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Abstract

We critically review the literature on two orientations that have attracted substantial attention in the marketing literature: (a) market orientation, or the values, beliefs, practices and actions of marketers implicated in responding to markets and engaging in marketplace exchanges, and (b) consumers’ orientation, or the consumers’ values, beliefs, and attitudes concerning, and behavioral tendencies towards marketers involved in marketplace exchanges. Although these bodies of work are largely disconnected, we argue that a relationship marketing view suggests an integrative approach and analysis may be useful. To facilitate this work, we develop the notion of “market climate” and provide a framework to initiate further conceptualization, operationalization and theoretical development. We outline four issues that are critical in this future research and discuss their implications for the market climate construct including (a) level of abstraction, (b) multidimensionality, (c) heterogeneity, and (d) simultaneity.
Introduction

Ever since the Chinese invented paper money in the first millennium, marketers and consumers have been tied together in a never-ending relationship based on the simple idea that both gain something of value through marketplace exchanges. It has been the best of relationships. It has been the worst of relationships. In recent times, the relationship probably peaked with the Reagan-era as markets were deregulated, “customer satisfaction” achieved buzzword status, and consumers’ purchasing power expanded. However, the recent Firestone fiasco, disclosures of Tobacco industry, and collapse of the California electric grid following deregulation portend a consumer-market relationship at its nadir. Such ebbs and flows are nothing new. History attests that markets are dynamic, self-regulating, cyclical systems where periods of ebullience are eventually followed by mutual distrust and cynicism.

Despite these interesting patterns in the climate of consumer-marketer relationship, it is surprising that the relationship marketing literature has remained focused on micro-phenomenon of individual consumer-firm relationships ignoring these broad market dynamics. Nevertheless, the dynamics of market climate hold important implications for consumers, firms, industry associations, public policy and consumerist groups. In ebullient climates, consumers are likely to be more responsive to individual firm’s efforts to build loyalty, show a proclivity for open communication and less likely to resort to collective actions as a means of dialogue with companies. During a climate of distrust and cynicism, loyalty is ephemeral and greater pressure exists for regulatory intervention and reform. Although there are few, if any, studies that have directly examined market climate issues, several disconnected bodies of work exist in the marketing literatures that have indirectly examined this issue. Our goal in this paper is to closely examine two such bodies of work, find areas of connection, and establish a ground for future research on the study of market climate.

Specifically, this paper is a tale of two orientations: (a) market orientation, or the values, beliefs, practices and actions of marketers implicated in responding to markets and engaging in marketplace exchanges, and (b) consumers’ orientation\(^1\), or the consumers’ values, beliefs, and

\(^1\) This should not be confused with “consumer orientation” as used in the market orientation literature to refer to firms’ disposition to place the consumers’ interest ahead of their own. We use the term “market orientation” to refer broadly to all constructs and concepts that examine the dispositions of marketers. The term “consumers’ orientation” refers broadly to dispositions of consumers.
attitudes concerning, and behavioral tendencies towards marketers involved in marketplace exchanges. Both orientations command a strong and growing body of literature with several construct developments and empirical investigations. Yet, while it is self evident that consumers and marketers are the primary partners in marketplace exchanges, an artificial divide separates and insulates these literatures. The purpose of this paper is to bridge this divide. We critically review each of the orientation literatures in an effort to identify common themes, conceptualizations and limitations. Based on this review, we propose the notion of “market climate” and develop a framework to guide future theorizing and empirical investigation that provides a meaningful and simultaneous consideration of market and consumer orientations. We begin with a review of the market orientation literature.

**Market Orientation: Evolution, Construct, and Findings**

*Roots*

Market orientation’s roots can be traced back to the writings of scholars such as Peter Drucker, Theodore Levitt and Philip Kotler as marketing gained prominence following the reconstruction that began at the end of World War II. With expanding market demand and continuous stream of product innovation, managers adopted a view that products and sellers rather than customers and needs define markets. Anticipating market saturation and maturity, Drucker (1954, p. 37) called for a change in thinking: “Marketing is not only much broader than selling, it is not a specialized activity at all. It is the whole business seen from the point of view of its final result, that is, from the customer’s point of view.” In his well-cited article, Levitt (1960) further emphasized this perspective noting that customer needs are more robust than the products that currently fulfill them. Kotler and others gave a concrete scholarly form to these issues by using them to define and broaden the scope of marketing itself (Keith 1960; Kotler 1972; Kotler and Zaltman 1971; Bagozzi 1975). They argued that marketing should adopt the “marketing concept”—a philosophy that places customer satisfaction and value as the core of its mission and the exchange as the basic unit of analysis—and eschew the pursuit of product- or selling-concepts. Despite this early crystallization of the “marketing concept,” almost 15 years later Kohli and Jaworski (1990) were to note that little systematic effort had been directed toward implementation of this concept within modern organizations. Thereafter, several
scholars have attempted to address this issue resulting in multiple, and sometimes confusing and contradictory, proposals for conceptualizing and operationalizing market orientation. Table 1 summarizes the marketing literature on market orientation.

**Multiple Conceptualizations**

Using grounded research approaches, Kohli and Jaworski (1990, p 6) conceptualized market orientation as degree to which a firm engaged in activities directed at three areas: (a) organization-wide generation of market intelligence, (b) dissemination of that information across departments, and (c) organization-wide responsiveness to it. By contrast, Narver and Slater (1990, p. 21) defined market orientation as particular modality of the organization “culture” that “most effectively and efficiently creates the necessary behaviors for the creation of superior value for buyers and, thus, continuous superior performance for the business”. Consistent with this focus, Narver and Slater identify five dimensions of organizational practices that indicate market orientation including (a) customer orientation, (b) competitor orientation, (c) interfunctional coordination, (d) long term horizon, and (e) profit emphasis. However, on the basis of empirical results, Narver and Slater excluded the latter two dimensions from their conceptualization of the market orientation construct. Using a strategic management focus, Ruekert (1992) conceptualized market orientation as the degree to which a SBU (a) uses customer information, (b) develops a market oriented strategy, and (c) implements its market strategy. Noting that a customer orientation is synonymous with market orientation, Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993) define customer orientation as unidimensional set of beliefs that place customers’ interest first, ahead of all other organizational stakeholders. In a later study, Deshpande and Farley (1998a) proposed a somewhat different definition for market orientation that places special emphasize on “cross functional processes and activities”. This led to a spirited debate (Narver and Slater 1998; Deshpande and Farley 1998b) about the nature of market orientation. Although Slater and Narver (2000) extended their definition of 1990, it too is embedded in organizational culture.
Operationalizations and Measurement Fidelity

In our review of competing operationalizations, we consider three issues: (a) correspondence of the items with the underlying conceptualization, (b) measurement quality and (c) generalizability of the results (see Table 1).

As is common for most recent scale development work, the authors have followed established procedures for developing the original set of items, refining them on the basis of factor analysis, and providing psychometric data concerning the reliability and validity of the proposed scale. Kohli, Jaworski and Kumar (1993) report on a scale development of market orientation construct as proposed by Kohli and Jaworski (1990). Consistent with the proposed definition, the operational items focus on specific organizational activities that involve information generation, its dissemination throughout the organization, and organizational responsiveness. In their final analysis, a 20-item scale with 6 items for generation, 5 items for dissemination and 9 items for responsiveness is proposed. However, in their efforts to establish the reliability and validity of their scale, Kohli et al. found that the proposed dissemination and responsiveness items lacked discriminant validity. In addition, the generation items correlated poorly with the dissemination and responsiveness items. The authors interpreted these results by noting that, while generation primarily involves independent efforts of a single SBU, dissemination and responsiveness involves interdepartmental coordination and effort. If so, the unmeasured facet of interdepartmental involvement may be a critical factor in the conceptualization and operationalization of Kohli et al.’s market orientation construct.

Narver and Slater (1990) explicitly included the interdepartmental coordination as an important dimension of their definition of market orientation. Using various qualitative approaches, the authors developed an initial set of items intended to capture the “behavioral” aspects of market oriented as conceptualized. However, during the evaluation and pretesting phase, the raters were asked to recommend items some of which were included in the final set of 15-items. This final set contains a mix of behavioral and belief items despite the earlier intention to tap behavioral items. More importantly, although the authors proposed that items were selected to represent three distinct dimensions of customer orientation, competitor orientation and interdepartmental coordination, strong psychometric evidence in regard to their
discriminant validity is not presented. Instead, the authors conclude that their market orientation scale is undimensional and may be used as such while maintaining the untested representation of the three proposed domains.

In a departure from the behavioral and activity focus of the preceding operationalizations, Deshpande et al. (1993) viewed their market orientation construct from an organizational culture perspective. Consistent with this view, their 9 operational items tap what they termed as “deeply rooted values and beliefs.” No specific dimensions are specified as the operational items are posited to be unidimensional, although Deshpande et al. appear to conceptually agree with multidimensional representations of Narver and Slater (1990) and Kohli and Jaworski (1990). Recognizing the confusion created by these diverse and disparate operationalizations, in a later study Deshpande and Farley (1998a) conducted a simultaneous analysis of the preceding three operationalizations. However, Deshpande and Farley did not adopt a conceptual lens to analyze the market orientation construct. Rather, they utilized an empirical perspective drawn from factor analysis to identify common elements of the operational items across the three constructs. Using the criteria of selecting the ten items with the highest loading on the first factor, Deshpande and Farley (1998a) proposed an operationalization that contained 5 items from the 15-item Narver and Slater scale, 2 items from the 20-item Kohli, Jaworski and Kumar (1993) scale, and the remaining 3 items from their own 9-item Deshpande et al. (1993) scale. In so doing, however, the conceptually important distinctions between beliefs and practices, information generation and use, customer contact and interdepartmental coordination that define different conceptualizations of market orientation remain unaddressed.

Despite the differences in operationalizations, market orientation has been found to consistently influence important organizational outcomes and relates systematically to antecedents. Kohli and Jaworski (1990) provided a conceptual framework of market orientation and its antecedents and consequences. The three categories of antecedents found were senior management factors (e.g., commitment of top management as well as communicating this commitment), interdepartmental dynamics (e.g., level of interdepartmental conflict and connectedness), and organizational systems (e.g., formalization). In a following study Jaworski
and Kohli (1993) gave empirical evidence for the distinct relevance of top management emphasis and risk aversion, conflict and connectedness, and organizational aspects like formalization, centralization, and reward systems. In terms of consequences, Ruekert (1992) showed that market orientation is positively associated with organizational practices in the recruiting, training and rewarding of personnel. Consequences were categorized into customer response (e.g., customer satisfaction), employee responses (e.g., organizational commitment) and business performance. The majority of findings show a positive relationship between market orientation and business performance (Narver and Slater 1990; Ruekert 1992; Deshpande, Farley, and Webster 1993; Jaworski and Kohli 1993) although significant moderators have been identified including business strategy and power asymmetry with customers. Regarding employee responses Ruekert showed a positive relationship between market orientation and job satisfaction. Furthermore market orientation positively influences the quality of a relationship from the sellers point of view (Baker, Simpson, and Siguaw 1999).

**Summary and Critical Assessment**

Four issues are critical in the assessment of the market orientation construct, namely: (a) multidimensionality, (b) level of abstraction, (c) heterogeneity within and across firms/units, and (d) heterogeneity across market segments. We discuss each in turn.

First, a key issue in the conceptualization of the market orientation construct is the nature and scope of its dimensionality. The various studies by Kohli and Jaworski suggest that information-gathering activities do not necessarily correlate highly with information dissemination and use in building responsiveness to the market. This implies that, relative to other SBUs, an SBU may do well in information generation but poorly in terms of information use and building responsiveness. *Should market orientation be conceptualized to focus primarily on information dissemination and use?* Because information gathering from the market and hearing the voice of the customer is central to the marketing concept, it is difficult to conceptualize market orientation that focuses on one but not the other informational dimension. Likewise, Narver and Slater have distinguished between customer and competitor orientation noting that SBUs need to maintain a balance between competing pressures of these different
orientations. In a recent article, Slater and Narver (1998) have further extended these
distinctions by distinguishing between customer-led and market-oriented business. The
customer-led business focuses on understanding the expressed desires of the customers in their
served markets and on developing products and services that satisfy those needs. The
fundamental philosophy of this strategic direction can be described as being reactive in nature
and short term in focus. The market-oriented business goes a step further and focuses on
developing new products and services that provide new solutions to unexpressed needs of
customers. Consequently the market-oriented business is characterized as being proactive in
nature and long term in focus, while continuing to satisfy current customer demands. Should
market orientation focus only on activities that provide a long term orientation in meeting
customer demands? Because Slater and Narver emphasize that market-oriented is not
necessarily correlated highly with customer-oriented, it appears problematic to conceptualize the
market orientation construct as focus on one but not the other set of activities. Both set of
activities appear to be central to the notion of marketing concept.

