in era iii, this period is characterised by new challenges in business world like short-term financial focus, downsizing, globalization, and reengineering. Dominant perspectives are questioned in philosophy of science debates. Marketers are pressured to publish on academics and Knowledge infrastructure expands and diversifies into specialized interest areas. Research on institutional players in the market system like consumers, marketers, and government were given a lot of attention contributing to formulation of policies like consumer protection and improvement of societal issues. Publications in the field are many as scholars and doctoral students are under pressure to produce published research (Wilkie & Moore, 2003).

### **2.3 Evolution of marketing by Maclaran, Miller, Parsons, and Surman**

According to the sage handbook of marketing theory by Maclaran, Saren, Stern, and Tadjewski (2009) marketing thought can be classified into two, the early schools and

modern schools. The early schools of marketing thought were established to answer questions that arose in the process of describing and explaining marketing as a scientific field of knowledge (Shaw, Jones, & McLean, 2010). In mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, the modern school stated replacing the early or traditional concepts in marketing. This school looked at theories like the marketing management which introduced the managerial approach to marketing; the marketing systems school, which was closely related to Alderson's functional approach which attempted to answer the questions "What activities constitute marketing?"; the consumer behaviour school which was also shaped under the influence of Alderson's argument that behavioural sciences should supplement economics as the basis for academic research (Lüdicke, 2007).

Modern schools of thought theories like marketing management and consumer behaviour theories paved the way for the school of macro marketing, which dealt with the impact and consequences of marketing activity for society and the impact of society on marketing (Shaw et al., 2010). Alderson is also credited with introducing the school of social exchange as another sub discipline of marketing. This looked at the interaction between sellers and purchasers engaged in market transactions, as well as interactions between groups of sellers and purchasers. The school of marketing history gave rise to comprehensive research in the field (Maclaran et al., 2009).

### **3.0 Levels of marketing theory**

Marketing theory just like other discipline theories has been conceptualized in four distinct levels. To start with, at the metatheory level which looks at body of knowledge about a field of study, or about what that field should concern itself with. Marketing remains at a highly conceptual level although it also often incorporates other levels of theory. Much critical theorizing takes place at this metatheoretical level in an attempt to deconstruct the field of marketing *per se* thereby overturning fundamental claims and assumptions (Maclaran et al., 2009). The second level is the grand theory which seeks a broad, but slightly less conceptual, perspective about the marketing field. Scholars like Gummesson (2006) have however noted that there is little grand theory of marketing today that develops consciously and is solidly grounded and conceptually advanced. The third level is the middle range theory which seeks to have a broad scope of a phenomena than grand theory and is more specific (Maclaran et al., 2009; Merton, 1949). Lastly, the practice theory level which aims at explaining the way a phenomenon occurs in practice and hence it doesn't prioritize the conceptual importance of either individual actors or societal structures. In essence it balances between theory and practice without prioritizing one over the other (Böhm, 2002; Whittington, 2006).

### **3.1 Current trends in marketing theory**

From the development of marketing theory explained in the above schools of thought, it is very clear that there is continuous change in the marketing discipline. The dynamism in the environment has also necessitated this. According to Goldsmith (2004)

organizational, scientific, technological, economic, and social changes also necessitate changes in marketing theory and practice. Some of the major trends like; integrated marketing, changing roles in marketing, globalization of marketing, technology use in marketing, mass customization and personalization among other factors can be identified as the main marketing issues that will shape how marketing discipline will be undertaken today and in the coming years. Some of these factors are discussed below.

### **3.1.1 Integrated marketing and relationship marketing**

To succeed in the 21st century, one has to produce a product to fulfil the needs of their customers, thus the marketing concept (Webster Jr, 1994). This concept works on an assumption that consumers buy products which fulfil their needs. Businesses following the marketing concept conduct researches to know about customers' needs and wants and come out with products to fulfil the same better than the competitors. By doing so, the business establishes a relationship with the customer and generate profits in the long run (Philip, 2017). Integrated marketing is one of the pillars of the marketing concept. All the functions within an organization are expected to contribute to the marketing success of a business entity. This therefore means that marketing will also play a major role in influencing the decisions of other business functions on the basis of systems approach to management where each part of the organization affects the other parts in some magnitude (Witzel, 2016).

