Wroe Alderson's *Marketing Behaviour and Executive Action* inserted into Reavis Cox's marketing theory course at Wharton 50 years ago

A student's reaction

Donald F. Dixon
Lansdale, Pennsylvania, USA

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of the paper is to describe and evaluate the changes in the content of the marketing theory course at Wharton 50 years ago, taught by Reavis Cox, as a result of the insertion of Wroe Alderson's book *Marketing Behaviour and Executive Action*.

Design/methodology/approach – The paper presents a personal experience of taking the course before the insertion of Alderson's book and a review of the revised course outline.

Findings – The course content moved away from a broader philosophically based marketing systems course linked to ideas from other disciplines, to one focused on marketing management.

Originality/value – The period in question is an important turning point in the way marketing theory was taught and developed that influenced future development of the discipline in ways that narrowed its focus and limited its contribution.

Keywords Marketing theory, Marketing management, History

Paper type General review

Introduction

This paper has arisen from some half-century old notes that resurfaced a few years ago while winnowing books and papers upon retirement. Being aware of the resurgence of interest in Alderson, I sent a copy of the material to Ian Wilkinson, thinking that he would be intrigued. Learning that copies were to be distributed to others, I have attempted to make the material a bit more readable.

I first encountered Alderson's name in the Wharton MBA Introduction to Marketing course taught by Orin Burley in 1951. Several textbooks, each with a different perspective, were assigned. Students also were encouraged to read other texts, and one of these was a pre-war edition of Alexander, Surface and Alderson, which I recall having a conceptual structure reflecting contemporary developments in microeconomics. This course provided both a comprehensive view of marketing and intellectual stimulation uncommon in the program.

At this time, I also discovered some of Alderson's ideas in Cost and Profit Outlook, but found them very difficult to place in any comprehensive framework. Meeting Wroe at the marketing theory seminar, held in alternate years at Boulder and Burlington, and on occasion while I was a PhD candidate and part-time instructor, reinforced my earlier

Journal of Historical Research in Marketing
Vol. 3 No. 1, 2011
pp. 10-28

1755-750X
DOI 10.1108/17557501111102382

conclusion that he was very stimulating and offered a variety of thoughtful insights, but it was very difficult to discern any underlying pattern of thought. Thus, I looked forward to the publication of his book, assuming that its preparation would provide an opportunity for him to organize his ideas.

The title of this book, *Marketing Theory and Executive Action*, suggested Alderson's limited view of marketing; its contents demonstrated his reliance upon microeconomics as marketing theory. At the time, I felt that the introduction of this book into the excellent PhD marketing theory course taught by Reavis Cox was a disaster and subsequently worked out the details on paper to clarify my own thoughts. When I sent a copy of these notes to Ian, I was thinking that "I was there" at the beginning of the end of marketing as an academic discipline. Comparing Burley's thoughtful 1951 introductory course with the narrowly focused books, characterized by a silly mnemonic, used in subsequent university courses, provides one measure of how far the field has disintegrated.

The debates regarding business education in the 1950s

In the 1950s, US business became fascinated with the idea of broadening managers' social awareness as a means of improving decision making. Milton Eisenhower, the President of Pennsylvania State University, asserted, "While it is obvious that the physical sciences are vital to modern business, they are no more essential than are many of the social sciences and the humanities" (Koshetz, 1953). The annual report of the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching declared that higher education failed to provide "systematic consideration" of basic concepts: "By weaving a pattern of facts around great ideas, and of ideas around significant concepts the complex fabric of our intellectual and spiritual heritage might be made to appear in clearer outline" (*The New York Times*, 1953). The definitive impact of this nationwide interest came at the end of the decade with the publication of the Gordon and Howell (1959) and Pierson (1959) reports on business education. Indicating that the business professional needs education in the basic disciplines rather than technical skills, these reports emphasized the importance of a business education grounded in the traditional basic disciplines of a liberal education.

Some ongoing university programs reflected an interest in broadening the scope of higher education. A seminar program at Columbia University that began in 1945, "attempted to reach into the center of the problems that confront society." The seminar's conceptual foundation was clear: "The University seminar sees society organized in many institutions, such as the state, the church, trade unions, the military establishment and the educational system" (Fine, 1953). A review conducted at St Johns College in 1954 confirmed the strength of its "Great Books" program, which included about 130 works "that have shaped Western tradition." The College held that:

> Insofar as we educate men and women to think, to express ideas clearly, to analyze problems, and to make rational and intelligent decisions, we are confident that we are squarely meeting the challenge to higher education (Fine, 1954).

Moreover, in the early 1950s, several universities offered liberal arts programs designed for executives. One of these, the University of Pennsylvania's Institute of Humanistic Studies for Executives, responded to a request from the President of Pennsylvania's Bell Telephone Co., who alleged that "the young executive seemed to have neither the background nor the ability to make the sort of broad decisions that modern business demands." The University of Pennsylvania's program, established in 1953, was analogous to the "Great Books" of St Johns:

> They read everything from Beardsley's Practical Logic to Crane Brinton's Ideas and Men. They studied the Bible and the Bhagavad-Gita, proceeded to the Iliad, the plays of Sophocles and Shakespeare, Dante's Inferno, the Brothers Karamazov, Remembrance of Things Past, Ulysses, The Magic Mountain and Moby Dick. They read The Portable Medieval Reader and the Autobiography of Cellini, studied the economics of Adam Smith and Marx, of Tawney, Keynes and Executive Suite (*The Time Magazine*, 1955).

The Wharton School was not immune to the extensive debates concerning higher education in business. A commitment to change within the University of Pennsylvania came in 1953 with the appointment of Gaylord Harnwell as President, and the initiation of an "Educational Survey" that encompassed the entire university. Within Wharton, the reform movement was furthered in 1955 by the appointment of C. Arthur Kulp as a dean, and his establishment of the Wharton Survey Advisory Committee. Although the subsequent vigorous faculty debates, and the ultimate attempt "to provide a more 'liberal' form of instruction," focused on undergraduate education, the reform environment did not go unnoticed in the graduate programs (Sass, 1982, p. 258).

Reavis Cox was deeply involved in this reform process. He not only played an important role in the organization of the Faculty Senate in 1952, but also was the Chairman of the Curriculum Committee that presented the initial reform proposal to the faculty.

Course material for the 1955-1956 academic year

An interest in marketing theory in the 1950s was stimulated by an article by Alderson and Cox (1948, p. 137) that announced, "Conspicuous in the professional study of marketing in recent years has been a lively and growing interest in the theory of marketing." Theory is needed because: "The multitude of facts thus far assembled seems to add up to very little" (p. 138), and it is necessary to address "issues raised by events in the areas of public and private policy as applied to marketing" (p. 139).

