

When you finish this chapter, you should:

- Understand why marketing must be evaluated differently at the micro and macro levels.
- Understand why the text argues that micro-marketing costs too much.
- Understand why the text argues that macro-marketing does not cost too much.
- Know some of the challenges marketers face as they work to develop ethical marketing strategies that serve consumers' needs.

Chapter twenty-two

Ethical Marketing
in a Consumer-Oriented
World: Appraisal
and Challenges

You may already have heard something about the term “sustainable development,” but could you define it? The first time the business world really woke up to sustainable development was in 1987. Many business leaders found a copy of *Our Common Future* in their in-trays. Produced by the *World Commission on Environment and Development*, chaired by Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland, the book reframed the environmental debate. The key

sentence was this: “Humanity has the ability to make development sustainable—to ensure that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”

The report went on to make it clear that:

- Sustainable development is a *total concept* providing an agenda, though not a blueprint, for action;
- It is a *process* of harmonizing resource use, investment, technological development, and institutional change;
- The shift to sustainable development must be powered by a continuing flow of *wealth* from industry;
- But future wealth creation will need to be much less environmentally damaging, more just and more secure.¹

Sustainable development is in many respects a revolutionary idea with far-reaching implications. That being so, it's surprising how quickly the concept gained a considerable degree of corporate acceptance. The World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) is a coalition of 125 international companies united by a shared commitment to the environment and to the principles of economic growth and sustainable development. Its members are drawn from 35 countries and more than 20 major industrial sectors. Its Canadian members include Avenor, Noranda, Ontario Hydro, Suncor Energy, and Transalta. The WBCSD operates in conjunction with a global network of national and regional business councils and partner organizations.

The WBCSD was formed in January 1995 through a merger between the Business Council for Sustainable Development in Geneva and the World Industry Council for the Environment (WICE), which was an initiative of the Paris-based International Chamber of Commerce. Those two parent bodies had been at the forefront of business's response to the challenges arising from the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. Today, the WBCSD has become the pre-eminent business voice on sustainable development. You can learn more about that organization by visiting its Web site (www.wbcds.ch)

Sustainable development is such an all-encompassing concept that even sympathetic corporations may not know how to proceed. Fortunately, the WBCSD and a number of organizations sharing similar concerns can provide a great deal of assistance. Some of these organizations are Canadian-based. The National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy plays an important facilitating role by bringing together environmental groups, industry, government, and academia in a search for mutually acceptable, “win-win” environmental solutions.



The International Institute for Sustainable Development has an office in Calgary that provides “how to” information to corporations exploring what it means to become sustainability-driven. Its Web site (iisd1.iisd.ca/business) will lead you to a wide variety of special studies with further links to many other valuable sources of information. As a useful starting point, sustainable development is operationally defined from a business perspective:

For the business enterprise, sustainable development means adopting business strategies and activities that meet the needs of the enterprise and its stockholders today while protecting, sustaining, and enhancing the human and natural resources that will be needed in the future.

Such a definition obviously has far-reaching implications for marketing managers. On the producer side, it goes well beyond “green marketing,” by also addressing the environmental implications of the firm’s production and waste disposal procedures. Sustainable consumption is an even more far-reaching concept. It suggests that “more is not necessarily better” and leads some to conclude that a *conserving society* must inevitably replace our society’s current emphasis on consumption. Sustainable consumption thus raises a fundamental challenge to the consumer sovereignty and market economy concepts discussed in the remainder of this chapter.

Sustainable development is almost certain to grow in both social and managerial importance. Students who wish to learn more about the concept have a unique opportunity not only to do so but also to earn a certificate attesting to this fact. For more information on the Sustainable Development Challenge Brief and its associated on-line exam, visit (<http://challenge.bi.no/sbc>).² •

How economies function

All societies must provide for the needs of their members. Therefore, every society needs some sort of **economic system**, which is defined as the way an economy organizes to use scarce resources to produce goods and services and distribute them for consumption by various people and groups in the society.

How an economic system operates depends on a society’s objectives and the nature of its political institutions.³ But regardless of what form these take, all economic systems must develop some method—along with appropriate economic institutions—to decide what and how much is to be produced and distributed by whom, when, to whom, and why. How these decisions are made may vary from nation to nation. But the macro-level objectives are basically similar: to create goods and services and make them available when and where they are needed, in order to maintain or improve each nation’s standard of living or other socially defined objective.

There are two basic kinds of economic systems: planned systems and market-directed systems. Actually, no economy is entirely planned or entirely market-directed. Most are a mixture of the two extremes.

Government planners may make the decisions

In a **planned economic system**, government planners decide what and how much is to be produced and distributed by whom, when, to whom, and why. Producers generally have little choice about what goods and services to produce. Their main task is to meet their assigned production quotas. Prices are set by government planners and tend to be very rigid—not changing according to supply and demand. Consumers usually have some freedom of choice—it’s impossible to control every single detail! But the assortment of goods and services may be quite limited. Activities such as market research, branding, and advertising usually are neglected. Sometimes they aren’t done at all.

Government planning may work fairly well as long as an economy is simple and the variety of goods and services is small. It may even be necessary under certain conditions—during wartime, drought, or political instability, for example. However, as economies become more complex, government planning becomes more difficult. It

may even break down. Planners may be overwhelmed by too many complex decisions. And consumers may lose patience if the planners don't respond to their needs.

The collapse of communism in Eastern Europe dramatically illustrates this. Citizens of the former Soviet Union were not satisfied with the government's plan, because products consumers wanted and needed were not available. To try to reduce consumer dissatisfaction, government planners tried to put more emphasis on making consumer goods available, but they were not able to produce the results consumers wanted. In short, it was consumer dissatisfaction with decisions made by government planners that brought about a revolution—one that is leading to the development of market-directed economies in the new, independent republics of Eastern Europe.⁴

A market-directed economy adjusts itself

In a **market-directed economic system**, the individual decisions of the many producers and consumers make the macro-level decisions for the whole economy. In a pure market-directed economy, consumers make a society's production decisions when they make their choices in the marketplace. Through their dollar "votes," they decide what is to be produced and by whom.

PRICE IS A MEASURE OF VALUE Prices in the marketplace are a rough measure of how society values particular goods and services. If consumers are willing to pay the market prices, then apparently they feel they are getting at least their money's worth. Similarly, the costs of labour and materials are a rough measure of the value of the resources used in the production of goods and services to meet these needs. New consumer needs that can be served profitably—not just the needs of the majority—will probably be met by some profit-minded businesses.

