What is the nature of macromarketing? What is the nature of micromarketing? This article reviews the controversy concerning the nature of the macromarketing/micromarketing dichotomy, empirically examines the domains of macromarketing and micromarketing and attempts to resolve the controversy by developing a taxonomical model for specifying both concepts.

At least three major, closely related marketing controversies were substantially resolved in the last decade: Is marketing a science, should marketing be broadened to include public and nonprofit applications, and should marketing be broadened to include the societal consequences of marketing activities and systems? The controversies were both major and closely related because each had to do with the fundamental nature of the marketing discipline. After briefly reviewing the three controversies, this article examines a major question left unanswered: What is the nature of the macromarketing/micromarketing dichotomy?

The "Is marketing a science?" controversy was explored by such writers as Bartels (1951), Baumol (1957), Buzzell (1963), Converse (1945), Halbert (1965), Hutchins (1952), and Taylor (1965). The debate culminated in 1976 with a model, known as the Three Dichotomies Model, which proposed that all of the problems, issues, theories and research in marketing can be analyzed using the three categorical dichotomies of (1) profit sector/nonprofit sector, (2) micro/macro, and (3) positive/normative (Hunt 1976). The controversy was then analyzed by demonstrating that those marketers who believed that marketing could not be a science were implicitly (and unnecessarily) restricting the scope of marketing to its profit/micro/normative (managerial) dimensions. The discussion concluded that "the study of the positive dimensions of marketing can be appropriately referred to as marketing science" since the positive dimensions of marketing have the requisites of science: (1) a distinct subject matter drawn from the real world which is described and classified, (2) underlying uniformities and regularities interrelating the subject matter, and (3) intersubjectively certifiable procedures for studying the subject matter (Hunt 1976, p. 28).

The tremendous increase in interest in developing marketing theory since 1976 provides significant evidence that the marketing science debate has been resolved affirmatively. The American Marketing Association has held three special conferences devoted exclusively to marketing theory. A careful analysis of the proceedings of these conferences shows that the papers develop theoretical structures that describe, explain and predict marketing phenomena—precisely...
the province of marketing science (Ferrell, Brown and Lamb 1979; Hunt and Bush 1982; Lamb and Dunne 1980).

The second controversy, that marketing be broadened to include public and other nonprofit sector organizations and social causes, was debated by Ferber (1970), Kotler (1972), Kotler and Levy (1969a), Kotler and Zaltman (1971), and Luck (1969 and 1974). In a review article on public and nonprofit marketing, Lovelock and Weinberg (1978) conclude:

It is evident that nonbusiness marketing has come a long way in a relatively short period of time. The subject is taken seriously in academia, having a growing impact on management practice in a diverse range of applications, and is contributing to general advancement of the field of marketing. These facts, we believe, justify our contention that public and nonprofit marketing has come of age. They in no way imply a lack of potential for future growth, improved judgment, or greater sophistication (p. 442).

As evidence for their conclusion, Lovelock and Weinberg note that seven books or monographs have been published on nonprofit marketing and that a bibliography by Rothschild (1977) contains more than 600 references relating to marketing for public and nonprofit organizations. More recent evidence that nonprofit marketing has arrived comes from a study by Delene (1981), which concludes that nonprofit marketing courses “have been successfully incorporated into the curricula of a number of institutions and that enrollments in these courses are adequate to warrant their continuation for students in business programs” (p. 30).

The third controversy focused not on the nature of marketing per se but rather on the role of marketing research. Should research be directed at the (micro/normative) problems of the marketing manager? Or should more attention be paid to the societal consequences of marketing activities? Lazer (1969) pleaded, “What is required is a broader perception and definition of marketing than has hitherto been the case—one that recognizes marketing’s societal dimensions and perceives of marketing as more than just a technology of the firm” (p. 9). Others sounding a similar theme were Lavidge (1970), Takas (1974), and Dawson (1971), who deplored the fact that “the emphasis upon practical problem-solving within the discipline far outweighs the attention paid to social ramifications of marketing activity” (p. 71).

Research directed at the social consequences of marketing activities has come to be included in the macromarketing half of the macro/micro dichotomy. Marketers have responded to the pleas of Lazer, Dawson and others with an outpouring of research and publications concerning macromarketing (Furuhashi and McCarthy 1971, Grashof and Kelman 1973, Kangun 1972, Moyer and Hutt 1978, Webster 1974, and Wish and Gamble 1971). There have also been numerous special conferences on macromarketing in the United States (Fisk and Nason 1979; Fisk, Nason and White 1980; Slater 1977; White and Slater 1978); Europe (Fisk, Arndt and Gronhauge 1978); and Canada (Thompson et al. 1980). Further evidence that macromarketing has arrived is the institutionalization of the concept through the appointment of a section editor for macromarketing in the Journal of Marketing and the development of a new journal, The Journal of Macromarketing.

