

Evaluation Of Kotler And Levy Published Research Work For Broadening The Concept Of Marketing

Naeem Shah, Naushad Khan, Ikramul Haq

Institute of Development Studies, The University of Agricultural Peshawar
Institute of Development Studies, The University of Agricultural Peshawar
Department of Agricultural Extension Education and Communication, The University of Agricultural Peshawar

ABSTRACT: Marketing is a process which start from the demand of the commodity and end to reach consumer table. It play key role in the development of the world. Seeing to its scope the present study was conducted and the major objective was that to see the Kotler and Levy research work published in 1969. The present efforts launched to review the situation that how much really the Kotlerian thoughts have helped in moving the boundaries and limits of marketing subject from what it was in 1969 era. The present study aimed to answer the questions about the role played by the article published in 1969 in expanding the territorial limits of the marketing discipline. This study explained that how the published article contributed to the general discussion on the role of Kotlerian thoughts in expanding the limits of marketing. Thus, it will explore through: 1) How has been the work of the article in question applied since it is published, 2) How far has it been extended marketing boundaries and 3) What impact the Kotler and Levy work has on the field of marketing and consumer behavior? As is evident from the historical traces that the Kotler and Levy article of great marketing fame was published almost 44 years ago (1969) in the United States of America, in the renowned Journal of Marketing in its Volume(1)33 at pages 10 – 15 under the caption “Broadening the Concept of Marketing”. A number of artifacts motivated the authors to evaluate the Kotler & Levy’s article. However, the prominent of these factors are; a number of published materials on marketing issues the authors came across until now; one way or the other, this article has been referred to in all these works. Secondly, authors’ personal observations and feelings are that this paper really played the role of a stone thrown in a pond of water that creates waves reaching to the outer extremes of the pond. So in contemporary world marketing is everywhere; it starts as early as perceiving some thing economical and it transpires when the good or service is utilized by end-users/consumers. Furthermore, Johan Arndt article, “How Broad Should the Marketing Concept Be?”, published in 1978, the authors drew the conclusion that the Kotler and Levy work really has contributed a lot and because of their work now the territorial outskirts of the marketing discipline are reaching out to new limits. Personally, to the authors marketing subject is the sky of commercial world and like the divine sky marketing too does not have any limits. All this made possible because of the spadework done by the Kotler and Levy’s article, “Broadening the Concept of Marketing” published in the renowned marketing journal in 1969 and seconded by a huge community of researchers who constitute the Kotlerian School of thoughts. Today marketing subject covers every aspect from buzz marketing to societal marketing and credit goes to Kotler and Levy.

Key words: Evaluation, Kotler and Levy Reseach Work, For Broadening the Concept of Marketing

1. INTRODUCTION

For the past 44 - years there has been an energetic debate throughout the marketing scientific community concerning a possible change of paradigm after the Kotler and Levy work published in the marketing journal (Arndt, 1985; Sheth and Sisodia, 2006). As stated by Kotler and Levy (1969) that, “The broadening of the marketing” movement was an effort to free the marketing paradigm from the narrow confines of commercial marketing and to show its application to a far larger number of contexts in which exchange and relationship activities take place. Until 1970, marketing language and theory focused on explaining how goods and services priced, promoted, and distributed in commercial markets by for-profit firms. In the late 1960s, some scholars began to believe that noncommercial organizations such as museums, churches, social agencies and social action groups faced "marketing-like" problems that could be fruitfully addressed with marketing language and concepts. Since then, the invasion of marketing into the noncommercial arena has been a drama laden with setbacks, oppositions, and victories, but the consensus is that broadening marketing has been good for marketing and good for the areas that marketing has invaded. The day, the article “Broadening the Concept of Marketing” has been published in January 1969; it has instigated a huge fire of scholarly discussion. This discussion amongst the academicians of the marketing concern in particular and that of various others disciplines in general, focused on the core thesis of limits and boundaries of the marketing, as provided in the