According to Shirshendu, Eshghi, and Nada (2009), the concept of relationship marketing (RM) though not explicitly first entered the marketing literature, in early 1950s, but well formulated research streams did not emerge until the 1980s as scholars began to challenge the notion of conventional competitive marketing where the seller and buyer are pitted against each other in an adversarial relationship. Sheth, Parvatiyar, and Sinha (2012) noted that the emergence of RM as a separate academic domain of marketing in the 1980s and 1990s becomes more comprehensible from a historical perspective. There are different definitions of relationship marketing. According to O'Malley (2018), relationship marketing is a set of interactions and networks. Scholars have noted that the term relationship Marketing is used to reflect a variety of perspectives and marketing themes some of which are narrow while others are too broad and somewhat paradigmatic in approach and orientation (Hibbard, 2015). One of the narrow perspectives of relationship marketing is to consider relationship marketing only as customer retention in which a variety of after Marketing tactics is used for customer bonding or staying in touch after the sale is made. With a lot of Information technology application in relationship marketing, the focus on individual or one-to-one relationship with customers that integrates database knowledge with a long-term customer retention and growth strategy has been developed and is also termed as Customer Relationship Management (CRM) which also provides a narrow view of relationship marketing (Atul & Mona, 2015).

Those scholars holding a broader view of relationship marketing perceive it as a

strategic tool for an organization (Payne & Frow, 2017). The strategic view holds that relationship marketing is about putting the customer first and shifting the role of marketing from manipulating the customer (telling and selling) to genuine customer involvement (communicating and sharing the knowledge) (Sheth et al., 2012). Berry (2016) defined relationship marketing as attracting, maintaining, and – in multi-service organizations – enhancing customer relationships. Berry's notion resembles that of service marketing by scholars like Grönroos and Gummerus (2014) who perceived relationship marketing as a marketing strategy that establishes, maintains, and enhances relationships with customers and other partners, at a profit, so that the objectives of the parties involved are met. This is achieved by a mutual exchange and fulfillment of promises (Gummesson, 2017).

Based on the work of (Hunt, 2018), some scholars have taken a process view of relationship Marketing. This view currently prevails the literature and indicates that the Marketing practice and research needs to be directed to the different stages of the relationship Marketing process. The relationship Marketing process comprises distinct stages such as the core interaction, planned communication that provides opportunity for meaningful dialog, and the creation of customer value as an outcome of relationship Marketing (Grönroos, 2017).

### **3.1.2 Changing role of marketing**

As businesses become more concerned with managing their image as a marketing tool, marketing function is shifting attention to new roles away from the traditional roles. This is supported by Goldsmith and Moutinho (2017), who noted that in the realm of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), consumer expectations about the role businesses play in their lives are changing. Consumers are becoming more aware of how businesses operate and of the effects business decisions have on the world; and this awareness is becoming more important to their consumption decisions than in the past. This is also enhanced by consumer concerns on issues like green consumption, sustainability, female empowerment, local sourcing among other issues that marketers must start to embrace or continue embracing (Kasriel-Alexander, 2016).

### **3.1.3 Globalization of marketing**

This is a trend that affects all aspects of modern business. Globalization as an aspect of global economic integration is inevitable and due to that marketers are faced with increased competition, new customers increased market among other issues (Alon, Jaffe, Prange, & Vianelli, 2016; Mohanty, 2017). Marketers are therefore required to widen their marketing and management scope in order to also become more global. Global partners must be sought in order to increase competitiveness. Marketing practitioners must learn to work with distant customers in distant markets (Polat & Akgün, 2017). Consequently, marketing theorists should reflect this global environment by not limiting themselves to national or regional trends but rather broadening the scope of marketing

education and marketing research so that they can be applicable worldwide. This trend is bound to continue for years to come as more and more ideas of tackling globalization come into play.