Given the preceding concern with accounting for the diverse but relevant dimensions of
the market orientation construct, unidimensional operationalizations appear neither particularly
useful nor valid despite their parsimony and convenience. This is because unidimensional
operationalizations do not ensure a balanced and full representation of the different dimensions
and may likely overrepresent some dimensions while underrepresenting others. More
significantly, this construct misspecification is obfuscated by unidimensional
operationalizations. Thus, while we applaud the aim of studies such as Deshpande and Farley
(1998a) to prospectively meta-analyze the different operationalizations, it seems appropriate to
begin such attempts by providing a conceptual resolution of the multi-dimensionality of market
orientation construct. Future researchers may want to address this issue.

Second, the level of abstraction needs to be considered in conceptualizing the market
orientation construct. One set of conceptualizations define market orientation at the behavioral
or action level, while another conceptualization define it at the level of values and beliefs.
Although this issue has not been resolved in the literature, its implications are significant and
reminiscent of the attitude-behavior controversy. Beliefs do not necessarily translate into action,
and values are sometimes out-of-step with the behaviors of individuals. In an organizational context, this difference assumes even higher significance because of the level of analysis problem. That is, like culture, organizational values and beliefs are at the highest level of analysis—pertaining to the organization as a whole—and such values pervade the entire organization. By contrast, behaviors and activities are defined at the actor level positioning these variables at relatively lower level of analysis. Consequently, behaviors and activities may be operationalized at the unit or lower level (e.g., individual) but rarely at the organizational level. Currently, a debate is ongoing on whether market orientation relates to an organizations’ culture or to the behaviors and activities of its members (Narver and Slater 1998; Deshpande and Farley 1998b). However, this debate has not explicitly considered the theoretical ramifications of the different levels of abstraction for the market orientation construct. Yet grappling with these ramifications appears critical if the level of abstraction concerns have to be addressed with respect to the market orientation construct. In resolving these concerns, future researchers can benefit from the debates surrounding the distinction between organizational culture and climate/practices that raged in the management literature in the early eighties.

Third, market orientation conceptualizations need to account for heterogeneity within and across organizations. Different units within organizations may differ significantly in terms of how they gather and use information, implement market strategy and respond to market demands. Likewise, different organizations differ in terms of their market orientation. Both sources of variation are important to capture for substantive purposes. It is possible that operational items at different level of specificity may be needed to capture these disparate sources of variation. For instance, behavioral items may be more suited for capturing the heterogeneity within firms, while value/belief items may be more suitable for capturing heterogeneity across firms. Future researchers may find it useful to match the level of analysis to the scope of heterogeneity to be measured. It may be also useful to consider heterogeneity in market orientation across industries. Some industries may be more market oriented while other industries may be less. Public policy and macromarketing theory may find it useful to tap this source of variation as well.
Finally, another source of variation is the heterogeneity across market segments. That is, different market segments may judge a given firm differently in terms of its market orientation. Because of variability in the nature and intensity of relationships across customer segments, it is likely that a firm’s market orientation differs substantially across customer segments. This suggests that conceptualization of market orientation must account for this source of variation. Current studies have not tackled the theoretical and empirical implications for this heterogeneity. This raises a larger issue about who is the appropriate key informant for evaluating the market orientation of a firm. Thus far, most studies have assumed that market orientation is best evaluated by key informants within the organization probably because they are most familiar with internal processes and actions. However, consumers are also exposed to a firm’s practices and actions as they engage in multiple exchange encounters at the firm’s boundaries. For relational ongoing exchanges, consumers may have even more information about a firm’s practices to judge its market orientation. *Can consumers also serve as key informants for judging the market orientation of firms?* Deshpande et. al. have argued that it is the customer’s judgment of market orientation (viz. customer orientation) that should impact performance, rather than self-reports. A few studies have attempted to take customer-side measures of market orientation and the results are illuminating. Siguaw, Simpson and Baker (1999) conducted a study with 179 matched supplier-distributor dyads whereby both sides of the dyads evaluated market orientation of the other side of the dyadic relationship. Theoretically, Siguaw et al. posit that, for a dyadic member, “perceived” market orientation (i.e., based on self report) may differ significantly from “actual” market orientation (i.e., as reported by the of a dyadic partner). Steinman, Deshpande and Farley (2000) measured the seller’s market orientation from the perspective of buyers and sellers involved in dyadic exchanges in the US and Japan. Results indicated that consistently, buyers perceived sellers to be less market oriented compared to sellers’ self-perceptions. As the length of the relationship progressed, there was greater convergence in perceptions across the dyad. Webb, Webster, Krepapa (2000) measured the impact of market orientation from the customers’ perspective on customer satisfaction adopting Narver and Slater’s three-dimensional conceptualization. The authors demonstrate significant asymmetric impact of each dimension on customer satisfaction, with competitor
orientation having the strongest effect on building satisfaction. Unfortunately, since the authors did not collect company-side data on the constructs, a comparative analysis was not provided.

Consumers' Orientation: Evolution, Construct and Findings

Roots

The study of consumer orientation or attitudes toward the marketplace has a long tradition in marketing. Ever since the development of the consumer sentiment/confidence index in the 1940s by the Michigan’s Survey Research Center, a significant body of literature has been established (Barksdale and Darden 1972; Lundstrom and Lamont 1976; Allison 1978; Gaski and Etzel 1986; Singh 1991). However, interest in this topic has waxed and waned with the changing market environment. The upsurge of the consumer movement in the late 1960s prompted marketing researchers, practitioners and public policy officials to devote increasing attention to conceptualizing, operationalizing and tracking consumers’ evolving orientation toward the marketplace. With the enactment of consumer protection laws and the fragmentation of the markets, interest in studying consumers’ orientation has waned in recent years although reporting and tracking of consumer confidence has attained a ritualistic status. Biannually, consumer confidence statistics are reported, acknowledged by the popular press and everyone goes back to business as usual. However, with privacy concerns on the horizon and the unregulated ecommerce markets gaining ground, interest in the study of consumer orientation is likely to resurge in the new economy. In this light, we review the progress-to-date, insights obtained and set an agenda for future research. Table 2 summarizes the relevant literature.

Multiple Conceptualizations

Not unlike the market orientation construct, several different conceptualizations have been proposed for the consumer orientation construct. Because of their significance, we focus here on three different conceptualizations: (a) global sentiments regarding marketing and consumerism issues, (b) dispositional tendencies vis-à-vis the marketplace, (c) individual interaction styles in exchange encounters. We discuss each in turn.
In terms of global sentiment, Barksdale and Darden (1972) conceptualized their construct of consumers’ attitudes toward marketing and consumerism to capture consumers’ perceptions about the marketing systems and its operations. In the early seventies, the interest focused on descriptive understanding of the consumer movement and this construct was proposed to fill this role. However, in contrast to earlier studies (Bauer and Greyser 1968; Jolson 1970), Barksdale and Darden did not concentrate on a single aspect of marketing (e.g., advertising). Rather, they considered multiple aspects including: philosophy of businesses, product quality, advertising, pricing, and other market activities (e.g. distribution). An interesting aspect of this conceptualization is that it does not focus exclusively on activities of marketers. Instead, it encompassing other marketing issues such as consumerism, government regulation and consumer responsibilities. In an independent attempt based on a comprehensive review of the consumer movement, Lundstrom and Lamont (1976, p. 358) conceptualized a consumer discontent construct “to include the collection of attitudes held by the consumers toward the product strategies of business, business communications and information, the impersonal nature of business and retail institutions, and the broader socioeconomic forces which are linked with the business system”. In a subsequent effort, Klein (1982) built on these conceptualizations by using both, consumers and marketers, as key informants for global sentiments. In Klein’s multi-informant study, six different issue categories were identified: business’ responsiveness, consumers’ protection and education, quality of products, efficiency of the business system, honesty of packaging, and nature of business. Finally, Gaski and Etzel (1986) developed an “index of consumer sentiment toward marketing” that captured consumers’ perceptions of, and satisfaction with the marketing establishment by focusing on attitudes toward the four major instruments of marketing practice.

The second stream of work defined consumer orientation in terms of individual’s dispositional tendencies toward the marketplace by drawing from the sociological and psychological literature. In an early attempt, Pruden et al. (1974) utilized Seeman’s sociological concept of alienation (Seeman 1959, 1967) and defined marketplace alienation as attitudes and feelings held by consumers including: (a) inability to determine market practices (powerlessness), (b) inability to predict the outcomes of alternative market behaviors.
(meaninglessness), (c) distrust of business and market practices (normlessness), (d) estrangement from the institutions of the market system (social isolation), and (e) inability to identify with behavior traditionally associated with the consumption role (self-estrangement). In a further construct development effort, Allison (1978) defined alienation as an “internal psychological state” of an individual reflected in the “presence of certain attitudes and feelings”, but did not include aspects of meaninglessness. Related to this, Lambert (1980) conceptualized alienation “as subjective state of mind consisting of certain attitudes, beliefs and feelings” toward an object (marketplace). However, the dimension of self-estrangement was omitted from this conceptualization. Later, Lambert (1981) conceptualized alienation in terms of consumers’ perceptions of marketers and their behaviors towards them, and used all five variants of alienation suggested by Seeman (1959). An interesting aspect of this dispositional conceptualization is that it does not include behaviors and practices of marketers. Rather, it concerns itself only with dispositional tendencies of consumers.

Finally, in terms of interactional styles, Fornell and Westbrook (1979) and Richins (1983) introduced specific concepts of assertiveness and aggressiveness to capture consumers’ behavioral tendencies in individual exchange encounters. That is, the focus is not on general perceptions and/or dispositions; instead, these conceptualizations focus on modes of consistent behavior patterns that different consumers may utilize in “interpersonal interactions with retail employees” (Richins 1983, p. 73). This focus is appropriate given the intention of these researchers to understand consumer complaining and redress seeking that often involves interaction with front line employees. For instance, drawing from the psychological literature, Richins (1983, p. 73) conceptualized assertive behaviors as actions that "enables a person to act in his own best interest, to stand up for himself without undue anxiety, to express his honest feelings comfortably, or to exercise his rights without denying the rights of others”. By contrast, Richins noted that aggressiveness is “a response that delivers noxious stimuli to another organism.” The underlying theory for the preceding concepts comes from psychological literature (Buss 1961; Tedeschi, Schlenker, and Bonoma 1973). Both concepts may be expressed with verbal and nonverbal actions and are tailored to the context of interaction of consumers with representatives of market institutions (e.g., in seeking redress).
Operationalizations and Measurement Fidelity

Like the case for market orientation, we review operationalizations for the consumer orientation construct by focusing on three issues: (a) conceptualization-operationalization correspondence, (b) measurement quality, and (c) generalizability issues (Table 2).

Because the consumer orientation constructs were developed in the 70s, the operationalization efforts reflect the knowledge base of the times. The use of confirmatory factor analysis was rare, and much of the empirical procedures were exploratory in nature. Nevertheless, the authors followed established procedures for item development, scale refinement, and the assessment of reliability and validity. Consistent with the intention to provide a construct that can descriptively capture the breadth of the consumer movement, Barksdale and Darden (1972) proposed 40 conceptually relevant items into seven categories. An interesting aspect of Barksdale and Darden's operationalization was that they construed consumer orientation as composed of two broad dimensions: (a) marketers' responsibilities, and (b) consumer responsibilities. The former dimension captured the degree to which marketers act responsibly in the marketplace (e.g., in advertising), while the latter dimension focused on consumer responsibilities (e.g., reducing waste, environmental concern). Gaski and Etzel (1986) operationalized the consumer global sentiment construct by focusing exclusively on marketers actions and attitudes. Drawing items from the literature as well as developing original items, Gaski and Etzel used item-total correlations to purify and measure four dimensions including marketers actions for product development, pricing, advertising, and retailing/selling. The authors also employed factor analysis to establish the convergent and discriminant validity of the items and dimensions (all alphas higher than .76).

