

Marketing's Changing Role: Expanding or Contracting?

Can marketing survive the constant state of change occurring in the marketplace?

IT IS evident in the literature that current circumstances are changing the role of marketing—what marketing does and in whose interest it does it. The portents are that the change may well be radical. A critical question thus is raised: Is the role expanding or contracting as marketing changes and, if contracting, what can be done to preserve the current strengths of that role?

The literature on marketing's role has, for the past five years, been marked by change, contradiction, and confusion—in short, by all of the problems attending a concept in transition. The shifting and often conflicting themes in the literature have reflected the state of transition through which the concept is passing and an uncertainty on the part of marketing experts about which future course the change will take. The leading authors on the subject have differed both among themselves and even, in successive writings, with themselves as to which course of change the role of marketing should or will follow. Yet these authors seem generally to agree that the role of marketing must and will change—in fact, that it is changing.

Review of Current Literature on the Role of Marketing

At one extreme, some authors have continued to advocate that marketing must stimulate massive consumption. At least one even recommended that new consumption standards be adopted to recognize that extravagant demands and hedonistic desires are normal¹ to, and justified by, an affluent society.¹ At the other extreme,

1. William Lazer, "Marketing's Changing Social Relationships," *JOURNAL OF MARKETING*, Vol. 33 (January 1969), pp. 3-9.

Journal of Marketing, Vol. 39 (April 1975), pp. 58-66.

many authors have subsequently insisted that marketing must become "societal" or socially conscious and, therefore, should champion vital social issues and beneficial public services.²

On another issue, some of these authors have urged that marketing, having succeeded so well in selling the products of the firm, should now extend that same expertise to organizations other than the firm for the "marketing" of their services.³ Most recently, many of these same authors are arguing that, in view of the limitations pressing on the supply of the firm's products, marketing should concentrate on serving in a new and different role, keyed to excess demand rather than excess supply.⁴

Views in 1969

In an article published in 1969, Lazer deduced that from the perspective of a marketing concept "geared to interpersonal and social development, one of marketing's roles may be to encourage increasing expenditures by consumers of dollars and time to develop themselves socially, intellectually, and morally." This in itself seems a worthy

2. Leslie M. Dawson, "Marketing Science in the Age of Aquarius," *JOURNAL OF MARKETING*, Vol. 35 (July 1971), pp. 66-72; Lawrence P. Feldman, "Societal Adaptation: A New Challenge for Marketing," *JOURNAL OF MARKETING*, Vol. 35 (July 1971), pp. 54-60; and Phillip Kotler and Gerald Zaltman, "Social Marketing: An Approach to Planned Social Change," *JOURNAL OF MARKETING*, Vol. 35 (July 1971), pp. 3-12.

3. Feldman, same reference as footnote 2; and Philip Kotler and Sidney J. Levy, "Broadening the Concept of Marketing," *JOURNAL OF MARKETING*, Vol. 33 (January 1969), pp. 10-15.

4. "The Squeeze on Product Mix," including comments by Richard W. Hansen, Paul Gallagher, and Forrest Price, *Business Week*, January 5, 1974, pp. 50-55. See also, Phillip Kotler and Sidney J. Levy, "Demarketing, Yes, Demarketing," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 49, December 1971, pp. 74-80.

deduction, but Lazer went on to recommend that "new consumption standards should be established, including the acceptance of self-indulgence, of luxurious surroundings, and of nonutilitarian products."⁵ In another article published that same year, Kotler and Levy predicted the extension of the role of marketing beyond business to other organizations—such as political parties, professional associations, charities, universities, and government agencies—to market the persons, organizations, and ideas that these organizations might wish to promote.⁶ Luck disagreed with this broadening of marketing's role, which led Kotler and Levy to publish a rejoinder reinforcing their broadening concept.⁷