In summary, in a market-directed economic system, the prices in both the production sector (for resources) and the consumption sector (for goods and services) vary to allocate resources and distribute incomes according to consumer preferences. Over time, the result is a balance of supply and demand and the coordination of the economic activity of many individuals and institutions.

GREATER FREEDOM OF CHOICE Consumers in a market-directed economy enjoy great freedom of choice. They are not forced to buy any goods or services, except those which must be provided for the good of society—things such as national defence, schools, police and fire protection, highway systems, and public health services. These are provided by the community—and citizens are taxed to pay for them.

Similarly, producers are free to do whatever they wish, provided that they stay within the rules of the game set by government *and* receive enough dollar votes from consumers. If they do their job well, they earn a profit and stay in business. But profit, survival, and growth are not guaranteed.

CONFLICTS CAN RESULT When producers and consumers make free choices, conflicts and difficulties can arise. This is called the **micro-macro dilemma**: What is "good" for some producers and consumers may not be good for society as a whole.

Consider for a moment problems related to the sale of alcohol. Each year, thousands of people die or are hospitalized as an indirect or direct result of liquor consumption. The cost to society is high, yet the sale of alcohol is not banned. Alcohol consumption is an accepted practice in Canada, and producers profit by selling it. Should society limit its availability to certain segments of the population, or should society allow it to be freely available to anyone who wants to purchase it, regardless of social cost?

Many Canadians want the convenience of disposable products and products in easy-to-use, small-serving packages. But these same "convenient" products and packages often lead to pollution of the environment and inefficient use of natural resources. Should future generations be left to pay for the consequences of pollution that is the result of free choice by today's consumers? Alternatively, should all of us alive today endorse the Declaration of Interdependence of the David Suzuki Foundation (see Marketing Demo 22-1)?

Marketing Demo 22-1

Declaration of Interdependence



DECLARATION OF INTERDEPENDENCE

THIS WE KNOW

We are the earth, through the plants and animals that nourish us.

We are the rains and the oceans that flow through our veins.

We are the breath of the forests of the land, and the plants of the sea.

We are human animals, related to all other life as descendants of the firstborn cell.

We share with these kin a common history, written in our genes.

We share a common present, filled with uncertainty.

And we share a common future, as yet untold.

We humans are but one of thirty million species

weaving the thin layer of life enveloping the world.

The stability of communities of living things depends upon this diversity.

Linked in that web, we are interconnected -

using, cleansing, sharing and replenishing the fundamental elements of life.

Our home, planet Earth, is finite; all life shares its resources and the energy from the sun,

and therefore has limits to growth.

For the first time, we have touched those limits.

When we compromise the air, the water, the soil and the variety of life,

we steal from the endless future to serve the fleeting present.

THIS WE BELIEVE

Humans have become so numerous and our tools so powerful

that we have driven fellow creatures to extinction, dammed the great rivers,

torn down ancient forests, poisoned the earth, rain and wind, and ripped holes in the sky.

Our science has brought pain as well as joy; our comfort is paid for by the suffering of millions.

We are learning from our mistakes, we are mourning our vanished kin,

and we now build a new politics of hope.

We respect and uphold the absolute need for clean air, water and soil.

We see that economic activities that benefit the few while shrinking the inheritance of many are wrong.

And since environmental degradation erodes biological capital forever,

full ecological and social cost must enter all equations of development.

We are one brief generation in the long march of time; the future is not ours to erase.

So where knowledge is limited, we will remember all those who will walk after us,

and err on the side of caution.

THIS WE RESOLVE

All this that we know and believe must now become the foundation of the way we live.

At this turning point in our relationship with Earth,

we work for an evolution: from dominance to partnership;

from fragmentation to connection; from insecurity,

to interdependence.



Questions like these are not easy to answer. The basic reason is that many different people may have a stake in the outcomes—and social consequences—of the choices made by individual managers *and* consumers in a market-directed system. Having read this book and learned more about marketing, you will also have learned more about social responsibility in marketing—and why it must be taken seriously.

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT The Canadian economy and most other Western economies are mainly market-directed—but not completely. Society assigns supervision of the system to the government. For example, besides setting and enforcing the “rules of the game,” government agencies control interest rates and the supply of money. They also regulate radio and TV broadcasting, set import and export rules that affect international competition, sometimes control wages and prices, and so on. Government also tries to ensure that property is protected, contracts are enforced, individuals are not exploited, no group unfairly monopolizes markets, and producers deliver the kinds and quality of goods and services they claim to be offering.

How well does our macro-marketing system work?

A macro-marketing system does more than just deliver goods and services to consumers—it allows mass production with its economies of scale. Also, mass communication and mass transportation allow products to be shipped where they’re needed. Coconuts from the tropics can be found in Canadian stores almost year-round, and electronic parts from Taiwan are used in making products all over the world.⁵

It encourages growth and new ideas

In addition to making mass production possible, a market-directed, macro-marketing system encourages **innovation**—the development and spread of new ideas and products. Competition for consumers’ money forces firms to think of new and better ways to satisfy consumer needs.

It has its critics

In explaining marketing’s role in society, we described some of the benefits of a market-directed, macro-marketing system. We can see this in Canada’s macro-marketing system. That system provides—at least in material terms—one of the highest standards of living in the world. It seems to be effective and fair in many ways.

We must admit, however, that marketing, as it exists in Canada and other developed societies, has many critics. Marketing activity is especially open to criticism because it is the part of business most visible to the public. There is nothing like a pocketbook issue for getting consumers excited!

Typical complaints about marketing include these:

- Advertising is too often annoying, misleading, and wasteful.
- Products are not safe, or the quality is poor.
- Marketing makes people too materialistic and motivates them toward “things” instead of social needs.
- Easy consumer credit makes people buy things they don’t need and really can’t afford.
- Packaging and labelling are often confusing and deceptive.
- Intermediaries add to the cost of distribution, and raise prices without providing anything in return.
- Marketing creates interest in products that pollute the environment.

- Too many unnecessary products are offered.
- Marketing serves the rich and exploits the poor.

Such complaints cannot and should not be taken lightly. They show that many people aren't happy with some parts of the marketing system. Certainly, the strong public support for consumer protection laws proves that not all consumers feel that they are being treated like royalty.

We must evaluate at two levels

As you consider the various criticisms of marketing, keep in mind that some of them deal with the marketing practices of specific firms and are micro-marketing oriented. Others are really criticisms of the entire macro-marketing system. This is an important distinction. Some critics of specific ads, for example, probably wouldn't be satisfied with *any* advertising. When evaluating marketing, we must treat these two levels separately.