Theory and science in the study of marketing

Alderson and Cox followed the 1948, article with a book of readings, *Theory in Marketing* (Cox and Alderson, 1950), but not all marketing academics shared the authors' interest in theory. Grether, University of California, a former editor of *Journal of Marketing* and coauthor of *Marketing in the American Economy* (1952), contributed Chapter 6, "A theoretical approach to the analysis of marketing" to *Theory in Marketing*. Here, he asserted, "In marketing, at present, there is no need for 'pure theory' – that is, theory ranging so widely as to take the form of a logical framework with little or no relevance to reality" (Grether, 1950, p. 114).

A comment on the 1948, Alderson and Cox article was published by Roland S. Vaile, University of Minnesota, who had been Editor of *Journal of Marketing*, 1937-1941, but was especially well known at Wharton as a coauthor of *Marketing in the American Economy* (Vaile *et al.*, 1952). Vaile (1949, p. 522) argued, "When all is said and done, marketing will remain an art in which innovation and extravaganza will continue to play an important, albeit unpredictable part."

The "art" versus "science" issue often reappeared in the readings. Bartels, Ohio State University, asserted, "theory" and "reality" can be separated by assigning different personnel to each area; marketing technicians are distinguished from

"Marketing theorists" who "will endeavor to integrate and to balance in a systematic body the knowledge stemming from observation and investigation, on the one hand, and from theoretical deductions, on the other" (Bartels, 1951, p. 328). Hollander (1955) suggested something of this sort, distinguishing between the goal of marketing practice, which is profit maximization, and that of marketing theory, which is a search for truth. In a discussion of Hollander's paper, McInnes (1955) argued that the practitioner differed from the theorist in the method chosen to approach problems.

A few marketing writers insisted that marketing was a science. Converse (1951, p. 31), whose marketing textbooks had been published since 1924, demonstrated this by a careful choice of words: "Science has been defined as an organized body of knowledge, or a branch of knowledge dealing with a body of facts or truths systematically arranged. Marketing meets the conditions specified in these definitions and so can rightfully be called a science." Alderson (1951, p. 81) defined science in a conventional manner; hypotheses are formulated "as general laws which may be incorporated in the general theory or lead to its revision." Initially, Alderson's references to "general" laws and "general" theory were taken to refer to a broad perspective of marketing; Cox (1955, p. 198) argued against this idea of a "general" theory: "the most fruitful way to develop meaningful theory is go at the job piecemeal."

Kenneth D. Hutchinson, Boston University, appraising marketing discussions of theory and science, concluded that marketing is not a science (Hutchinson 1952, p. 293). Moreover, some of those asserting that marketing was a science "wrestle with dictionary meanings, warping them and twisting them, until at last marketing is seen to have fulfilled many, though not all, of the requisite characteristics of a science" (p. 288).

Some of the assigned discussions of theory and science were unrelated to marketing, and thus avoided the "warping" that Hutchinson noted. Churchman (1950), Wayne University, who contributed "Basic Research in Marketing" to "*Theory in Marketing*" had published *Methods of Inquiry: Introduction to Philosophy and Scientific Method*, with Russell L. Ackoff, in 1950. Churchman emphasized that no phase of basic research:

> [. . .] can be considered wholly apart from the others. This is especially true of the definition of the concepts that a given field of inquiry uses, for these depend ultimately on the kind of objective that field has in mind.

Essentially Churchman (1950, p. 11) describes a "'conceptual framework' for the science of marketing," which must include "a more general scheme in which the relationship of marketing concepts to concepts of other fields is made explicit."

Morris R. Cohen, a noted Philosopher who contributed the article "Method, Scientific" to the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, maintained that "the ideal of science is to see the facts logically connected according to their essential nature, summarized in some small number of connecting laws or principles (Cohen 1933, p. 390)." Furthermore, the essence of scientific method "is to be sought not in the context of its specific conclusions but rather in the method whereby its findings are made and constantly corrected" (p. 389).

A. Cornelius Benjamin, Professor of philosophy at the University of Missouri, defining science as "the method of verified hypotheses," asserted that it "is concerned with the construction of a system of ideas that is presumed to portray the realm of facts (Benjamin 1949, p. 193)." Especially, interesting was his description of different aspects of science:

- a "descriptive phase" consisting of acquiring, manipulating and describing data;
- an "explanatory" phase, that is, the discovery of hypotheses; and
- verification, which involves making predictions and checking results.

There is also “rational science,” mathematics, for example, “which conforms to the rules of logic, but which may convey no information whatever about the world in which we live” (p. 197). His observation that “The type of science that one prefers is, I believe, largely a matter of temperament” (p. 198) was a refreshing change from the unending controversies among marketing writers.

Max Planck, who received the 1918 Nobel Prize in Physics for his work in quantum theory, stated that the goal of science is the creation of a picture of “the real world, in the absolute, metaphysical sense of the word real.” The scientific world picture “remains always a mere approximation, a more or less well defined model Planck (1948, p. 323).” The “practical utilization of the scientific world picture, is the task of technology;” these two tasks are equally important (p. 326).

Claude Levi-Strauss, Ecole Practique des Hautes Etudes, was a French Anthropologist, best known for his refusal to assess “primitive peoples” from the perspective of Western civilization. Although insisting that “a science is not really a science until it can formulate a precise chain of propositions (Levi-Strauss 1954, p. 593),” he recognized “a fundamental difficulty of measurement” in the social sciences:

> There are, no doubt, many things in our fields of study which can be directly or indirectly measured; but it is by no means certain that they are the most important things (p. 585).

Unfortunately, this measurement caveat does not seem to have been widely recognized among academics.

Examples of “descriptive” theory

The “descriptive phase” of theory building identified by Benjamin is illustrated by several readings. John Q. Stewart, professor of astronomy and physics at Princeton, who contributed Chapter 2, “Potential of Population and Its Relationship to Marketing” to *Theory in Marketing*, declared, “Science is always academic, directed toward description only” and thus “may lack interest for the practitioner in the field of marketing” who often finds “rules of thumb and experience with special situations good enough for restricted ends (Stewart 1950, p. 37).” Stewart applies concepts of classical physics to social activity. However, “tolerances are rather large” and this means, “In social physics one is satisfied temporarily if agreement with a formula is within a factor of, say, 1.3 for half the observations” (p. 38). Nevertheless, the resulting empirical regularities are thought to “have applications to a variety of critical economic and political situations” (p. 39).

The discussions of trading areas by Converse (1949) and Reynolds (1953a, b) are analogous to Stewart’s work. In both instances, the underlying effort is to describe social activity by means of mathematical statements derived from data, without reference to an underlying theory. In 1949, Converse published his law:

> [. . .] a trading center and a town in or near its trade area divide the trade of the town approximately in direct proportion to the populations of the two towns and inversely as the squares of the distance factors, using 4 as the distance factor of the home town.