Views by 1971

By 1971, in a spate of articles on the role of marketing, the proponents of change had modified their attitudes to reflect their greater awareness of the important social issues of the times. Kelley foretold that "environmental deterioration is the social issue which will probably receive the greatest amount of business involvement" and that "business responsibilities toward improving the environment will become more important."⁸ Dawson predicted that "during the 1970's there will be increasing attention to: 'Should it be sold? Is it worth its cost to society?'" despite the fact that "marketing may feel more comfortable in focusing on the question, 'Can it be sold?'"⁹ Weiss foresaw increasing regulation of marketing in the 1970s, a basic change to "what is sold, not how much," the abandonment of "a style of economy marked by profligate production, consumption and waste for an economy marked by rationalized production and recycling." He also predicted that services would "mushroom."¹⁰ Feldman similarly forecast the

trend "away from the purchase of material goods and toward the consumption of services" and the preeminence of "societal considerations . . . in the purchasing decision."¹¹ He also suggested that "the knowledge of the marketing of physical products can be applied to the marketing of such services as waste disposal and public transportation." Kotler and Zaltman, in a related vein, envisioned an extension of marketing principles and procedures to "social marketing . . . the design, implementation, and control of programs calculated to influence the acceptability of social ideas."¹² In addition, Kotler and Levy subsequently originated the concept and coined the term *creative demarketing* as "that aspect of marketing that deals with discouraging customers in general or a certain class of customers in particular on either a temporary or a permanent basis."¹³

Therefore, by 1972 the main themes had become the following:

- Social conscience, generally expressed as a concern for environmental restoration and preservation¹⁴
- Rationalized marketing, typified by the questions "Should it be sold?" and "What will it cost society?"¹⁵
- Marketing service in the public interest to influence the acceptance of critical social ideas and of beneficial public utilities¹⁶
- The genesis of the idea that among marketing's prominent roles should be to "regulate the shape and level of demand"¹⁷

It is interesting to note the marked differences between the bold ideas of 1969 and the more conservative and chastened ideas of 1971. Whereas in 1969 such ideas as the extravagant stimulation of consumption and the broadening of the concept of marketing "to all organizations" were being advocated,¹⁸ in 1971 the central ideas were the ultimate benefit to society of what was sold and

Growth-Mania to Shrinkmanship," *Advertising Age*, February 1, 1971, p. 35.

11. Feldman, same reference as footnote 2.
12. Kotler and Zaltman, same reference as footnote 2.
13. Kotler and Levy, same reference as footnote 4.
14. Feldman, same reference as footnote 2; and same references as footnote 8 and footnote 10.
15. Dawson, same reference as footnote 2; and same reference as footnote 10.
16. Feldman, same reference as footnote 2; and Kotler and Zaltman, same reference as footnote 2.
17. Kotler and Levy, same reference as footnote 4.
18. Kotler and Levy, same reference as footnote 3; and same reference as footnote 1.

5. Same reference as footnote 1.

6. Kotler and Levy, same reference as footnote 3.

7. David J. Luck, "Broadening the Concept of Marketing—Too Far," *JOURNAL OF MARKETING*, Vol. 33 (July 1969), pp. 53–55; and Philip Kotler and Sidney J. Levy, "A New Form of Marketing Myopia: Rejoinder to Professor Luck," *JOURNAL OF MARKETING*, Vol. 33 (July 1969), pp. 55–57.

8. Eugene J. Kelley, "Marketing's Changing Social/Environmental Role," *JOURNAL OF MARKETING*, Vol. 35 (July 1971), pp. 1–2.

9. Dawson, same reference as footnote 2.

10. E. B. Weiss, "The Coming Change in Marketing: From

* ABOUT THE AUTHORS.

F. Kelly Shuptrine is assistant professor of marketing and Frank A. Osmanski is a doctoral candidate in marketing in the College of Business Administration, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

marketing's new responsibility to sell less in some circumstances rather than more.¹⁹

Views in 1973-74

During 1973 and 1974, the central propositions became even more conservative. Some of the principal ideas advanced during this period were: the efficient use of resources in production;²⁰ the management of demand to keep it within the bounds of limited supply;²¹ improved product management to eliminate frivolity and waste in production;²² and again, as had been foreseen in earlier years, the social advantages of increasing the proportion of services over products as the output of industry.²³

Summary of the 1969-74 Period

It is significant to note the contrasts in the various views through the five years since 1969:

- Apply marketing principles to social issues versus apply societal considerations to marketing
- Broaden the concept of marketing to apply to all organizations versus modify it to discourage customers of the firm from buying too much
- Justify and stimulate unbounded consumption versus use resources rationally, with efficient production and responsible and frugal consumption

Table 1 summarizes the various ideas and emphases by these periods and by their chief authors. It is apparent that the positions of these experts on the role of marketing have been changing substantially, have been somewhat contradictory, and have included a degree of confusion. Indeed, the antitheses in these views over the five-year period can be summarized in terms of three major dichotomies: (1) expand the role of marketing or modify it within its present scope; (2) sell as much as possible or sell only what is beneficial to society; and (3) stimulate and respond to every desire of the consumer or regulate and moderate demand more nearly to match supply.

19. Feldman, same reference as footnote 2; and Kotler and Levy, same reference as footnote 4.

20. George Fisk, "Criteria for a Theory of Responsible Consumption," *JOURNAL OF MARKETING*, Vol. 37 (April 1973), pp. 24-31.

21. "The Squeeze on Product Mix," same reference as footnote 4.

22. "The Squeeze on Product Mix," same reference as footnote 4.

23. Same reference as footnote 20.

Stages in the Evolution of Marketing's Role

Although it is not yet clear what the nature of the forthcoming changes in marketing's role will be, it is quite clear that change is in process. Probably the nearest approach that can be made to describing the change now in process is to summarize comparatively the essentials of the role of marketing at three different stages in its evolution: pre-1960, 1960-1970, and post-1970. Such a summary and comparison is outlined in Table 2, which shows how the focus of marketing has proceeded through the three primary economic agents: entrepreneurs (i.e., producers), consumers, and resource owners.²⁴

That the current change, the shift from a focus on consumers to a focus on resources, will be radical is epitomized in Weiss's prophecy that marketing innovations in the 1970s and 1980s "will reshape it more dramatically" than did "the totality of marketing's evolution over the last 50 years."²⁵ Marketing's innovations will now assume revolutionary dimensions and pace.

Marketing's role has survived radical change before. In the 1950s marketing experienced the complete reversal of its orientation. Until that time the role of marketing had been "selling hard" to the affluent and impressionable consumer the self-styled products of the firm.²⁶ Thereafter it began responding efficiently and satisfactorily to the expressed or implied wants of a more discriminating consumer with suitable and desirable products of his choice.²⁷ Marketing expanded, grew in stature, and prospered as a result of this reorientation. Indeed, it was because of this radical transformation that what is marketing today—with its principles of product, price, promotion, and physical distribution—was born of what had previously been merely advertising and selling.²⁸

Throughout these earlier changes, however, the role of marketing remained essentially concentrated on consumption. True, as time passed the nature of that consumption altered from being what the producer wanted to sell to more nearly what the consumer needed to buy. Nonetheless, it was still ever-increasing consumption that marketing sought to induce.

The emphasis on increasing consumption, how-

24. C. E. Ferguson, *Microeconomic Theory* (Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1972).

25. Same reference as footnote 10.

26. Vance Packard, *The Hidden Persuaders* (New York: David McKay Co., 1957).

27. Kotler and Levy, same reference as footnote 3.

28. Kotler and Zaltman, same reference as footnote 2.

TABLE I
THE ROLE OF MARKETING:
MATRIX OF ISSUES, PERIODS, AND VIEWS

Issue	Author	Pre-1960	1960-1970	Post-1970	
				1971-1972	1973-1974
Increase consumption vs. Manage demand	Packard:	Sell hard what firm produces Stimulate consumption	Sell easy what consumer needs Maximize sales volume	Rationalize sales	Ask consumer what he wants
	Galbraith:				
Broaden marketing vs. Confine it to marketplace	Others:	Broaden marketing beyond firm Confine marketing to marketplace Stimulate consumption Establish hedonistic standards	Extend marketing to social ideas Manage demand	Ask worth of sales to society	
	Kotler et al.:				
	Luck:				
	Lazer:				
Selfish values vs. Social values	Feldman:		Include societal considerations Increase services Conserve and improve the environment Produce rationally and recycle Increase services Regulate marketing Consider what is sold		
	Kelley:				
	Weiss:				
Products vs. Services	Fisk:				Use resources carefully Increase services Manage demand Improve product development Consult consumer on desires
	<i>Business Week</i> (three spokesmen):				
Dominant Idea:		Increase Consumption	Broaden Marketing	Conserve Resources	