Consumer satisfaction is the objective in Canada

An earlier section of this text emphasized that *the basic objective of our market-directed economic system has been to satisfy consumer needs as they—the consumers—see them*. This objective implies that political freedom and economic freedom go hand in hand, and that citizens in a free society have the right to live as they choose. The majority of consumers in Canada and the United States would be unwilling to give up the freedom of choice they now enjoy. The same can be said of consumers in Great Britain and most other countries in the European Community. However, for focus, we will concentrate on marketing as it exists in North American society.

Can consumer satisfaction be measured?

Since consumer satisfaction is our objective, marketing's effectiveness must be measured by *how well* it satisfies consumers. Unfortunately, consumer satisfaction is hard to define—and even harder to measure.

Satisfaction depends on individual aspirations

There have been various efforts to measure overall consumer satisfaction, not only in Canada but also in other countries. However, measuring consumer satisfaction is difficult because satisfaction depends on consumers' levels of aspiration or expectation. Less prosperous consumers begin to expect more out of an economy as they see the higher living standards of others. Also, aspiration levels tend to rise with repeated successes—and fall with failures. Products considered satisfactory one day may not be satisfactory the next day, and vice versa. A few years ago, most of us were more than satisfied with a 19-inch colour TV that pulled in three or four channels. But once you've watched one of the newer large-screen models and enjoyed all the options possible with a cable hook-up or satellite, that old TV is never the same again. And once high-definition TVs become readily available, today's most satisfying units won't seem quite so acceptable. So consumer satisfaction is a highly personal concept—and looking at the "average" satisfaction of a whole society does not provide a reliable standard for evaluating macro-marketing effectiveness.⁶

Measuring macro-marketing must be subjective

If the objective of macro-marketing is to maximize consumer satisfaction, then we must measure total satisfaction—of everyone. But there's no good way to measure aggregate consumer satisfaction. Some consumers will always be more satisfied than others. So our evaluation of macro-marketing effectiveness can only be subjective.

Probably the supreme test is whether the macro-marketing system satisfies enough individual consumer-citizens that they vote—at the ballot box—to keep it running. So far, we've done so in North America.

Measuring micro-marketing can be less subjective

Measuring micro-marketing effectiveness is also difficult, but it can be done. Individual business firms can and should try to measure how well their marketing mixes satisfy their customers (or why they fail). In fact, most large firms now make some type of ongoing effort to determine whether they're satisfying their target markets. Many large and small firms measure customer satisfaction with attitude research studies. For example, the J. D. Power marketing research firm is well known for its studies of consumer satisfaction with different makes of automobiles and computers. Other widely used approaches involve unsolicited consumer responses (usually complaints), opinions of intermediaries and salespeople, market test results, and profits. Of course, customers may be very satisfied about some aspects of what a firm is doing but dissatisfied about other dimensions of performance.⁷

In our market-directed system, it's up to each customer to decide how effectively an individual firm satisfies his or her needs. Usually, customers will buy more of the products that satisfy them—and they'll do it repeatedly. That's why firms that develop really satisfying marketing mixes are able to develop profitable long-term relationships with the customers they serve. Because efficient marketing plans can increase profits, profitability can be used as a rough measure of a firm's efficiency in satisfying customers. Nonprofit organizations have a different bottom line, but they too will fail if they don't satisfy supporters and get the resources they need to continue to operate.

Evaluating marketing effectiveness—difficult but not impossible

Because it's hard to measure consumer satisfaction—and, therefore, the effectiveness of micro- and macro-marketing—it's easy to see why opinions differ. But if the objective of the economy is defined clearly, and the argument is stripped of emotion, the big questions about marketing effectiveness probably *can* be answered.

In this chapter, we argue that micro-marketing (how individual firms and channels operate) frequently *does* cost too much but that macro-marketing (how the whole marketing system operates) *does not* cost too much, *given the present objective of the Canadian economy—consumer satisfaction*. Accept this position not as *the* answer, but rather as a point of view. In the end, you'll have to make your own judgment.⁸

Micro-marketing often does cost too much

Throughout the text, we've explored what marketing managers can or should do to help their firms do a better job of satisfying customers. Many firms implement highly successful marketing programs; others are still too production-oriented and inefficient.

For customers of these latter firms, micro-marketing often does cost too much.

Research shows that many consumers are not satisfied. But you know that already. All of us have had experiences when we weren't satisfied—when some firm didn't deliver on its promises. And the problem is much bigger than some marketers want to believe. Research suggests that the majority of consumer complaints are never reported. Worse, many complaints that *are* reported never get fully resolved.

The failure rate is high

Further evidence that too many firms are too production-oriented—and not nearly as efficient as they could be—is the fact that so many new products fail. New and old businesses, even ones that in the past were leaders in their markets, also regularly fail.

Marketing inefficiencies are due to one or more of the following three reasons:

- 1 Lack of interest in—or understanding of—the sometimes fickle customer.
- 2 Improper blending of the four Ps, caused in part by overemphasis on internal problems.
- 3 Lack of understanding of, or adjustment to, the marketing environment—especially what competitors do.

The high cost of poor marketing mixes

Perhaps lack of concern for the customer is most noticeable in the ways the four Ps are sometimes combined—or forced—into a marketing mix.

Too many firms develop a new product to satisfy some manager's pet idea, not to meet the needs of certain target customers. Or they see another company with a successful product and try to jump into the market with another me-too imitation—without even thinking about the competition they'll encounter. Often, they don't worry about quality. In fact, until very recently most North American manufacturers lacked *any* quality control procedures, even in the production of goods and services. The idea of using total quality management to implement marketing plans to meet customers' requirements was foreign to them.

Some marketing managers don't pay attention to getting needed support from intermediaries. Too many producers don't even consider the possibility that a big retail chain may see better value for its customers—and greater profit potential—in someone else's product.

Firms often ignore demand and set prices on a cost-plus basis. While margins are fairly definite, managers can only predict volume. So they choose high margins—which may lead to high prices and reduced volume.

If a product is poorly designed, if a firm uses inadequate channels, or if pricing isn't competitive, it's easy to see why promotion may be costly. Aggressive spending on promotion doesn't make up for other types of mistakes.

Top-management decisions on company objectives may increase the cost of marketing unnecessarily. Seeking sales growth for growth's sake, for example, often leads to too much spending for promotion and poor profits on what is sold.

Another sign of failure is the inability of firms to identify new target markets and new opportunities. A new marketing mix that isn't offered doesn't fail—but the lost opportunity can be significant both for a firm and for society. Too many managers seize on whatever strategy seems easiest instead of seeking really new ways to satisfy customers.

