



A Comparative Theoretical Discussion on the Modern and Postmodern Consumer Behaviors

H. Çağatay KARABIYIK*, Mahmut Nevfel ELGÜN**

ABSTRACT

To understand consumption, which is one of the most important factors of the post-modern period, it is necessary to examine it comparatively with modern consumption. Because the method of understanding Postmodernism, which was born as a reaction to Modernism, is to compare it with Modernism. In this study, the modern consumption is examined in a comparative way with the post-modern consumption. Although post-modern consumption is frequently studied in the literature, modern consumption has not been studied enough. Considering that post-modern consumption can be correctly understood by comparing it with modern consumption, the importance of this study also emerges. As a result, modern consumption is divided into functional consumption, socialist consumption, sustainable economy, rational consumption and supply-leading economy sub-dimensions. The equivalents of these dimensions in post-modern consumption are symbolic consumption, pleasure seeking, meta-orientation, experiential consuming, communicator, activist, individual consumption, asocial individualism, acceptance of differences, identity creator, decentered subject, paradoxical juxtaposition of opposites, sustainable consumption, reversal of production and consumption, greed, hyper-reality, shopping-focused behavior, impulse purchase and demand-leading economy. In the conclusion part, these determinations are classified and analyzed in a comparative way.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Postmodern consumption, Modern consumption, Consumer behavior, Postmodernism, Modernism

JEL Sınıflandırması: M30, M31, M39

Modern ve Postmodern Tüketici Davranışları Üzerine Karşılaştırmalı Bir Teorik Tartışma

ÖZ

Post-modern dönemin en önemli etkenlerinden biri olan post-modern tüketimi doğru anlamak için onu modern tüketim ile karşılaştırmalı olarak incelemek gerekmektedir. Çünkü Modernizme bir tepki olarak doğan Postmodernizmi anlamının yöntemi onu Modernizmle karşılaştırmaktır. Bu çalışmada modern tüketim anlayışı post-modern tüketim anlayışıyla karşılaştırmalı bir şekilde incelenmiştir. Her ne kadar post-modern tüketim literatürde sıklıkla çalışılsa da modern tüketim yeterince çalışılmamıştır. Post-modern tüketimin modern tüketimle karşılaştırılarak doğru bir şekilde anlaşılabilmesi göz önünde bulundurulduğunda bu çalışmanın önemi de ortaya çıkmaktadır. Sonuç olarak modern tüketim fonksiyonel tüketim, toplumsuluk, sürdürülebilir ekonomi, rasyonalite ve arz çeşitli ekonomi alt boyutlarına ayrılmıştır. Bu boyutların post-modern tüketimdeki karşılıkları ise sembolik tüketim, haz arayıcılığı, meta uyumu, deneyimcilik, iletişimcilik, aktivizm, bireyci tüketim, asosyal bireycilik, farklılıkların kabulü, kimlik yaratıcılığı, merkezsiz özne, zıtlıkların paradoksal yakınlığı, sürdürülebilir tüketim, üretimin yerini alan tüketim, açgözlülük, hiper-gerçeklik, alışveriş odaklılık, anlık satın alma ve talep çeşitli ekonomi olarak belirlenmiştir. Sonuç bölümünde bu tespitler sınıflandırılmış ve karşılaştırmalı bir şekilde incelenmiştir.

Keywords: Postmodern tüketim, Modern tüketim, Tüketici davranışları, Postmodernizm, Modernizm

JEL Classification: M30, M31, M39

Geliş Tarihi / Received: 18.04.2022 Kabul Tarihi / Accepted: 18.05.2022

* h.cagataykarabiyik@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-1898-5907

** Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, İşletme Bölümü, melgun@erbakan.edu.tr, ORCID:0000-0002-8380-886X

1. INTRODUCTION

Consumption and consumer behavior have become one of the important variables to properly understand today's individual and society. While consumer behaviors are examined in terms of individual consumer behaviors, which businesses implement marketing activities and make brands sustainable, at the micro level, it is examined in terms of how consumers affect the macroeconomic and social structure at the macro level (Khan, 2006: 5). This shows that consumer behavior is not a phenomenon with purely economic effects. Considering that consumption has economic, sociological, psychological and anthropological effects, it is understood that consumer behavior is not only an economic research topic, especially in the postmodern society where consumption has become one of the foundations of society. In other words, the phenomenon that directs the sociological, psychological and cultural factors in the background of the social structure formed in the Post-Modern period is consumption and consumer behavior (Szmigin, 2003: 5). For this reason, consumer behavior has become the subject of research by many disciplines today. For example, social psychology of consumer behavior was examined by Wanke (2009) in the context of psychology. Similarly, in Khan's (2021) study, examining the cultural dimensions of consumer behavior in the context of cultural anthropology also shows the close relationship between consumer behavior and anthropology. At the point where these interdisciplinary studies have come recently, it is seen that the integration process of consumer behavior and marketing and other disciplines has come to an end and new integrated fields have emerged. For example, in current trends, even pedagogical approaches developed within the framework of consumer anthropology are seen (Morais, 2022). The integration process, which started in the 1980s when consumer behavior was seen as an opportunity by other disciplines (Sherry Jr., 1987), is now seen to be completed by interdisciplinary studies. Undoubtedly, while consumption penetrates the base of the social structure in practice, methodological theoretical changes have also been seen to explain this change. In order to respond to the change in this process, a scientific approach has emerged, designed with the focus of explaining the practice in postmodern science and adopting interdisciplinary approaches and methods (Vlasova, Pshinko & Vlasova, 2021: 31). All these developments show that it is extremely important to examine consumption and consumer behavior as a phenomenon in order to understand the postmodern society. In addition to studies that approach today's society from sociological, anthropological and philosophical perspectives, consumer behavior is more important than ever in history in terms of economy. Especially understanding consumer behaviors and consumers has gained great importance especially with the demand-leading economy understanding and increasing competition. Because, considering the increasing competition conditions and production quantities, it has become important for businesses to understand and persuade consumers. As a result of these changes, at the point reached today, while 30,000 new consumer products are launched in the USA every year, 90% of them fail in competitive market conditions (Christensen, Cook & Hall, 2013: 85). It is noteworthy that the predictions of studies (Bauer, 1954) that evaluated this change as a marketing revolution in the 1950s, when consumption began to increase rapidly and the beginning period of the consumer society, were confirmed today. Since then, marketing has gradually increased its effectiveness in the field of economics. Today, the issue has become not to reach a product, but to reach the consumer. In this case, both theoretically and practically, understanding the consumer's behavior and developing research and strategies suitable for consumption patterns has become the basis of marketing. This determination also shows the importance of the subject of this study in the economic context.