broadening of marketing concept article. In the following paragraphs out of the total 163 citations, few of the citations reproduced to evaluate their direct and strong correlation to the original work of the authors. In the original article Kotler and Levy (1969), stated that “it is the authors’ contention that marketing is a pervasive societal activity that goes considerably beyond the selling of toothpaste, soap, and steel. Political contests remind us that candidates are marketed as well as soap; _ marketing will either take on a broader social meaning or remain a narrowly defined business activity”.The Kotler and Levy work published in the month of January, 1969 and received a very prompt response from David Luck (July 1969), just after six months in the shape of his article under the heading “Broadening the Concept of Marketing. This was a very strong critique of the concepts promulgated by the Kotler & Levy. The extent of disagreement with the authors’ views can be measured from the language and tone used by David Luck in his article. He wrote in the abstract that the article of Kotler and Levy is intriguing and imaginative”. He further stated that “Perhaps the motives underlying such declarations are that marketers have guilt feelings because profit, making business activities may not be socially beneficial, However; this is no reason to distort and attenuate the scope of “marketing” in order that we may see marketing participate where it does not. Enis (1973) stated that “Broadened concept of marketing” is a significant contribution to the development of the discipline. Yet, the broadening concept is not as straight- forward as it first

appears; rather, it seems to be multidimensional. The following three dimensions appear to be meaningful: Broadening the nature of the product exchange from economic goods and services to anything of value, Broadening the objective of the exchange from profit to any type of payoff and Broadening the target audience of the exchange from consumer to any “public” that relates to the organization. Bartels (1974) stated that, ‘on the other hand there are also some possible disadvantages to broadening the concept of marketing, through the notion that techniques derived largely from the study of market phenomena are generic, when in fact those market techniques are applications to the marketplace of a broader class of techniques, expressing more basic principles of social behavior. A recent study by Nichols showed that 95% of marketing educators believe that the scope of marketing should be broadened to include non-business organizations. Similarly 93% agreed that marketing goes beyond just economic goods and services, and 83% favored including in the domain of marketing many activities whose ultimate result is not a market transaction. Anderson (1983) stated that, “Of course marketing can point with pride to its accomplishments in improving the efficiency and effectiveness of managerial practice in the private as well as non-profit and public sector, if, discipline truly wishes to implement the broadened concept of marketing, it is clear that it must adopt a different set of goals and a different attitude towards its ultimate purpose. Sirgy (1985) in his article stated that, “More recently, basic marketing contractual have changed drastically. Marketing is no more confined to the business sector; marketing products are not restricted to tangible physical products; marketing consumers are not restricted to marketing clients; and more drastically, marketing is now being viewed as an exchange activity not limited to organizations. The author concludes that consumer behavior is developing within the context of the evolution of the marketing discipline. Marketing is no longer an engineering discipline whose primary mission is to solve business problems; marketing is becoming a social science investigating social exchange and social influence in a variety of settings. In this context, consumer behavior has developed to adapt to the evolving changes within marketing. Thus, consumer behavior is meeting its challenge as a marketing science. Foxall (1989) raised another related criticism that “scant attention was paid to the broadened concept’s effect on the process of exchange. Some questioned the form, clarity and even existence of an actual exchange process under a broadened concept of marketing, for example, if the conceptual boundaries of marketing were to be broadened, so the argument went, then traditional processes may provide an inappropriate framework for doing so. Graham (1993) studied that Kotler and Levy’s (1969) call for a broadened concept of marketing won a great number of supporters. Not all marketers, however, embraced the notion with fervor. Some argued that Kotler and Levy’s (1969) paper had gone too far conceptually, but at the same time had not given enough consideration to the complexity of such a broadened concept its likely benefits and consequences nor actually provided a clear redefinition of marketing. Amongst the critique, leading ones are Bartels, 1974; Enis, 1973; Luck, 1969; and Tucker, 1974. According to Graham (1993), “in effect,