TABLE 2
SUMMARY AND COMPARISON OF STAGES IN THE EVOLUTION OF
THE ROLE OF MARKETING

Role Facet	Pre-1960	1960-1970	Post-1970
Focus:	Producers	Consumers	Resources
Emphasis:	Selling	Marketing	Demarketing
Objective:	Consumption	Customer satisfaction	Conservation
Method:	Advertising	Product development	Demand management

ever, brought expanding production and a concomitant mounting waste and depletion of natural resources.²⁹ The net result has been that "never before in modern marketing's 50-year history has it stood so low in public esteem."³⁰ Indeed, historian Arnold Toynbee's indictment of the U.S. economy resounds to the discredit of marketing as it had been conceived up to the late 1960s:

Toynbee, in assessing our norms and value systems (particularly advertising), wrote that if it is true that personal consumption stimulated by advertising is essential for growth and full employment in our economy (which we in marketing believe), then it demonstrates automatically to his mind that an economy of abundance is a spiritually unhealthy way of life and that the sooner it is reformed, the better.³¹

Current Forces in the Transition of Marketing

What recent or current influences have served to bring about the present state of transition in the role of marketing and the prospect that once again it will undergo radical change? What might be the nature of the role as it eventually emerges from this dynamic flux, the course and outcome of which puzzle even the experts?

The Three C's

Partly in reaction against this continued emphasis on massive consumption, partly as a result of it, and partly from other causes, three factors in the environment of marketing have emerged as forces acting to change its role: consumerism, clean-up, and conservation (the three C's). The first of these, consumerism, is concerned with

truth in advertising, safety and quality of ingredients, and full and reliable labeling. It is acting to direct marketing's concern away from *how much* of a product can be sold to *how well* that product is made and how faithfully it is represented to the consuming public. Its effect, therefore, is essentially to direct the marketer from considerations of commercial gain to those of human welfare. The second, clean-up, concentrates on proper disposal, ecological concern, and recycling. It has served to introduce into marketing, primarily into its packaging and promotion aspects, consideration for environmental welfare. The third, conservation, is a reaction, generally, to the long-time abuse, misuse, and overuse of natural resources and, more recently, to the energy crisis. As a result, it is injecting into product development and promotion a disposition toward the discriminate use of resources; toward the prudent design and economical manufacture of products; and toward rational, constrained, and justifiable demand.

There are many examples to demonstrate that "the three C's" have already made an impact on corporate policies and practices, and that positive corporate response has begun. General Electric has established a public issues committee, which "concentrates on major public issues," such as consumerism and the environmental effects of company operations and products, and "assesses management's response to them."³² During 1974, the General Foods Consumer Center "made special efforts on television, in newspapers, and in other media to tell homeowners new ways to use selected GF brands to combat rising food prices and shortages."³³

Manufacturers are now paying from \$30 to \$60 per ton for recovered steel and \$300 per ton for aluminum. "Reynolds Aluminum has been recy-

29. Same references as footnote 10 and footnote 20.

30. Same reference as footnote 10.

31. Same reference as footnote 1, p. 15, quoting from "Toynbee vs. Bernbach: Is Advertising Morally Defensible?" *Yale Daily News*, Special Issue, 1963.

32. "Public Issues Committee," *General Electric 1973 Annual Report*, p. 24.