The increased emphasis on macromarketing issues has not been without controversy. There have been vigorous debates on what kinds of marketing problems, issues and research should be denoted as macromarketing. Smith and Konopka (1980) review the debate and conclude:

Our review of the semantic referents of the term macromarketing indicates the term was infrequently used until the 1970s. Its advent was unpretentious and without ceremony, and resulted from the need for a designation. By process of natural selection, macromarketing survived a number of lexicemic alternatives, and throughout the 1970s solidified its hold upon the jargon of discipline. Clearly, there is a lack of consensus as evidenced by the multiple meanings of macromarketing and its relationship to theory (p. 335).

The present article reviews the nature of the macromarketing/micromarketing issue, analyzes the controversy by examining empirically the domain of the concepts macromarketing and micromarketing, and attempts to resolve the controversy by proposing a taxonomical model incorporating both macromarketing and micromarketing. Consistent with the perspective adopted by Fisk (1980), this paper approaches the nature of macromarketing controversy from a taxonomical rather than definitional perspective. Although definitional schemata are closely related to taxonomical schemata, the objective of a taxonomical schema is to partition some particular universe into its elements. That is, a taxonomical perspective on macromarketing attempts to find classificatory criteria such that all marketing phenomena will be either macro or micro. On the other hand, from a definitional perspective one could define macromarketing and micromarketing in such ways that there could be some marketing phenomena that are neither macro nor micro. The importance of good classificatory schemata to the development of science is well documented. Harvey (1969) suggests that classification is often the starting point for scientific investigation. Other philosophers have noted that the inductive route to scientific inquiry includes observation of facts, classification of facts, inductive derivation of generalizations and further testing of generalizations (Hempel 1966). The importance of the
nature of macromarketing issue has been demonstrated by White and Emery (1978), who pointed out that the explication of the macromarketing/micromarketing dichotomy is necessary to facilitate communications among marketing researchers and to guide their research efforts.

The Macromarketing/Micromarketing Issue

Although the term macromarketing is of relatively recent vintage, many of the early works on marketing would probably be considered by most marketers as macro in nature. For example, Weld’s 1920 classic, The Marketing of Farm Products, addressed the macro issue, “Are there too many middlemen in food marketing?” Other writers whose works were macro in nature include Barger (1955), Borden (1942), Cox (1965), and Stewart (1939). Similarly, as pointed out by Smith and Konopa (1980), although the term macromarketing occasionally appeared in the literature before the 1970s, it did so in a casual, undefined and unspecifed context. It appears that Moyer’s 1972 book, Macromarketing: A Social Perspective, was the first attempt by any marketing writer to delineate the differences between macromarketing and micromarketing. Moyer suggested that micromarketing is firm-oriented and that macromarketing “studies marketing within the context of the entire economic system, with special emphasis on its aggregate performance” (p. viii).

Table 1 shows various writers’ perspectives on the controversy concerning the concepts macromarketing and micromarketing. Although Table 1 does not include the views of all writers, it does give a representative sampling of the various perspectives on the subject. This paper will not chronologically review the debate. Rather we shall use Table 1 as a reference to explore the process-product ambiguity, and then analyze in detail four key perspectives that are representative of the other perspectives and provide a conceptual foundation for a proposition to be tested.

A review of the perspectives in Table 1 shows that the concept macromarketing involves a systematic ambiguity often referred to by philosophers of language as the process-product ambiguity (Rudner 1966). Macromarketing sometimes is used to refer to a set of activities (process) and sometimes to an area of study (product). Levy (1976) has observed a similar process-product confusion concerning the domain of marketing:

One source of these problems and the struggles with them lies in the idea of marketing as an activity. It is not surprising that educators are urged to see marketing as a “doing profession,” when marketing is a doing. When one is a seller and markets, one is a marketer who does marketing; and a buyer does marketing; and a buyer goes marketing. Thus, if educators teach marketing, they should teach how to do it (p. 380).