The “distance factor” varies with the number of towns involved: “We have experimented with this method and it appears to work satisfactorily” (1949, p. 382). Reynolds (1953a, p. 275) tests the Converse model and fails to verify it. Converse (1953) comments that he is certain that his law applies, and that Reynolds must have been using faulty data. Reynolds (1953b) demurs, defending his data. The potential problems caused by an *ad hoc* two-variable model are not addressed in the debate.

Anthony Standen was the Executive Editor of the Kirk-Othmer *Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology*, a mainstay for chemists, biochemists, and engineers. His hard-hitting, but humorous book, *Science Is a Sacred Cow*, which greatly annoyed some scientists, asserts: "The world is divided into Scientists, who practice the art of infallibility, and non-scientists, sometimes contemptuously called 'laymen,' who are taken in by it" (Standen, 1950, p. 13). Some social scientists "are content to study history, and call themselves historians, or economics and call themselves economists, without continually blowing their own horn about how 'scientific' they are" (pp. 142-3). There are, however:

> [. . .] a small but highly vocal group who think they have something entirely new in the works, something better than anything that ever was before [. . .]. At present they are energetically assembling great quantities of facts, and they are waiting for a Galileo or a Newton to set up some "Laws," or establish conceptions, by which the whole thing will tumble together and make a tight logical system like physics (p. 144).

It should not be difficult to imagine how this work was received by students who had quite enough of "theory" and "science" discussions.

Sources of marketing theory – economic theory
Hutchinson's (1952, p. 288) appraisal of the "theory and science" literature of marketing noted a "wholesale onslaught on many of the time honored [economic] concepts." Indeed, the initial Alderson and Cox (1948, p. 151) "Toward a Theory of Marketing" article declared, "Any market analyst [. . .] must grow impatient with the faltering attempts of economic theorists to deal with the dynamic aspects of an enterprise economy." Hutchinson (1952, p. 289) commented, "marketing scholars can never expect to develop their own body of theory merely by critical appraisal of the shortcomings of another one."

Converse (1951, p. 2) recognized that "many of the marketing theories we hold today are modifications of applications of older economic theories." However, economic theory has limited usefulness because "many human actions are not logical" (p. 1). Vaile (1949, p. 522) remarked:

> [. . .] it seems likely to me that such generalizations as are useful in marketing will continue to come, in the main from economists, psychologists, and specialists in the several scientific disciplines.

In "Economic theory and marketing," a contribution to *Theory of Marketing*, Vaile (1950, p. 150) called for "the more intelligent use of economic theory." As we have seen, Grether (1950, p. 114) was concerned about "relevance," and argued that marketing needed nothing more than "various types of 'applied theory':"

> A worthwhile approach to the study of marketing or trade is through an economic analysis of the behavior of the individual firm under monopolistic or heterogeneous competition in the contests of the local market, the regional market, and interregional marketing or trade (pp. 122-3).

The numerous chapters in *Theory in Marketing* and other readings based upon economic theory demonstrated that, although the field was not always held in high esteem, it represented a significant part of what at the time might be termed "theory relevant to marketing." Mehren (1950, p. 126), University of California, Editor of *Journal of Marketing*, 1955-1958, contributed Chapter 7, "The theory of the firm and marketing" to *Theory of Marketing*. He was not especially popular among many marketing academics because he defined marketing theory "as that part of the economic theory of the firm relevant to the marketing phases of the production process" and simply stated, "There is no need for marketing theory" (p. 141).

Edward R. Hawkins, Johns Hopkins University, and editor of *Journal of Marketing*, 1949-1953, contributed Chapter 11, titled "Vertical price relationships" to *Theory of Marketing*. He examined the pricing implications of the differing demand elasticities facing various channel members, concluding that "economic theory applied to marketing problems may, in the end, turn out to be a large part of 'marketing theory'" (Hawkins, 1950, p. 191). In a subsequent article, Hawkins (1954, p. 233), observes that the marketing literature treats price policies "as though they have no relation to economic theory of any sort." And yet, by interpreting various pricing policies discussed in the marketing literature in terms of ordinary economic diagrams, he demonstrates that "Most of the 'price policies' described by marketing specialists are merely special cases of the general theory of monopolistic competition" (p. 240).

Verdoorn (1956, p. 227), Rotterdam School of Economics, declared "The central problem of marketing theory [...] is how to combine the five instruments constituting the 'marketing mix' in such a way as to ensure the highest possible present profits." Verdoorn adapted production theory to marketing by substituting marketing variables for conventional production agents in Sune Carlson's work, developed in the 1930s and incorporated in Weintraub's (1949, pp. 289-336) *Price Theory*, a standard economics text in the Wharton PhD program.

Sources of marketing theory – the field of marketing itself

McGarry (1951) introduced a contractual function of marketing, by which firms develop and maintain webs of relations with other firms that lead to system flexibility and adaptability. This is a clear statement of what later became fashionable as "relationship marketing." McGarry also noted that the initiative in organizing interfirm networks could come from various locations, including both producer and consumer ends of the marketing channel. This was one of the first attempts to depict channel structure as complex adaptive networks co-produced by the organizations involved and not necessarily dictated by one organization or "channel captain."

Blankertz (1950), University of Pennsylvania, who contributed Chapter 10, "Consumer actions and consumer nonprofit co-operation" to *Theory in Marketing*, pointed out that most discussions were from the firm's perspective and argued that the activities of consumers must be considered as part of the marketing process.

Sources of marketing theory – other disciplines

Joseph Clawson, Harvard University, who contributed Chapter 3, "Lewin's vector psychology and the analysis of motives in marketing," to *Theory in Marketing*, summarized the contributions of Kurt Lewin, often considered the founder of modern social psychology. The underlying theme is that although empirically verifiable theory is the essence of science, theory requires model building focusing on relevant variables that can be conceptualized and observed. Clawson (1950, p. 51) argues:

> Much economic, political, and psychological research has gone astray on the unfortunate assumption that events in one state [...] can or at least should be neatly explained by events in any previous state [...] without regard to intervening variables.

Edward A. Shils, a sociologist and social philosopher, probably best known by graduate students as a coauthor with Parsons, of *Toward a General Theory of Action*

(Shils (1951)), reviewed the development of the primary group as a focus of research, describing the work of familiar authors such as Elton Mayo and Kurt Lewin. Shils pointed out that the study of primary groups would be "more properly appreciated" once the influence of the groups was traced to:

> [. . .] the personality structure of their members and into the remoter areas in the behavior of individual member, their behavior in political situations, in corporate bodies such as the church, in unorganized interclass and intraclass relations, and in other primary groups" (Shils, 1951, p. 69).