Micro-marketing costs too much, but things are changing

For reasons like these, marketing does cost too much in many firms. Despite all the lip service, the marketing concept is not really being applied.

But not all firms and marketers deserve criticism. More of them *are* becoming customer-oriented. And many are paying more attention to market-oriented planning to carry out the marketing concept more effectively. Throughout the text, we've highlighted firms and strategies that are making a difference. The successes of innovative firms—which include Wal-Mart, 3M, Toys “Я” Us, and Rubbermaid—do not go unnoticed. Yes, they make some mistakes. That's human—and marketing is a human enterprise. But they have also benefitted from the results that strategic market planning can produce.

Another encouraging sign is the end of the idea that anybody can run a business successfully. This never was true. Businesses are growing more complex and require many different types of professionals—not only business managers but also computer and communications specialists, psychologists, statisticians, and economists.

Managers who adopt the marketing concept as a way of business life do a better job. They look for target market opportunities and carefully blend the elements of the marketing mix to meet their customers' needs. As more of these managers rise in business, we can look forward to much lower micro-marketing costs—and strategies that do a better job of satisfying customer needs.

Macro-marketing does not cost too much

Many critics of marketing take aim at the macro-marketing system. In their view, (1) promotion in any form is socially undesirable, and (2) the macro-marketing system causes poor use of resources, limits income and employment, and leads to an unfair distribution of income.

Most of these complaints imply that some micro-marketing activities should not be permitted, and that because they are, our macro-marketing system does a poor job. Let's look at some of these positions to help you form your own opinion.

Micro-efforts help the economy grow

Some critics feel that marketing helps create monopolies or at least monopolistic competition. Further, they think this leads to higher prices, restricted output, and reduction in national income and employment.

It's true that firms in a market-directed economy try to carve out separate monopolistic markets for themselves with new products. But consumers do have a choice. They don't *have* to buy the new product unless they think it's a better value. The old products are still available. In fact, to meet the new competition, prices of the old products usually drop. And that makes them even more available.

Over several years, the innovator's profits may rise—but rising profits encourage further innovation by competitors. This leads to new investments, which contribute to economic growth and higher levels of national income and employment. Around the world, many countries with centrally planned systems failed to achieve their potential for economic growth because this type of profit incentive didn't exist.

Increased profits also attract competition. Profits then begin to drop as new competitors enter the market and begin producing somewhat similar products. (Recall the rise and fall of industry profit during the product life cycle.)

Is advertising a waste of resources?

Advertising is the most criticized of all micro-marketing activities. Indeed, many ads *are* annoying, insulting, misleading, and downright ineffective. This is one reason why micro-marketing often does cost too much. However, advertising can also make both micro- and macro-marketing work better.

Advertising is an economical way to inform large numbers of potential customers about a firm's products. Provided that a product satisfies customer needs, advertising can increase demand for the product and foster economies of scale in manufacturing, distribution, and sales. Because these economies may more than offset advertising costs, advertising can actually *lower* prices to the consumer.⁹

At the macro level, the increased demand that advertising creates gives producers a faster return on their investment. This, in turn, stimulates further investment, encourages innovation, creates jobs, raises personal incomes, and generates economic growth.

Does marketing make people buy things they don't need?

From our discussion so far, it seems that micro-marketing activities aimed at satisfying consumer needs do *not* lead to improper use of resources. Giving individuals what they want, after all, is the purpose of our market-directed economic system. However, some critics feel that most firms—especially large corporations—don't really cater to

the needs and wants of the consumer. They think that such firms use clever ads to persuade consumers to buy whatever the firms want to sell.

Historian Arnold Toynbee, for example, felt that North American firms manipulated consumers into buying products that aren't necessary to satisfy "the minimum material requirements of life." Toynbee saw American firms as mainly trying to fulfill "unwanted demand"—demand created by advertising—rather than "genuine wants." He defined genuine wants as "wants that we become aware of spontaneously, without having to be told by Madison Avenue that we want something that we should never have thought of wanting if we had been left in peace to find out our wants for ourselves."¹⁰

WHAT ARE THE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS OF LIFE? One problem raised by this line of reasoning is this: How do we determine the minimum material requirements of life? Should people go back to living in caves or log cabins? Which products consumed today are unnecessary and should not be produced?

Obviously, we have to make some value judgments in order to answer such questions—and few of us share the same values. One critic suggested that Americans could and should do without such items as pets, newspaper comic strips, second family cars, motorcycles, snowmobiles, campers, recreational boats and planes, aerosol products, pop and beer cans, and hats.¹¹ You may agree with some of these. But who should determine the minimum material requirements of life—consumers or critics?

CONSUMERS ARE NOT PUPPETS The idea that firms can manipulate consumers to buy anything the company chooses to produce simply isn't true. A consumer who buys a soft drink that tastes terrible won't buy another can of that brand, regardless of how much it's advertised. In fact, many new products fail the test of the market. Not even large corporations are assured of success every time they launch a new product. Consider, for example, the dismal fate of products such as Ford's Edsel, Du Pont's Corfam, Campbell's Red Kettle Soups, and RCA's computers. And if powerful corporations know some way to get people to buy products against their will, would General Motors not so long ago have tallied the biggest loss in history?

NEEDS AND WANTS CHANGE Consumer needs and wants change constantly. Few of us would care to live the way our grandparents lived when they were our age—



Should consumers in China be allowed to decide what needs are important and what products should be available—or should those decisions be made by government planners?

let alone like the pioneers who travelled to unknown destinations in covered wagons. Marketing's job is not just to satisfy consumer wants as they exist at any particular point in time. Rather, marketing must keep looking for new—and better—ways to serve consumers.

Does marketing make people materialistic?

There is no doubt that marketing caters to materialistic values. However, people disagree as to whether marketing creates these values or simply appeals to values already there.

Even in the most primitive societies, people want to accumulate possessions. In fact, in some tribal villages social status is measured by how many goats or sheep a person owns. Further, the tendency for ancient pharaohs and kings to surround themselves with wealth and treasures can hardly be attributed to the persuasive powers of advertising agencies!