this further extended the concept of marketing by including all organizations’ that partook in social causes”. Alicia et al; (2003) told that, “Broadening the conceptual boundaries of marketing in the late 1960s led to a significant paradigm shift. Social marketing emerged under the auspices of this extended concept. It is not surprising, therefore, that social marketers have tended to apply conventional marketing tools, albeit within a vastly different context. Hastings and Saren (2003) had written in their article published in the Journal of Marketing theory that “we see this prescient, not, as Alan suggests, confused. By way of compromise, we would content that the first part of this definition is an apt summation of social marketing’s development to date, but the addition of the second half helps mark out its future. This broadened remit enables it to provide a further critique and understanding of marketing processes and outcomes. Over the last thirty years, since Kotler and Levy (1969) first mooted this transferability of thinking, may basic marketing ideas have been accepted in the social and health sector .L.K. Vaswani et al; (2005) in their article, write that based on the Kotler and Levy (1969) work “The indecisive debate on proper domain or boundaries of marketing has revolved around two distinct fronts, application of marketing to non-economic exchange (social, non-profit, etc.) and controversy surrounding the internal subdivision within marketing. The debate on rural marketing, at least in terms of its further divisions, is no different. Bernard, *et.al* (2006), while critically examining the Kotlerian approach, mentioned that what is astonishing in this reorganization of the panorama of marketing panaceas into five distinct logics, is the fact that marketing; whose etymology is tied to the word ‘market’, tries essentially to draw beyond environment, social groups, social relations and on this side personal experiences; and competences of the individuals of the market to renew itself.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study organized to answer the questions about the role played by an article published in a USA marketing journal during year 1969. During the study author reviewed more than 200 articles published in different sources on the issue of marketing. However, in light of the literature reviewed and evaluated for knowing the concern of the various published works about the Kotler & Levy article, about 163 articles found relevant. Out of these 163 articles in the international marketing journals, for present paper 40 different articles selected and studied in a sleek detail. Later on from these forty articles, some content of the most relevant articles are reproduced as evidence for Kotler and Levy work that is expanded on 44 years history of the article citation. On the basis of relevancy to the idea of broadening concept of marketing from the literature studied and reviewed, answers to the study questions are framed in the paragraphs as here after.

3. CRITICAL REVIEW OF PAST LITERATURE

As stated earlier according to the *Web of Science* (ISI) search tool, the article of Kotler and Levy has been consulted by a huge number of 163 different articles in the

marketing journals that have been written in the later times either in support to Kotler & Levy work or presented in opposition to the authors' work. However, one claim about the subsequent work can be made that the number of articles that are written in support to the "Broadening the concept of Marketing" out numbers those article that are written in opposition to this concept of the Kotler and Levy.

A. Published Work Application in the Field of Marketing

In the perspective of broadening approach, the discipline of marketing is now addressing a number of different and never areas of the commercial as well as non-commercial interests. At this juncture of the marketing history, marketing presents a very modern and differentiating outlook as compared to the pre-Kotlerian era. Moreover, to authors, as conceived from the literature the broadening of marketing is still successfully in progress. A number of new corridors and avenues have been explored and researched by this rapidly growing and expanding discipline and all this is just because of the Kotlerian theme. The marketing concept is now being applied to health, social, educational and commercial problems with the same zeal and intensity as were exclusively utilized for the business issues in the pre-broadening the concept of marketing. Good news is that marketing is successful in solving these problems in new environments. As is evident from the citation of the Kotler and Levy article published in January 1969 and it is duly responded by different educators and people concerned with the marketing discipline. The article got its ever first response in the shape of a critique from David Luck just after six months and it ignited a fire of scholarly discussion about the broadening concept of marketing. Particularly few of the writers were very responsive to this broadening concept, Luck, Ardnt, and Bartels are the prominent amongst them. In light of the broadening concept, Social marketing was "born" as a discipline in the 1970s, when Philip Kotler and Gerald Zaltman realized that the same marketing principles that were being used to sell products to consumers could be used to "sell" ideas, attitudes and behaviors. Brown (2002) while commenting on the broadening work stated that, "Thirty years ago, Kotler drafted the modern marketing constitution and most would agree that it has served the discipline well. Marketing is doubted by its scholarly citizens, questioned by a standing army of consultants and challenged by increasingly anarchistic consumers who are voting with their pocketbooks. A dictatorship of the imagination is advocated, an ingenuity-led insurrection is recommended. A confederacy of creativity is called for. And a retrospective secession is suggested. Further more, as is evident from the citation under various disciplines such as, marketing, marketing strategy, advertising and other corridors marketing is every where and this presence of marketing has proved the critique wrong that " If marketing is every thing then it is nothing" as said by one of the critique. Now, we can say that despite the fact that marketing is everything and everywhere yet again it is a great and important thing to all individuals and businesses. The reason is that it is very close to the human nature and it really feels the heat about the issue a human being is experiencing as consumer, manufacturer, manager or

investor. Because, the overall goal seems to be the welfare of humanity free of religion or disciplines.