In this study, the literature on the characteristics of modern and postmodern consumer behavior has been compared in order to understand postmodern consumer behavior more accurately. Throughout the study, while postmodern consumer behaviors express current consumption trends, modern consumer behaviors express consumer behaviors before the

postmodern period and fulfill the function of a catalyst that shows what has changed in consumer behavior today. Although it does not express the dominant consumer behavior patterns in today's society, it is of great importance to compare the consumer behavior patterns seen in previous periods with today as a method for understanding current trends. When evaluated in this context, this study should not be evaluated as a mere literature review. Although it is a literature review, it basically aims to understand today's consumer behavior. In this study, first of all, the conceptual framework was determined in order to understand the study correctly. Then, the literature on modern and postmodern consumer behavior was reviewed. In this process, the historical backgrounds of the modern and postmodern periods were also examined. In the discussion and conclusion part, the characteristics of the consumer behavior patterns of the two periods were determined and discussed in a comparative way.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In order to understand the theoretical studies correctly, it is necessary to specify the frameworks of the concepts used throughout the study. Because each concept can have different meanings in each scientific study (Tudor, 2013: 79-80). Definitions and conceptual assumptions of the concepts used throughout this study are as defined in this section unless otherwise stated.

In this study, the concepts of “postmodern” and post-modern” are used in different meanings. In this context, the concept of post-modern expresses an intellectual structure that is seen in practice and expresses the social structure that follows modern society (Bauman, 1988: 790). The concept of postmodern, on the other hand, means an abstract understanding of philosophy of science that emerged as a reaction to the disintegration of modernist approaches in scientific understanding, depending on the post-modernist changes in the social structure. When the difference between the concepts of postmodern and post-modern is examined, it is possible to say that postmodernism is a more definable concept than post-modernism (Parker, 1992: 8). The research subject of this study is post-modern consumer behavior. In other words, although the consumer behavior literature formed within the framework of postmodern science is reviewed, the main research subject of the study is the definition and comparison of what happens in practice.

The practical emergence of modern society is initiated with the Industrial Revolution, especially in terms of economic history (De Vries, 1994: 250). Although it is discussed in the literature whether Modernism as a social structure goes back to the Renaissance, in this study, the concept of Modern Society is expressed as the socio-economic structure that emerged after the Industrial Revolution. The concept of post-modern should be seen as a concept that emerged as a negation of Modernism (Featherstone, 2007: 3). When the historical literature is examined, the emergence of the post-modern society coincides with the 1960s (Bertens, 1995: 22). In this study, 1960s was accepted as the starting period of post-modern social structure. The fact that people began to be seen as a means of consumption capacity rather than production in this period (Bauman, 2000: 76) shows that post-modernism in the socio-economic sense started in this period. Finally, since the context of this study is not history, the emergence of practical phenomena in socio-economic terms is accepted as the beginning of that period in this study.

In addition to Modernism and Post-Modernism as the social structure seen in practice, it is necessary to mention the concepts of Modernism and Postmodernism in terms of philosophy of science. While Modernism as a scientific understanding expresses a positivist determinist structure with a rationalist ontology, Postmodernism expresses an understanding that adopts subjective epistemology and realist ontology focused on theory-practice harmony (Fleetwood, 2005: 214-215). The scientific relationship between Modernism and Postmodernism emerged as Postmodernism, which emerged as a reaction to Modernism, as in practice. When examined in

this context, Postmodernism as a scientific understanding should be seen as a conflict orientation originating from the German-French school that emerged as a reaction to Modernism (Rosenau, 1992: 12-13).

When the conceptual framework of this study on Postmodernism and Modernism is examined, the point that should not be ignored throughout the study is that Postmodernism emerged as a reaction or a negation of Modernism. This situation also explains why modern and post-modern consumer behaviors are studied comparatively. In addition, it should not be ignored that the phenomena expressed as post-modern throughout the study emerged as a reaction to the modern structure.