The idea that marketers create and serve “false tastes”—as defined by individual critics—was answered by a well-known economist:

The marketplace responds to the tastes of consumers with the goods and services that are salable, whether the tastes are elevated or depraved. It is unfair to criticize the marketplace for fulfilling these desires . . . it is like blaming waiters in restaurants for obesity.¹²

MARKETING REFLECTS OUR OWN VALUES Experts who study materialism seem to agree that in the short run, marketing reflects social values, while in the long run, it enhances and reinforces them. One expert pointed out that consumers vote for what they want in the marketplace and in the polling place. To say that what they choose is wrong, he said, is to criticize the basic idea of free choice and democracy.¹³

PRODUCTS DO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF LIFE More is not always better. The quality of life can't be measured just in terms of quantities of material goods. But when we view products as the means to an end rather than the end itself, they *do* make it possible to satisfy higher-level needs. For example, microwave ovens greatly reduce the amount of time people spend preparing meals, and this frees them to pursue other interests. And more dependable cars expand people's geographic horizons, affecting where they live, work, and play. The Internet empowers people with information in ways that could not have been imagined just a few years ago.



Colgate is concerned not only with profit but also with social responsibility; its dental vans offer free dental screenings to children in inner-city communities.

Consumers ask for it, consumers pay for it

The monopolistic competition typical of our economy results from customer preferences—*not* manipulation of markets by business. Monopolistic competition may seem costly at times when we look at micro-level situations. But if the role of the marketing system is to serve consumers, then the cost of whatever goods and services they demand cannot be considered too high. It's just the cost of serving consumers the way they want to be served.

Not all needs are met

Some critics argue that our macro-marketing system is flawed because it does not provide solutions to important problems, such as questions about how to help the homeless, the uneducated, dependent children, minorities who have suffered discrimination, the elderly poor, and the sick. Many of these people do live in dire circumstances. But is that the result of a market-directed system?

There is no doubt that many firms focus their efforts on people who can pay for what they have to offer. But as the forces of competition drive down prices, more people are able to afford more of what they need. And the matching of supply and demand stimulates economic growth, creates jobs, and spreads income among more people. In other words, a market-directed economy makes efficient use of resources. However, it can't guarantee that government aid programs will be effective. It doesn't ensure that all voters and politicians will agree on which problems should be solved first—or how taxes should be set and allocated. It can't eliminate the possibility that a child will be ignored.

These are important societal issues. But they are not the result of a market-directed system. Citizen-consumers in a democratic society assign some responsibilities to business and some to government. Most people in business share the concern that government too often does not do an effective job of addressing these problems. Many firms are working to identify and contribute solutions. But ultimately, consumer-citizens vote at the ballot box for how to deal with these concerns—just as they vote with their dollars for which firms to support. As more managers in the public sector understand and apply marketing concepts, we should be able to do a better job of meeting the needs of all people.

Challenges facing marketers

We've said that our macro-marketing system does *not* cost too much, given the present

objective of our economy. But we admit that the performance of many business firms leaves a lot to be desired. This presents a challenge to serious-minded students and marketers. What needs to be done—if anything?

We need better performance at the micro level

Some business executives seem to feel that they should be completely free in a market-directed economy. They don't understand that ours is a market-directed system, and that they must serve the needs of consumer-citizens. Instead, they focus on their own internal problems—and don't satisfy consumers very well.

WE NEED BETTER MARKET-ORIENTED PLANNING Many firms are still production-oriented. Some hardly plan at all, while others simply extend one year's plans into the next. Progressive firms are beginning to realize that this doesn't work in our fast-changing markets. Strategic market planning is becoming more important in many companies. Firms are paying more attention to changes in the market—including trends in the marketing environment—and to how marketing strategies need to be adapted to consider these changes.

WE NEED CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT Good strategic market planning needs to focus on a specific target market and a marketing mix to meet its needs. The basic frameworks and ideas about how to do that haven't changed all that much

over the years. At the same time, thinking about all these changes highlights the fact that marketing is dynamic. Marketing managers must constantly evaluate their strategies to be sure they're not being left in the dust by competitors who see new and better ways of doing things.

It's crazy for a marketing manager to constantly change a strategy that's working well. But too many managers fail to see or plan for *needed* changes. They're afraid to do anything different, and adhere to the idea that "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." But a firm can't always wait until a problem becomes completely obvious to do something about it. When customers move on and profits disappear, it may be too late to fix the problem. Marketing managers who take the lead in finding innovative new markets and approaches gain a competitive advantage.

Recent social and technological changes are having a positive effect on how marketers serve society. Whether it's because marketers are applying new technologies to solve old marketing problems or applying classic marketing concepts to new kinds of opportunities, consumers are better off. And this ongoing improvement is self-directing. As consumers shift their support to firms that do meet their needs, laggard businesses are forced to either improve or get out of the way.

We need to welcome international competition

Increasingly, marketing managers are facing global competition. Some managers hate that thought. Worldwide competition creates even more pressure on marketing managers to figure out what it takes to gain a competitive advantage, both at home and in foreign markets. But with the challenges come opportunities. The forces of competition in and among market-directed economies will help speed the diffusion of marketing advances to consumers everywhere. As macro-marketing systems improve worldwide, more consumers will have the income to buy products, from wherever in the world the products come.

Marketers can't afford to bury their heads in the sand and hope that international competition will go away. Rather, they must realize that it is part of today's marketing environment—and they must do strategic market planning that rises to the challenges it poses.

May need more social responsibility

Good business managers put themselves in the consumer's position. A useful rule to follow might be this: Do unto others as you would have others do unto you. In practice, this means developing satisfying marketing mixes for specific target markets. It may mean building in more quality or more safety. The consumer's long-run satisfaction should be considered, too. How will the product hold up in use? What about service guarantees? While trying to serve the needs of some target market, does the marketing strategy disregard the rights and needs of other consumers, or create problems that will be left for future generations?

Short-sighted, production-oriented approaches undoubtedly won't work in the future. Tougher competition, from companies at home and abroad, may force old-style, production-oriented business managers to change their thinking just to survive.

The environment is everyone's need

Marketers need to work harder and smarter at finding ways to satisfy consumer needs without sacrificing the current or future environment. All consumers need the environment whether they realize it yet or not. We are only beginning to understand the consequences of the environmental damage that's already been done. Acid rain, depletion of the ozone layer, and toxic waste in water supplies—to mention but a few current environmental problems—have catastrophic effects. Many top executives now say that preserving and protecting the environment will be one of the major challenges—if not *the* major challenge—of business firms in the next decade. This chapter opened with a discussion of sustainable development. The marketing management implications of this concept are elaborated upon in Marketing Demo 22-2.

Marketing Demo 22-2



What Sustainability Means to Consumer Product Marketers

In the environmental marketing world, it's no longer enough to be "green." Businesses and products must be "sustainable."

Sustainability is defined as meeting the needs of the

present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs. This means balancing the seemingly contradictory tasks of improving standards of living worldwide while cutting down on fossil fuels, cutting out pollution, and conserving natural resources.