### **3.1.4 Technology use**

Technology has revolutionised all aspects of marketing theory and practice (Maklan, Peppard, & Klaus, 2015). This trend is also expected to continue as new inventions and innovations emerge over the coming years. High speed computers, improved data bases, internets and related item are being used to improve sales, advertisements, relationship building, and distribution among other aspects of marketing (Mohanty, 2017; Shankar et al., 2016). Scholars are also benefiting from these technological developments. For example, it's now easier for research and study materials to be shared online and in softcopies. In future we expect more sophisticated methods of leaning to emerge. It is expected that improved marketing program simulations and three-dimensional demonstrations will be easier to use.

### **3.1.5 Mass customization and Personalization**

According to Gilmore (1997) customization is focusing on the customer in developing products and services of marketing programs. This is a very important aspect in the current business world aimed at retaining as many customers as possible. This however has its own challenges. Due to the peculiar nature of customers whose needs grow increasingly diverse, such an approach has become untenable for global companies as it adds unnecessary cost and complexity to operations (Chesula, Kiriinya, & Rintari, 2020). Companies around the world are now embracing mass customization in an attempt to avoid those challenges. Supported by information technology and flexible work processes marketers are able to customize goods or services for individual customers in high volumes at low cost.

Personalization is also a concept expected to gain more attention in the near future. Ronald. Goldsmith and Freiden (2004) even suggested that personalization be considered as an addition to the expanded traditional marketing Ps as the 8<sup>th</sup> P after the 4ps (product, price, promotion, place) and the 3 extra strategic service marketing as (personnel, physical resources and procedures). Personalization is a strategy of individualizing products or marketing activities to uniquely satisfy each customer (Nguyen, Emberger-Klein, & Menrad, 2018). With improved marketing tools like marketing information systems, it's easier and safer to acquire and store information on individual customers that can be used to personalize marketing programs (Chesula et al., 2020).

## **4.0 Marketing research trends for the future**

According to Goldsmith (2004) marketing research teaching and practice has for a long time assumed a standard format with emphasis on qualitative approaches, mostly focus groups and personal interviews, and quantitative approaches, mostly surveys and

experiments. Quantitative research has often been used as input for subsequent quantitative research. Logical positivism with a descriptive bias where the research is applied and an explanatory or hypothesis testing bias are the guiding philosophies. Alternative approaches to research are however emerging and being embraced by marketing researchers a trend expected to continue.

To start with, postmodern (interpretivist) approach to marketing research is gaining attention. Unlike the standard approach, this approach embraces a symbolic, subjective view of the world. They stress the socially constructive rather than objective nature of reality and value multiple, simultaneous interpretations of marketing phenomenon (Iosifides, 2016). Woodside (2012) presented a summary of several studies that have used this type of research using the long interviews, measured chain analysis, storytelling theory and other qualitative techniques.

Another approach to future marketing research is the behavioural ecology perspective majorly used in consumer behaviour. Instead of seeking subjective, symbolic and verbal descriptions of consumer behaviour, the approach seeks to confirm that consumer market place behaviour can be understood as conditioned responses to environmental contingencies. For example, brand choice corresponds to patterns that can be modelled using the patterns of operant conditioning animal studies (Foxall & James, 2003). This is also supported by the work of Vermeij (2009) who presented the idea by arguing that the behaviour of all organisms including humans and the organization follow the basic laws of change adaptation and development in the evolutionary fashion. Behavioural ecology perspective approach of marketing research stresses tightly controlled experiments, computer modelling, and rigorous mathematical analysis. It also employs the macro perspective thus looking at the behaviour of systems rather than individuals.