George A. Lundberg, University of Washington, was explicit about the significance of group behavior:

> Marketing behavior [. . .] is only a special case of group behavior [. . .]. The basic phenomenon in marketing behavior as in other forms of group behavior is communication. Interaction by means of communication then constitutes that large area of phenomena we call social (Lundberg 1945, p. 9).

Consequently:

> The greatest fault with current marketing theory is the tendency to place the emphasis upon "the things exchanged", the tangible inducements to action, the ratios between inducements – i.e. prices – not upon the acts of cooperation as such (p. 23).

Bavelas (1951, p. 201) addressed the question as to how communication patterns affect group behavior by describing experiments, in which both group structure and assigned tasks were varied. He concluded that these experiments "suggest that an experimental approach to certain aspects of social communication is possible, and that, in all probability, it would be practically rewarding."

Ward Edwards, Johns Hopkins University, whose research was in behavioral decision theory and decision analysis, raised questions about the competence of decision makers by comparing human performance with that of optimal models. In "The Theory of Decision Making", Edwards (1954) reviewed the theoretical literature of decision making, moving from the riskless choices postulated in conventional economic theory to risky choices, and described the potential contribution of the theory of games.

Deutsch (1952), MIT, provided a meticulous discussion of models and their evaluation, perhaps best illustrated by a discussion of organizational growth. Four dimensions of growth are defined:

(1) an increase in sources of information;
(2) an increase in the efficiency with which information is distributed and acted upon within the organization;
(3) an increase in the organization's ability to change its environment in response to projected requirements; and
(4) an increase in the ability to change its own goals in response to change.

In his contribution of "Pluralistic competition," Chapter 5 in *Theory in Marketing*, Gettell (1950, p. 89), of *Fortune*, proposed:

> [. . .] the integration of economic and political theory with particular reference to the identification of the policymaking units and the classification and analysis of the areas and tactics of conflict and co-operation among them.

Marketing as more than a business activity

A. Cornelius Benjamin considered the presuppositions of science, asking "What does the scientist believe?" He pointed out that scientists, often unknowingly, base their work on a set of assumptions:

- the rationality of nature;
- the adequacy of the scientific method; and
- the relative attainability of truth.

It is an unusual scientist who considers an examination of presuppositions "to be an important part of this task as a scientist," unless "he is disturbed by some of the shocks science has suffered in the past." Benjamin (1951, p. 153) concludes that to the extent that a scientist is concerned about these presuppositions, and for the interrelations of his subject with other areas of experience, "he exhibits that broader understanding, which transforms science as specialized knowledge into science as an important enterprise of the human spirit."

Some of the authors of the course materials seemed to lack Benjamin's "broader understanding" to the extent that they considered marketing to be nothing more than a business function. A few, however, implied that there was something more than marketing management. Perhaps, the most memorable was Lundy (1950), General Electric, who contributed Chapter 20 of *Theory in Marketing*, "How many service stations are 'too many?'" In the midst of discussions of "theory" and "science," Lundy provided a "common sense" discussion of how one might determine the appropriate level of service to be offered by a group of marketing agencies, by calculating customer waiting time. Since the appropriate number of stations can be very small if the objective is to maximize the profits of the sellers, but very large if the objective is maximize consumer convenience, the answer to such questions depends upon the purpose served by the agencies.

Chapter 16 of *Theory of Marketing*, "Some functions of marketing reconsidered," contributed by McGarry (1950, p. 278), University of Buffalo, presented a new list of marketing functions. The conventional list is defective because it:

> [. . .] is inadequate for the purpose of explaining marketing in its broader aspects and defining its place in the social structure. To accomplish this latter objective, *it is necessary to define functions in terms of purposefulness for society and to focus attention on the relationship of the marketing system to the environmental field in which it operates* [Emphasis supplied].

Converse (1951, p. 11) offered a rudimentary idea of economic development: "marketing can increase people's desires;" this causes people to work harder and "increase their purchasing power which increases the total demand for goods and services." Consequently, marketing "has had a large part" in providing "the mass of the people" automobiles, paved roads, diamond rings, fur coats, and bathtubs, for example (p. 12). Subsequently, McGarry (1953, p. 39) stated that his view of marketing emphasized "the attitudes of people toward the goods [. . .]. To me marketing is most important and molding and shaping human relationships and attitudes rather than in the physical handling of goods."

Oswald Whitman Knauth, who left a distinguished career at Macy's in 1948 joined the Columbia University faculty, where he was noted for his contributions of the insights of a practicing businessman. In "Marketing and managerial enterprise," Chapter 9 of *Theory in Marketing*, Knauth argues: "The theory of the classical economists was based on scarcity," but "When mass production functions anywhere near capacity, we have an economy of plenty." In such an economy the seller normally is in an inferior position because "steady distribution in the necessary volume" must be achieved. The result is the "powerful trade positions of many concerns," and this has implications for public policy; political interference with monopoly power "may cause a reversion to an economy of scarcity" (Knauth, 1950, p. 161).

Walton H. Hamilton, a Leader in American Institutional Economics, defined competition as "rivalry subdued into organization by rules of the game (Hamilton 1931, p. 142)." However, "competition-as-it-is" is not the same "as-it-is-set-down-in-books," and there exists "a serious discrepancy between ideal and actuality" (p. 145). The institution of competition is changing and will continue to change both by "acts of the state" and "the growth of a scheme of formal control within business itself" (p. 147).

Henry Harrison Bakken, University of Wisconsin saw marketing as an institution or pattern of behavior that facilitated "the transfer of legal rights and titles to ownership in goods, services, and properties (Bakken 1953, p. 34)." Thus, the subject of marketing "is exclusively concerned with one particular attribute of things – their exchangeability [. . .] the transaction is the means of consummating an exchange" (p. 177). Since goods and services are acquired for their future contributions, Bakken devotes a great deal of attention to the concept of futurity and the role of specialized markets dealing in expectations of the future. Working (1953), an Agricultural Economist at the Stanford Food Research Institute, challenged the prevailing view about commodities markets that hedgers paid a risk premium to speculators to divest themselves of risk. He claimed that hedgers still bear risk – but of a different type, namely changes in the spread between the spot and the futures price.

Geoffrey S. Shepherd, Iowa State College, provided a conventional economic "Framework of theory for analyzing marketing problems." A market is defined as "a group of buyers and sellers," and the fundamental analytical concept is that of the perfect market, the distinguishing feature of which "is that a uniform price prevails" (Shepherd, 1955, pp. 17-18). Once variations among markets in time, place and form are recognized, "a structural framework for appraising markets and market performance" emerges (p. 30). Although this approach to model building generally was not highly thought of by marketing writers, it apparently was serviceable; the book went through seven editions from 1946 to 1982.