Since it constitutes the main context of this study, it is necessary to specify the framework of the concepts related to marketing and consumer behavior used throughout the study. First of all, the concept of "market" used throughout the study is defined as any virtual and physical environment where supply and demand with purchasing power meet, all components of the marketing mix exist, and purchases, product deliveries or purchase contracts are made (Imber, 2000: 342). In addition, although consumer roles are widely used in the marketing literature, such a distinction was not used in this study. Instead, the concept of consumer was used as a concept that means a person with a need and purchasing power (Mucuk, 2017: 70). For this reason, the concept of consumer is used as a general concept, unless otherwise stated. The definition of the consumer concept, on the other hand, requires the definition of the concepts of want and need.

In today's marketing literature, it is defined as deficiencies that create physiological and psychological tension when the concept of need is not met (Desmond, 2003: 147-148). Desires, on the other hand, are defined as the preferred tools of satisfying needs. In a more specific definition, desire is defined as the forms of needs embodied by culture and personality (Kotler et al., 1999:10). However, it should not be ignored that the literature reviewed in this study and the discussion were conducted in the context of want. Because, considering that needs are abstract and very basic things arising from people's motives (Fraser, 2008: 19), the subject discussed or researched in today's markets and consumer behaviors focuses on the concept of desire and want unless otherwise stated. This understanding of want and need is also valid in this study.

Finally, in the discussion and conclusion part of this study, it is seen that post-modern consumer behaviors are classified in a more numerous, transitive, and difficult to draw boundaries. The reason for this situation should be seen as a methodological result of postmodern science. In order to understand the origin of this difference, it is necessary to mention about the differences between modern and postmodern sciences. While modern science has a positivist, determinist and normative structure, the postmodern science adopts a realist approach in order to explain the practice more accurately (Fleetwood, 2005). In other words, postmodern science considers semiology and symbolic realities to understand practice (Hackley & Kitchen, 1999: 20). Such variables, on the other hand, cause ambiguities in the theory that tries to explain the practice. These ambiguities, on the other hand, cause discussions of untheorization of postmodern science (Devers, Nisangyi & Gamache, 2014: 249) and meaninglessness (Danermark, Ekström & Karlsson, 2002: 6) in terms of philosophy of science. However, these discussions in the philosophy of science were ignored in this study and the understanding of Lewin (1952: 110) regarding postmodern science, "A good theory is practice", was adopted.

3. MODERN AND POST-MODERN CONSUMPTION CHARACTERISTICS

3.1. Modern Consumption

As stated in the conceptual framework, in this study, the Modern Period begins with the Industrial Revolution, the characteristics of which are evident in market conditions. In this context, Modern Period consumer behavior is discussed between 1790-1850 (Mokyr, 1988). In this period, the period when consumption started to be discussed was the years 1815-1850 (Mokyr & Grada, 1988). Because, in order to observe consumption or consumerism in today's sense, investments must be made for the increase in production between 1790 and 1815. However, this time, with the agricultural crisis in the 1840s, the change in consumer behavior triggered by the Industrial Revolution was delayed again (Vanhaute, Paping & O Grada, 2006: 2). With the overcoming of this crisis and the increase in production, it can be mentioned that a social class emerged after 1850, where consumption started, although not as much as today. Although there was an increase in consumption in this period, it can be determined that the form of consumption is different from today. These differences form the basis for the classification of modern and post-modern consumer behavior.

First of all, it should be noted that problems such as the increasing need for raw materials in the foundations of the Modern Period culture, the high investment financing required to realize the Industrial Revolution, and technical innovation were decisive in the socio-economic structure of that period (Pollard, 1958: 215). Similarly, supply was of great importance in economic theory and history until this period, and economic phenomenon were discussed on the axis of supply (Gilboy, 2013: 621). For this reason, it is understood that the solution process of these problems, which provided an important transformation for that period, was also effective in the economic and non-economic structure of the society. Especially in a period when there are problems such as investment, financing and raw materials, the fact that consumers are more dependent on rational consumption should also be evaluated in this context. Therefore, it is concluded that modern consumption has more functional consumption decision and behavior characteristics. Focusing on the pure functionality of products shows that consumption is conformist in the Modern Period, while a rational consumption approach shows that there is planned consumption (Thomas, 1997: 57).

Undoubtedly, the individuals of the society who made a radical revolution in the production methods will also consider the society before individualism. As a matter of fact, the results of this inference are also seen in the Modern Period. In other words, it is necessary to examine the modern consumer on the basis of socialist approaches, not individualistic ones. Because the early Modern Period consumer exists in a production-oriented social structure. In addition, it has undertaken the mission of providing the conditions that will reveal the market economy in today's sense (Polanyi, 2017: 85). It should be considered natural for an individual who consumes under these conditions to consume for the society at that time. However, this socialist approach should not be evaluated in the context of today's consumer seeing himself as a means of positioning himself in society, but in the context of consumption serving the society. A consumption that serves the society shows that the social benefit is primarily aimed. This understanding of benefit resulted in a linear structure and homogeneity of the superficial consumer behavior functions made at that time. For example, the functions of Hicks and Marshall, who model the Modern Period consumer behaviors, are based on budget-functional utility analysis in a linear structure (Deaton & Muellbauer, 1986: 43). Similarly, there are studies that define the consumption of the Modern Period in sociological and philosophical terms as puritanical consumption (Featherstone, 2007: 21).