Lastly, another new approach to marketing research according to Ronald (2004) is the technological approach. This is the use of technology to study the market place. For example, the use of radio listening technology which allows researchers to directly monitor which radio stations are tuned as cars pass a listening post, measuring what product categories retain listeners through commercials and which songs keep them from switching channels. New technological developments are finding their way into marketing research improving data yield and insights never seen by traditional research. Researchers can also do online surveys, test marketing or advertising, conduct focus group (Burns & Bush, 2005).

## **5.0 Conclusion**

Analysis of the different marketing schools of thought explaining the evolution of marketing depicts an academic field that is vast in scope and provides great promise as the evolution is still ongoing. Scholars in the marketing field have produced very few accurate, comprehensive and significant generalizations, principles or theories. Scholars

like Alderson and Cox even with their vast contribution to the field of marketing believed and noted that a sound theory is needed, not simply to produce immediate generalizations, but because it helps marketers to better initiate and direct their inquiries. This is an indication that further research is important and must be undertaken for better theory (Lüdicke, 2007).

Sheth and Parvatiyar (1995) while looking at relationship marketing noted that research in marketing tends to take shortcuts and over generalize and oversimplify at a stage when the understanding is still shallow. This shows that marketers need to delve deeper into the field in order to clearly develop it as a distinct science characterised by its own unique principles. At the moment a lot is borrowed from other fields like economics to simplify marketing matters in the academic field. However, there is also a challenge when marketing scholars start fragmenting the marketing field into sub sections with no concrete theoretical or literature backing. Scholars argue that this might lead to loss of knowledge as a lot is not transmitted or new practices might replace old but good practices.

It is worth noting that from the evolution of marketing and development of marketing theory has brought fundamental development that has changed the relationship between marketing and society. This article has briefly reviewed some of the literature and hence not exhaustive. Other trends in the development of marketing and the trends that might shape the field in the near future of might still be discovered if more research is undertaken with more reliable methodology in place. It is also worth noting that for scholarship purposes, the study is not meant to rewrite any of the theories in marketing; instead, it helps to open up and ensure that scholars and researchers understand marketing perspectives within a broad theoretical and historical context and as observed by Kotler and Levy (1969) marketing is both for business and non-business entities. This notion is also highlighted by McKenna (1991), “marketing is everything and everything is marketing.”

*The research is financed by the authors.*

## REFERENCES

- Alderson, W., & Shapiro, S. J. (1957). *Marketing behavior and executive action: A functionalist approach to marketing theory*: RD Irwin.
- Allen, F. L. (1954). *The big change: America transforms itself, 1900-1950* (Vol. 150): Transaction Publishers.
- Alon, I., Jaffe, E., Prange, C., & Vianelli, D. (2016). *Global marketing: contemporary theory, practice, and cases*: Routledge.
- Atul, P., & Mona, S. (2015). The conceptual foundations of relationship marketing: Review and synthesis. *Экономическая социология*, 16(2).
- Baker, M. J., & Saren, M. (2016). *Marketing theory: a student text*: Sage.
- Bartels, R. (1988). *The History of Marketing Thought*, Columbus, OH: Publishing Horizons. In: Inc.
- Bartels, R., Shaw, E. H., & Tamilya, R. D. (1962). The development of marketing thought.
- Berry, L. L. (2016). Revisiting “big ideas in services marketing” 30 years later. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 30(1), 3-6.
- Böhm, S. (2002). Movements of Theory and Practice. *ephemera*, 4(2), 328–351.
- Boone, L., & Kurtz, D. (2005). *Contemporary Marketing*, Thomson South-Western. Stamford, CT.
- Borden, N. H. (1964). The concept of the marketing mix. *Journal of advertising research*, 4(2), 2-7.
- Brown, S. (1996). Art or science?: Fifty years of marketing debate.
- Burns, A. C., & Bush, R. F. (2005). *Marketing Research: Online Research Applications with SPSS 13.0 Student Version for Windows*.
- Bussiere, D. (2000). Evidence of a marketing periodic literature within the American Economic Association: 1895-1936. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 20(2), 137-143.
- Chesula, O. W., Kiriinya, S. N., & Rintari, A. (2020). *Relationship Marketing Practices, Switching Cost and Customer Satisfaction Among Tier One Supermarkets in Nairobi County*. (Doctor of Philosophy In Business Administration and Management (Marketing Option)). Kenya Methodist University, Nairobi.
- Cohen, E. B., & Lloyd, S. J. (2014). Disciplinary evolution and the rise of the transdiscipline.
- Coulter, R. A. (2016). From fragmentation to imagination: moving to Marketing’s next Era. *AMS Review*, 6(3), 132-141.
- Cross, G. S., & Gary, S. (2000). *An all-consuming century: Why commercialism won in modern America*: Columbia University Press.
- Darroch, J., Miles, M. P., Jardine, A., & Cooke, E. F. (2004). The 2004 AMA definition of marketing and its relationship to a market orientation: an extension of Cooke, Rayburn, & Abercrombie (1992). *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 12(4), 29-38.
- Dowling, G. R., & Dowling, G. R. (2004). *The art and science of marketing: marketing*