In perhaps the most extensive scale development effort, Lundstrom and Lamont (1976) initially extracted 173 items from the consumerism literature to develop their consumer discontent scale to tap global sentiments. Using several reliability, internal consistency, and validation analysis, a scale consisting of 82 items was derived. However, in contrast to its conceptualization that considered four different facets of discontent, the Lundstrom and Lamont (1976) operationalization proposed a unidimensional measure (Cronbach’s Alpha .94). This contrasts with another analysis consumer discontent items presented in Lundstrom and Lamont.
In terms of dispositional tendencies, Pruden et al. (1974) followed closely the underlying theoretical framework to operationalize their consumer alienation construct. The five facets of alienation were operationalized by two items each. Reliability was assessed by test-retest procedures ($r = .79$) and validity established through correlation analysis. Using published materials, empirical studies, original item formulation and judges to reduce the number of items, Allison (1978) proposed a battery of 50 items to capture all theoretical aspects of the consumer alienation from the marketplace construct. However, the empirical results did not confirm the presence of the proposed 4 dimensions. Instead, Allison used internal consistency considerations to further shorten the scale to 35 items and proposed a unidimensional consumer alienation construct. In a later study, Beardon and Mason (1983) used Allison’s scale and reported a coefficient Alpha of .88. In an independent effort, Lambert (1980) used 19 items to operationalize the four facets of consumer alienation. Unfortunately, no measurement fidelity information is provided. In a following publication (Lambert 1981), 21 items were used to operationalize alienation: 7 for consumer powerlessness, 3 each for consumer meaninglessness and normlessness, 6 for cultural estrangement, and 2 for political powerlessness. Reliability coefficients above .64 were reported for all the subscales.
Finally, to operationalize consumer interaction styles, Richins (1983) generated a 15 item measure for assertiveness (alpha for the entire scale .85), comprising 3 factors, namely resisting requests for compliance, requesting information or assistance, and seeking redress, as well as an unidimensional measure for customer aggressiveness (.73). The items were based on literature analysis and qualitative work and evidence for discriminant, convergent, and content validity was provided.

Few, if any, studies have attempted to examine the generalizability issues regarding the consumer orientation construct, or examine the different conceptualizations/operationalizations for common themes and key differences. In part, this is because there is little interest in the field at this time to pursue consumerism issues. Nevertheless, earlier studies that have utilized the different variants of consumer orientation do report a consistent pattern of effects.

**Summary and Critical Assessment**

Several aspects are critical in the assessment of the research-to-date on the consumer orientation construct including: (a) theoretical foundation, (b) empirical correspondence and multidimensionality, (c) level of abstraction, and (d) heterogeneity across informants. We discuss each issue in turn.

Important differences are evident in Table 2 in regard to the theoretical foundations of the different conceptualizations proposed. It is apparent that the research on global sentiments toward marketing and consumerism was triggered by the need to understand how consumers feel about the business system and to gauge “how marketing is doing” (Singh 1991, p. 264). Little theoretical work has been done to define the scope of this construct and circumscribe its key elements. Consistent with this, the different constructs developed to assess global sentiments vary significantly in terms of the dimensional structure (e.g., cf. “consumer discontent” and “index of consumer sentiment”), and the scope of the phenomenon covered (e.g., cf. Barksdale and Darden’s work and Bauer and Greyser’s construct). By contrast, the constructs developed to tap consumers’ dispositional tendencies and interactional styles tend to have stronger theoretical foundation. The dispositional tendencies are mostly focused on consumer alienation that in turn has roots in the sociological literature on alienation dating back
to the writings of Marx, Weber and Durkheim (Seeman 1959). Likewise, the research on interactional styles draws from the personality research in psychology that examines consistency in individual behavior patterns across situations.

Despite the apparent differences in terms of their theoretical foundations, the consumer orientation literature in general has suffered because important conceptual questions have remained largely unexplored. **What** is the conceptual content of these orientations—beliefs, attitudes or behavioral tendencies? **Who** is the focus of these orientations—consumers or marketers? **What** is the etiology of these orientations? and **How** do these orientations influence marketplace exchanges? The consumer orientation literature does not offer clear answers to these straightforward questions. In regard to the first question, while consumer alienation is conceptualized to tap attitudes and feelings and interactional styles assess behavioral tendencies, the global sentiment stream does not clarify its conceptual content. Beliefs, attitudes, and behavioral tendencies—all are included, and nothing is excluded. In regard to the second question, both the global sentiments and dispositional tendencies literature lack clarity. It is unclear if the conceptualization should focus on the attitudes/behaviors of consumers or of marketers. For instance, in their development of consumer discontent construct, while Lundstrom and Lamont (1976) appeared to suggest that the focus of their construct is on business strategies and practices, their development procedures allowed for inclusion of conceptual content that focused on attitudes and behaviors of consumers themselves. For example, consider this operational item: “People rate other people by the value of their possessions”: here, the conceptual focus is on “people” attitudes not on business strategies and practices. A similar situation arises in regard the consumer alienation construct. In defining the construct, while Allison (1978) specified that the conceptual content involves internal attitudes and feelings of consumers, he was silent about the focal target—businesses or consumers. Consequently, the consumer alienation construct confounds the conceptual content for the two targets. Consider the following two marker items for powerlessness that Allison provides and illustrate this confound:

Most companies are responsive to the demands of the consumers. (business-focus)

People are unable to determine what products will be sold in the store. (consumer-focus)
Interestingly, in a comparative study of consumer discontent and alienation constructs, Singh (1991, p. 265) attempted to analyze these issues and concluded that, while the two constructs have some conceptual overlap, “the notion of [consumer] loss of control or withdrawal is a point of departure between the two constructs.” This suggests that a consumer focus may provide more clarity to the consumer alienation construct. In this regard, the interaction styles stream has unequivocally focused on the consumer. For instance, Richins (1983) has conceptualized the domain of assertive and aggressive style to include the individual consumer’s (focus) behavioral tendencies toward front line retail employees (content). This clarity has provided a sound foundation for the operational items that capture both the focus and content reasonably well.

As far as conceptual issues of etiology and influence are concerned, the consumer orientation literature has made little progress in developing nomological frameworks to embed the different constructs proposed. Most of the initial studies drew loosely from the consumerist movement and were correlational in nature. Later, when these initial studies had provided a reasonable foundation to develop such nomological frameworks, interest in the area waned and future development suffered. With the recent interest in topics such as materialism (Richins and Dawson 1992), marketplace stress (Mick and Fournier 1998) and voluntary simplicity (Csikszentmihalyi 2000), it is likely that researchers may return to these foundations to build and enhance our understanding of consumer orientations.

Second, important concerns remain in regard to the conceptual-empirical correspondence and multi-dimensionality of the different consumer orientation constructs. A key concern in the literature is how and to what extent the different constructs are redundant. This of course is both a conceptual (as noted above) and empirical issue. For example, Lambert (1980, p. 11) stated researchers “should exercise care to avoid overlapping measures” when selecting instruments to measure consumer alienation and dissatisfaction. In a study on construct redundancy using consumer alienation and discontent as illustrative constructs, Singh (1991) showed that, while discontent and alienation may be conceptually nonredundant, their current operationalizations are empirically redundant. Our review in Table 2 suggests that the empirical redundancy issues are likely pervasive in the consumer orientation literature and Singh’s (1991) conclusion may
apply to other constructs involving global sentiments toward marketing and consumerism. These redundancy problems reflect the lack of clarity regarding the conceptual content (what) and focus (who) of the underlying constructs. As such, attitude/belief and behavioral items are randomly juxtaposed with consumer or business focus, and intermingled across constructs. In fact, it is not surprising to find the same item to show up in one form or other across different constructs, regardless of the conceptual distinction proposed by the authors (e.g., “In general, I am dissatisfied with the quality of most products today.”).

While sorting through these empirical redundancy issues, clarifying conceptualizations and achieving close conceptual-empirical correspondence is a daunting task, it appears to be intimately tied to the multidimensionality issue. Singh (1991) demonstrated that, while consumer alienation and discontent constructs are redundant at the higher-order level, important differences can be identified when the individual dimensions of these constructs are considered. Specifically, Singh (1991) found that two alienation dimensions—personal norms and informed choice—both of which tap attitudes and behavioral tendencies with consumer as the focus reflect unique aspects of alienation that are not shared with consumer discontent. These unique aspects could be traced to the notion of “loss-of-control” that is central to the conceptualization of the alienation construct. Unfortunately, few studies have examined the dimensionality of the consumer orientation constructs and, consequently, little consensus exists regarding their multidimensionality. It appears that future progress will depend on tackling these issues.

Third, the level of abstraction needs to be closely examined. In the instance where business strategies and practices are the focus, the level of abstraction can vary from a single firm with whom the consumer transacts frequently, to general strategies/practices of firms within an industry, and to the overall marketing system at the highest level of abstraction. Most studies have not carefully considered which abstraction level is appropriate for their construct. Instead, the default option of using the highest level of abstraction is used. That is, most operationalizations refer to “companies” in general without specifying additional constraints based on industry or consumer experience. This omission is surprising since studies documenting industry variation in consumer attitudes and perceptions have produced consistent and compelling data. Likewise, where consumer is the focus of conceptualization, studies have
often failed to specify whether level of abstraction is at lowest individual level (e.g., “I”) or at the highest level referring to all consumers (e.g., “Most consumers”). This lack of attention to abstraction level is also evident in the case of studies of interactional styles that typically have a high level of clarity in terms of content (i.e., behavioral tendencies) and focus (i.e., consumer). For instance, consider the following two items from Richins’ assertive/aggressive scale: (a) “I have on occasion told salespeople I thought they were too rude” and (b) “Salespeople need to be told off when they are rude.” While the first item has a consistent abstraction level on the consumer, the second item leaves this ambiguous implying a higher level of abstraction. Because responses are likely to vary depending on the level of abstraction, it is important to carefully consider this factor in future research.

Finally, another aspect to consider is the heterogeneity across informants and the danger of aggregation bias. In most studies, consumers serve as informants (see Klein 1982 for an exception—to be discussed). However, there is considerable variation in consumers’ orientation across segments. Individual characteristics, recent experiences, consumer expertise and demographics might lead to very different consumer orientations. Current studies have not considered conceptual and empirical consequences of this heterogeneity. Related to this issue is the question, who is the appropriate key informant for assessing the consumers’ orientation? With the exception of Klein (1982), thus far all studies used consumers as respondents. However, front line employees of a marketing organization, especially those with frequent and intense customer contact might be a valuable source for the evaluation of consumer orientation in a given marketing system. Considering parallel findings in market orientation research (Deshpande, Farley, and Webster 1993, Steinman, Deshpande, and Farley 2000), it is likely that significant gaps between the sellers’ and consumers’ perspective will be detected. Measurement and analysis of this gap can shed important insights into the link between market and consumer orientation. If marketers are increasing more market oriented, why are consumers increasingly more cynical and alienated? These linking questions require a simultaneous consideration of the market and consumer orientation literature, as if they are two sides of the relational coin. We next address this issue and providing guidelines for such an effort.
Market and Consumers’ Orientations: Bridging the Divide

Almost 30 years ago, Alderson and Halbert (1968) published a Marketing Science Institute sponsored monograph in which they outlined the notion of marketing “climate”. Using a broad brush and adopting a marketer’s perspective, Alderson and Halbert (p. 23) defined this climate to include “a range of social, political and governmental factors which might have an important influence on the success of a particular marketing organization.” While this “climate” definition is too broad, it provides the impetus to consider the notion of “market climate” that serves as the situational context in which individual exchange encounters between consumers and marketers occur. Like the organizational climate, market climate influences the behaviors and practices of the key exchange partners—the individual consumer and the marketer’s representatives (e.g., retailer, front line employee)—and, in turn, these behaviors and practices in the collective shape the market climate. While individual consumers and marketers are the key players exchanging things that they value in this market climate, government regulations, industry standards, social/political factors and other environmental considerations can influence the market climate. However, market climate is sensitive to exchange dynamics such that different industry categories (e.g., health care vs. automobile purchase) and geographical settings (e.g., North vs. South) may evidence dramatically different market climates.