Grashof and Kelman (1973) and McCarthy (1978) view macromarketing as a set of activities culminating in a system or process. The other perspectives in Table 1 see macromarketing as an area of study. This paper will treat macromarketing as an area of study rather than a set of activities, since our interest here is in macromarketing and micromarketing as two halves of the discipline of marketing.

The first key perspective is that of Moyer (1972), who contends that whereas micromarketing is firm-oriented, macromarketing studies marketing within the context of the entire economic system, with special emphasis on its aggregate performance. Two themes emerge from this perspective, aggregation and performance. Moyer suggests that macromarketing is bigger than micromarketing. This is a level of aggregation criterion which, in one manner or another, is repeated in many of the other perspectives on macromarketing. Secondly, the performance criterion suggests that a major function of macromarketing is to evaluate, in a normative sense, marketing within our society. Consistent with this perspective, Moyer’s book looks at such issues as efficiency, productivity, advertising performance and consumerism.

The level of aggregation criterion for macromarketing is consistent with usage of the term macro in other social science disciplines. For example, Ackley (1961) says that macroeconomics deals with economic affairs “in the large.” More specifically, macroeconomics concerns itself with such variables as the aggregate output of an economy. Similarly, Demerath and Maxwell (1976) write that the difference between macrosociology and microsociology is “the distinction between analyzing social phenomena from the standpoint of larger social structures and cultural processes, on the one hand, and from the standpoint of individuals and their immediate world of interactions and interrelationships on the other hand” (p. 138). Finally, Miles (1980) differentiates macro-organizational behavior from micro-organizational behavior in that the former studies “structures and processes within major systems, organizations, and their environments, and the linkages among them.” Therefore, on a consistency basis, the credibility of using “level of aggregation” as a criterion for separating macromarketing from micromarketing is well-established within the social sciences. Nevertheless, as we shall see, there are problems with relying exclusively on this criterion.

A second key perspective is provided by Bagozzi (1977). Bagozzi perceived micromarketing to be “behavior and characteristics of individual actors and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Moyer (1972)</td>
<td>Macromarketing studies marketing within the context of the entire economic system with special emphasis on its aggregate performance. Micromarketing is firm-oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Shapiro (1973)</td>
<td>Marketing from the overall view of the aggregate activity in the economy for meeting society's objectives of a proper flow of goods and services is macromarketing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Grashof and Kelman (1973)</td>
<td>The macromarketing system in the U.S., a mass production mass consumption mixed-market directed economy, serves to overcome discrepancies or mismatches between production and consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Spratlen (1975)</td>
<td>Macromarketing pertains to the aggregates of market transactions or exchange activities, institutions, behavior and performance analyzed with respect to such units as industries, sectors, regions or the marketing system as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Hunt (1976)</td>
<td>Macromarketing suggests a higher level of aggregation, usually marketing systems or groups of consumers. Micromarketing refers to individual units, normally individual organizations (firms) and consumers or households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Bagozzi (1977)</td>
<td>Macromarketing studies networks of relationships connecting marketing actors and societal patterns or systemic relationships among marketing actors. Micromarketing studies the behavior and characteristics of individual actors or attributes of single marketing entities and dyadic relationships between marketing actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Bartels and Jenkins (1977)</td>
<td>Perhaps most widely, macromarketing has meant marketing in general and the data that depict marketing in general. It has meant the marketing process in its entirety, and the aggregate mechanism of institutions performing it. It has meant systems and groups of micro institutions, such as channels, conglomerates, industries and associations, in contrast to their individual component units. More recently, it has meant the social context of micromarketing, its role in the national economy and its application to the marketing of non-economic goods. It has also meant the uncontrollable environment of micro firms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Hunt (1977)</td>
<td>Macromarketing refers to the study of marketing systems, the impact and consequences of marketing systems on society, and the impact and consequences of society on marketing systems. Micromarketing refers to individual units: organizations, firms, consumers or households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Nickels and Hill (1978)</td>
<td>Macromarketing is the study of intranational and international exchange systems rather than particular dyadic exchange relationships, and includes: (1) the structure, process (flows), and power relationships within systems; (2) the effects of exchange systems on various subsystems; (3) the effects of various environmental influences on the total exchange systems; (4) the productivity and equity of various exchange systems; (5) the interactions between and among domestic and international exchange systems; (6) the management of exchange systems rather than particular organizations; (7) the effect of the total exchange system on economic development; (8) the complex decision making processes of buying centers and distribution systems; (9) the activities and structure of collectives within exchange systems; and (10) the public policy implications of the total exchange system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. McCarthy (1978)</td>
<td>Macromarketing is a socioeconomic process that directs an economy's flow of goods and services from producers to consumers in a way that effectively matches heterogeneous supply capabilities with heterogeneous demand and accomplishes both the short run and long run objectives of society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Slater (1978)</td>
<td>Marketing and distribution from a societal perspective is macromarketing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. White and Emory (1978)</td>
<td>Studying the impacts of the transaction upon the broader system, society or groups is macromarketing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Shawver and Nickels (1979)</td>
<td>Macromarketing is the study of exchange activities and exchange systems from a societal perspective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Although Bagozzi’s specification of macromarketing is more detailed and appears different from Moyer’s, the two perspectives are really quite similar. Bagozzi’s use of the terms networks of relationships..."
and societal patterns is actually another way of stating a level of aggregation criterion. What is conspicuously absent from Bagozzi’s perspective is the normative emphasis suggested by Moyer. Bagozzi does not insist that the purpose of macromarketing studies is to evaluate the performance of marketing. To Bagozzi it would appear that the study of the positive dimensions of networks of relationships would be considered as macromarketing. The issue of whether macromarketing must be evaluative (normative) will be addressed later.