In order to understand the structure of consumer behavior in the Modern Period, the marketing policies applied in that period should also be examined. However, first of all, it should be noted that there are no marketing practices in today's sense, especially in early modern

consumption. Because at that time, a supply-leading economic system dominated. One of the natural consequences of an economy being supply-leading is that the economic research of that period was also conducted in supply-side contexts. For this reason, when the Modern Period economics research are examined, it is seen that these research investigate issues such as ethical production, work-oriented structure and more production (Ransome, 2005: 159). For this reason, studies on Modern Period consumer behavior are also limited. Because in a supply-leading economy, the issue for all economic actors is production and there is less production than demand. Therefore, it should be considered natural that there are fewer consumer behavior studies in the context of marketing in a supply-leading economy. When evaluated in this context, the consumer behavior studies of that period were mostly researched by economists in a linear structure in the context of budget-functional benefit.

With the Industrial Revolution and the maturation of mass production methods, the demand-leading economy has begun to be seen as a result of the supply that can offer more output than the demand in quantity. The breaking point of this change is the Great Depression (1929) and the Keynesian economy that emerged as a solution to that crisis. According to the approach, households' demands for money should be directed to products by creating purchasing power (Meltzer, 1976: 4161. As a matter of fact, the existence of marketing in today's sense started to be discussed with this period because now the period when suppliers should convince consumers and consumers need to provide purchasing power has begun.

The period between the beginning of the implementation of Keynesian economics and the period until the 1960s is accepted as the early period of Post-Modern consumption. With the consumer society structure that started in the 1960s, consumption has become the main research focus of social sciences (Miller, 1987; Glennie & Thrift, 1992: 423). In other words, the discussion of production in the Modern Period has left its place to the discussion of consumption in the Post-Modern Period (Lash, 1990: 11; Bertens, 1995: 140).

3.2. Post-Modern Consumption

The beginning of the Post-Modern Period is shown in the literature as the 1940s (Williams, 1989). However, it would be more accurate to describe this process as the end of World War II. Because in an environment where the world war took place, it is not possible to talk about consumerism in today's sense. For this reason, it is necessary to accept that the foundations of post-modern consumption emerged after the 1940s and became operational in the 1960s.

Although there is change in many aspects, one of the most important characteristics of the Post-Modern Period is shown as consumption. Defining this change in a striking way, Baudrillard defines today's cities as places where there is unlimited promotion for their needs (Baudrillard, 1998: 65). Veblen, on the other hand, shows consumption as the most important element of living standards in the city (Veblen, 1994: 55). These phrases, which show that sociologists who examine urban life sociologically, place consumption at the center of urban sociology, clearly show the important place of consumption in today's society. Similarly, Kvale (2003) defines the social structure as a structure that focuses on religion from science and from science to consumption today. However, as can be seen in the literature review of the Modern Period, consumption did not fulfill such an important function in that period. For this reason, there are not as detailed studies on modern consumption as today. This fundamental change results in modernity inevitably staying in the past (past) and leaving its place to post-modernism (Hebdige, 1986: 79). With this radical change, the concept of marketing has started to penetrate all layers of society and lifestyles (Morgan, 1996: 19).

The science of marketing, which examines the consumption phenomenon in terms of both businesses and consumers, focused on consumer behaviors in this period and determined these characteristics by conducting detailed research to reveal the characteristics of consumption decisions and behaviors. According to the determinations of Thomas (1997: 56-57), the post-modern consumer has the characteristics of active, pleasure-seeking, shopping-oriented, communicative, and activist behavior. As a natural consequence of consumption becoming social, another feature of post-modern consumption is that consumption takes a symbolic form and brands fulfill the function of image contractors (Odabaşı, 2004: 58).

According to a different finding of Odabaşı (2004: 64), the act of consumption itself has become a product of experience in post-modern society. When Odabaşı's inference is evaluated together with the communicative feature identified by Thomas, it is understood that the existence of symbolic consumption is used by consumers as a means of communication (Featherstone, 1987: 57; Grubb & Grathwohl, 1967: 24).

Discussing that post-modern consumption and society should be evaluated together, Firat and Vankatesh (1993) define post-modern consumption with the characteristics of hyper-reality, fragmentation, reversal of production and consumption, decentered subject, and paradoxical juxtaposition of opposites. In addition to these features, Van Raaij (1993) identified the features of pluralism and acceptance of differences as a dominant approach. When the post-modern consumer characteristics are examined, it is understood that today's consumption should be examined on a social basis. This social context is consumers' consumption in order to position themselves in the society they live in and to create their social identity (Hamouda, 2015: 612). This shows that the individual acts as a consumer in society (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1992; Thompson, 2002). This role, on the other hand, enables individuals to form their social identity, while simultaneously fulfilling their purpose and self-recognition function (Firat, Dholakia & Venkatesh, 1995).