Using the preceding notion of market climate provides a meaningful way to conceptually link the market and consumer orientation literature. Consumer orientation involves how consumers act in the marketplace across multiple exchange encounters (e.g., interaction styles) and/or how consumers evaluate the behaviors and practices of marketers (e.g., consumer discontent). In the collective, consumers’ actions and perceptions help shape the climate under which individual exchanges occur. For instance, if a large number of consumers perceive that marketers in an industry are untrustworthy, a market climate of distrust is likely to occur resulting in lower loyalty and satisfaction in individual exchange encounters. However, consumers are not the only primary players in the market. Marketers’ actions and practices are important as well. Market orientation involves how marketers respect and value their customers, and how they acquire, use and respond to customer feedback. As such, accounting for both orientations—marketers and consumers—provides a more holistic view of the market
climate, and holds the potential to yield useful insights into market dynamics. Using this basic idea, below we develop a framework to guide such work. In so doing, we utilize the recent developments in meso-theory to address concerns regarding the different levels of abstraction (House, Rousseau and Thomas-Hunt 1995). Moreover, we show how the proposed framework can help resolve some of the identified shortcomings and concerns of the market orientation literature. The proposed framework is not a theory of consumer and market orientations, however. Rather, it throws a different light on the orientations literature and holds the potential for guiding future theoretical development work.

**A 2x2 Framework for Understanding the Market Climate Construct**

Figure 1 presents a 2x2 framework for understanding market climate. The market climate construct is defined as the contextual variable that characterized by different patterns of values, beliefs, attitudes and dispositions of consumers and marketers. The domain of the market climate construct is limited to marketplace exchanges. The X-axis represents the conceptual content of the construct and can be either an (a) internal characteristic (e.g., an internal psychological state or internal dynamics/processes) or (b) external, visible behavioral dispositions/practices. The Y-axis reflects the focal target as being either (a) consumer or (b) marketer. As such, consumer interaction style is classified as external-consumer since the content of aggressiveness/assertiveness constructs involves behavioral dispositions (external) and the focus is on consumer dispositions (focal target). By contrast, the consumer alienation construct may be categorized as internal-consumer as it is most clearly associated with the internal psychological state of the consumer. However, the construct proposed by Allison (1978) includes internal elements that focus on both the marketer (e.g., normlessness/business ethic dimension; cf. Singh 1991) and consumer (e.g., powerlessness dimension). Likewise, in terms of the MARKOR scale of Kohli, Jaworski and Kumar (1993), the information generation and dissemination dimensions of market orientation are classified as internal-marketer since they pertain to activities and processes internal to the organization and focus on the marketer.
Conversely, the third dimension, organizational responsiveness is categorized as external-marketer since it represents how the organization is behaviorally disposed in responding to customers and the focus is on marketers’ dispositions. Note that we have not explicated the informant involved. Depending on the category considered, different and multiple informants may be plausible. For the internal-marketer category, employees at different hierarchical levels within the organization are reasonable, while the key source of data on internal-consumer is likely to be the consumers themselves. However, for the external categories, both or either consumers and marketers (e.g., front line employees) may be used as key informants.

The proposed framework can address and clarify several concerns raised earlier including (a) level of abstraction, (b) multi-dimensionality, and (c) heterogeneity. More importantly, the proposed framework suggests how a relational perspective may be utilized to provide a simultaneous consideration of consumer and market orientations. We discuss these issues in turn.

**Level of Abstraction.** The market climate construct can be defined at different levels of abstraction including the (a) individual, (b) segment/industry, and (c) global level. At the individual level, the market climate concerns the exchange dynamics involving a specific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumer</th>
<th>Consumer Alienation</th>
<th>Consumer Discontent</th>
<th>Consumer Interaction Styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>MARKOR (Information Generation and Dissemination)</td>
<td>Market Orientation (Deshpande and Farley 1998)</td>
<td>MARKOR (Organizational Responsiveness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketer</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: A 2x2 Framework for Understanding Market Climate
consumer and firm. The consumer interaction styles construct is consistent with this individual focus as the conceptual content involves behavioral tendencies of the individual consumer. The MARKOR construct is likewise consistent with this individual firm level of conceptualization. Note that, at the individual level, market climate is not based on attitudes and behaviors evidenced in a single transaction. Rather, it draws from the history of a stream of past transactions combined with information gleaned from nontransactional sources (e.g., media, friends). At the global level, the market climate may describe the environment governing marketplace exchanges in a given culture. The earlier work on consumer discontent is defined at this level. The market orientation literature has tended to shy away from such a global level of abstraction, perhaps due to the strong managerial thrust of this literature. However, the recent interest in conceptualizing market orientation as a set of values and beliefs suggests that a global level of abstraction is plausible for this construct.

Few studies have explored the intermediate level of segments/industry for either the market or consumer orientation. Are some industries more market oriented than others? Do some consumer segments evidence a higher degree of powerlessness (or alienation) than others? To what extent is the market orientation of industries shaped by the orientation of their key customer segments? And vice versa? House, et al. (1995) have recently argued that such intermediate-level questions have not received much attention in the literature despite their potential to link the macro- and micro-phenomenon of interest. Referring to intermediate-level as the meso-level, House et al. call for researchers to build meso-level theories that can shed new light on both the micro- (e.g., individual exchanges) and macro-phenomenon (e.g., consumerism, privacy). This remains a major gap in the orientations literature.

Although the proposed framework does not specify the level of abstraction, it encourages researchers to conceptualize and operationalize the framework at different levels of abstraction. Moreover, by juxtaposing the consumer and market orientation constructs, it draws attention to the gaps in the literature such as (a) where one literature has made some advances but the other hasn’t (e.g., consumer orientation at the global level, but not the market orientation) and (b) where neither literature has achieved much success (e.g., intermediate level). Future researchers may find these gaps useful to pursue.
Multidimensionality. While the orientations literature is mixed about the multidimensionality of the different constructs, the proposed model offers a systematic approach for dealing with this issue. Two specific factors of multidimensionality have been proposed as critical to understanding orientations: (a) conceptual content as internal or external, and (b) customer or business focus. As noted earlier, the internal/external factor draws a distinction between internal states that may not be visible to exchange partners (e.g., attitudes, values, inter-departmental coordination) and external behavioral tendencies, actions and practices that are evident in marketplace exchanges. This distinction has been ignored in much past research. However, we argue that maintaining this distinction is as important as treating attitudes and behaviors as related but separate constructs. More importantly, to the extent the marketplace exchanges are shaped by behaviors of exchange partners, the external dimension reflects the “visible spectrum” of market climate. By contrast, the internal dimension is the “invisible spectrum” that remains below the surface of market exchanges and provides situational consistency across multiple encounters. Both are important aspects to consider in understanding market climates, yet maintaining their distinction is crucial for theory and practice.

Heterogeneity. Regardless of the level of abstraction, it is important to account for the heterogeneity in market climates. For instance, in a given industry (intermediate level), it seems inappropriate to assume that all firms are equally market oriented. Because of the common social, political and regulatory environment, it does seem appropriate to hypothesize that market orientation does not vary significantly in a given industry. Our point is that this hypothesis must be explicitly tested within a given study and not assumed away on conceptual grounds, however logical or compelling. Likewise, consumer orientation may be hypothesized to be invariant for
consumers that fall within a demographic segment and are served by the focal industry; however, this hypothesis needs to be explicitly tested. As noted earlier, past studies have tended to either disregard heterogeneity or assume that markets are homogeneous.

If the heterogeneity is supported (a likely scenario), we are not suggesting that it is necessary to drop down a level of abstraction. That is, in the event the homogeneity hypothesis for market orientation at an industry level is rejected, it does not imply that future researchers abandon the intermediate level of abstraction and resort to the individual level of analysis. Instead, an alternative and, perhaps more promising, approach is to utilize configurational theory to map this heterogeneity without altering the level of abstraction. The configurational theory, drawn from the notion of pattern recognition and evolutionary biology, proposes several interrelated ideas: (a) at any level of analysis, phenomenon is heterogeneous depicting many different patterns, (b) the number of distinct and viable patterns are far fewer than the elements at that level, and (c) over time, only a few dominant patterns survive, till (d) a perturbation in the system generates new patterns restarting a competitive pressure for viability and survival (Miller 1980). The configurational theory has had wide applicability in the strategic management field providing new insights into the understanding of firm orientations associated with effectiveness and long term success (Meyer, Tsui and Hinings 1993).

Using configuration theory, future researchers can begin to identify distinct patterns of consumer and market orientation at different (and every) level of abstraction. At the intermediate level, for instance, it is likely that a consumer segment based on homogeneous demographic characteristics is actually significantly heterogeneous in terms of their orientations such as external, dispositional tendencies reflecting consumer alienation and discontent. However, this heterogeneity may have three distinct patterns (for example): (a) low discontent and low alienation, (b) high discontent but low alienation, and (c) high discontent and alienation. In addition, these three sub-segments may differ in terms of their size, character and dynamics. Search for such patterns are likely to reveal new insights into the consumer orientation phenomenon. Similar patterns for market orientation can be identified.

Simultaneous Consideration. A key point of our paper is that, in addition to the level of abstraction, multidimensionality and heterogeneity, the study of market climate requires a
simultaneous consideration of consumers’ and marketers’ orientations. Past research has tended to examine these orientations independently. However, we contend that these orientations are like two sides of a coin and examining one without the other provides an incomplete and, perhaps misleading, view of the market climate. Figure 1 depicts this simultaneity by the oval that circumscribes the consumer and marketer “foci” and falls along the “external” conceptual domain of the market climate construct. In this instance, the market climate is conceptualized in terms of the dispositional tendencies and visible practices/actions of marketers and consumers in marketplace exchanges. Likewise, and alternatively, the market climate may be conceptualized in terms of the internal psychological state of consumers and functioning and processes of marketers (i.e., within firm phenomenon). Note, however, that, while past research has tended to separate along the “foci” of market climate, we are arguing that both foci must be simultaneously considered and separation along the conceptual content may be more reasonable.

*How can this simultaneity be operationalized?* Although this issue requires careful consideration and development, we suspect that conventional approaches for construct development may not prove completely adequate. This is because conventional construct development is likely to operationalize consumers’ and marketers’ orientation as two dimensions of an overarching market climate construct. While this multi-dimensional operationalization accounts for both orientations, it falls short of a valid simultaneous consideration. The simultaneity notion argues that the “interaction” effect of consumers’ and marketers’ orientation be considered in addition to their “main” effect. By “interaction” effect, we imply that the nature, character and influence of a market climate is not determined by the additive combination of the level of consumers’ and marketers’ orientation. Instead, the pattern of scores on the individual orientations matters, regardless of the equality of the additive score. As such, a market climate defined by highly pro-consumer (positive) marketers’ orientation and highly alienated consumers is not the same as a climate defined by highly opportunistic marketers and very compliant consumers. Specific patterns of consumers’ and marketers’ orientations indicate substantively different climates and can't be ignored. Thus, treating these orientations as distinct, additive dimensions of a higher order market climate construct is likely to underidentify the crucial dynamics inherent in the climate construct.
This significance of patterns is consistent with, and builds upon the ideas from configuration theory. As noted earlier, configuration theory provides guidelines for construing phenomenon in terms of viable patterns and suggests approaches for pattern recognition and validation. In operationalizing simultaneity, future researchers may consider supplementing conventional constructs development approaches with elements of configurational theory. Initial work may proceed under the rubric of conventional scale development by refining the conceptualization and operationalization of the consumers’ and marketers’ orientations as two distinct dimensions. In so doing, the review and critical assessment provided here may prove useful. Thereafter, configuration theory may be employed to identify viable patterns of market climate by simultaneously analyzing the two orientations. These patterns can be validated and their properties characterized. The emerging work in strategy may provide the basic groundwork for such an application of configurational theory (Meyer, Tsui and Hinings 1993).

Finally, once issues of simultaneity have been addressed, attention may focus on building a meso-level theory that specifies the mechanisms by which market climates influence micro-phenomenon such as consumer satisfaction and loyalty, or firm’s strategies for pricing and promotion in individual exchange encounters. Such theorizing is likely to draw from the work on situational influences and person-situation interaction. Likewise, industry-based market climates may be theorized to explain macro trends including the rise and fall of consumerism movement, and periods of active governmental regulation. Such theorizing can draw effectively from institutional and evolutionary research in marketing and management.