The third key perspective is provided by Hunt (1977): “Macromarketing refers to the study of (1) marketing systems, (2) the impact and consequences of marketing systems on society, and (3) the impact and consequences of society on marketing systems.” Micromarketing is the study of “marketing activities of individual units: organizations, firms, consumers, or households” (p. 56). Like both Moyer (1972) and Bagozzi (1977), the marketing systems criterion implies that the level of aggregation of the study is important for separating macro from micro. Unlike Bagozzi, the consequences of marketing systems on society criterion specifically recognizes that macromarketing is concerned with the relationships between marketing systems and the rest of society. Recalling that Moyer emphasized the normative evaluation of marketing, the consequences on society criterion implies that the study may be either positive or normative. Finally, the consequences of society on marketing systems criterion introduces a completely new element into the specification of macromarketing. This criterion suggests that if it is macro to explore the consequences of different kinds of marketing systems on economic development, it is also macro to explore the consequences of different stages of economic development on the development of marketing systems.

The final perspective is provided by Shawver and Nickels (1979) who suggest that “macromarketing is the study of exchange activities and exchange systems from a societal perspective” (p. 41). They indicate that this was the consensus perspective arrived at by the participants at a special macromarketing conference. Note that the phrase exchange systems is used instead of marketing systems. Shawver and Nickels believe that since an individual firm may be considered a marketing system and since the study of the marketing activities of an individual firm is micromarketing, the use of exchange systems is preferable to marketing systems. However, the Shawver and Nickels perspective implies that the positive study of exchange systems per se is not macromarketing. Only the study of exchange systems from a societal perspective is macromarketing. Unlike Bagozzi (1977) and Hunt (1977), this criterion suggests that macromarketing is exclusively normative or evaluative in content. And so, this final perspective appears to be similar to the evaluative aggregative performance criterion originally suggested by Moyer.

The preceding discussion, in conjunction with the original specification of the Three Dichotomies Model (Hunt 1976), provides the conceptual foundations for the nine propositions examined in this research:

Proposition 1: Studies of marketing systems are macro (Moyer 1972).
Proposition 2: Studies of networks of exchange relationships are macro (Bagozzi 1977).
Proposition 3: Studies adopting the perspective of society are macro (Shawver and Nichols 1979).
Proposition 4: Studies examining the consequences of marketing on society are macro (Hunt 1977).
Proposition 5: Studies examining the consequences of society on marketing are macro (Hunt 1977).
Proposition 6: Studies of the marketing activities of individual, profit-sector organizations are micro (Moyer 1972), as are studies that adopt the perspective of individual profit-sector organizations (Shawver and Nichols 1979).
Proposition 7: Studies of the marketing activities of individual, nonprofit-sector organizations are micro (Hunt 1976).
Proposition 8: Studies adopting the perspective of an individual industry are micro (Hunt 1976).
Proposition 9: Studies of the marketing activities of consumers are micro (Hunt 1976).

Method

Modern philosophy of language contends that the meaning of a scientific term is determined by the use of the term (Alston 1964). When a new term is introduced in a discipline, there often are several rival (sometimes contradictory) meanings associated with it. Over time, a workable consensus develops within the discipline about the meaning of the term. For it to be useful in a discipline, only a workable not a complete consensus is required. With respect to macromarketing, Bartels and Jenkins (1977) agree:

The coinage of terms is license of authorship; but it is expected that consistency of use will ultimately
prevail. As there is no formal ultimate authority for the marketing lexicon, usage generally implies definition, however imprecise it may be. The use of “macromarketing” to date has neither been challenged nor authenticated (p. 17).