To achieve global sustainability, some experts such as those at Germany's Wuppertal Institute believe that we will need to reduce our use of resources by as much as 10 times by 2040! With reductions such as these, consumer products and marketing as we know them won't survive. However, this doesn't necessarily mean lost business. Sustainability actually can be good for business.

Today, smart businesspeople embrace greening because it can pay off in more efficient processes and products and hence, reduce costs. (I like to say, "An environmentalist is an efficiency expert in a green cloak.") In the future, as it becomes important to use resources as sparingly as possible, the market will shift toward those companies and industries who align their products and services most closely with the needs of their customers (I call this, "Zero Waste equals 100% Customer Satisfaction"). This means companies who eliminate all the bells and whistles customers don't want in the first place (Gateway makes every computer it sells according to individual customer specs). Companies that eliminate the packaging that makes consumers feel guilty to throw away. Companies that cut down on the energy costs that make a product expensive to run. Look for the biggest opportunities to be created in the areas of energy efficiency and renewable resource management, pesticide-free agriculture, information management, alternative transportation, recycling and recovery, and ecotourism.

Forward-looking industrialists now prepare their companies and redesign or invent new products to compete in a sustainable economy. Here are some of the strategies they pursue:

Replace Material Products with "Dematerialized" Services. If you think about it, people don't need products per se. They just need the functional benefits the products provide. Oftentimes, services can do the job better than products, saving a lot of material and energy along the way. According to the United Nations Working Group on Sustainable Product Development, services can take several forms:

- 1 Product extension services such as repair and maintenance.
- 2 Services like car leasing or laundrettes that allow some products to be shared. (In the Netherlands, a "green-

wheels" service allows consumers to "time share" rather than own or lease cars. Our Atlanta-based client, Interface, has introduced an Evergreen Lease Program, which allows customers to lease carpeting and ancillary maintenance services; used carpeting is taken back for re-use or recycling).

- 3 Intangible services or "de-materialized" products that substitute services for products, for example, electronic voice mail replacing answering machines, and automated bill-paying services.
- 4 "Result services" designed with the aim of reducing the use of material products, e.g., pedestrian access rather than need for cars, integrated pest management versus pesticides.

New "R's" of Reuse and Remanufacturing—Move over Recycling. Businesses are learning how to lay claim to product residual value by adding re-use and remanufacturing to their materials-use arsenal. Grow Biz International has generated a \$100 million business selling used equipment through its retail chains that include Play It Again Sports, Once Upon a Child, Computer Renaissance, Music Go Round, and Disc Go Round.

Control Population Growth. The biggest environmental problem may not be air or water pollution but population growth—too many people fighting for finite resources. Residents in developing countries need access to information on AIDS and birth control. Conventional radios are not always the answer because in these countries, batteries are not always available, and power supply is inconsistent. So, a British businessman invented the "Freeplay" radio, which operates using a clockwork mechanism powered by a carbon steel spring. Running on human power, it takes 25 seconds to wind up, and yields 25 minutes of play. Manufactured in Cape Town, South Africa, by 200 disabled workers, the radio has already sold 150,000 units.

Reduce Resource Use. 80% of the environmental impacts of washing machines occur during use. Hoover doubled its market share in the environmentally-conscious German market with its "New Wave" horizontal axis washing machine. The fully recyclable washing machine not only reduces water, energy, and detergent consumption, it creates less pollution and waste during production and distribution. Procter and Gamble is now test marketing Dryel, a technology that allows consumers to dry clean products at home.

Source: Abridged from Jacquelyn A. Ottman, "What Sustainability Means to Consumer Product Marketers," *The Ottman Report on Environmental Marketing and Innovation*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (1998) (http://www.greenmarketing.com/articles/Ottman_Report.html).

In the past, most firms didn't pass the cost of environmental damage on to consumers in the prices that they paid. Pollution was a hidden and unmeasured cost for most companies. That is changing rapidly. Firms are already spending billions of dollars to correct problems—including problems created years ago. The government isn't accepting the excuse that "nobody knew it was a big problem." Consider yourself warned: Businesspeople who fail to anticipate the public backlash on this issue put their careers and businesses at risk!

May need attention to consumer privacy

While focusing on consumers' needs, marketers also must be sensitive to other consumer concerns. Today, sophisticated marketing research methods and new technologies make it easier to abuse consumers' rights to privacy. For example, credit card records—which reveal much about consumers' purchases and private lives—are routinely computerized and sold to anybody who pays for the list.

Most consumers don't realize how much data about their personal lives—some of it incorrect but treated as fact—is collected and available. A simple computer billing error may land consumers on a computer bad-credit list—without their knowledge. Marketing managers should use technology responsibly to improve the quality of life—not disrupt it. See Internet Insite 22-1 for a discussion of the ethical issues associated with this new breakthrough technology.

Need to rethink some present laws

One of the advantages of a market-directed economic system is that it operates automatically. But in our version of this system, consumer-citizens provide certain constraints (laws), which can be modified at any time. Managers who ignore consumer attitudes must realize that their actions may lead to new restraints.

Before piling on too many new rules, however, we should review the ones we have. Some of them may need to be changed, and others may need to be enforced more carefully. Antitrust laws, for example, are often applied to protect competitors from one another, when they were really intended to *encourage* competition.

ICH WAR EIN AUTO.



Ford-Automobile sind in hohem Maße aus wiederverwertbaren Teilen gefertigt. Da kann es vorkommen, daß manche dieser Teile in einem völlig anderen Produkt wieder auftauchen.

Wichtiger ist uns jedoch die umfassende und sinnvolle Wiederverwendung aller eingesetzten Werkstoffe im Automobilbau. Deshalb untersucht Ford in einer Pilot-Demontageanlage die optimale Zerlegung von Altfahrzeugen.

Mit den dort gewonnenen Erkenntnissen verbessern wir ständig die Recyclingfähigkeit neuer Ford-Modelle. So können wir bereits seit Oktober 1991 die kostenlose Rücknahme aller ab diesem Zeitpunkt vom Band gelaufenen Fahrzeuge der Escort-/Orion-Baureihe garantieren.

Wenn Sie mehr über Recycling oder andere umweltentlastende Maßnahmen beim Produktionsprozeß bei Ford wissen möchten, rufen Sie uns einfach an: 01 30 42 42.

FORD. BEI UNS DREHT SICH ALLES UM SIE.
Die Ford Motor AG beantwortet bis 2011 den Weltweit den Umgang mit Umweltschutz und alles die Personale.



Socially responsible marketing managers are concerned about the environmental impact of their products. Ford, for example, assembles cars with parts that can be recycled. The toy in this German ad was made from recycled auto parts. The headline says, "I was a car."