- for marketing managers*: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Foxall, G. R., & James, V. K. (2003). The behavioral ecology of brand choice: How and what do consumers maximize? *Psychology & Marketing*, 20(9), 811-836.
- Gardner, B. B., & Levy, S. J. (1955). The product and the brand. *Harvard business review*, 33(2), 33-39.
- Gilmore, J. H. (1997). The four faces of mass customization. *Harvard Business Review*, 75(1), 91-101.
- Goldsmith, R. (2004). Current and Future Trends in Marketing and Their Implications for the Discipline. *Journal of marketing theory and practice*, 12, 10-17. doi:10.1080/10696679.2004.11658527
- Goldsmith, R. E. (2004). Current and future trends in marketing and their implications for the discipline. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 12(4), 10-17.
- Goldsmith, R. E., & Freiden, J. B. (2004). Have it your way: consumer attitudes toward personalized marketing. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 22(2), 228-239.
- Goldsmith, R. E., & Moutinho, L. (2017). The Near Future of Marketing From The Consulting Perspective. *Journal of Applied Marketing Theory*, 7(2), 30-42.
- Gołębiewski, J. (2015). Evolution Of The Theory Of Marketing—A Micro-And A Macroapproach. *Annals of Marketing Management & Economics*, 1(1), 13-21.
- Grönroos, C. (2017). Relationship marketing readiness: theoretical background and measurement directions. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 31(3), 218-225. doi:doi:10.1108/JSM-02-2017-0056
- Grönroos, C., & Gummerus, J. (2014). The service revolution and its marketing implications: service logic vs service-dominant logic. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 24(3), 206-229.
- Gummesson, E. (2006). Many-to-many marketing as grand theory. *The service-dominant logic of marketing: Dialog, debate, and directions*, 339-353.
- Gummesson, E. (2017). From relationship marketing to total relationship marketing and beyond. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 31(1), 16-19.
- Gundlach, G. T., & Wilkie, W. L. (2009). The American Marketing Association's new definition of marketing: Perspective and commentary on the 2007 revision. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 28(2), 259-264.
- Hibbard, J. D. (2015). Business Marketing Relationships: An Empirical Generalization with Implications for Future Research. In *Global Perspectives in Marketing for the 21st Century* (pp. 267-268): Springer.
- Hollander, S. C. (1960). The wheel of retailing. *Journal of Marketing*, 25(1), 37-42.
- Howard, J. A. (1957). *Marketing Management: Analysis and Planning*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin. In: Inc.
- Hunt, S. D. (1976). The nature and scope of marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 40(3), 17-28.
- Hunt, S. D. (2002). *Foundations of marketing theory: Toward a general theory of marketing*: ME Sharpe.