Social marketing is a good example of a term that has acquired consistency of meaning though usage. Kotler and Zaltman (1971) proposed that social marketing was “the explicit use of marketing skills to help translate present social action efforts into more effectively designed and communicated programs that elicit desired audience response” (p. 5). However, Lazer and Kelly (1973) proposed that social marketing included both the use of marketing tools to promote social programs as well as “the social consequences of marketing policies, decisions, and actions” (p. 4). Over time usage of the term by members of the marketing discipline suggests that the Kotler and Zaltman position prevailed. One can hypothesize that the Kotler and Zaltman position “won” at least in part because social marketing intuitively suggests a set of behaviors or actions, rather than a set of consequences of behaviors and actions. In any respect, the concept of social marketing has acquired meaning through its usage.

The preceding discussion suggests that the propositions concerning macromarketing and micromarketing can be meaningfully examined first, by generating a set of items that span the problems, issues, theories and research conducted in marketing and then by having members of the marketing discipline scale the items as to their macro and micro content. Although this methodology is appropriate now that the terms macromarketing and micromarketing have been used extensively for a decade, it would be inappropriate for examining terms in their first one to three years of use. The items used in this research were generated (1) from the original article on the nature and scope of marketing (Hunt 1976), (2) from articles previously discussed in this paper concerning the macromarketing/micromarketing controversy, and (3) by developing other items directed specifically at the propositions previously discussed. The first iteration of items was pretested on a convenience sample of marketing academicians. The second set was pretested on a probability sample of 50 academicians from the American Marketing Association membership directory. The final set of 50 items appears in Table 2.

At the present time both macromarketing and micromarketing are terms used almost exclusively by academicians. Although the terms will eventually be adopted by practitioners, such is not yet the case. Therefore, a self-administered questionnaire was sent to a sample of 1,399 marketing academicians, representing a systematic sample of three out of every four academic members listed in the AMA directory. A total of 289 usable questionnaires were returned, for a response rate of 20.7%. Response rates in this range are not uncommon when using marketing educators as a universe. For example, Jolson and Greer (1981) obtained a 20% response rate with a questionnaire sent to marketing faculty concerning consulting activities. High response rates with marketing academicians as subjects are usually obtained only with extremely short, simple questionnaires. For example, Browne and Becker (1977) achieved a 64% response rate, but the questionnaire simply listed marketing journals and asked respondents to evaluate each journal on a four-point scale as to quality level. During the pretest stage, the present authors chose to trade-off a few percentage points in response rate in order to have sufficient items to cover all nine propositions of concern in this study adequately.

Respondents making up the final sample were analyzed according to their degree of research activity, the nature of their research (micro vs. macro), academic rank, age, public vs. private school, and kind of business program (undergraduate, master’s, etc.). The evidence suggests that the final sample was broadly representative of marketing academe. Concerning research activity, 59% were “active” or “extremely active,” whereas 41% were only “something active” or “not active at all.” Research interests showed that 14% did “mostly macro” or “almost exclusively macro” research, 29% did “relatively equal” amounts of both macro and micro research, 50% did “mostly” or “almost exclusively micro” research, and 7% did “neither” macro nor micro research. The sample consisted of 48% full professors, 34% associates, 14% assistants and 4% others. Subjects were asked how many years had elapsed since they had received their last degree. 49% said 10 years or less, 37% 11–20 years and 15% were in the “over 20 years” category. Public schools accounted for 73% of the sample, whereas 27% taught at private schools. Finally, 43% taught at universities with doctoral programs, 46% at schools with masters’ programs and 10% at schools with only undergraduate programs.