Social Implications of Electronic Marketplace

In the previous chapters, the Internet Insites focused on how the Digital Revolution and Electronic Commerce can benefit the consumer and the marketer. But is the emergence of an electronic or virtual marketplace good for the society as a whole, or will it just benefit the privileged few? Will it simply lead to more wasteful materialism, or will it improve the quality of life for everyone? Several prominent authors have weighed in on these questions.

Don Tapscott, author of *Digital Economy*, suggests that in the knowledge-based digital world, “internet-worked enterprises” connected to suppliers and customers will emerge.¹ As businesses “internetwork” and as manufacturers connect directly with customers, new business processes and models will emerge. One consequence will be “disintermediation”—the elimination or diminishing of intermediaries in the marketing channel. Many workers may be displaced, and most will have to retrain to succeed in the new economy.

Mitchell Kapor, founder of software company Lotus Development, is deeply concerned about the negative social effects of the Digital Revolution and the marginalization of a vast segment of the population. Mr. Kapor has founded the Electronic Frontier Foundation, a public interest organization dedicated to realizing the democratic potential of new computer and communications media. He argues that cyberspace is so far staying true to Jeffersonian ideals of liberty, commitment to pluralism, diversity, and community.² But he also seems to favour a role for the government and is encouraging public debate on the subject of the social implications of cyberspace.

Cybercommunities and chat groups are, to some, manifestations of grassroots democracy at work. Techno-idealists like George Gilder³ and Don Tapscott foresee massive social changes, mostly positive, and greater economic prosperity resulting from the Digital Revolution. Others are far more cynical and fear that technology may dominate our lives in an Orwellian sense. Scholar and media critic Neal Postman, for instance, fears a “technopoly”⁴—a hegemony of technology where technological tools are not integrated into the culture, but instead *attack* that culture.

Technology will not cure all existing social problems. Some wonder if we will end up creating millions of information have-nots, who are marginalized, or if we will have the political will to harness the technology and use it for broad-based social and economic resurgence.⁵ The Internet has a culture of its own. Some think it is Americanized and fear that other cultures could become Americanized. The Internet can be chaotic, with a high signal-to-noise ratio. It offers anonymity, which is misused by some.

Neal Postman rightly blames humanity, not technology itself, for some of the negatives. Take cyberporn, for example. The most frequently searched word on the Internet is “sex,” according to a study by Reuters.⁶ Some of the sites peddling digital erotica are generating a lot of traffic and advertising revenue. The Net also serves as a meeting place for those engaging in racist and hateful activities. Software tools such as Net Nanny® allow parents to monitor, screen, and block access to any inappropriate information, thus protecting children. Abuse of the technology, however, cannot be completely eliminated.

On the positive side, consumers now have greater access to information than ever before. Small businesses have access to newer markets. Nonprofit organizations such as MADD (www.madd.org) have a very effective channel for reaching the younger generation. Larger organizations communicate with suppliers and customers more effectively. Online communities are thriving. Distance is no longer an issue. The world has, in some ways, truly become a global village.

The generation following, called the Net Generation (N-Gen) will, according to Tapscott, think, learn, work, play, and communicate in fundamentally different ways from their parents.⁷ The N-Gen is used to the “interactive” and nonlinear hypermedium. They will be at ease with chat rooms and e-mail. They will learn and consume through the Net.

The Internet has much to offer marketers and consumers. However, we need to be vigilant against abuses. In the long run, the impact of the

technology is likely to be determined by the choices we make, both as individuals and collectively as a society.

¹Don Tapscott, *Digital Economy: Promise and Peril of Networked Intelligence*, McGraw-Hill, 1995.

²Mitchell Kapor, "Where is the Digital Highway Really Heading?" in *Wired Magazine* (www.wired.com/wired/1.3/features/kapor.on.nii.html).

³George Gilder, "Washington's Bogeyman," *Forbes ASAP*, June 4, 1994.

⁴Neal Postman, *Technopoly: The Surrender of Culture to Technology*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1992.

⁵Daniel Burnstein and David Kline, *Road Warriors: Dreams and Nightmares Along the Information Highway*, Dutton, 1995.

⁶CyberAtlas

(www.cyberatlas.com/segments/retail/market_segments.html).

⁷Don Tapscott, *Growing Up Digital*, McGraw-Hill, 1998.

Source: This is one of a series of Internet Insites prepared in April 1998 by Dr. Ramesh Venkat of Saint Mary's University for *Basic Marketing*, Ninth Canadian Edition.



Canadian antitrust laws were originally developed with the idea that all firms competing in a market would be on a level playing field. That is no longer always true. For example, in many markets, individual North American firms compete with foreign firms whose governments urge them to cooperate with one another. Such foreign firms don't see one another as competitors; rather, they see firms from other countries—as a group—as their competition.

Laws should affect top managers

Strict enforcement of present laws could have far-reaching results if more price fixers, fraudulent or deceptive advertisers, and others who violate existing laws—thus affecting the performance of the macro-marketing system—were sent to jail or given heavy fines. A quick change in attitudes might occur if unethical top managers—those who plan strategy—were prosecuted, instead of the salespeople or product managers expected to deliver on weak or undifferentiated strategies.

In other words, if the government made it clear that it was serious about improving the performance of our economic system, much could be achieved within the present system—*without* adding new constraints.

Laws merely define minimal ethical standards

In our discussions of ethical issues in marketing, we have emphasized that a marketing manager doesn't face an ethical dilemma about complying with laws and regulations. Whether a marketer is operating in his or her own country or in a foreign nation, the legal environment sets the *minimum* standards of ethical behaviour as defined by a society. In addition, the American Marketing Association's Code of Ethics (Exhibit 1–5) provides a checklist of basic guidelines that a marketing manager should observe. But marketing managers constantly face ethical issues where there are no clearly defined answers. Every marketing manager should be aware of this and make a personal commitment to carefully evaluate the ethical consequences of strategic marketing decisions.

On the other hand, our marketing system is designed to encourage firms to compete aggressively as long as they do it fairly. New and better ways of serving customers and society give a firm a competitive advantage—at least for some period of time. This is how we move forward as a society. Innovative new marketing strategies *do* sometimes cause problems for those who have a vested interest in the old ways. Some people try to portray anything that disrupts their own personal interest as unethical. But protecting the status quo is not in itself an appropriate ethical standard. On the contrary, our society's most basic ethical charge to marketers is to find new and better ways to serve society's needs.