Concluding Notes and Implications

In this brief tale, we have argued for a closer review of the marketers’ and consumers’ orientation literatures from the critical perspective of the level of abstraction, multidimensionality, heterogeneity and simultaneity. While these literatures have remained largely divided, our review generates powerful centripetal force to bring these literatures together and develop the notion of market climate. To propel this work, we have provided a framework to guide future researchers in conceptualizing and operationalizing the market climate construct, and develop a meso-level theory that interconnects both macro- and micro-
marketing phenomenon via the mechanism of variations in market climates. Much remains to be done, however, since our framework is a rough sketch, not a clarifying theory.

We recognize that our framework is likely to be controversial and researchers may hesitate to tackle these integrative issues especially at a time when the marketers’ and consumers’ orientation literatures are being driven apart by centrifugal forces. For instance, researchers and managers have recently warmed up to the idea of market-driving orientation (Jaworski, Kohli and Sahay 2000). The underlying logic is that, in order to be able to serve customers well, it is important to anticipate, not just measure, consumer needs and wants. Moreover it is argued that, because consumers often cannot verbalize the products and services that they would need in the future, managers should not only look towards consumers to identify successful new products/services.

Although we agree that market-driving orientation may be useful in some situations, it is noteworthy that the underlying logic assumes that (a) consumers are homogeneous (e.g., all or none rationale), and (b) successful market driving orientation is independent of consumer orientation. By assuming that consumers are homogeneous, it follows that, in situations where consumers lack expertise or knowledge to anticipate future needs and wants, an orientation based on responding to consumers’ stated needs and wants might not be fruitful. However, what if this assumption is just that. If markets are heterogeneous (as we assume), a firm or industry may be facing different consumer segments with different levels of expertise, experience and orientation. A high expertise and pro-industry oriented segment of consumers may provide useful inputs to help a firm/industry early detection and weeding out of unsuccessful market driving ideas. Our proposed model suggests that recognizing and modeling such heterogeneity is critical to understanding consumer and market orientations.

More importantly, successful market driving orientation will likely require a simultaneous consideration of consumer orientation and a full accounting of the market climate. Consider the risk of ignoring these factors. While it is probably correct that Amazon has been able to drive the bookselling market, we should ask: Why have the HMOs efforts to drive health care market boomeranged? Why did Priceline’s efforts to reshape pricing markets result in its own demise? Although analysts and researchers are carefully diagnosing these evolving events,
it is hard to ignore the role of consumer orientation and market climate dynamics. HMOs' inability to control health care costs and aggressive efforts to constrain consumer choice are key factors in the growing consumer discontent and pressure for a “patient bill of rights.” The story of Priceline is no different. Initial market ebullience is followed by discontent and cynicism that ultimately casts a dark shadow on the individual firms and their marketplace transactions. Whether one is market driving or market driven (and hopefully one can be both), the dynamics and influence of market climate cannot be ignored. The proposed framework draws attention to the complexity and simultaneous nature of market climate. Researchers and managers may use this framework as a guideline for theory building and empirically investigating the etiology and influence of market climate across industries and contexts.
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TABLE 1
Overview of Empirical Research Regarding Market Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Study focus</th>
<th>Conceptualization/definition and dimensions utilized</th>
<th>Roots</th>
<th>Sample characteristics/focus of data collection</th>
<th>Operationalization/ key results</th>
<th>Measurement fidelity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kohli, A.K.; Jaworski, B.J.;</td>
<td>1990.</td>
<td>Conceptualization of the market orientation construct; Development of a research proposition linking antecedents and consequences of a market orientation.</td>
<td>- Market orientation is the organization wide generation of market intelligence pertaining to current and future customer needs, dissemination of the intelligence across departments, and organization-wide responsiveness to it.  - Intelligence generation;  - Intelligence dissemination;  - Responsiveness to market intelligence</td>
<td>Original theoretical contribution</td>
<td>In depth interviews with 62 managers in four U.S. cities were held. The sample existed of 33 marketing, 15 non-marketing, and 14 senior management managers.  In addition 10 business academics at two large U.S. universities were interviewed as well to get insights from an academic point of view.  The interviewees responded about their understanding of market orientation, factors that hinder or foster it, and consequences of market orientation.</td>
<td>Definition of market orientation: Market orientation is defined as the organizationwide generation of market intelligence, dissemination of that information across departments, and organizationwide responsiveness to it.  Market orientation is conceptualized along three dimensions: Intelligence generation; Intelligence dissemination; Responsiveness to market intelligence  In addition a conceptual model of antecedents (senior management factors, interdepartmental dynamics, organizational systems) and consequences (performance, employees response, customer response) of a market orientation and respective research proposition as well as Managerial implications of research propositions are provided.</td>
<td>As this paper is paper is conceptual, no measurement issues are included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narver, J.C.; Slater, S.F.;</td>
<td>1990.</td>
<td>Development of a valid measure of market orientation and analysis of its effects on a businesses’ profitability</td>
<td>- Market orientation is the organization culture that most effectively and efficiently creates the necessary behaviors for the creation of superior value for buyers and, thus, continuous superior performance for the business.  - Customer orientation  - Competitor orientation  - Interfunctional coordination</td>
<td>Sustainable competitive advantage  - Market orientation</td>
<td>The sample contains 140 strategic business units of a major western corporation. All of them are in the forest products division of the corporation.  In every SBU each member of the top management team received a questionnaire. The respondents reported on their perceived market orientation as well as on the company performance and situational market variables.  Of 440 persons contacted 371 responded.</td>
<td>A measure of market orientation was developed (one-dimensional construct consisting of three behavioral components and two decision criteria [see “Dimensions utilized”]). Customer orientation was measured using 6 items, competitor orientation 4, interfunctional coordination 5 and long-term horizon and profit emphasis 3 each.  Evidence was found for the hypothesis that market orientation is</td>
<td>Evidence was found for reliability, convergent, discriminant and concurrent validity:  - Reliability is acceptable for customer orientation, competitor orientation and interfunctional orientation (α&gt;.70). Low reliability scores for long-term horizon (.47) and profit emphasis (.13).  - Convergent validity: strong correlations between the three components of market orientation were found (all exceed .67 at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Long-term focus in planning
• Profit emphasis
(The first three components are behavioral and the last two are decision criteria)

responded (84%).

an important determinant of profitability (separate regressive analysis for commodity and non-commodity business are provided).

Because of the low reliability scores, conclusions about the relationship of the two decision criteria with the three behavioral components of market orientation were not drawn.

• Because of the low reliability scores, conclusions about the relationship of the two decision criteria with the three behavioral components of market orientation were not drawn.

Because of the low reliability scores, conclusions about the relationship of the two decision criteria with the three behavioral components of market orientation were not drawn.

• Discriminant validity: correlation of human resource management policy and interfunctional coordination is significantly less than the one between interfunctional coordination and the other market orientation components. This provides support for the discriminant validity of the three component market orientation construct.

• Concurrent validity: was shown by correlating market orientation with measures from differentiation strategy (.45) and low cost strategy (.28). The difference between the correlations is significant at p<.05.

Ruekert, R.W., 1992. *Relationships between market orientation and organizational processes, individual attitudes and financial performance*

The level of market orientation in a business unit is the degree to which the business unit: obtains and uses information from customers, develops a strategy which will meet customer needs, and implements that strategy by being responsive by customers needs and wants.

Use of customer information
Development of a market oriented strategy
Implementation of a market oriented strategy

Market orientation
Development of market orientation

A total of 5016 surveys were distributed to the managers of five SBU’s of a large US-company. Of the 3500 returned surveys, a sample of 400 was drawn at random.

Another sample of 400 respondents was generated to test the reliability of the results.

Emphasis is on the business level. Multiple informants from each SBU were used to report on market orientation and selected organizational aspects on the SBU at an individual level.

Based on discussions with managers more than 150 items were initially generated. Through additional discussions and pretests a 23-item scale which captures each three proposed dimensions of market orientation.

Hypotheses were tested on item, subscale and total scale levels. The degree of market orientation within the investigated company

• varies by division (ANOVA, all aggregate scales and 16 out of 23 items are significant; p<.05),

Reliability of the “use of customer information subscale” (α=81), for the “development of a customer oriented strategy” (.72), and for the “implementation of a customer oriented strategy” (.81) is provided. Overall the 23-item scale produced an alpha of .89.

The pair wise correlations between the subscales were all positive and significant and ranged from .48 to .70, showing a high degree of convergence between the three sub-dimensions of market orientation examined by the three subscales.

Market orientation is the organization-wide generation of market intelligence pertaining to current and future needs of customers, dissemination of intelligence within the organization, and responsiveness to it.

- **Overall market orientation**
- **Intelligence generation**
- **Intelligence dissemination**
- **Responsiveness**

Two national samples were used:
- The single informant sample consisted of 500 marketing executives and was drawn from a recently completed American Marketing Association membership roster. The final response rate was 47.2% (230 respondents).
- Two distinct sampling frames were used for the multi-informant sample: A sample of 49 MSI member firms, 13 agreed to participate, the respondents were 27 matched pairs of executives. The response rate was 88.9% for marketing and 77.8% for nonmarketing executives.
- A further sample was based on CEOs in the Dun and Bradstreet top 1000. 500 CEOs were contacted. The respondents were: 102 firms with a total of 229 SBUs, the response rate was 79.6% for the marketing and 70.0% for the nonmarketing executives.

Development of a 20-item scale, which assesses the degree to which a SBU (1) engages in multi-department market intelligence generation activities (6 items), (2) disseminates this intelligence generation activities vertically and horizontally through both formal and informal channels (5 items), and (3) develops and implements marketing programs on the basis of the intelligence generated (9 items). The best representation for the 20 items was identified in a model with one factor for each of the three aspects.

Three pretests with marketing and non-marketing executives as well as academic experts were conducted to assess the quality of the measure item. This procedure resulted in a pretested scale of 32 items.

After the three pretests the single-informant sample was used to reduce the number of items. Using confirmatory factor analysis for different factor structures, the set of items was reduced from 32 to 20. Refitting the best model (one general factor and three correlated market orientation component factors) led to a fit of Chi-Square with 147, df=223.55, and GFI=.875.

The multi-informant sample was used to identify the most appropriate factor representation. Starting with plausible models and using different elimination criteria, led to a model, wherein the component factors of intelligence dissemination and responsiveness were collapsed into a single one. Correlation between intelligence generation factor and dissemination/responsiveness was .483 (t-value=4.194). The Chi-Square with 191, df=214, and GFI=.872.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall market orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligence generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligence dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsiveness (response design, response implementation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To cross validate the findings, two samples were used:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A multiple-informant design was used in the first sample. The first part of the sample consisted of MSI company members, the second part was based on firms which were chosen from the top 1,000 companies listed in the Dun and Bradstreet Million Dollar Directory. In total, senior marketing executives (response rate: MSI 88.9%, D&amp;B 79.6%) as well as senior nonmarketing (MSI 77.8, D&amp;B 70.0%) executives of 222 business units responded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The second sample was randomly drawn from the AMA membership roster (500 names). A total of 230 informants of all higher ranks in the organizational hierarchy, responded (47.2% of an effective base of 487).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The informants were requested to respond to questions designed to measure how they perceive market orientation, its antecedents, and its consequences regarding their own SBU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market orientation was measured by a 32-item scale based on Kohli, Jaworski, and Kumar (1993).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antecedents: Using regression analysis the overall market orientation scale and the three subscales the distinct relevance of top management emphasis and risk aversion, interdepartmental dynamics (conflict, connectedness), and organizational aspects (formalization, centralization, departmentalisation, reward systems) could be shown for all four dependent variables in both samples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consequences: The impact of market orientation could be proofed for business performance (sample 1: ( b = .23, p &lt; .01 ); sample 2: ( b = .36, p &lt; 0.01 )), for market share and return on equity no impact was detected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong support is reported on the effects of a market orientation organizational aspects (1: ( b = .44, p &lt; .01 ); 2: ( b = .66, p &lt; .001 )) and esprit de corps (1: ( b = .51, p &lt; .001 ); 2: ( b = .58, p &lt; .001 )). No moderating effects of market turbulence, competitive intensity and technological turbulence on the linkage between market orientation and performance were identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Deshpande, R.; Farley, J.U. Webster, F.R.; 1993. Analysis of the impact of organizational | Customer orientation is the set of beliefs that puts the customers interest first, while not excluding those of all other stakeholders, in order to develop a long-term |
| Customer orientation | Of the publicly traded firms on the Nikkei stock exchange 50 were randomly selected. |
|  | After that 50 sets of four interviews in specific business were conducted. |
|  | The scale was developed on qualitative work and the literature. The items are consistent with Narver and Slater (1990) and the conceptual discussion of Kohli and Jaworski (1990). Nine |
|  | The scale included nine items. Cronbachs' alpha for customer orientation was evaluated by supplier (.69) and by customer (.83). |