In *The Economics of Installment Buying*, Cox (1948) described the development of installment selling and the organization and management of installment buying. The course material, however, focused upon a section of the book that explored the social and economic consequences of installment buying. Time preference was the basis of the discussion from the consumer's perspective, and this led to a consideration of alternative means by which the consumer might deal with a perceived "high cost of waiting."

Harold Barger taught at Columbia from 1937 until 1975. Graduate students would have been familiar with textbook references to the Twentieth Century Fund's 1939 study *Does Distribution Cost Too Much*, which generated the estimate that distributions costs represented 59 percent of the consumer's dollar. Barger's work (1955) was significant not so much that it resulted in a different estimate, but that it made clear that different definitions of subject matter and that different methodologies lead to different results. Although questions arose concerning Barger's measurement of changes in the structure of distribution over time, his identification of these changes provided valuable insights regarding the costs and benefits of marketing in the US economy.

Cox and Goodman's (1954) "Channels and flows" , conducted under a contract from the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, studied the flow of building materials employed in the construction of private residences. The study's purpose was to determine the amount of marketing work done, the effectiveness with which this work is done, and how one might improve the effectiveness of the process. The significance to marketing theory is the actual demonstration of the work that is required in establishing definitions and measurements in concrete cases.

Mitchell and Rapkin (1954), both professors of finance at the University of Pennsylvania, are often given credit for first making clear the connection between land use patterns and travel behavior. They asserted that planners must forecast changes in land use that follow from proposed transit projects. To accomplish this task, it is necessary to identify the "structure of traffic" (Mitchell and Rapkin, 1954, p. 18). Moreover:

> The concept of land use is made more meaningful if consideration is given to the components of land use and to the individuals and establishments participating in organized systems of action (p. 19).

In the 1950s, this connection began to be incorporated into models, designed to predict travel demand as a function of the distribution of population and employment.

Course materials for the 1957-1958 academic year

Before considering the most significant change, the addition of Alderson's (1957b) *Marketing Behavior and Executive Action*, adjustments in the course material, mainly to accommodate the addition of this book, will be examined. Minor adjustments to assigned material, such as chapters added or removed from *Theory in Marketing*, Bakken, Barger, and Mitchell are not mentioned here.

1955-1956 course material omitted in 1957-1958

Many of the discussions about theory or science in the marketing literature were omitted; one hoped that this was at least partly because such discussions had been a passing phase, but this proved to be a naive view. The unique discussions on theory and science by Claude Levi-Strauss, A. Cornelius Benjamin, and Max Planck also were omitted. Some efforts to demonstrate the application of economic theory to marketing, as well as attempts to develop theories by extending existing marketing ideas were omitted as well. The section of the earlier course identified above as "Sources of marketing theory – other disciplines" was gutted; Alex Bavelas, Karl Deutsch, Ward Edwards, George A. Lundberg, and Edward A. Shils all vanished, together with the exposure to their different patterns of thought and the introduction of new sources of literature. Walton H. Hamilton's introduction to institutional economics from the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* was a surprising omission because it was a valuable treatment of a concept of crucial importance to marketing. Finally, Standen's popular warning not to take one's "scientific" endeavors too seriously was sorely missed.

Course material added in 1957-1958

In "Three-in-one marketing," Cox (1956), defended the usefulness of carefully considering marketing concepts. The example chosen was the general inadequacy of management decisions as to the particular business expenditures to allocate to marketing. The underlying problem was not the lack of the technical or human relations skills of managers, but the lack of conceptual skills. Thus, to improve the effectiveness of marketing planning: "We must begin by improving our concepts of marketing and its problems" (Cox, 1956, p. 68).

Significant additions were made to material in the section of the earlier course identified above as "Marketing as more than a business activity." In *Marketing Efficiency in Puerto Rico*, Galbraith and Holton (1955, p. 1) attempted "to compare the present organization of marketing activity with what it might be," to increase the efficiency of marketing activities; ultimately this meant achieving lower costs and margins. The authors were "reasonably certain that the benefits therefrom will redound to the consumer" (p. 3). However, any reorganization of the marketing system "must be done in a context where careful and compassionate consideration is given to the employment and well-being of those who are displaced." Although this consideration was not part of the study, its relevance was clearly recognized. Final recommendations included consumer and retailer education in addition to the reduction of the number of retailers to increase average sales volume.

In 1932, Gardiner C. Means and Adolf A. Berle published the classic *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*, demonstrating the significance of the separation of ownership and corporate control. In "Collective capitalism and economic theory", Means (1957) presented some implications of the earlier work for the analysis of business firms. Profit cannot be taken as a unique business objective because it often conflicts with management's interest in increasing personal incomes and expanding personal power. Moreover, the political power of large corporations must be considered together with their economic power, and the ultimate responsibilities of these organizations to their stakeholders.

In *The Politics of Distribution (1955)*, Palamountain considered the theory that legislation emerges from conflicting group interests, and reflects a balance of the relative strengths of these groups. Focusing on political activity in the 1930s, when influential business and political groups attempted to obtain legislation to regulate distribution, Palamountain finds that the result of moves and counter moves is more than a reflection of the respective power of groups. A significant contribution to marketing theory is the identification of three types of economic conflict in distribution; horizontal competition occurs within a group, inter-type competition occurs among different types of distribution, and vertical competition among different levels of distribution.

In *Business Practices Trade Position and Competition* (1956), Knauth expanded the argument presented earlier in *Theory in Marketing*. His basic position is unchanged; market power is necessary "to avoid the chaotic instability of the market place" (Knauth, 1956, p. 171). In this context:

> The kind of equilibrium sought by a business enterprise that is not completely at the mercy of the market, may be compared with the equilibrium of a living organisms described by the physiologist Walter B. Cannon in his *The Wisdom of the Body*. The equilibrium he calls 'homeostasis' (p. 169).

Within Knauth's (1956, p. 128) framework "Marketing postulates a heterogeneous production and demand. It is concerned with the differentiation of the product and the segmentation of demand".

Marketing behavior and executive action

It is difficult to characterize one's deep disappointment with *Marketing Behavior and Executive Action*. Years of exposure to Alderson's references to systems and general theory, and his obvious familiarity with social and behavior sciences, raised expectations of a much more comprehensive approach. For example, the seminal Alderson and Cox (1948, p. 139) article specifically noted the need for theory to deal with "issues raised by events in the areas of public and private policy as applied to marketing." These expectations were reinforced by contemporary suggestions of integrating theories, such as the work of Miller (1955), the originator of Living Systems Theory.