Need socially responsible consumers

We've stressed that marketers should act responsibly—but consumers have responsibilities, too.¹⁴ Some consumers abuse policies about returning goods, change price tags in self-service stores, and expect attractive surroundings and courteous, well-trained



**STOP SHOPLIFTING.
CALL SENSORMATIC.**

AisleKeeper is the most sophisticated anti-shoplifting system designed specifically for supermarket environments. It increases profits by protecting high-theft items such as meat, cigarettes, HBC, batteries and other general merchandise against theft.

*And, AisleKeeper is so cost-effective that it typically pays for itself within one year. For all your loss prevention needs call us today at **1 800 368-7262**.*

A I S L E K E E P E R[®]

Sensormatic
THE WORLD LEADER IN LOSS PREVENTION
500 Northwest 12th Avenue, Deerfield Beach, Florida 33442
Telephone: (305) 420-2000 FAX: (305) 420-2017

Consumers have social responsibilities, too.

sales and service people—and want discount prices. Some are downright abusive to salespeople. Others think nothing of ripping off businesses because “they’re rich.” Shoplifting is a major problem for most retailers, and honest consumers pay for the cost of shoplifting in higher prices.

Canadians tend to play their dual role of consumer-citizens with a split personality. We often behave one way as consumers, and then take the opposite position at the ballot box. For example, we cover our beaches and parks with garbage and litter, while urging our legislators to take stiff action to curb pollution. We protest sex and violence in the media, and then flock to see the latest R- or X-rated movies. Parents complain about advertising aimed at children, and then use TV as a Saturday morning babysitter.

Consumers share the responsibility for preserving an effective macro-marketing system. And they should take this responsibility seriously.

Let’s face it, there’s a wealth of information already available to aid consumer decision making. The consumerism movement has encouraged nutrition labelling, open dating, unit pricing, truth-in-lending, plain-language contracts and warranties, and so on. And government agencies publish many consumer buying guides, as do organizations such as Consumers Union. Yet the majority of consumers continue to ignore most of this information.

How far should the marketing concept go?

Our macro-marketing system is built on the assumption that we are trying to satisfy consumers. But how far should the marketing concept be allowed to go?

Consumers’ freedom of choice

Achieving a better macro-marketing system is certainly a desirable objective. But what part should a marketer play in deciding what products to offer?

This is extremely important, because some marketing managers—especially those in large corporations—can have an impact far larger than they do in their roles as consumer-citizens. For example, should they refuse to produce hazardous products—such as skis or motorcycles—even though such products are in strong

demand? Should they install safety devices that increase costs—and that customers don't want?

These are difficult questions to answer. Some things marketing managers do clearly benefit both the firm and consumers, in that they lower costs and/or improve consumers' options. But other choices may actually reduce consumer choice, and conflict with a desire to improve the effectiveness of our macro-marketing system.

Consumer-citizens should vote on the changes

It seems fair to suggest, therefore, that marketing managers should be expected to improve and expand the range of goods and services they make available to consumers—always trying to better satisfy their needs and preferences. This is the job we've assigned to business.

If pursuing this objective makes excessive demands on scarce resources—or has an unacceptable ecological effect—then consumer-citizens have the responsibility to vote for laws restricting individual firms that are trying to satisfy consumers' needs. This is the role that we, as consumers, have assigned to the government—to ensure that the macro-marketing system works effectively.

It is important to recognize that some *seemingly minor* modifications in our present system *might* result in very big, unintended problems. Allowing some government agency to prohibit the sale of products for seemingly good reasons could lead to major changes we never expected. (Bicycles, for example, are a very hazardous consumer product. Should they continue to be sold?) Clearly, such government actions could seriously reduce consumers' present rights to freedom of choice—including "bad" choices.¹⁵

We, as consumer-citizens, should be careful to distinguish between proposed changes designed simply to *modify* our system and those designed to *change* it—perhaps drastically. In either case, we should have the opportunity to make the decision (through elected representatives). This decision should not be left in the hands of a few well-placed managers or government planners.

Marketing—even more necessary in the future?

Regardless of the changes consumer-citizens may enact, we will need some kind of a marketing system in the future. Further, if satisfying more subtle needs—such as for the good life—becomes our objective, it could be even more important to have market-oriented firms. We may have to define not only an individual's needs, but also society's needs—perhaps for a better neighbourhood, and more enriching social experiences, and so on. As we move beyond tangible physical goods toward more sophisticated need-satisfying blends of goods and services, the trial-and-error approach of the typical production-oriented manager will become even less acceptable.

Questions and Problems



1. Explain why marketing must be evaluated at two levels. What criteria should be used to evaluate each level of marketing? Defend your answer. Explain why your criteria are better than alternative criteria.
2. Discuss the merits of various economic system objectives. Is the objective of the Canadian economic system sensible? Could it achieve more consumer satisfaction if sociologists—or public officials—determined how to satisfy the needs of lower-income or less-educated consumers? If so, what education or income level should be required before an individual is granted free choice?
3. Should the objective of our economy be maximum efficiency? If your answer is yes, efficiency in what? If not, what should the objective be?
4. Discuss the conflicts of interests among production, finance, accounting, and marketing executives. How does this conflict affect the operation of an individual firm? The economic system? Why does this conflict exist?
5. Why does adoption of the marketing concept encourage a firm to operate more efficiently? Be specific about the impact of the marketing concept on the various departments of a firm.
6. In the short run, competition sometimes leads to inefficiency in the operation of our economic system. Many people argue for monopoly in order to eliminate this inefficiency. Discuss this solution.
7. How would officially granted monopolies affect the operation of our economic system? Consider the effect on allocation of resources, the level of income and employment, and the distribution of income. Is the effect any different if a firm obtains a monopoly by winning out in a competitive market?
8. Comment on the following statement: “Ultimately, the high cost of marketing is due only to consumers.”
9. How far should the marketing concept go? How should we decide this issue?
10. Should marketing managers, or business managers in general, refrain from producing profitable products that some target customers want but that may not be in their long-run interest? Should firms be expected to produce “good” but less profitable products? What if such products break even? What if they are unprofitable but the company makes other profitable products—so on balance it still makes some profit? What criteria are you using for each of your answers?
11. Should a marketing manager or a business refuse to produce an “energy-gobbling” appliance that some consumers are demanding? Should a firm install an expensive safety device that will increase costs but that customers don’t want? Are the same principles involved in both these questions? Explain.
12. Discuss how slower economic growth or no economic growth would affect your college or university community—in particular, its marketing institutions.

Suggested Cases

21 Honda Hit • Run • Throw

38 Ecolad Incorporated

31 The Parks Canada Dilemma