Finally, greed, asocial individualism and meta-orientation have been added to post-modern consumer behavior features by different studies (Ackerman, 1997: 652; Gabbott, 2008: 110; Featherstone, 2007: 81). The greed feature shows the consumers' desire to consume continuously and unlimitedly. This situation causes the Post-Modern Age to be called the age of mass consumption (Glickman, 2012: 411). The concept of asocial individualism does not express an individual who is cut off from society, but a consumer ontology that rejects direct consumption advice as a social pressure (Karabıyık, 2020: 75-76). In fact, this situation is also referred to as the “Generation Me” in the psychology literature (Twenge, 2006). Meta orientation, on the other hand, refers to the demand of consumers to get more information about products and adapt them to their lives. The emergence of experiential marketing in today's marketing world, and beyond that, the fact that consumption as a whole has become an experience is a result of meta orientation (Skandalis, Byrom & Banister, 2019: 43).

Post-modern consumer behavior literature shows that consumption today has a very complex structure. While this structure creates the society, it both enables individuals to position themselves in that society and also functions as a means of self-recognition of individuals. For this reason, contrary to the simplicity of modern consumption, post-modern consumption has many dimensions. These dimensions are examined in the discussion and conclusion part within the scope of the purpose of this study.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Before the discussion, the importance and methodology of this study should be mentioned. As seen in the literature review, it is a necessity to understand the consumption phenomenon to understand today's society. In addition to this situation, considering the existence

of the demand-leading economy, consumer behavior should be primarily examined. So much so that today, even in the statements made after the terrorist attacks, consumption is mentioned. For example, after the September 11 attacks, Tony Blair called the people to shop (Clarke, 2003: 1). However, the absence of a school and tradition in consumer behavior, which is such a deep-rooted sociological factor, is an important deficiency in understanding both theory and practice (McCracken, 1987: 139). This study is important in terms of eliminating this deficiency in the literature. In addition, it is seen that modern consumption has not been studied sufficiently in the literature and the characteristics that will systematize the consumption of the Modern Period have not been compiled. Although consumption in the Modern Period did not form the center of the social structure, it is important today to make comparative studies to understand post-modern consumption. Because post-modern consumption and modern consumption are two subjects that interact with each other and therefore need to be examined comparatively (Therborn, 2003). In other words, in order to see the big picture in post-modern consumption, it is necessary to understand the phenomenon of modern consumption in a comparative way (Canavan, 2021: 252). This study is important because it is a study that examines modern consumption and compiles its characteristics.

The modern and post-modern consumer behavior characteristics obtained from the literature review in this study are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Comparative Characteristics of the Modern and Post-Modern Consumption

Modern Consumption	Post-Modern Consumption
Functional Consumption	Symbolic Consumption
	Pleasure Seeker
	Meta Orientation
	Experiencer
	Communicator
Socialist Consumption	Activist
	Individualistic Consumption
	Asocial Individualism
	Acceptance of Differences
	Identity Creator
Sustainable Economy	Decentred Subject
	Paradoxical Juxtaposition of Opposites
	Sustainable Consumption
Rational Consumption	Reversal of Production and Consumption
	Greed
Supply-Leading Economy	Hyperreality
	Shopping-Focused Behavior
	Hedonic Consumption
	Impulse Purchase
	Demand-Leading Economy

In order to properly understand the modern and post-modern consumer characteristics, it is necessary to examine each class separately in Table 1.

Functional Consumption: In modern consumption, where consumption is not a social self-forming style, consumption takes place on a functional basis. In this period, the sub-dimensions of functional modern consumption are conformist and utilitarian consumption. Today, however, consumption has become the key to individuals' self-creation and even the process of self-recognition. Today, the key features of post-modern consumption are symbolic consumption, pleasure seeking, meta orientation, experiential consuming, communicativeness and activism. It is a natural result that research on consumer behavior is limited in the Modern Period, where consumption is reduced to functionality. The integration of consumption with social life in the Post-Modern Period required postmodern science to examine the consumption phenomenon in many dimensions. As a result of this theoretical and practical change, sociological, psychological, and anthropological studies examining the Post-Modern Period have also started to focus on consumption and consumer behavior (Elliot, 1992: 112). Undoubtedly, the fact that consumers have abandoned functional consumption and turned to symbolic consumption has radically changed the science of marketing. This change, on the other hand, was created in theory with the study of Kotler in 1967, and since then, marketing has undergone a rapid change and gaining importance (Hakansson, Harrison & Waluszewski, 2004: 1). One of the important examples examining this change from a practical point of view was brought to the literature by van Raaij. According to Van Raaij (1993: 551-558), a dinner for the modern consumer is only a service to satisfy the hunger need. However, for the post-modern consumer, it is an experiential service that shows his social position and includes some rituals. Undoubtedly, it is not possible to apply the same marketing strategy to two different consumers who demand the same product from these two different perspectives. As a result of these changes, the concept of "placebo effect" was created in postmodern marketing. According to this approach, the post-modern consumer does not only taste the products while consuming food. Post-modern consumers also get a taste of the consumed brand. According to experimental research, post-modern consumers not only taste the taste of the beverage, but also the value, price, and social status of that brand (Shiv, Carmon & Ariely, 2005: 383-393; Wright, Hernandez & Sundar et al., 2013: 197-198). In fact, the features of meta orientation and experiential consuming should be seen as a result of consumption breaking away from functionality. Because the modern consumer, who assumes products only as a means of fulfilling needs, will not have the goal of meta orientation or experiential consuming. The post-modern consumers, on the other hand, develops an abstract relationship with the products and brands that make up their own image, since they consume on a social basis, and establish a relationship with the society by using this relationship as a language.