B. Extension in Marketing Boundries

Now, because of the broadening movement launched in 1969 by Kotler and Professor Levy, marketing discipline is discharging its role in the newer and versatile areas. Many new fields have been covered under the expanded role of marketing. It now endeavors as Cause-related marketing, Nonprofit Marketing, Relationship marketing, extended self and possession related issues, corporate social responsibility, and the more appreciable subject of Social marketing. In my opinion based on the literature review about the broadening the concept of marketing Kotler and Levy were very timely in promulgating this approach. Marketing to me even starts at the time when one conceives the idea of doing any thing that is aimed at human welfare. In this human welfare, the self of the human being is the foremost to all other stakeholders. When we decide to interact with any other individual or group of individuals, we actually begin the marketing activity. Based on the concept launched by Kotler and Levy the Gift giving, possession of extended self, corporate social responsibility and cause related marketing like areas are very successful addressed by the new marketing limits. Marketing is now not just a transaction amongst producers and consumers as it was prior to 1969. The definition of the era as given by Wilkie (2006) that "the performance of business activities that direct the flow of goods and services from producers to consumers." With the broadened concept marketing has transformed from the traditional 4-Ps of McCarthy presented in 1960 and it is now some thing having some more functions under its canopy. Alicia et al; (2003) study reflected that "the field of social marketing stemmed from a broadened concept of marketing and the coupling of social capital theory with social marketing will help guide social marketers in their efforts to engender beneficial social change. Golosinski (2006), in his writing, "Happy Birthday, Mr. Marketing!" wrote that "Broadening the Concept of Marketing' created a sensation" when it was published in the Journal of Marketing in 1969. Some considered the article too radical in its claim that marketing could, and should, be among the tools leveraged by government organizations, hospitals and nonprofit groups. The critics were proven wrong"(web). The way this broadening concept has extended can be better understood from the Stephen Brown (2002) article, "Vote, Vote, Vote for Philip Kotler". He paid tributes to the Kotler work in a very public style by stating that "Thirty years ago, Phillip Kotler drafted the modern marketing constitution and most would agree that it has served the discipline well". He concluded the article with these wordings "Vote early. Vote often. Vote retro. You know it makes sense.

C. Impact on the field of marketing and consumer behavior

Nourishing from the broadening concept, marketing is playing a zenith role in the commercial and social activities of our day-to-day life. A number of new tools and techniques have been designed and developed in the marketing field. Now you can rely on the traditional 4Ps of marketing as a lot has been changed and now marketing feels more strength as compared to pre Kotlerian era.

Even after the lapse of three and a half decades, McCole in his article written during (2004) still feels that there is a further need to broaden the concept of marketing. He states that “the concept and practice of marketing need to be refocused. Traditional teachings need to be revised and not discarded, and marketing personnel need to know the traditional way of “doing marketing” before one can accept new or different ways of delivering and implementing a marketing program. Eric and Jones (2005) narrated in their article “A history of schools of marketing thought” that “Marketing has been practiced since ancient times and has been thought about almost as long. In this article they traced the evolution of 10 schools of marketing thought. During the mid 1970s, three of the modern schools - marketing management, consumer behavior, and exchange - underwent a 'paradigm broadening'. The broadened paradigm has bifurcated marketing thought from the conventional domain of business behavior to the much broader domain of all human social behavior. Thus, at the beginning of the 21st century marketing thought is at a crossroads. In this article the author has termed the broadening movement as 'paradigm broadening' of the marketing subject. More supportively, it can be observed from the following three definitions given by Wilkie (2006) of the marketing over time, which includes the one prior to 1969 the time Broadening concept, was launched and the two more definitions showing period later to the floating of the Broadening concept. He defines marketing in the three eras as; in 1935 era the concept of Marketing was “the performance of business activities that direct the flow of goods and services from producers to consumers”. In year 1985 almost sixteen years later the concept of Marketing reshaped into “the process of planning and executing the conception, pricing, promotion, and distribution of ideas, goods and services to create exchanges that satisfy individual and organizational objectives”. Yet in the recent time that is 2004 Marketing is “an organizational function and a set of processes for creating, communicating and delivering value to customers and for managing customer relationships in ways that benefit the organization and its stakeholders. In Kotler’s own words (2005), the broadening movement subsequently introduced new areas to the study of marketing. On examining the list of books, it is possible to see when certain domains entered into marketing discourse. The order seems to be as; Social Marketing, Educational Marketing, Health marketing, Celebrity marketing, Cultural Marketing, Church Marketing, and Place Marketing.