33. "Meeting the Changes of the '70s," *General Foods/Annual Report 1974*, p. 12.

cling aluminum beverage cans since 1967 and last year [1973] paid Americans about 4.5 million dollars for bringing in used cans; the resulting recycling of these cans . . . takes only 5% of the energy needed to make aluminum from virgin ore.³⁴ About 25 major cities across the nation are already sorting their garbage and either selling it (the metals) or shredding it (the combustible remainder) to burn along with coal for the generation of electric power; about a dozen others are considering doing the same.³⁵ For example, the Union Electric Company in St. Louis has contracted to take all trash from that city and seven surrounding counties to burn for part of its fuel requirements, and the Coors Brewery near Denver is creating power by burning garbage in its furnaces. Several other major cities are planning similar operations, either by direct burning of trash or by pyrolysis, a process refined by Monsanto and Union Carbide by which organic trash is converted into oil or gas for fuel.³⁶

Oregon outlawed disposable beer and soft drink containers. Many housewives are insisting on biodegradable detergents with low phosphate content. The government now requires that unleaded gasoline be available at almost all service stations. All of these measures, of course, are aimed mainly at preserving the natural environment.

Likewise, to conserve natural resources, many public utilities have converted their slogans to ones such as South Carolina Electric and Gas Company's "satisfy your minimum essential requirements."³⁷

Castle and Cooke, Inc., which processes Dole pineapple, "has reduced the number of fruit cuts and can sizes from 27 retail consumer items to 11 in just two can sizes, 20 oz. and 8 oz."³⁸ And the term *demarketing* was raised prominently and repeatedly during an April 1974 meeting of oil company executives in Houston, when among the subjects they discussed was "how to handle the demand for gasoline now that supplies are limited."³⁹

These are all prime examples of progressive change, but there are still many examples of disregard for the C considerations: the ubiquitously discarded cigarette filter tip continues to be non-

biodegradable; the dangers to humans and birds from the tab from pull-top cans is still present; and Americans continue to waste a valuable asset by "throwing away 125 million tons of garbage every year."⁴⁰ So, while much is already being done, a far greater amount remains to be done before the demands of "the three C's" receive the full response they deserve.

Implications of the Three C's

It is still too early to determine the net impact of these three forces on marketing. However, some of the obvious indications are:

1. More productive capacity—and, therefore, more marketing effort—will be devoted to services rather than to products.
2. Excess demand will become as much a concern of marketing as excess supply.
3. Additional sales volume will be generated on the basis of what is sold rather than how much is sold.
4. Marketing will increasingly be subject to regulation.
5. Firms could be subject to appraisals of their environmental performance and their contributions to social change. This in turn will affect the "pitch" of marketing.

Future Thrust of These Forces on Marketing Parameters

Sometimes one is too quick to generalize when faced with new conditions and forces. Thus, it is possible that this section and the next one present idealized situations that will not develop to the extent predicted. The following is, therefore, conjecture but judicious induction is feasible. In fact, some of the parameters of the prospective role of marketing can already be discerned.

First, catalogs, advertisements, brochures, accompanying instructions for use, and labels will have to be more expansive, detailed, and explicit both as to the contents and the uses of the products they describe; and, to the extent practicable, as to the impact of these on the individual, the environment, and society.

Second, certain questions will have to be answered, either in the firm's advertising and the labeling of its specific products or in the more general promotional schemes that induce its public image. Examples of such questions are: Which and how much of critical natural resources were used in the manufacture and use of the product?

34. "We Don't Believe in Waste," *Business Week*, December 2, 1974, p. 28.

35. "Environment," *Time*, December 2, 1974, p. 102.

36. Same reference as footnote 35.

37. Billboards on all main highways leading into Columbia, South Carolina, Fall 1974.

38. "Toward Higher Margins and Less Variety," *Business Week*, September 14, 1974.

39. *The Wall Street Journal*, May 16, 1974, p. 1.

40. Same reference as footnote 35.

How are waste products resulting from both manufacture and use to be disposed of? Which, if any, of the ingredients or potential uses of the product have suspected or known unfavorable effects? For which of the effects claimed as favorable is there established proof and for which no proof? How should the container and any residue be effectively disposed of ("Dispose of properly" will not be sufficient)?

Third, efforts of the firm to contribute to the welfare of the community and the general society will have to be publicized. In fact, these will probably have to be reported openly to established government and civic agencies. Thus, there will be more public announcements along the lines of those advertisements of the major energy-producing firms that have extolled their efforts to alleviate the energy crisis or forestall its recurrence.⁴¹

Fourth, the potential customer will more frequently be asked "What do you want?" before the firm undertakes to develop and produce either its routine products or proposed new ones.