Socialist Consumption: Modern consumption has a more socialist structure. In fact, post-modern consumption is also in a socialist structure. However, the collectivism of the modern and post-modern consumer takes different forms. The modern consumers consume by considering the benefit of the society in which they live. However, as seen in Table 1, the socialist structure of the post-modern consumer consumes in the sub-dimensions of identity creation and relationship development with society. This resulted in the consumption of the Post-Modern Period being "lifestyle consumption" (Shields, 1992: 99). Asocial individualism, identity creator and decentered subject, which is one of the sub-dimensions of post-modern consumption, means that the post-modern consumer does not accept direct consumption suggestions from the society. Acceptance of differences, on the other hand, similarly shows the existence of the understanding that each individual should be accepted with their differences. This understanding, on the other hand, shows the connection of individuals who communicate with the society through consumption in order to be a society with the paradoxical juxtaposition of opposites.

Sustainable Economy: Economic debates of the Modern Period focus on the sustainability of the economy. Issues such as the sustainability of production and adequate resource supply are specifically discussed. However, the debate in the consumption economy of the Post-Modern Period is sustainable consumption. Because in this period, consumption must be increased in a sustainable way for the continuous growth of the economies. This process, on the other hand, has caused consumption to become a lifestyle, as seen in the first two characteristics. Also in this period, specific topics such as sustainable consumer behavior have become the subject of research (Trudel, 2019). However, the sustainability of consumption causes environmental problems today and initiates discussions on making the environment sustainable with consumption (Cramer, Yohe & Auffhammer, et al., 2014). Although the sustainability of the environment is also discussed in the modern economy, while the sustainable environment was discussed in the context of production at that time, it is discussed in the context of consumption in the Post-Modern Period. Since the structure created in the Post-Modern Period instead of the functional consumption and socialist consumptions of modern consumption has made consumption a lifestyle, the markets offer green marketing and green products and market this problem by turning it into a lifestyle. One of the striking examples in this regard is the economization of bohemia, which Alain de Botton offers as a solution proposal in his Status Anxiety approach. Botton suggests bohemianism to reduce consumption (Botton, 2020). Markets, on the other hand, commodify this philosophy with products such as bohemian clothing and bohemian holiday concepts. Moreover, since it fits with the lifestyle of consumers who demand meta orientation, it is easier for these products to be promoted in the markets. Even modern consumer products are commodified and remarketed today (Outka, 2009).

Rational Consumption: Economic trends in the modern consumption period also assumed that individuals were rational. In this context, in the modern economy period, the rational individual is ontologically defined as the person who makes the right decision with the knowledge of they have (Sutherland, 2013: 2). However, the structure that has become a consumer society with the effect of post-modernism has begun to find no response in rational theory. Thus, although the rationalist economic understanding was tried to be maintained in a normative way (Thaler, 1980: 39), the theory-practice incompatibility caused a scientific crisis and thus theories were formed within the framework of irrational human ontology. The sub-dimensions of irrational consumption seen in the Post-Modern Period are shopping-focused behavior, hedonic consumption, and impulse purchase. These sub-dimensions are also meaningful as consumption becomes a lifestyle. Because in modern consumption where consumption is realized in a functional way, it is not possible for consumers to make impulse purchase and hedonic consumption. However, when consumption becomes a lifestyle, consumers get pleasure from consumption itself. In addition, functional consumption is need-oriented. Moving away from functionality in post-modern consumption triggers unplanned shopping. This causes the impulse purchase sub-dimension.

Supply-Leading Economy: The distinction between supply-leading economy and demand-leading economy actually constitutes the macroeconomic reflections of modern and post-modern consumer behavior. Because the demand-leading of an economy forces the system to increase the demand continuously. As a matter of fact, the reason why marketing gained importance both theoretically and practically in this period is this change in macroeconomic understanding.

As a result, the main leading force of the economic system in the Post-Modern Period is consumption. Although it is seen as a supply-leading economy and a demand-leading economy in theory, in practice this change is a consumption-related issue. In other words, in order to understand the post-modern economic system, it is necessary to understand marketing. The demand-leading economy requires understanding consumer decisions and behaviors in the field of marketing. Considering that post-modernism emerged as a reaction to modernism, it becomes

important to understand consumer behavior by comparing modern and post-modern. In this study, modern and post-modern consumer behaviors were examined comparatively, and their characteristic differences were determined.

The limitation of this study is that the discussion is conducted in the context of marketing. Undoubtedly, there are many components of the rooted factors that change the social structure. In this study, these factors are discussed in the context of marketing and non-economic factors such as communication technologies are ignored. These non-economic factors constitute the limitation of this study. However, the fact that the change process took place in the context of economy, marketing and consumption does not invalidate this study. The studies research the transition from the Modern Period to the Post-Modern Period in the context of other factors constitute the recommendations of this study.

Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Beyanı

Bu çalışma bilimsel araştırma ve yayın etiği kurallarına uygun olarak hazırlanmıştır.

Yazarların Makaleye Katkı Oranları

Yazar 1'in makaleye katkısı %60, Yazar 2'nin makaleye katkısı %40'tır.