Square for the final model was 955.21, df=659, and GFI=.681. |
| Correlation of all factors of the construct with six constructs used for validation supported the validity of the construct moderately. |
| Evidence of convergent validity was found by comparing the two individual samples. A strong convergence in the findings of the two samples is visible. The correlations between the subscales ranged from .55 to .70, between the subscales and the overall market orientation scale from .70 to .92.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>culture, customer orientation, and innovativeness to business performance in a simultaneous way</th>
<th>profitable enterprise.</th>
<th>According to that double dyads of interviews at vendor and customer firm were made (quadrad analysis).</th>
<th>items were used to measure the unidimensional construct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Customer orientation</td>
<td>• At the seller’s side divisional marketing executives were chosen as interviewees because of their familiarity with their customers.</td>
<td>• The marketers’ customer orientation as reported by customers is related positively to business performance (correlation with the discriminant function .52).</td>
<td>• The ten item summary scale showed a Cronbach’s alpha of .88.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At the customers side purchasing executives were interviewed.</td>
<td>• The customers’ perspectives are significantly more important for performance than the marketers own perception and there is only weak agreement between self-reports on market orientation (r=.17, p&lt;.13).</td>
<td>• The correlation between marketers’ perception and performance is very low (.00, p&lt;.988).</td>
<td>• To check predictive validity, correlations with the performance measures of the 10 items scale were compared with those of the 34 items included. The average correlation of the items of the new scale with two performance measures was higher than the average of the other 34 items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deshpande, R.; Farley; 1998a. Development of a market orientation scale based on three existing ones by using meta-analysis Inter and intra-scale characteristics are examined.</td>
<td>• Market orientation is the set of cross functional processes and activities directed at creating and satisfying customers through continuous need assessment.</td>
<td>• The sample is composed of 82 marketing executives from 27 companies of different countries and industries.</td>
<td>• The N-S (.90) and the D-F-W (.72) scales had acceptable levels of standard reliability measure, while the K-J-K (.51) was weaker (but also in the range for exploratory work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Narver and Slater (1990) (N-S) - customer orientation - competitor orientation - interfunctional coordination - interfunctional coordination</td>
<td>• Market orientation</td>
<td>• Average responses are three per SBU. Participants provided an assessment of their own firms market orientation.</td>
<td>• Validity: Correlation with a constant sum scale to measure in an direct way the scales- vs. market orientation. All three scales correlated positively with market orientation (N-S .36, D-F-W .50, K-J-K .40). Correlation with two performance measures was used to assess predictive validity (N-S .39 and .54, D-F-W .35 and .67, K-J-K .44 and .30). Correlation with an Organizational Climate Scale indicated discriminant validity of all scales (seven out of nine did not correlate).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kohli, Jaworski and Kumar (1990) (K-J-K) - Intelligence generation - Intelligence dissemination - Responsiveness</td>
<td>• Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993) (D-F-W) - market orientation (9 items)</td>
<td>• The ten item summary scale showed a Cronbach’s alpha of .88.</td>
<td>• Overall as well as cross-national analysis show the three scales appear interchangeable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To check predictive validity, correlations with the performance measures of the 10 items scale were compared with those of the 34 items included. The average correlation of the items of the new scale with two performance measures was higher than the average of the other 34 items.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baker, T.L.; Simpson, P.M.; Siguaw, J.A.; 1999. *Investigation of perceived market orientation in a channel context and its effects on key relationship marketing constructs*. Using exploratory factor analysis a new scale (10 items) was synthesized from the three earlier ones, with a clear customer focus. 

- Market orientation is the set of cross functional processes and activities directed at creating and satisfying customers through continuous need assessment.
- Suppliers perceptions of their resellers market orientation (based on Desphande, Farley and Webster 1993)
- To measure perceived market orientation the 9-item scale from Desphande, Farley, and Webster (1993) was used in a way that allowed the assessment of a firm’s market orientation from a supplier’s perspective.
- It is proposed that a suppliers’ perception of a resellers’ market orientation will positively affect the suppliers’ perception of certain key relationship marketing constructs (trust, commitment, cooperative norms, satisfaction).
- Perceived market orientations is strongly linked to trust (.63), cooperation (.50), satisfaction (.46), and commitment (.35) in a relationship (p<.001 for all constructs).
- Thus market orientation contributes positively to the quality of a relationship from the seller’s perspective.
- Cronbach’s alpha for the perceived market orientation is (.83).
- Item inter correlations, item total correlations and factor structure were assessed.
- Discriminant validity between market orientation and relation constructs were detected by using LISREL (no model provided).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker, T.L.; Simpson, P.M.; Siguaw, J.A.; 1999. <em>Investigation of perceived market orientation in a channel context and its effects on key relationship marketing constructs</em>. Using exploratory factor analysis a new scale (10 items) was synthesized from the three earlier ones, with a clear customer focus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Market orientation is the set of cross functional processes and activities directed at creating and satisfying customers through continuous need assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Suppliers perceptions of their resellers market orientation (based on Desphande, Farley and Webster 1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To measure perceived market orientation the 9-item scale from Desphande, Farley, and Webster (1993) was used in a way that allowed the assessment of a firm’s market orientation from a supplier’s perspective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is proposed that a suppliers’ perception of a resellers’ market orientation will positively affect the suppliers’ perception of certain key relationship marketing constructs (trust, commitment, cooperative norms, satisfaction).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Perceived market orientations is strongly linked to trust (.63), cooperation (.50), satisfaction (.46), and commitment (.35) in a relationship (p&lt;.001 for all constructs).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Thus market orientation contributes positively to the quality of a relationship from the seller’s perspective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cronbach’s alpha for the perceived market orientation is (.83).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Item inter correlations, item total correlations and factor structure were assessed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discriminant validity between market orientation and relation constructs were detected by using LISREL (no model provided).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Market orientation is the organization-wide generation of market intelligence pertaining to current and future needs of customers, dissemination of intelligence within the organization, and responsiveness to it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intelligence Generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intelligence Dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To validate the new market orientation scale and to compare it with MARKOR, 1.334 marketing executives were chosen at random (667 for each scale).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The focus of analysis was the strategic business unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Data were collected through a self-administered written questionnaire (two versions of the questionnaire were developed: one with the new market orientations scale items, one with the MARKOR items).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- After three waves of mailing response rates were 40.8% (n=264) and 42.2 (n=275) for version A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To refine the MARKOR scale of Kohli, Jaworski and Kumar (1993) the domain of items was extended to a broader range of stakeholders and market factors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Two pretest, both using descriptive statistics for the normality of the observed variables as well as fit statistics and reliability statistics for the item deletion and purification process, lead to a 22 items scale (8 for intelligence generation, 6 for intelligence dissemination, and 8 for responsiveness).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- By capturing a more complete set of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The reliability of some scale components is not high (intelligence generation=.61; intelligence dissemination=.69; responsiveness=.81). The scale as a whole showed a high level of reliability (.85).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Predictive validity: A business performance measure was used to provide predictive validity. The new market orientation scale was positively and significantly related to the included performance measures (β values range from .42 to .63), leading to a high predictable validity (χ²=338.83, df=353; χ²/p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Slater, S.F.; Narver, J.C.; 2000
**Replication of the findings of Narver and Slater (1990) regarding the relationship between market orientation and business profitability. In contrast to the original study a broad sample of business is used.**

- Market orientation is the business culture that produces outstanding performance through its commitment to creating superior value for customers. The values and beliefs implicit in this culture encourage: continuous cross-functional learning about customers expressed and latent needs and about competitors capabilities and strategies; and cross-functionally coordinated action to create and exploit the learning.

**Market Orientation (Narver and Slater 1990)**
- Data were collected from a wide range of businesses. (53% product, 47% service). Altogether 53 single-business corporations of SBUs of multibusiness corporations in three western cities were investigated.
- Respondents were general managers, chief marketing officers, and chief human resources management officers.
- For operationalization the scale from Narver and Slater (1990) was used.
- A positive relationship between market orientation and business profitability is supported by both the OLS p<.05 and stepwise regression results p<.01.
- A comparison of the Pearson correlation coefficient of the study of Narver and Slater 1990 (.345) and this study (.362) provides evidence that the relationship of market orientation and business profitability is robust across industry boundaries.
- Entrepreneurial Values did not add to the exploratory power of the market orientation performance modul.
- From the original 15-item measure 2 items were excluded (item-to-total less than .4). Exploratory factor analysis found three factors that clearly correspond to the initial subscales.
- Cronbach’s alpha for customer orientation (.77), competitor orientation (.40) and interfunctional coordination (.61) is provided.

**Impact of disagreement concerning market orientation on customer-supplier relationships.**

- Market orientation is the set of cross functional processes and activities directed at creating and satisfying customers through continuous need assessment. (Deshpande and Farley 1998a)
- Actual market orientation
- Normative market orientation (both based on Deshpande, Farley, and Webster 1993).

**Market orientation**
- A random nth-observation sample of firms on the NY Stock exchange and the Nikkei stock exchange in Tokyo.
- Each case consisted of two buyer-seller dyads, leading to four interviews (quadrad design).
- N is not provided, but it is mentioned that only a small sample size was used.
- Interviewees responded to their perception of the actual market orientation and the level of market orientation as it should be.

**A 9-item scale based on Desphandé, Farley, and Webster (1993) was used to measure the own and business partner’s market orientation.**
- Suppliers and customers do disagree about the actual supplier’s market orientation (t=3.53) as well as the normative market orientation (t=4.32). Suppliers think significantly better of themselves.
- The normative market orientation gap decreases with the longer Because of the quadrad design two types of reliabilities are provided:
  - Interrater reliabilities at customer and supplier firms for individual items (significant at $\alpha=.01$ in all but one case) and scales (all significant at $\alpha=.01$).
  - Reliabilities of the four market orientation scales that are composed of individual items all $>.70$. 
Market orientation is the process of generating and disseminating market intelligence for the purpose of creating superior buyer value.

Customer orientation
Competitor orientation
Interfunctional coordination (all based on Narver/Slater 1990).

800 U.S. manufacturing companies listed in Dun's Market Identifiers File were randomly selected. Experienced telemarketers called the company headquarter with the request to speak to an available company executive. After getting information on the research project and upon agreeing to participate, the executives were asked to identify a key informant in the company’s core SBU. Key informants in 561 SBUs agreed to receive questionnaire. 239 companies declined participation. Valid questionnaires were received from 194 SBUs (34.6%).

Sample characteristics: On average the SBUs had been in operation for 28 years, employed 267 employees, and earned $51 million in sales revenue per year. 35% used mass production technology, 65% used customized production technology. Of the responding key informants 32 percent held a marketing title.

Narver and Slater’s (1990) market orientation scale was used. Six items measured customer orientation, four items competitor orientation, and five items interfunctional coordination.

The hypothesis that more line extensions are introduced when customer orientation increases is not supported. Customer orientation is not related to line extension. However, standardized regression coefficients suggest that a business launches more line extension when less competitor oriented (b=-.16, p<.05) and more interfunctionally correlated (b=.57, p<.001).

The hypothesis that competitor orientation increases, the more me-too products are introduced is supported (b=.48, p<.05). In addition, customer orientation (b=-.18, p<.05) and interfunctional coordination (b=-.25, p<.01) have a negative and significant effect on me-too products. These findings suggest that a business launches more product imitations when it becomes more competitor oriented, less customer oriented, and less interfunctionally coordinated.

The third hypothesis that the greater relationship (r=-.37, p<.001) and with the importance of the relationship (r=-.27, p<.01).

The actual market orientation gap and relationship length (r=-.17) and relationship importance (r=-.09) do not correlate significantly, but are directionally as expected.

Both, the actual and normative market orientation gaps are smaller in Japan (collectivist culture) than in the U.S. (t=-2.35 and –2.71, respectively).