Alderson's book was introduced in a course in which discussions had been wide-ranging, and this course was part of a PhD program that encompassed the study of social sciences, including sociology and a variety of perspectives of the field of economics. In such a context, marketing came to be viewed in terms of systems, including firms, marketing channels, national and international economies, all of which interacted with a variety of social institutions. Thus, there existed a vast scope of potential areas of study within marketing theory. From this perspective, *Marketing Behavior and Executive Action* represented nothing less than a betrayal. It was only "a vantage point from which to understand business policy" (Alderson, 1957b, p. 23); "The culmination of marketing theory is in demonstrating its value as perspective for marketing practice" (p. 353).

This narrow scope of Alderson's work excluded the hierarchy of marketing systems discussed by Hawkins (1950), Cox and Goodman (1954) and McGarry (1951), noted in passing by Converse (1951) and embodied in Barger (1955), Galbraith and Holton (1955) and leads to questions relevant to marketing introduced by Gettell (1950), Knauth (1950, 1956), Means (1957), Mitchell and Rapkin (1954) and Palamountain (1955).

The conceptual underpinnings of Alderson's work also represented a violation of confidence. Since Alderson (1957b, p. 11) repeatedly expressed distain for economic theory, sometimes in an unrestrained manner, it is surprising to discover that:

> A central purpose of this book is to present a richer and more suggestive version of the *theory of the firm* which will provide perspective on marketing problems for the market analyst and the marketing executive [Emphasis supplied].

Alderson's (1957b, p. 23) theory is based on "functionalism," which is "the most promising approach for theoretical development in marketing." But, "functionalism" sounds very much like conventional microeconomic theory: "The substance of the functionalist approach is very similar to what Chamberlin implied by 'monopolistic competition' and what J. M. Clark has recently designated as 'the economics of differential advantage'" (p. 101). In any event: "Chamberlin has been the leading figure in the contemporary movement toward a more realistic theory of competition. His book [...] has been very influential in marketing circles" (p. 129).

The "difference in perspective" that separates Alderson's approach from microeconomics is specious:

> The two sides of the market have been traditionally described as "demand" and "supply." From the standpoint of a marketing organization attempting to achieve its objectives in the market place there appear to be distinct advantages in substituting the terms "opportunity" and "effort." These terms refer to the same thing as demand and supply, but they reflect a more dynamic view of the relationship as seen by the marketing organization itself [...].

> Sales results are the function of organized marketing effort applied to market opportunity (Alderson, 1957b, p. 355).

Alderson (1957b, p. 25) also introduced the term "organized behavior system," defined as "a group taken in conjunction with the environment in which it moves and has its being." However, this terminology is typically replaced by the familiar, although mundane, "firm," when explaining "opportunity" and "effort" and linking them to common ideas:

> The term "opportunity" is more specific and more narrowly defined than the broad concept of "demand." It means demand for the particular products or services that the individual firm is prepared to provide (p. 355).

Here, Alderson is substituting "opportunity" for what is commonly referred to in economic theory as the demand curve facing the firm. Subsequently, Alderson (1957b, p. 357) identifies opportunity as "sales potential."

The term "effort" designates:[. . .] the activities which a firm puts forward to serve its market. While it pertains to supply, it is a more dynamic concept that supply because it relates to a set of activities rather than to a quantity of goods. This one of the key points at which the present view is trying to press beyond traditional theory in order that marketing may be understood in terms of the functional analysis of behavior systems (Alderson, 1957b, p. 356).But, this "key point" resolves itself into some rather familiar things:

> Possible types of marketing effort can be broken down into such categories as personal selling, advertising and sales promotion, the combination of these ingredients [is] sometimes designated as the "the marketing mix."

Moreover, "Other types of activities which must be regarded as part of a total marketing program [. . .] include product development, sales development, and quality control" (p. 361). That is, marketing effort involves the variables that can be manipulated by a seller, price, product variation, promotion, and location, introduced into microeconomics by Chamberlin (1933).

Essentially, what we have here is a marketing management textbook based upon the theory of the firm, together with its limitations. Baumol (1957, p. 418), Princeton University, in a comment on *Marketing Theory and Executive Action*, pointed out that Alderson's work failed to overcome one of the conventional objections to economic theory:

> Rational problem solving remains the central concept [. . .]. To the extent that it permits deductions about market behavior, they must rest on this concept. Since conscious and deliberate problem solving does not presumably occupy a large part of the time of either executives or housewives, a book with this emphasis can scarcely be regarded as realistic description.

Alderson (1957a, p. 21) responded to Baumol's criticism by remarking, "Functionalism does not require perfect rationality, but only a capacity of learning and an interest in improving the efficiency of operations at whatever level." In the context of Edwards (1954), Levi-Strauss (1954), and other readings in the marketing theory course, one might well ask how "a capacity of learning" and an "interest in improving efficiency" might be conceptualized and measured.

The fundamental problem is Alderson's mindset. It is exceedingly difficult to see that a focus on the actions of the marketing executive can provide a basis for "The general theory so earnestly wanted by students of marketing" (Knauth, 1950, p. 151).

Indeed, Alderson's (1957b, p. 15) managerial bias, and heavy reliance on his interpretation of economic theory, leads to a definition of marketing that is entirely inadequate: "Marketing, of course, is the exchange taking place between consuming groups on the one hand and supplying groups on the other." However, marketing is only one form of exchange, and Alderson violates Churchman's (1950, p. 11) requirement that the appropriate framework for marketing theory is "the relation of marketing concepts to concepts of other fields is made explicit."

The extent of Alderson's misconception is clear when non-market forms of exchange are considered. In the 1950s, a controversy between Claude Levi-Srauss and George Homans regarding social exchange theory received much attention. Social exchange occurs outside the market; behavior is motivated by "non-monetary" rewards such as information, goods, services, or social support that have been provided to others in the past or are expected in the future. Homans (1958, p. 597) saw exchange as a unifying concept, suggesting that treating it as the basis of social behavior "may clarify the relations among four bodies of theory: behavioral psychology, economics, propositions about the dynamics of influence, and propositions about the structure of small groups."

Moreover, exchanges of goods for money occur outside the formal market that provides the context of Alderson's argument. Some goods may not be available, or some people may not discover that certain goods are available in formal markets. Moreover, market prices do not represent buyer's costs; even if a buyer is willing to pay market prices, market access costs may be too high. Thus, needs may be satisfied in parallel markets, where transaction costs are lower. Parallel markets represent a substantial part of a nation's "underground economy," and thus have an impact upon a nation's marketing system.

Marketing as conceived by Alderson, is no more than an aspect of market exchange, which in turn is only one type of exchange. Thus, *Marketing Theory and Executive Action* is less than helpful if one's interest lies in the broad scope of marketing encountered in Reavis Cox's theory of marketing course.