Subjects were asked to scale each item using the following procedure:

The terms “macromarketing” and “micromarketing” are becoming commonplace in the marketing literature. We are interested in how you perceive the meaning of these terms. For each of the issues, problems and activities listed below, please check the box indicating the extent to which you believe a “macro” or “micro” perspective is indicated. The categories are:

1. Exclusively or almost exclusively micro
2. Mostly micro
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Exclusively Macro&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Mostly Macro</th>
<th>Equally Macro and Micro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.</td>
<td>Determining the aggregate performance of marketing in society</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.</td>
<td>Studies evaluating marketing from society’s perspective</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.</td>
<td>The consequences on society of marketing actions and transactions</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4.</td>
<td>Studying the optimum channel structure from society’s perspective</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5.</td>
<td>Studying the social desirability of vertical marketing systems</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.</td>
<td>Comparing the marketing systems of different nations</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7.</td>
<td>Studying the social desirability of political advertising</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8.</td>
<td>Comparing networks of exchange relationships across different cultures</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9.</td>
<td>The impact of technology on marketing systems</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10.</td>
<td>Studies of marketing systems</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11.</td>
<td>Examining how marketing adapts to different cultures</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1.</td>
<td>The impact of the pricing practices of the steel industry on inflation</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2.</td>
<td>Studies of highly aggregated marketing activities</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3.</td>
<td>The impact of the marketing activities of General Motors on the quality of life</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.</td>
<td>Examining Alderson’s general theory of marketing</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.</td>
<td>Evaluating networks of exchange relationships</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3.</td>
<td>Evaluating general theories of marketing</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.</td>
<td>Examining the characteristics of marketing institutions</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5.</td>
<td>The impact of consumer activists on the automobile industry</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6.</td>
<td>Examining the role of Sears Roebuck &amp; Co. in encouraging economic development in Mexico</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7.</td>
<td>Studying the evolution of different kinds of wholesalers</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Neither %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8. The consequences of new federal legislation on an industry</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9. Examining conflict in channels of distribution</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10. Exploring how nonprofit organizations use marketing</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Mostly Micro

D1. The consequences on higher education of universities engaging in sophisticated advertising campaigns for new students | 2.86 | 1.15 | 4.2       | 2.5          | .41               |
D2. Evaluating general models of consumer behavior                   | 2.64 | 1.15 | 6.3       | 2.1          | .48               |
D3. Examining restrictions on advertising from the perspective of the cigarette industry | 2.56 | 1.15 | 2.1       | 0.7          | .32 .45           |
D4. Mapping the channels of distribution for several commodities     | 2.51 | 1.11 | 1.8       | 1.1          | .31               |
D5. Examining how the "stop smoking" campaign should be organized    | 2.47 | 1.27 | 6.3       | 2.1          | .61               |
D6. Exploring how various state governments advertise for new industry | 2.36 | 1.06 | 1.8       | 1.8          | .67               |
D7. Examining product safety requirements from the perspective of a single industry | 2.32 | 1.07 | 2.8       | 1.4          | .44 .31 .53       |
D8. Studying how the appliance industry selects channels of distribution | 2.02 | .94  | 0.0       | 0.4          | .35 .41           |
D9. Examining alternative channels of distribution from the perspective of a single industry | 1.93 | .82  | 0.4       | 0.4          | .34               |

E. Exclusively Micro

E1. Determining the success of the "Smookey the Bear" campaign        | 2.46 | 1.28 | 3.2       | 2.5          | .72               |
E2. The role of learning theory in buyer behavior                     | 2.19 | 1.16 | 14.4      | 2.1          | .32               |
E3. The impact of the Department of Energy on the product line of Exxon Corp. | 2.10 | 1.07 | 1.8       | 1.4          | .62               |
E4. The consequences of government regulation on a particular firm     | 1.97 | 1.05 | 0.4       | 1.8          | .75               |
E5. Studying how hospitals should price their services to increase revenue | 1.95 | 1.03 | 1.1       | 0.7          | .62               |
E6. Examining how firms conduct strategic marketing planning          | 1.94 | 1.02 | 1.8       | 0.7          | .68               |
E7. Evaluating government regulations in the beer indu-
### TABLE 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Neither %b</th>
<th>Don’t Know %c</th>
<th>Factor Structured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>try from the perspective of Miller Brewing Company</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8. How to use multidimensional scaling</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9. Examining how museums segment their markets</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10. Determining the best theme for United States Army recruiting posters</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11. Studying how the steel industry should segment its market</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>.31 .37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12. How to use conjoint analysis in marketing research</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13. Determining how United Way should allocate its media budget</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14. Studies focused on an individual consumer’s buying practices</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15. Examining how firms should make pricing decisions to maximize profits</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16. Determining how the Whirlpool Corp. uses marketing research</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>.30 .44 .39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17. Determining how Proctor &amp; Gamble should set its advertising budget</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalues: 11.4  5.6  3.3  2.9  2.1  2.0  1.6  1.5
Percent Explained Variance: 22.9  11.1  6.7  5.8  4.1  4.0  3.1  3.0
Coefficient alpha: 0.90  0.87  0.85  0.82  0.78  0.79  0.69  0.70

*Items are grouped according to modal response: For example, Group A items are those whose modal response was 5, i.e., exclusively or almost exclusively macro. Group B items were 4, i.e., mostly macro, and so on. Within each group the items are ranked according to mean score.