Internal consistency was assessed by coefficient alpha: customer orientation (.83), competitor orientation (.64), and interfunctional coordination (.80).
### Development of a Model of Market-Oriented Organizational Culture


**Development of a model of market-oriented organizational culture**

- Within the multiple-layer model of market-oriented organizational culture, market-oriented behaviors are conceptualized on the basis of Kohli and Jaworski (1990) and Kohli, Jaworski, and Kumar (1993).
  - Generation of market intelligence
  - Dissemination of marketing intelligence
  - Responsiveness to market intelligence

- Market orientation
- Organizational culture

- Based on content analysis of popular business magazines, qualitative interviews with managers (n=10) and literature analysis the model was developed.
  - Mailed survey to 1100 managers in 1100 business units in Germany stemming from 5 industries. Response rate 15.7%.

- Market orientation
  - Based on the 20-item scale by Kohli, Jaworski, and Kumar (1993) was used.
  - Market-oriented behaviors were not directly influenced by norms for market orientation, but indirect via artifacts indicating existence (AIEMO) and absence of market orientation (AIAMO). AIEMO have a significant positive effect on market-oriented behaviors (.76, p > .01) and AIAMO a significant negative effect (-.16, p > .01).

- Results indicate acceptable reliabilities for the three dimensions of market-oriented behaviors. Structural equation modeling revealed a lack of discriminant validity. Finally, a 12-item measure was used, which included items of all three proposed dimensions (α = .91, average variance extracted .50).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Study Focus</th>
<th>Conceptualization/ definitions and dimensions utilized</th>
<th>Sample Characteristics/focus of data collection</th>
<th>Operationalization/ key results</th>
<th>Validity and measurement Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barksdale, H.C.;</td>
<td>1972.</td>
<td>Consumer attitudes toward marketing and consumerism</td>
<td>How consumers view the marketing activities of business. Consumer perceptions of the marketing system and its operation are described.</td>
<td>Pretest: 160 adults in three cities (40 of 67 items were chosen after the test). National sample of consumers was randomly selected from telephone directories within each state in proportion to its population.</td>
<td>Forty items were used to measure consumer attitudes toward marketing and consumerism in 7 distinct areas (see conceptualization).</td>
<td>Descriptive results. Distribution of responses for each item were provided. After eliminating the uncertain responses, each item was subjected to a two-tailed z test (p=.5). 3 of the 29 were not significant at the .02 level. Evidence of validity was not reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darden, W.R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Philosophy of business • Product quality • Advertising • Other marketing activities • Consumer responsibility • Consumerism • Government regulation</td>
<td>Questionnaires were mailed to an original national sample of 785 consumers. 376 questionnaires (48%) were returned, of these, 354 (45%) were complete and usable. Consumers were asked about their attitudes toward marketing (business policies and practices), consumerism and government regulation.</td>
<td>• Attitudes were generally consistent across most consumer groups, but differences in opinions were noted for younger consumers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pruden, H.O.;</td>
<td>1974.</td>
<td>Development and test of an instrument measuring alienation from the marketplace</td>
<td>The marketplace is interpreted as the something from which consumers feel a sense of alienation.</td>
<td>Structure of Respondents: 61% male, 67% conservatives, 35% over the age of 55, and 83% were married.</td>
<td>Initially a 16-item measure was used to measure Alienation from the marketplace. A final index is based on 10 items, where two items for each sub-concept of alienation are included.</td>
<td>Re-test reliability in the student sample (several measurement after two weeks) accounted for .79 (Spearman Coefficient of rank-order correlation). Correlations within the five facets of marketplace alienation ranged from -.03 to .48. Content validity was followed from the operational definitions of Seeman’s five concepts. Concurrent validity was tested through an intercorrelation analysis of general alienation and alienation from the marketplace. It was .55. Between the respective general and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuptrine, F.K.;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Powerlessness (P) • Meaninglessness (M) • Normlessness (N) • Social isolation (SI) • Self-estrangement (SE)</td>
<td>Further sample of 35 students (undergraduate marketing class, University of Texas) was used for reliability and validity examination.</td>
<td>High degree of correspondence among the various dimensions of general alienation. Intercorrelations ranged from .10 (SI/N) to .45 (SE/M).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longman, D.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seeman’s (1959) alienation concept</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intercorrelations among the market place alienation showed some separability among the concepts: correlation between SI and N was -.03. Others showed a fair amount of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

**Overview of Empirical Research Regarding Consumers’ Orientation**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lundstrom, W.J.; Lamont, L.M.; 1976. Development of a scale to measure consumer discontent</th>
<th>Attitude measurement</th>
<th>Consumerism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The scope of consumer discontent was defined to include the collection of attitudes held by the consumers toward the product strategies of business, business communications and information, the impersonal nature of business and retail institutions, and the broader socioeconomic forces which are linked with the business system.</td>
<td>Four Samples were used:</td>
<td>Based on literature and an exploratory field study 173 items were identified to be of relevance for the measurement of consumer discontent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer discontent</td>
<td>Initial item analysis: 309 Denver, Colorado, consumers (initial sample: 600) were asked about their attitudes toward business practices (87% white, 10% African-American, 3% Mexican-American across all income groups).</td>
<td>A scale consisting of 82 items was acknowledged using different methods of item reduction (see following column).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability tests: 226 students (University of Colorado)</td>
<td>The individual statement and summated item scores. 15 items with significantly different means for the two groups were eliminated from the scale. The 84 remaining items were significantly different at alpha level .10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validity tests (know-group validity):</td>
<td>Reliability: The student sample was used to calculate split-half reliability (.94) and test-retest reliability after six weeks (.79,p≤.001). In addition acquiescence and social desirability of the scale were non-significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content group: 100 members from the Rotary and Kiwanis business and professional service organizations Discontent Group: 180 members of a consumer activist organization and complainers to the Denver Better Business Bureau.</td>
<td>Internal consistency: 82 of 84 items significantly correlated at .10 alpha level or better with total sum scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External validity: Know-groups were used to test for the difference between discontented and contented consumers (z=28.2, p≤.001).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Allison, N.K.; 1978. Development of a consumer alienation scale | Seeman’s alienation concept | Consumer alienation from the marketplace is positively related to social alienation (.61, p≤.001) and belief in government intervention (.45, p≤.001). ANNOVA results show that ethnic
| Alienation is defined as feelings of separation from the marketplace. It is based on the constructs of powerlessness (feelings held by consumers that they are unable to help determine market practices, the market environment or events within the market); normlessness (distrust of business and market practices), social isolation (feelings of estrangement from the institutions, practices, and outputs of the market system); | Stratified-by-area sample of census tracts of Austin, Texas was used to collect data from 400 respondents. Of these, 368 were usable. | Based on literature and own input, a pool of 115 attitudinal statements was generated to capture alienation from the marketplace. |
| | Consumers were asked about their identification with market institutions, practices and outputs, and feelings of separation from the self (in the consumption role). | By means of factor analysis a unidimensional measure for consumer alienation was identified (35 items). |
| | Structure of respondents was representative concerning to: gender, age, income, and ethnic origin. | Consumer alienation from the marketplace is positively related to social alienation (.61, p≤.001) and belief in government intervention (.45, p≤.001). |
| | Reliability test: 123 graduate business students. | ANNOVA results show that ethnic
| | | Explanatory factor analysis as well as alpha coefficients for the subscales (<.50) and the total scale (.86) indicated that a multi-dimensional measure is not appropriate. |
| | | Coefficient alpha was used to maximize internal consistency. Highest coefficient found was .88 based on 35 items. |
| | | A test-retest reliability coefficient of .75 (p<.05) was calculated from the student sample. |
| | | Validity was tested in a nomological way. Expected relations of the
| Commonality. They ranged from .13 (SE/N) to .48 (M/P). | Marketplace facets correlations ranged from .16 (N) to .37 (P). |
and self-estrangement (inability to identify with behavior traditionally associated with the consumption role).
- Powerlessness
- Normlessness
- Social isolation
- Self-estrangement

minorities suffered more from alienation (with control for level of income) as well as low income consumers (with control for ethnicity). Adjusted mean scores across ethnic groups are: White, 108.67; Black, 112.2; Mexican-American, 116.84. Adjusted mean scores across income groups ranged from 115.45 for individuals with income below $4,000 to 104.51 for individuals with incomes over $16,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample of 194 undergraduate students (voluntary participation during a class meeting at the University of Arizona) was used to obtain measurements of product satisfaction (automobile/footwear), dispositional sources of affect, and concurrent affective states.</td>
<td>160 Subjects were owner of an automobile, 147 reported a purchase of shoes or boots during the last four months.</td>
<td>The 41-item Consumer-discontent Scale by Lundstrom and Lamont (1976) was used to measure generalized consumer discontent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability was estimated by using a convenience subsample (N=47) of the original subjects. This administration was disguised as a separate study and conducted three weeks later.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regression results showed a negative correlation between consumer discontent and automobile satisfaction (b=-.141, p&lt;.05). The correlation between consumer discontent and footwear satisfaction was not significant. Therefore discontented consumers tended to perceive lower satisfaction with automobiles whereas footwear satisfaction was not affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of four Southeastern metropolitan areas were sampled using a mail questionnaire, which yielded over 200 usable returns (response rate: 38%).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Life satisfaction was negatively related to consumer discontent (r=-.14, p&lt;.05).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 10.7% of the respondents had not completed high school, 38% had high school diplomas but had not attended college, about 25% claimed to have some college, 26 said they were college graduates.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A multivariate comparison of data collected by mail and by personal interviews with a smaller sample showed no statistically significant differences (p&gt;.05).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A 19-item scale was developed based on literature and subsequent factor analysis of pilot-study data: 7 for consumer powerlessness, 3 each for consumer meaninglessness and normlessness, and 6 for cultural estrangement. | | Internal consistency was calculated by using alpha Coefficients which were .76 for powerlessness, .65 for meaninglessness, .67 for normlessness and .42 for cultural estrangement. The relatively low coefficient for cultural estrangement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lambert, Z.V.; 1980. Relationships between consumer dissatisfaction, consumer opinions on consumerism issues and consumer alienation</th>
<th>Alienation is a subjective state of mind consisting of certain attitudes, beliefs, and feelings (individual’s perceived circumstances).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Powerlessness (P)</td>
<td>Residents of four Southeastern metropolitan areas were sampled using a mail questionnaire, which yielded over 200 usable returns (response rate: 38%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaninglessness (M)</td>
<td>Approximately 10.7% of the respondents had not completed high school, 38% had high school diplomas but had not attended college, about 25% claimed to have some college, 26 said they were college graduates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normlessness (N)</td>
<td>A 19-item scale was developed based on literature and subsequent factor analysis of pilot-study data: 7 for consumer powerlessness, 3 each for consumer meaninglessness and normlessness, and 6 for cultural estrangement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural-estrangement (CE)</td>
<td>40.8% of general dissatisfaction could be explained by the four dimensions of alienation (p&lt;.0005, F=9.49, d.f.=26.40).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(drawn from published instruments primarily in sociology and political science)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lambert, Z.V.; 1981. *Relation of consumer alienation from the marketplace to demographic factors*

- Alienation was conceptualized primarily in terms of consumers’ perceptions of marketers and their behavior vis-a-vis the consumer.
  - Consumer Powerlessness
  - Meaninglessness
  - Normlessness
  - Cultural-estrangement
  - Political powerlessness
  - Mainly based on Lambert (1980)

- Residents of four Southeastern metropolitan areas were sampled using a mail questionnaire, which yielded 215 usable returns (same sample as in the study of 1980). The response rate was 38%.
  - Of the 215 respondents, 114 were female and 101 male, 35 were Afro-American and 180 whites.

- A 21-item scale based on Lambert (1980) which also included 2 items for capturing political powerlessness.
  - Large variation in scores (scores among the maximum range, one to six, were observed on each item) suggested that alienation varied among respondents (coefficients of variation ranged from 24.8 to 64.4 and had a mean of 46.1 for the items).
  - The 21 alienation scores were compared multivariately across demographic categories. Significant variations in alienation were found in relation to ethnic background (p<.0005, F=9.767, d.f.=4,210) sex (p<.05, F=8.092, d.f.=5.209), age

- A multivariate comparison of data collected by mail and by personal interviews with a smaller sample showed no statistically significant differences (p<.05).
- The questionnaire contained 21 items for assessing alienation with factor loadings above .35, calculated in a pilot test.
- Internal consistency was calculated by using alpha Coefficients which were .76 for powerlessness, .65 for meaninglessness, .67 for normlessness and 42 for cultural estrangement. The correlation of the two items of political powerlessness was .42.