The demise of marketing theory at Wharton

Initially, Alderson's work was well received at Wharton, and according to the Wharton School History (Sass, 1982), the work of Reavis Cox was disparaged: "Alderson's book had presented a systems-theoretical analysis of marketing; traditional economic theory, by contrast, appeared only as a negative point of reference." Furthermore, "As developed by Reavis Cox and Ralph Breyer, marketing studies at Wharton had been a branch of institutional economics. Although painting fine descriptions of complex distribution systems, the research of these institutionalists had actually said little about how to manage a marketing operation" (Sass, 1982, p. 309).

This contrast between Alderson's "systems-theoretical" approach and Cox, the institutionalist, is very strange. Alderson implied that he himself was an "institutionalist," stating that John R. Commons, whose *Institutional Economics* essentially defined the field in the USA, "illustrates better than any other economist what the present writer calls the 'functional approach'" (Alderson, 1957b, p. 21). Alderson then makes the astounding assertion that Commons "was not an institutionalist at all" (p. 21). An interesting Sass (1982, p. 308) *non sequitur*, "Unlike Cox, who had always considered himself an economist, Alderson had consumed literature from all parts of the social sciences," would seem to require no comment.

Referring to the period before Reavis Cox became the marketing department chairman, Sass (1982, p. 309) continues, "Herbert Hess and his old group in merchandising had much more to offer on such practical matters [. . .]. Wroe Alderson returned to the problems of marketing practice." This is an odd acclamation, since:

> Hess and his colleagues in merchandising were enthusiastic and popular teachers. But, with little scholarly research or sophisticated procedure to pass on to their students, they primarily gave instruction in the "how-to-do-it" of advertising and retail selling (p. 216).

And, of course, the entire focus on "how-to-do-it" was part of the heritage that Wharton was attempting to overcome by the educational reforms of the 1950s.

But, there is no doubt that Alderson represented a turning point at Wharton. He:

> [. . .] bought a radical new direction to the department's program [. . .]. Using mathematical models and quantitative techniques, Alderson would attack such problems as how to analyze consumer tastes. How much to spend on advertising, how big a sales force to maintain, how to allocate salesmen to accounts, and how to apportion marketing messages across the media (Sass, 1982, pp. 309-10).

Specifically, "Alderson's genius served as a catalyst in the introduction of advanced quantitative methods and the return of marketing to a practical, technical orientation" (p. 320).

In the 1970s, "Wharton's Marketing Department boasted great strength in statistical technique and psychometrics; economics, marketing's former 'mother discipline,' was now a secondary influence; operations research mattered even less" (Sass, 1982, pp. 319-20). Even, Alderson was cast aside: "systems theory was practically irrelevant" (p. 320).

Apparently, the call for marketing theory in the 1950s went for naught. In a *Wharton Alumni Magazine* article, the chairman of the marketing department states "This is a department that focuses on translating state-of-the art, cutting-edge research into decision tools that managers can use to make better decisions" (Moffitt, 2005, p. 15).

One would want to consider what is meant by "better" decisions, and how "better" might be measured 50 years ago. But, then marketing management and planning was a part of marketing theory; today it seems to be all that there is.

References

Alderson, W. (1951), "Progress in the theory of marketing", in Wales, H.G. (Ed.), *Changing Perspectives in Marketing*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, IL, pp. 77-90.

Alderson, W. (1957a), "Areas for basic research in marketing", mimeograph, September, p.17.

Alderson, W. (1957b), *Marketing Behavior and Executive Action*, Richard D. Irwin, Homewood, IL.

Alderson, W. and Cox, R. (1948), "Towards a theory of marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 137-52.

Bakken, H.H. (1953), *Theory of Markets and Marketing*, Mimir, Madison, WI.

Barger, H. (1955), *Distribution's Place in the American Economy Since 1869*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Bartels, R. (1951), "Can marketing be a science?", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 15, pp. 319-28.

Baumol, W.J. (1957), "On the role of marketing theory", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 21, pp. 413-18.

Bavelas, A. (1951), "Communication patterns in task-oriented groups", in Lerner, D. and Lasswell, H.D. (Eds), *The Policy Sciences: Recent Developments in Scope and Method*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA, pp. 193-202.

Benjamin, A.C. (1949), "On defining science", *Scientific Monthly*, Vol. 88, pp. 192-8.

Benjamin, A.C. (1951), "Science and its presuppositions", *Scientific Monthly*, Vol. 73, pp. 150-3.

Blankertz, D.F. (1950), "Consumer actions and consumer nonprofit co-operation", in Cox, R. and Alderson, W. (Eds), *Theory in Marketing*, Richard D. Irwin, Chicago, IL, pp. 163-77.

Chamberlin, E.H. (1933), *The Theory of Monopolistic Competition*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Churchman, C.W. (1950), "Basic research in marketing", in Cox, R. and Alderson, W. (Eds), *Theory in Marketing*, Richard D. Irwin, Chicago, IL, pp. 1-17.

Clawson, J. (1950), "Lewin's vector psychology and the analysis of motives in marketing", in Cox, R. and Alderson, W. (Eds), *Theory in Marketing*, Richard D. Irwin, Chicago, IL, pp. 41-63.

Cohen, M.R. (1933), "Method, scientific", in Seligman, E.R.A. (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, Macmillan, New York, NY, Vol. 10, pp. 389-96.

Converse, P.D. (1949), "New laws of retail gravitation", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 14, pp. 379-84.

Converse, P.D. (1951), "Development of marketing theory: fifty years of progress", in Wales, H.G. (Ed.), *Changing Perspectives in Marketing*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, IL, pp. 1-31.

Converse, P.D. (1953), "Comment on movement of retail trade in Iowa", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 18, pp. 170-1.

Cox, R. (1948), *The Economics of Installment Buying*, Ronald Press, New York, NY.

Cox, R. (1955), "The significance of marketing goals for students of marketing", in Rewoldt, S.H. (Ed.), *Frontiers in Marketing Thought*, Bureau of Business Research, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Cox, R. (1956), "Three-in-one marketing", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 34 No. 6, pp. 61-8.

Cox, R. and Alderson, W. (1950), *Theory in Marketing*, Richard D. Irwin, Chicago, IL.

Cox, R. and Goodman, C. (1954), "Channels and flows in the marketing of house building materials", mimeograph.

Deutsch, K.W. (1952), "On communication models in the social sciences", *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 16, pp. 356-80.

Edwards, W. (1954), "The theory of decision making", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 51, pp. 380-417.

Fine, B. (1953), "Columbia's permanent seminars have become an important feature of university life", *The New York Times*, May 10, p. E11.