*The percentage that indicated that the item was neither macro nor micro.

*The percentage that indicated that they didn’t know whether the item was macro or micro.

*Varimax rotation. Following Nunnally (1967) factor loadings of 0.3 and above are reported.

*Social marketing factor, i.e., how public sector and nonprofit organizations do and should conduct marketing.

*The intermediate marketing systems factor, i.e., marketing institutions, channels of distribution and industries.

*The total marketing system of a society factor.

*The consequences factor, i.e., the consequences of some unit of analysis on another unit of analysis.

*The society factor.

*The decision making techniques factor.

*The industry factor.

*The perspective of an industry factor.

3. Has relatively equal amounts of macro and micro
4. Mostly macro
5. Exclusively or almost exclusively macro
6. Neither macro nor micro
7. Don’t know

### Results

The results of the study are summarized in Table 2. The items are grouped according to the modal response. Group A items are those for which the modal response was *"exclusively or almost exclusively ma-
cro.' Group B items are those where the modal response was 'mostly macro.' Group C items were 'relatively equal amounts of macro and micro,' and, similarly, with D and E. Within each grouping the items are rank-ordered by mean score, with higher numbers indicating that the item is more macro. To assess the reliability of the items in each grouping, Cronbach's coefficient alpha was computed (Nunnally 1967). Alphas for groups A through E respectively were 0.84, 0.62, 0.81, 0.78 and 0.87. These alpha levels suggest high internal consistency among the items in each grouping. Table 2 also includes the results of the factor analysis (varimax rotation). Eight factors were generated that were interpretable and had eigenvalues greater than 1. The eight factors are interpreted as nonprofit organizations, intermediate marketing systems, total marketing systems, consequences, society, decision making techniques, industry and perspective of an industry. These factors accounted for 60.6% of total variance (more on the factor analysis later).

The nine propositions all address the question, "What are the criteria marketers use to categorize items as macro or micro?" This question presumes that marketers both can classify the items and that they will do so in a consistent fashion. This basic presumption underlies the Three Dichotomies Model of marketing and must be addressed before examining the nine propositions.

The basic presumption can be tested by examining the sample variance for each item. Suppose marketers could not consistently classify an item by means of the five categories used (the null hypothesis). The random assignment of scores by each respondent for each item would result in a uniform distribution of scores in each category for each item. The resultant variance for each item would be 2.0, that is, H₀: σ² = 2 for each item. If subjects can consistently classify each item, the variance should be less than 2.0, that is, H₁: σ² < 2.0.

An examination of Table 2 reveals that the sample variances range from a minimum of 0.28 to a maximum of 1.64, with the variance of most items being approximately 1.0. Therefore, the question is, "Is a sample variance of 1.0 significantly lower than the random assignment variance of 2.0?" A sample variance of 1.0 indicates a standard error of the estimate of approximately 0.1. Therefore, the sample variance is approximately 10 standard deviations below the random assignment variance of 2.0 and the null hypothesis is emphatically rejected.

A second way to test the basic presumption that marketers can classify items by way of the micro/macro dichotomy is to examine the extent to which respondents believed the items were neither macro nor micro. Table 2 shows that for almost all of the items the percentage that checked "neither" was very small. In only two cases, items E8 and E12, did the percentage of "neithers" exceed 15%. Both of these items dealt with research techniques, i.e., multidimensional scaling and conjoint analysis. Since research techniques per se are not marketing, the high percentage of "neithers" on these two items was both expected and affirmatively responsive to the basic presumption.

A third test can be conducted by examining the percentage of "don't knows." A high percentage would be evidence against the basic presumption. Again, in only a single case did the percentage of "don't knows" exceed 15%. For item B2, studies of highly aggregated marketing activities, 19% of the respondents did not know whether it was macro or micro. We believe that the respondents in this case were unsure of the meaning of highly aggregated marketing activities.

A fourth test would be the number of items in group C, designating that the items have relatively equal amounts of macro and micro. A large number of items in group C would be evidence against the basic presumption. Table 2 shows that only 20% of the total items reside in C. Given that there will always be borderline cases in any classificatory schema, the 20% figure seems reasonably small.