- Hunt, S. D. (2014). *Marketing Theory: Foundations, Controversy, Strategy, and Resource-advantage Theory: Foundations, Controversy, Strategy, and Resource-advantage Theory*: Routledge.
- Hunt, S. D. (2018). Advancing marketing strategy in the marketing discipline and beyond: from promise, to neglect, to prominence, to fragment (to promise?). *Journal of Marketing Management*, 34(1-2), 16-51.
- Iosifides, T. (2016). *Qualitative methods in migration studies: A critical realist perspective*: Routledge.
- Jones, D. B., & Shaw, E. H. (2002). A history of marketing thought. *Handbook of marketing*, 39-65.
- Jones, D. B., Shaw, E. H., & McLean, P. A. (2009). The modern schools of marketing thought. *The SAGE handbook of marketing theory*, 42-58.
- Kasriel-Alexander, D. (2016). *Top 10 global consumer trends for 2016*: Euromonitor International.
- Kerin, R. A. (1996). In pursuit of an ideal: the editorial and literary history of the Journal of Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(1), 1-13.
- Kotler, P. (1967). *Managerial marketing, planning, analysis, and control*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kotler, P., & Levy, S. J. (1969). Broadening the concept of marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 33(1), 10-15.
- Lavidge, R. J., & Steiner, G. A. (1961). A model for predictive measurements of advertising effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing*, 25(6), 59-62.
- Lebergott, S. (2014). *Pursuing happiness: American consumers in the twentieth century*: Princeton University Press.
- Levitt, T. (1960). Marketing myopia. *Harvard business review*, 38(4), 24-47.
- Lüdicke, M. (2007). *A theory of marketing: Outline of a social systems perspective*: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Maclaran, P., Saren, M., Stern, B., & Tadajewski, M. (2009). *The SAGE Handbook of Marketing Theory*: SAGE.
- Maklan, S., Peppard, J., & Klaus, P. (2015). Show me the money: improving our understanding of how organizations generate return from technology-led marketing change. *European journal of marketing*, 49(3/4), 561-595.
- Maynard, H. H. (1941). Marketing Courses Prior to 1910. *Journal of Marketing*, 5(4), 382-384. doi:10.2307/1245554
- McCarthy, E. J. (1960). *Basic Marketing: A Managerial Approach*, Homewood Ill: Richard D. Irwin.
- McKenna, R. (1991). Marketing is everything.
- McKitterick, J. B. (1957). What is the marketing management concept. *The frontiers of marketing thought and science*, 71, 71-82.
- Merton, R. (1949). *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York (The Free Press) 1949.
- Minniti, A. (2015). The evolution of the art market: from 15th century Florence to the

- Sotheby's-eBay agreement.
- Mittelstaedt, R. A. (1990). Economics, psychology, and the literature of the subdiscipline of consumer behavior. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 18(4), 303-311.
- Mohanty, S. K. (2017). Globalization, Innovation, and Marketing Philosophy: A Critical Assessment of Role of Technology in Defining New Dimensions. In *Business Analytics and Cyber Security Management in Organizations* (pp. 48-63): IGI Global.
- Murray, J. B., Evers, D. J., & Janda, S. (1995). Marketing, theory borrowing, and critical reflection. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 15(2), 92-106.
- Myers, J. G., Massy, W. F., & Greyser, S. A. (1980). *Marketing research and knowledge development: An assessment for marketing management*: Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Nguyen, M. T. T., Emberger-Klein, A., & Menrad, K. (2018). A Systematic Review on the Effects of Personalized Price Promotions for Food Products. *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, 1-19.
- O'Malley, L. (2018). Metaphor and Relationship Marketing discourse. In *The Routledge Companion to Critical Marketing* (pp. 259-271): Routledge.
- Payne, A., & Frow, P. J. J. o. S. M. (2017). Relationship marketing: looking backwards towards the future. *31*(1), 11-15.
- Perreault, W. D., & McCarthy, E. J. (1990). *Basic marketing: A managerial approach*: Irwin.
- Philip, K. K. (2017). *Marketing management*: Pearson.
- Polat, V., & Akgün, A. E. (2017). Revisiting the Marketing Capabilities from an Adaptive Perspective: An Abstract. In *Creating Marketing Magic and Innovative Future Marketing Trends* (pp. 1139-1140): Springer.
- Popper, K. (2013). *Realism and the aim of science: From the postscript to the logic of scientific discovery*: Routledge.
- Ronald, E. G. (2004). Current and Future Trends in Marketing and Their Implications for the Discipline. *Journal of marketing theory and practice*, 12(4), 10-17. doi:10.1080/10696679.2004.11658527
- Rownd, M., & Heath, C. (2008). The American Marketing Association releases new definition for marketing. *Chicago IL: AMA*, 1-3.
- Seth, A., & Zinkhan, G. (1991). Strategy and the Research Process: A Comment. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12(1), 75-82. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2486574>
- Shankar, V., Kleijnen, M., Ramanathan, S., Rizley, R., Holland, S., & Morrissey, S. (2016). Mobile shopper marketing: Key issues, current insights, and future research avenues. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 34, 37-48.
- Shaw, E. (2014). The quest for a general theory of the marketing system. *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing*, 6, 523-537. doi:10.1108/JHRM-07-2013-0041