Fine, B. (1954), "College curriculum based on 'Great Books' is judged a success and will continue", *The New York Times*, May 30, p. E7.

Galbraith, J.K. and Holton, R.H. (1955), *Marketing Efficiency in Puerto Rico*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Gettell, R.G. (1950), "Pluralistic competition", in Cox, R. and Alderson, W. (Eds), *Theory in Marketing*, Richard D. Irwin, Chicago, IL, pp. 89-109.

Gordon, R.A. and Howell, J.E. (1959), *Higher Education for Business*, Columbia University Press, New York, NY.

Grether, E.T. (1950), "A theoretical approach to the analysis of marketing", in Cox, R. and Alderson, W. (Eds), *Theory in Marketing*, Richard D. Irwin, Chicago, IL, pp. 113-23.

Hamilton, W.H. (1931), "Competition", in Seligman, E.R.A. (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, Macmillan, New York, NY, Vol. 4, pp. 141-7.

Hawkins, E.R. (1950), "Vertical price relationships", in Cox, R. and Alderson, W. (Eds), *Theory in Marketing*, Richard D. Irwin, Chicago, IL, pp. 179-91.

Hawkins, E.R. (1954), "Price policies and price theory", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 18, pp. 233-40.

Hollander, S.C. (1955), "limitations of science in the study and practice of marketing", in Rewoldt, S.H. (Ed.), *Frontiers in Marketing Thought*, Bureau of Business Research, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, pp. 175-85.

Homans, G.C. (1958), "Social behavior as exchange", *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 63 No. 6, pp. 597-606.

Hutchinson, K.D. (1952), "Marketing as a science – an appraisal", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 16, pp. 286-93.

Knauth, O.W. (1950), "Marketing and managerial enterprise", in Cox, R. and Alderson, W. (Eds), *Theory in Marketing*, Richard D. Irwin, Chicago, IL, pp. 151-61.

Knauth, O.W. (1956), *Business Practices Trade Position and Competition*, Columbia University Press, New York, NY.

Koshetz, H. (1953), "More stress urged on social sciences", *The New York Times*, November 14, p. 25.

Levi-Strauss, C. (1954), "The mathematics of man", *International Social Science Bulletin*, UNESCO, Paris, pp. 581-90.

Lundberg, G.A. (1945), *Marketing and Social Organization*, Curtis, Philadelphia, PA.

Lundy, R.D. (1950), "How many service stations are 'Too Many'", in Cox, R. and Alderson, W. (Eds), *Theory in Marketing*, Richard D. Irwin, Chicago, IL, pp. 321-33.

McGarry, E.G. (1950), "Some functions of marketing reconsidered", in Cox, R. and Alderson, W. (Eds), *Theory in Marketing*, Richard D. Irwin, Chicago, IL, pp. 263-79.

McGarry, E.G. (1951), "The contactual function in marketing", *Journal of Business*, Vol. 24, pp. 96-113.

McGarry, E.G. (1953), "Some new viewpoints in marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 18, pp. 33-40.

McInnes, W.C. (1955), "Discussion", in Rewoldt, S.H. (Ed.), *Frontiers in Marketing Thought*, Bureau of Business Research, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, pp. 187-96.

Means, G.C. (1957), "Collective capitalism and economic theory", *Science*, Vol. 126, pp. 287-93.

Mehren, G.L. (1950), "The theory of the firm and marketing", in Cox, R. and Alderson, W. (Eds), *Theory in Marketing*, Richard D. Irwin, Chicago, IL, pp. 125-42.

Miller, J.G. (1955), "Toward a general theory for the behavioral sciences", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 10, pp. 513-31.

Mitchell, R.B. and Rapkin, C. (1954), *Urban Traffic: A Function of Land Use*, Columbia University Press, New York, NY.

Moffitt, N. (2005), "Marketing 100 – how the world's largest, most cited and most published marketing department has changed the world of business", *The Wharton Alumni Magazine*, Spring, pp. 12-22.

(The) New York Times (1953), "Broader approach to learning urged", December 13, p. 63.

Palamountain, J.C. (1955), *The Politics of Distribution*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Pierson, F.C. (1959), *The Education of American Businessmen*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

Planck, M. (1948), "The meaning and limits of exact science", *Science*, Vol. 110, pp. 319-27.

Reynolds, R.B. (1953a), "A test of the law of retail gravitation", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 17, pp. 273-7.

Reynolds, R.B. (1953b), "Rejoinder", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 18, pp. 170-4.

Sass, S.A. (1982), *The Pragmatic Imagination*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, PA.

Shepherd, G.S. (1955), *Marketing Farm Products – Economic Analysis*, The Iowa State College Press, Ames, IA.

Shils, E.A. (1951), "The study of the primary group", in Lerner, D. and Lasswell, H.D. (Eds), *The Policy Sciences: Recent Developments in Scope and Method*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA, pp. 44-69.

Standen, A. (1950), *Science Is a Sacred Cow*, E.P. Dutton, New York, NY.

Stewart, J.Q. (1950), "Potential of population and its relationship to marketing", in Cox, R. and Alderson, W. (Eds), *Theory in Marketing*, Richard D. Irwin, Chicago, IL.

(*The*) *Time Magazine* (1955), "How to become an executive", February 28.

Vaile, R.S. (1949), "Towards a theory of marketing – a comment", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 13, pp. 520-2.

Vaile, R.S. (1950), "Economic theory and marketing", in Cox, R. and Alderson, W. (Eds), *Theory in Marketing*, Richard D. Irwin, Chicago, IL, pp. 143-50.

Vaile, R.S., Grether, E.T. and Cox, R. (1952), *Marketing in the American Economy*, Ronald Press, New York, NY.

Verdoorn, R.J. (1956), "Marketing from the producer's point of view", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 20, pp. 221-35.

Weintraub, S. (1949), *Price Theory*, Pitman, New York, NY.

Working, H. (1953), "Futures trading and hedging", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 43, pp. 314-43.

Further reading

Rewoldt, S.H. (Ed.) (1955), *Frontiers in Marketing Thought*, Bureau of Business Research, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

About the author

Donald F. Dixon is currently an Independent Scholar. He received his BA in Economics from Brown University, MBA and PhD course work at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, and PhD from London University. He served on the faculties of Villanova University, Temple University, and Pennsylvania State University – Great Valley and was also a Visiting Professor at the University of New South Wales, St Joseph College and the Open University of the Netherlands. His major research interests include the heritage of marketing, particularly the history of marketing thought and development of marketing theory, marketing systems, marketing productivity, services, macromarketing, and household behavior. In addition to publishing more than 70 journal articles, and over 80 conference papers, books, book chapters, and reviews, he is co-author of *The Marketing System* (with Ian Wilkinson).