Çıkar Beyanı

Yazarlar açısından ya da üçüncü taraflar açısından çalışmadan kaynaklı çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, F. (1997). Consumed in theory: alternative perspectives on the economics of consumption. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 31(3), 651-664.
- Baudrillard, J. (1998). *The consumer society: myths and structures*. London: Sage.
- Bauer, P.T. (1954). The economics of marketing reform. *Journal of Political Economy*, 62(3), 210-235.
- Bauman, Z. (1988). Sociology and postmodernity. *The Sociological Review*, 36(4), 790-813.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bertens, H. (1995). *The idea of the postmodern*. London: Routledge.
- Botton, A.d. (2020). *Statü endişesi*. İstanbul: Sel Yayınları.
- Canavan, B. (2021). Post-postmodern consumer authenticity, shantay you stay or sashay away? a netnography of rupaul's drag race fans. *Marketing Theory*, 21(2), 251-276.
- Christensen, C.M., Cook, S. & Hall, T. (2013). Yanlış pazarlama uygulaması. *Pazarlamayı Yeniden Keşfetmek (pp. 85-112)*. Harvard Business Review, İstanbul: MESS Yayınları.
- Clarke, D.B. (2003). *The consumer society and the postmodern city*. London: Routledge.
- Cramer, W., Yohe, G. W., Auffhammer, M., Huggel, C., Molau, U., da Silva Dias, M. A. F & Tibig, L. (2014). Detection and attribution of observed impacts. In C. B. Field, V. R. Barros, D. J. Dokken, K. J. Mach, M. D. Mastrandrea, T. E. Bilir, L. L. White (Eds.), *Climate change 2014: impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability. part a: global and sectoral aspects. contribution of working group ii to the fifth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change* (pp. 979-1037). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Danermark, B., Ekström, M. & Karlsson, J.C. (2002). *Explaining society: an introduction to critical realism in the social sciences. critical realism: interventions*. London: Routledge.
- De Vries, J. (1994). The industrial revolution and the industrious revolution. *The Journal of Economic History*, 54(2), 249-270.
- Deaton, A. & Muellbauer, J. (1986). *Economics and consumer behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Desmond, J. (2003). *Consumer behaviour*. London: Palgrave.
- Devers, C.E., Nisangyi, V.F. & Gamache, D.L. (2014). Editor's comments: on the future of publishing management theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(3), 245-249.
- Elliot, R. (1999). Symbolic meaning and postmodern consumer culture. D. Brownlie, M. Saren, R. Wensley & R. Whittington (Eds.), *Rethinking marketing towards critical marketing accountings* (pp. 112-125). London: Sage Publications.
- Featherstone, M. (1987). Lifestyle and consumer culture. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 4: 55-70.
- Featherstone, M. (2007). *Consumer culture and postmodernism* (2nd Ed). London: Sage Publications.
- Firat, A. F. & Venkatesh, A. (1993). Postmodernity: the age of marketing. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 10, 227-249.
- Firat, A.F., Dholakia, N. & Venkatesh, A. (1995). Marketing in postmodern world. *European Journal of Marketing*, 29, 40-56.
- Fleetwood, S. (2005). Ontology in organization and management studies: a critical realist perspective. *Organization*, 12(2), 197-222.
- Fraser, I. (2008). *Hegel ve Marx: ihtiyaç kavramı*. Ankara: Dost Yayınları.
- Gabbott, M. (2008). Consumer behaviour. In M.J. Baker & S.J. Hart (Eds.), *The marketing book* (pp. 109-120). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Gilboy, E. W. (2017). Demand as a factor in the industrial revolution. In R.M. Hartwell (Ed.), *The causes of the industrial revolution in England* (pp. 121-138). New York: Routledge.
- Glennie, P.D. & Thrift, N.J. (1992). Modernity, urbanism, and modern consumption. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 10(4), 423-443.