- Shaw, E. H., & Jones, D. B. (2005). A history of schools of marketing thought. *Marketing theory*, 5(3), 239-281.
- Shaw, E. H., Jones, D. B., & McLean, P. A. (2010). The early schools of marketing thought. *The SAGE handbook of marketing theory*, 27-41.
- Sheth, J. N., & Gardner, D. M. (1982). History of marketing thought: an update/BEBR No. 857. *BEBR faculty working paper; no. 857*.
- Sheth, J. N., & Parvatiyar, A. (1995). The evolution of relationship marketing. *International business review*, 4(4), 397-418.
- Sheth, J. N., Parvatiyar, A., & Sinha, M. J. e. s. t. e. e. n. (2012). The conceptual foundations of relationship marketing: Review and synthesis. *13*(3), 4-26.
- Sheth, J. N., Sheth, P. J. N., Gardner, D. M., Garrett, D. E., & Garrett, D. E. (1988). *Marketing Theory: Evolution and Evaluation*: Wiley.
- Shirshendu, G., Eshghi, A., & Nada, N. B. (2009). *Relationship Marketing: A critical Examination of Reserch Streams*. Paper presented at the ASBBS Annual Conference, Las Vegas.
- Smith, W. R. (1956). Product differentiation and market segmentation as alternative marketing strategies. *Journal of Marketing*, 21(1), 3-8.
- Stanton, W. J., Etzel, M. J., Walker, B. J., Báez, E. P., & Martínez, J. F. J. D. (2004). *Fundamentos de marketing*.
- Varadarajan, R. (2020). Advancing theory in marketing: insights from conversations in other disciplines. *AMS Review*, 10(1), 73-84. doi:10.1007/s13162-020-00167-8
- Vermeij, G. J. (2009). *Nature: an economic history*: Princeton University Press.
- Webster Jr, F. E. (1994). Executing the new marketing concept. *Marketing management*, 3(1), 8.
- Whittington, R. (2006). Completing the Practice Turn in Strategy Research. *Organization Studies*, 5(27), 613–634.
- Wilkie, W. L., & Moore, E. S. (2003). Scholarly Research in Marketing: Exploring the "4 Eras" of Thought Development. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 22(2), 116-146. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30000674>
- Wilkie, W. L., & Moore, E. S. (2003). Scholarly research in marketing: Exploring the “4 eras” of thought development. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 22(2), 116-146.
- Wilkie, W. L., & Moore, E. S. (2012). Expanding our understanding of marketing in society. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 40(1), 53-73. doi:10.1007/s11747-011-0277-y
- Witzel, M. (2016). *A history of management thought*: Routledge.
- Woodside, A. G. (2012). *Market-driven thinking*: Routledge.