D. CONCLUSION

So, based on the approach of “broadening concept of marketing” the discipline has extended and applied to a number of new areas and the limits and boundaries of the marketing concept still expanding. At present it is observing that the role marketing is playing in the corridors of Non and profit marketing, Cause-Related marketing, Relationship marketing and the most important one of these the Social marketing. Most prominently, marketing is now no more just a buying and selling, rather it is a societal concern too. In author’s opinion as marketing student marketing starts even prior to the start of any business activity, because a good manager first

foresee the marketing potential and then he or she goes for the formulation of the business objectives. When business is decided then marketing is that tool that integrates the entire functional department of the organization towards achieving the set goals. This all is because of the new and extended role assigned by broadening concept of marketing to the status of consumer. The consumer is now ruling this socioeconomic world, as all businesses decide their plans of action in light of the consumer relationship. All this is because of the work of Phillip Kotler and Professor S.J Levy published in 1969.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Alicia G.A, Whitwell, G., Bell, S.J., Menguc. B., (2003).Extending the vision of social marketing through social capital theory - Marketing in the context of intricate exchange and market failure, *Marketing Theory*. Vol. 3, p. 323
- [2]. Anderson, P. F., (1983). *Marketing, Scientific Progress, and Scientific Method*. Journal of Marketing. New York: Fall 1983. Vol. 47, p. 18
Bartels, R. (1976). “The History of Marketing Thought,” 2 ed., pp.1-33,
- [3]. Bartels, R. (1976). “The History of Marketing Thought,” 2 ed., pp.1-33, Ben M Enis, Samuel V Smith. (1977) Is purchasing management to buying as marketing is to selling?, *Academy of Marketing Science*. Journal. Vol. 5; p. 27
- [4]. Bernard, C., Olivier, B., and Ampelio, B. 2006. Beyond marketing: In praise of societing. Available at:<http://visionarymarketing.wordpress.com/2006/07/12/beyond-marketing-in-praise-of-societing-more-53> (Accessed 2006/07/12)
- [5]. Brown, S. (2002). Vote, vote, vote for Phillip Kotler, *European Journal of Marketing*: Vol. 36(3); p.313 - 324
- [6]. Enis, Ben M. (1973). Deepening the Concept of Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 37, p. 57
- [7]. Eric H Shaw, D G Brian Jones. (2005). A history of schools of marketing thought, *Marketing Theory*: Vol.5,(3); pg. 239
- [8]. George S Day, David B Montgomery. (1999). Charting new directions for marketing *Journal of Marketing*. Vol. 63; p. 3
- [9]. Gerard Hastings, Michael Saren. (2003).The critical contribution of social marketing - Theory and application, *Marketing Theory*. Vol. 3, 3; p. 305
- [10]. Hunt, S. D. 1976. The nature and scope of marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 40, p. 17
- [11]. Kotler P, Levy S.J. (1969). Broadening Concept of Marketing, *Journal of Marketing* Vol;33 (1):pp 10-15

- [12]. Kotler, Philip. (1972) A Generic Concept Of Marketing, Journal Of Marketing. Vol. 36, 2; P. 46
- [13]. Kotler, Philip. (2005). The role played by the broadening of Marketing movement in the History of Marketing thought, Journal Of Public Policy & Marketing. Vol. (24)1, P. 114-116
- [14]. Luck, David J. (1969). Broadening the Concept of Marketing--Too Far. Journal of Marketing. Vol. 33; p. 53
- [15]. McCole, P. (2004). Refocusing marketing to reflect practice: The changing role of marketing for business. Marketing Intelligence & Planning. Vol. 22, p. 531
- [16]. Richard A. Couto. (1998). Community Coalitions and Grassroots Policies of Empowerment Administration & Society, Vol. 30, No. 5, 569-594
- [17]. Sirgy, M.J. (1985). A conceptualization of the consumer behavior discipline. Academy of Marketing Science. Journal. Vol. 13, p. 104
- [18]. Sidney J Levy. (2002) Revisiting the marketing domain, European Journal of Marketing. Vol. 36, 3; p. 299
- [19]. Vaswami, L.K, Aithal, R., Pradhan D., Sridhar, G. (2005). Rural Marketing in the Development Paradigm. International Journal of Rural Management. Vol 1(2). P.246-262
- [20]. William L. Wilkie, Elizabeth S. Moore. (2003). Scholarly Research in Marketing: Exploring the "4 Eras" of Thought Development Journal of Public Policy & Marketing. Vol. 22, p. 116