### Seeman’s alienation concept

- 16.6% of the respondents were African-American, the balance were white. Ages ranged from 24 years and younger (11%) to 65 years and older (8%). 53 percent were females.
- 23.5% of the common variance of opinions on 10 consumerism issues was related to alienation (p<.0005, F=3.14, d.f.=190.20).
- An analysis of the relationship of alienation to general dissatisfaction and 10 consumerism issues identified R-Squares ranging from 13.52 to 48.37. Thus relationships of considerable magnitude exist between consumer alienation and consumerism issues.
- By hierarchical cluster analysis four groups of respondents on the basis of their alienation profiles were identified (alienation scales and items differed significantly across the clusters). ANOVA results show that higher levels of alienation are related to higher dissatisfaction with the marketplace and more intense pro-consumerism opinions (p<.05).
- The intensity of pro-consumerism opinions increased significantly with P, M, N for 8 of 10 issues (p<.05).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumerism</th>
<th>Consumerism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Consumerism is essentially a consumer phenomenon, brought about when consumers are dissatisfied with the actions of business. Many consumerism problems are apparently caused by differing perceptions of consumers and business people toward marketplace activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pretest sample: Residents of Long Beach, California, stratified by social class and within class by census tract. Within each randomly selected tract five residences were randomly selected. 213 usable questionnaires were returned. From a total of 1,174 business listed in Long Beach’s Chamber of Commerce firms were randomly selected. The sample returned 50 questionnaires.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Final sample: Respondents from Long Beach and Uppsala, Sweden, following the same procedure as with the pretest sample. Response rates: 83.9% in Uppsala and 88.3% in Long Beach. The business sample in Sweden produced 55 questionnaires (response rate: 68.7%) and in the US 75 (68.1%).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumerism</th>
<th>Consumerism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Based on literature and pre-testing a 20-item scale was developed (development procedures see below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- During the pretest the number of items was reduced from 113 to 42 using factor analysis for the consumer and business people sample as well as the combined data set in the US. In addition, expert judgments were used to assess the appropriateness for Sweden. Items were retained upon common meaning within each factor and loadings above .50.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- On the total final Swedish and US data factor analysis were proofed. Items which grouped similarly in both cultures were used. There were no significant differences between the two subgroups (p&lt;.10). The final instrument consisted of 20 items loading on six different factors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No evidence beyond the face validity of the items and the stated consistency of factor analysis results between cultures was provided for the scale. Neither total scale, factor nor item mean scores were provided.

(p<.001, F=3.806, d.f.=6,420), income (p<.0005, F=4.453, d.f.=6,420), education (p<.0005, F=5.466, d.f.=10,416) and marital status (p<.01).

- Partial F ratios showed little consistency in relationships between alienation items and particular demographics, because no one variable or group of demographic variables was consistently related to measures of alienation. Therefore, a clear demographic profile of alienated consumer groups is not provided.

- Cluster analysis (with cluster 1 contained the most alienated respondents and cluster 4 the least alienated) showed only significant variation concerning ethnic background (p<.02).
**Bearden, W.O.; Mason, J.B.; 1983.** *Covariates and Correlates of consumer alienation*

- Alienation is a state of perceiving oneself as being socially apart from society. Consumer alienation is defined as feelings of separation from the marketplace.
- Consumer Alienation (Allison 1978)
- Normlessness (Dean 1961)
- Shopping activity (Anderson, Engledow, and Becker 1979)

**Alienation**

- 2-phase mailing to 1,000 members of a 1,800 household, two-state consumer panel. The first mailing collected data on personality, attitudinal, and demographic variables. The second mailing after six month focused on satisfaction and behavior after unsatisfactory purchases. 749 usable responses to both mailings were obtained.

**The 35-item inventory by Allison (1978) was used to measure consumer alienation from the marketplace.**

- Consumers scoring high in alienation are (a) less personally competent (partial correlation=.29), (b) less trustful to others (-.42), (c) less confident in shopping ability (-.24), (d) have less positive attitudes toward business (-.44), (e) less satisfied with their level of living (-.18), (f) less satisfied with consumer activity (-.31), (g) have less positive attitudes toward complaining (-.14) and complaining situations (-.31), (h) perceive more constraints initiate complaining (.24) for all p<.01.

**Relationships between consumer alienation and assertiveness, propensity-to-complain or engagement in consumerism activity were non-significant.**

**Coefficient alpha for the consumer alienation scale was .88. Retest reliability .83 (35 undergraduate business students).**

**Correlates between alienation and powerlessness (.55, p<.01) and alienation and shopping activity (.02, n.s.) give some evidence of convergent and discriminant validity.**

---

**Richins, M.L.; 1983.** *Development of measurements and analysis of consumer interaction styles in the marketplace*

**Interaction styles are defined as relatively consistent behavior patterns that individuals employ in interpersonal interactions with retail employees. Two interaction styles are studied:**

- Assertiveness: (resisting request for compliance and requesting information assistance)
- Aggressiveness: (seeking redress)

**Assertiveness:** Conceptualization of Galassi and Galassi (1978)

**Aggressiveness:** Conceptualization of Buss (1961), and Tedeschi, Schlenker, and Bonoma (1973)

**Sample for construct specification:** 9 adult consumers (4 men, 5 women) were interviewed in their home by depth interview technique.

**Sample for initial sample:** 118 undergraduate and graduate students at western university in an urban area and 59 consumers from the same metropolitan area.

**Sample for test-retest reliability:** 112 college students.

**Sample for discriminant and convergent validity:** 83 college students.

**Sample for testing response biases:** 93 college students.

**Main sample (n=800):** 400 questionnaires were mailed to a random sample of residents of a Western SMSA, 212 to members of a consumer protection group residing

**Results of the scale development:** A 15 item assertiveness scale consisting of the dimensions resisting request for compliance, requesting information or assistance, and seeking redress (5 items each). A Aggressiveness scale with six items.

**Results of the scale development:** A 15 item assertiveness scale consisting of the dimensions resisting request for compliance, requesting information or assistance, and seeking redress (5 items each). A Aggressiveness scale with six items.

**Analysis including examination of item-to-total correlations, calculation of coefficient alpha, and preliminary principal components analysis resulted in 15 items for the assertiveness and 6 for the aggression measure (initial sample was used).**

**Reliability of the two scales was tested by test-retest (sample of 112).** The correlations for assertiveness and aggressiveness items were .82 and .83 respectively.

**Dimensionality was assessed by a principal components analysis using the initial sample and suggested that three factors were appropriate for the assertiveness scale and one for the aggression scale (loadings .45 and greater).**

**Discriminant and convergent
in the same area, and to 198 individuals in the area who had registered a complaint with a government agency within the previous year. The mailing resulted in 356 usable responses (response rate: 44%).

More assertive individuals report more positive attitudes toward business ($p<.001$). Analysis with perception of business responsiveness as dependent variable followed similar pattern. (b) Aggressive individuals are more likely to report that they enjoy making a complaint than non-aggressive individuals ($p<.001$). (c) Resort-to-aggressive group reports the greatest number of complaint behaviors and the nonassertive group reports the fewest. (d) In a follow-up study, subjects were called in random order several months after the mail survey. Respondents who were low in assertion and aggression taking the longest time to get off the phone and those high on both variables the shortest (all $p<.05$).

- Correlations of scale scores with demographic characteristics turned out to be weak.

validity were calculated by multitrait-multimethod (MTMM) approach (measures developed in psychology were used as additional operationalisations). Correlations of .68 and .42 for the assertiveness and aggressiveness measures ($p>.01$) point towards convergent validity. Evidence is also found for discriminant validity.

- Based on the students’ sample and a shortened form of the Crown-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale, correlations of .13 and .28 were cited as evidence of limited social desirability bias.

- Estimates of internal consistency reliability were .80 (assertiveness) and .89 (aggressiveness) in the main sample. Principal component analysis on the main sample confirmed the factor elements in the scale development samples. This provides additional evidence on internal consistency and content validity.

- Known group validation: The general population (mean score = 56.5) was significantly lower than the rest of the sample on assertion ($F=3.26$, $p<.05$). Consumer protection group members and third party complainers were about equal (58.9 and 58.1). There were also significant differences on the aggression measure ($F=5.63$, $p<.01$). Means for the aggressiveness factor were: third-party complainers, 16.5; general population, 14.5; consumer protection group, 14.7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaski, J.F.; Etzel, M.J.; 1986. <em>Development of an index of consumer sentiment toward marketing</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentiment toward marketing is a global measure of consumer satisfaction with marketing in general. Attitudes toward the four major elements of marketing comprise the construct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Product quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Price of products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Advertising for products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retailing or selling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Marketing in general</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumerism Consumer Discontent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sample is taken from the 200,000 household panel maintained by Market Facts. Questionnaires were mailed to 2,000 households and 1,428 (response rate of 71.4%) were completed and returned in the first survey. The overall panel is nationally balanced and continually updated to reflect the most recent US Census data in terms of geographic region, annual income, population density, age, sex, family size.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| The scale was developed using published items as well as ad hoc created ones. Initially a pool 24 items was used which les to a 20-item scale after purification. |
| - A mean consumer sentiment score of -14.85 was calculated and compared with the Barksdale-Darden-Perault (B-D-P) measure (1971-79) after converting the operative measures of consumer sentiment to an index number of 100. Results are as follows: |
| - There appears to have been some improvement in consumer sentiment toward marketing during 1971 and 1984, although it still lies in the negative range. |
| - The mean attitude score of male and female respondents appear to be significantly different, with man more hostile (Mean attitude score was -12.36 for women, and –17.71 for men, t=2.08, p<.05). |
| - The initial instrument was subjected to 50 panelists to ensure comprehensibility. Cronbach’s alpha was used to purify the scales. The two items from each scale with the lowest item-to-total correlations were deleted, leaving four sets of five-item scales. |
| - The alpha coefficients after purification were: .78 (product scale), .76 (price scale), .76 (advertising scale), and .82 (retailing/selling scale). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alienation: Business ethic (BE), informed choice (IC), personal norms (PN, Allison 1978).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discontent: General discontent (GD), general pro-business (GBP), profits and prices too high (PPH), product and promotion shortcomings (PPS), unnecessary purchases and anti-materialism (UPA, Lundstrom and Lamont 1975).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Attitudes toward complaining: Social benefits (SO), norms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumer Alienation Consumer Discontent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alienation was operationalized using the 35-item scale by Allison (1978). Consumer discontent was based on the 82 items developed by Lundstrom and Lamont (1975). The attitudes toward complaining construct is measured using 10 items based on Richins (1982).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sufficient theoretical evidence that alienation and discontent are non-redundant, though related, constructs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The initial instrument was subjected to 50 panelists to ensure comprehensibility. Cronbach’s alpha for BE .84, for IC .65, and for PN .62. The interfactor correlations range from .27 (IC-PN) to .53 (BE-IC).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - For the discontent measure a 5-factor solution was obtained. Different to Lundstrom and Lamont (1975) items concerning Inducing Unnecessary Purchase (IUP) and the Anti-Materialistic Shift (AMS) were...
pertaining to self (SE), norms pertaining to others (OT, Richins 1982).

- Empirical redundancy analysis suggested (a) that the measures lack discriminant and appear to show convergent validity (comparing two competing LVSE models, one which posits distinct latent constructs and the other presumes a unidimensional factor, Chi-Square difference = .90, df=1, p > .004), (b) no nomological relationships with the attitudes toward complaining were found (indicating high redundancy), and (c) with exception of PPS, all dimensions of discontent and the BE dimension of alienation contribute significant to redundancy.

- The attitudes toward complaining construct has a 3-dimensional structure. Coefficient alphas: BE .84, IC .65, PN .62. The interfactor correlations range from .24 (OT-SO) to .38 (SE-SO).

- Discriminant validity: Null Model, no underlying construct (Chi-Square, df; GFI, RMR); 1928.5, 28, 0.37, 0.34; Two-construct model: 132.3, 19, 0.90, 0.06; One-construct model: 133.2, 20, 0.90, 0.06.
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