Fifth, product management will become a more important factor in corporate management. This will require greater interaction of product planners with other departments—finance, engineering, and the like—as well as with suppliers.⁴²

Sixth, in many instances salesmen will have to persuade a current or potential customer to buy less, to accept a simpler design, or to wait longer for delivery in the interest of phasing demand more comfortably into supply; and they must do so in a manner conducive to retaining that customer's patronage and not alienating him from the firm's long-term objectives.⁴³

Last, competition among firms in the marketing of similar products will shift increasingly to a basis of comparative social values, to a basis no longer of efficiency in the economic sense alone but rather of efficiency in the sense of judicious use of resources and disposal of wastes. In addition, these firms will compete to make effective contributions to the general welfare by the articulation of both production and civic action. (Drucker disagrees with this last point. However, even he conceives of good management as "a

complex technology that performs a central function in society.")⁴⁴

Effects on the Role of Contemporary Marketing

What will these changes do to marketing as we know it now? Most likely the following will occur:

1. Catalogs will tend more nearly to "speak for themselves," through clearer and more complete exposition.
2. Salesmen will become better informed on the issues of the day. They will be able to relate their products and company to critical problems, community developments, consumer attitudes, and the general welfare of society.
3. The corporate image will be projected in terms not of size, capitalization, net worth, return on investment, and sales volume but rather of civic and social worth, impact on the ecology, society, and humanity, and "good works" other than the production of commodities and services.
4. The marketer's showcase will include a greater array of services, some of which will be literally beyond present imagination.⁴⁵
5. As better quality, greater environmental protection devices, and more consumer safety measures are built into products, they will be sold on the basis more of their worth than their cost, which will correspondingly rise. Likewise, durability, economy in consumption of natural resources, freedom from deleterious effects on society and the environment, and social and moral value will displace style, power, prestige, and novelty as selling points.

Finally, there is the possibility that the creation of a new selling agent—or, more correctly, the resurrection of an old purchasing one—will provide an intercessor between the producer and the consumer. This would be the purchasing commissioner. His job would be, as it was during his heyday between the Civil War and World War II, to represent to the potential customer the true merits and demerits of the products available to satisfy his needs. He would be a sort of manufacturer's representative in reverse, who would know the total span and worth of products offered for sale, the comparative advantages and disadvantages of competing products, and the

41. Advertisement by Combustion Engineering, Inc., *Fortune*, March 1974, pp. 178-179; Advertisement by General Electric Corporation, *Fortune*, November 1973, pp. 26-27; and "We'd like you to know . . ." advertisement by EXXON, *Smithsonian*, April 1974, pp. 46-47.

42. "The Squeezes on Product Mix," same reference as footnote 4.

43. Kotler and Levy, same references as footnote 3 and footnote 4.

44. Peter F. Drucker, *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974).

45. Alvin Toffler, *Future Shock* (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 196-197 and 206.

proven effects of ingredients and product capabilities. He would be able to present to the customer likely existing products that are suitable to his needs as well as represent the customer's otherwise unsatisfied needs to likely producers for their subsequent product development and manufacture.

Marketing's Future Role—Expansion or Contraction

Does this present a prospect of expansion or contraction in the role of marketing? Probably a mixture of both effects will ensue.

First, marketing within the firm must remain as it is for a while longer in order to recast its style and modify its methods in the directions indicated above before offering its refurbished expertise more broadly to other organizations for the promotion and sale of their nonphysical products. (This is a contraction, at least temporarily. For a view contrary to this, see George Steiner. However, Steiner's view that "the responsibilities of marketing managers . . . are expanding rather than contracting" refers to their functions within the firm and not in extension beyond it.)⁴⁶

At the same time, marketing must broaden its understanding and sharpen its explanations of the impact of the product on the environment, society, and the consumer (an expansion). Likewise, marketing will have to submit either to increased regulation or to stricter self-discipline in order to satisfy consumerism, and also to fulfill the requirements of clean-up and conservation (a contraction?).