- Glickman, L.B. (2012). Consumer activism, consumer regimes, and the consumer movement: rethinking the history of consumer politics in the United States. In F. Trentmann (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of the history of consumption* (pp. 399-447). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Grubb, E.L. & Grathwohl, H.L. (1967). Consumer self-concept, symbolism, and market behavior: a theoretical approach. *Journal of Marketing*, 31(4): 22-27.
- Hackley, C. E. & Kitchen, P.J. (1999). Ethical perspectives on the postmodern communications leviathan. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 20, 15-26.
- Hakansson, H., Harrison, D. & Waluszewski, A. (2004). *Rethinking marketing: developing a new understanding of markets*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hamouda M. (2015) The postmodern consumer: an identity constructor?. In L. Robinson (Ed.), *Marketing dynamism & sustainability: things change, things stay the same.... developments in marketing science: proceedings of the academy of marketing science* (pp. 612-620). New Orleans: Springer Cham.
- Hebdige, D. (1986). Postmodernism and 'the other side'. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 10(2), 78-98.
- Hirschman, E. C. & Holbrook, M. B. (1992). *Postmodern consumer research*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Imber, J. (2000). *Dictionary of marketing terms* (3rd Ed). New York: Barron's.
- Karabiyik, H.Ç. (2020). *Pazarlamaya psikolojik bir yaklaşım: merchandising uygulamalarını çıpalama teorisi bağlamında inceleyen deneysel bir araştırma*. Doctoral Thesis, Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Konya.
- Khan, M. (2006). *Consumer behaviour and advertising management*. New Delhi: New Age International.
- Khan, M.R. (2021). Relationship between cultural anthropology and cultural contexts of consumer behavior: a conceptual model. *International Journal of Art and Humanities*, 1(1), 1-7.
- Kotler, P., Armstrong, G., Saunders, J. & Wong, V. (1999). *Principles of marketing* (2nd European Edition). New Jersey: Prentice Hall Europe.
- Kvale, S. (2003). The church, the factory and the market: scenarios for psychology in a postmodern age. *Theory & Psychology*, 13(5): 579-603.
- Lash, S. (1990). *Sociology of postmodernism*. New York: Routledge.
- Lewin, K. (1952). *Field theory in social science: selected theoretical papers by Kurt Lewin*. London: Tavistock.
- McCracken, G. (1987). The history of consumption: a literature review and consumer guide. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 10, 139-166.
- Meltzer, A.H. (1976). Monetary and other explanations of the start of the great depression. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2(4), 455-471.
- Miller, D. (1987). *Material culture and mass consumption*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Mokyr, J. (1988). Is there still life in the pessimist case? Consumption during the Industrial revolution, 1790-1850. *The Journal of Economic History*, 48(1), 69-92.
- Mokyr, J. & Ó Gráda, C. (1988) 'Poor and getting poorer? Irish living standards before the Famine'. *Economic History Review*, 41, 209-235.
- Morais, R.J. (2022). Toward a pedagogy for consumer anthropology: method, theory, marketing. *Teaching Antropology*, 11(2), 37-47.
- Morgan, R.E. (1996). Conceptual foundations of marketing and marketing theory. *Management Decision*, 34(10): 19-26.
- Mucuk, İ. (2017). *Pazarlama ilkeleri* (21th ed). İstanbul: Türkmen Kitabevi.
- Odabaşı, Y. (2004). *Postmodern pazarlama*, İstanbul: MediaCat.
- Outka, E. (2009). *Consuming traditions: modernity, modernism, and the commodified authentic*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Parker, M. (1992). Post-modern organizations or postmodern organization theory?. *Organization Studies*, 13(1), 1-17.
- Polanyi, K. (2017). *Büyük dönüşüm: çağımızın siyasi ve ekonomik kökenleri*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Pollard, S. (1958). Investment, consumption and the industrial revolution. *The Economic History Review*, 11(2), 215-226.

- Ransome, P. (2005). *Work, consumption and culture: affluence and social change in the twenty-first century*. London: Sage Publications.
- Rosenau, P.M. (1992). *Post-modernism and the social sciences*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Sherry Jr., J.F. (1987). Marketing and consumer behavior: windows of opportunity for anthropology. *Journal of the Steward Anthropological Society*, 16(1&2), 60-95.
- Shields, R. (1992). The individual, consumption cultures and the fate of community. In R. Shields (Ed.), *Lifestyle shopping: the subject of consumption* (pp. 99-114). London: Routledge.
- Shiv, B., Carmon, Z. & Ariely, D. (2005). Placebo effects of marketing actions: consumers may get what they pay for. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 42(4), 383-393.
- Skandalis, A., Byrom, J. & Banister, E. (2019). Experiential marketing and the changing nature of extraordinary experiences in post-modern consumer culture. *Journal of Business Research*, 97, 43-50.
- Sutherland, S. (2013). *Irrationality: The enemy within*. London: Printer&Martin Ltd.
- Szmigin, I. (2003). *Understanding the consumer*. London: Sage Publications.
- Thaler, R. (1980). Toward a positive theory of consumer choice. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 1(1), 39-60.
- Therborn, G. (2003). Entangled modernities. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 6(3), 293–305.
- Thomas, M.J. (1997). Consumer market research: does it have validity? Some modern thoughts. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 15(2), 54-59.
- Thompson, C. I. (2002). A re-inquiry on re-inquiries: a postmodern proposal for a critical-reflexive approach. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29, 142-145.
- Trudel, R. (2019). Sustainable consumer behavior. *Consumer Psychology Review*, 2(1), 85-96.
- Tudor, A. (2013). *Beyond empiricism: philosophy of science in sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Twenge, J.M. (2006). *Generation me*. New York: Free Press.
- Van Raaij, W.F. (1993). Postmodern consumption. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 14, 541-563.
- Vanhaute, E., Paping, R. & Cormac, O.G. (2006). The european subsistence crisis of 1845-1850: A comparative perspective, ucd centre for economic research working paper.
- Veblen, T. (1994). *The theory of the leisure class: an economic study in the evolution of institutions*. New York: Dover.
- Vlasova, T., Pshinko, O. & Vlasova, O. (2021). Postmodern conflictology: Issues of theory and approaches to methodology. *Грани*, 24(2), 31-40.
- Wanke, M. (2009). *Social psychology of consumer behavior*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Williams, R. (1989) When was modernism?. *New Left Review*, 175(1): 48–53.
- Wright, S.A., Hernandez, J.M.d.C. Sundar, A., Dinsmore, J. & Kardes, F.R. (2013). If it tastes bad it must be good: consumer naive theories and the marketing placebo effect. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 30(2), 197-198.