Lastly, marketing will have to deal more in services than in products, with concomitant concern for details, follow-up, and support (an expansion?). Along these lines, marketing may shift the performance of its traditional functions to the purchasing commissioner (in which event, a great contraction; in fact, a displacement).

Conclusions and Recommendations

On balance, whether the role of marketing expands or contracts is probably contingent more on the subjective actions of marketing itself than on the immediately prospective actions of other forces (consumers, the general public, or government agencies). Following are some guidelines that marketers may find useful in making this adaptation smoothly and advantageously:

1. Further improve and adjust within present realms before extending to others.
2. Become more concerned with why a product should be sold than how it can be sold.
3. Represent the customer's needs to the firm as well as the firm's products to the customer.
4. Be more responsible in product development.
5. Be more familiar with such features of the products offered for sale as the amounts and types of critical materials or energy involved in their manufacture; specific effects of their use on human welfare, society, and the natural environment; the disposability of wastes resulting from manufacture and use; and benefits to society enabled or effected by the sale. Be less concerned with such other aspects as the power, style, novelty, and prestige effect of the product; the financial standing of the firm; and the personal satisfactions likely to be engendered by the sale.

In short, the role of marketing must become attuned to social improvement rather than economic gain, human aspirations rather than merely human needs, conservation rather than consumption, intrinsic worth rather than price, and the consumer and the firm as entities of a greater society rather than only as economic factors. The marketer will, in essence, have to become vitally concerned with human welfare rather than economic gain, and with the broader needs, aspirations, and potentialities of society rather than merely with the problems of competition, sales volume, and profit. All of this implies and requires an expansion of marketing's point of view, frame of reference, purpose, method, and skills. To accomplish the necessary adjustments entailed by this expansion might prove the greatest challenge to the marketing profession that it has yet experienced. Perhaps the simplest way to describe the gargantuan task is to say that to the five standard P principles of current marketing—Planning (meaning marketing research), Product (meaning product development but including packaging), Pricing, Promotion (including advertising), and Place (meaning physical distribution)—marketing must now add the three C considerations: Consumerism (meaning proconsumer), Clean-up (meaning anticontamination), and Conservation (meaning antidepletion).

The next major change in marketing will probably be based upon these C considerations. Whether this change will result in an expansion or a contraction of that role will depend largely

46. George A. Steiner, *Top Management Planning* (New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1969).

on how marketing faces up and adapts itself to the challenge of that change.

To assist initially in that adaptation and subsequently to direct the actions based on the C considerations, marketing probably should add a new functional element to its usual organization. This new element might be an office charged to keep abreast of—indeed, ahead of—the demands

of the citizenry and the requirements of the law for observance of these C considerations. Such an office might be directly associated with the office of the marketing manager. By organizing and utilizing such a staff element effectively, marketing can help avert contraction in its future role and preserve its present strengths and positive attributes.

MARKETING MEMO

Does American Food Equal Arabian Petroleum? . . .

. . . there are striking similarities between the positions occupied by the Arab states of the Middle East in the world petroleum market and by the United States in the world market for food. Both areas are surplus producers of their respective commodities, petroleum and food, and both possess sufficient productive capacity to close the gap between sufficiency and shortage for many countries in the world. Given this situation, it follows, of course, that both the Arab states and the United States possess enormous power in the market for these two most critical of all commodities.

. . . The world's peoples are presently walking a tightrope; only bare adequacy prevents a truly massive disaster. It is essential that the American business executive grasp the enormity of this dilemma because it will inevitably affect both him as an individual and his firm.

. . . If the demand and supply forecasts for 1985 prove accurate, there is little question that the United States will be earning large quantities of foreign exchange. This will be even more true should prices of agricultural commodities rise significantly. The position of the United States in international trade in 1985 could be analogous to that of the Arab states in 1974—the position of being able to supply that increment of an absolutely essential commodity to the rest of the world that will make the difference between sufficiency and disaster.

—Wayne Bartholomew and George A. Wing, "Arab Petroleum = American Food," *Business Horizons*, Vol. 17 (December 1974), pp. 5–14, at pp. 5, 6, 13. Copyright 1974 by the Foundation for the School of Business at Indiana University. Reprinted by permission.