A final test was conducted by asking respondents in another section of the questionnaire to indicate the degree of confidence they had in their abilities to categorize the items. A high degree of confidence would be evidence in favor of the basic presumption. Of the total, 11.8% were very confident, 31.9% were confident, 43.1% were somewhat confident and only 12.5% were not confident at all. Again, the evidence seems to be in favor of the basic presumption of the research.

Taken in isolation, none of the preceding tests would be conclusive evidence. Nevertheless, when all five tests are considered in toto they present strong evidence that marketers can consistently categorize the problems, issues and research in marketing by way of the macro/micro dichotomy. This conclusion becomes even stronger when one considers the extemporaneous comments that many respondents made on their questionnaires. For many respondents most of the ambiguity had to do with the meanings of many of the items themselves, rather than the meanings of macro and micro. For example, with respect to item C4 some respondents wished that the item had been further specified to include whether the characteristics of marketing institutions were going to be examined from the perspective of the firm or the perspective of society. Although pretests of the questionnaire had identified some of these ambiguities, the researchers chose not to resolve these ambiguities in the ques-
tionnaire development stage because one of the major purposes of the research was to determine whether marketers could consistently categorize items without such key descriptors as perspective of society or perspective of the firm. Therefore, it is appropriate to investigate the nine propositions concerning criteria for classifying items as micro or macro.

**Proposition 1**

Proposition 1 suggests that the study of marketing systems is macro. The results clearly support this proposition. Every item with the term *marketing systems* in it was considered by the sample to be macro (items A5, A6, A9 and A10). The factor analysis also provided supportive evidence. Factor 3 indicates that the total marketing system is a key underlying dimension that respondents rely on in making judgments. As previously discussed, when one uses marketing systems as a criterion for distinguishing macromarketing from micromarketing, one is implicitly using a level of aggregation criterion. Level of aggregation comes directly from macroeconomics and macrosociology. Items A1 and B2 specifically include the term *aggregation*, and both items are considered macro.

Although the study of marketing systems is clearly macro, the results point out a significant unresolved issue: What is the nature of a marketing system? Are channels of distribution marketing systems? Is an industry a marketing system? Are marketing institutions marketing systems? Are groups of wholesalers marketing systems? There is no doubt that most marketers would consider one or more of the preceding to be examples of marketing systems, and the study of marketing systems is clearly macro. Nevertheless, items C4, C5, C7, C8, C9 and D4 all involve channels of distribution, industries, institutions and wholesalers. Yet, there remains significant doubt among respondents as to whether these items are macro or micro. In fact, half of all the items in group C deal with these specific issues. The findings suggest that the study of marketing systems is conclusively macro only when the marketing systems involved are the *total marketing system* of an economy, not marketing systems that are intermediate between individual firms and the total marketing system. This is consistent with Arndt’s (1981) position, which suggests that the study of these intermediate marketing systems should be referred to as “meso” marketing.

**Proposition 2**

The second proposition says that the study of networks of exchange relationships is macro. Items A8 and C2 both involve networks of exchange relationships. Item A8 is considered clearly macro, yet item C2 is much less macro. Again, the factor analysis assists us in interpreting the results. Both items A8 and C2 load heavily on the total marketing systems factor. It appears that networks of exchange relationships are considered to be macro only to the extent that they are synonymous with the concept of a marketing system. Therefore, networks of exchange relationships across different cultures (A8) is macro, while simply studying networks is much less so.

**Proposition 3**

According to proposition 3, studies adopting the perspective of society are macro. Three items (A1, A2 and A4) specifically incorporate the phrase *perspective of society*. Two other items (A5 and A7) use the phrase *social desirability*. These two concepts are closely related since when one adopts the perspective of society, one is attempting to determine what is socially desirable. That is, both of these concepts have a heavy *normative* content. As expected, both of the social desirability items are exclusively macro. The factor analysis also suggests that the term *society* is a key underlying dimension (factor 5).

**Proposition 4**

The next proposition suggests that studies of the impacts and consequences of marketing on society are macro. Note that one can study the consequences of a marketing action on society without necessarily evaluating those consequences. That is, one can study the consequences from a positive perspective instead of a normative perspective. Items A3, B1 and B3 all examine the consequences of marketing on society and all are macro. Note that when one refers to marketing actions and transactions in general (A3) the item is more macro than the actions of an industry (B1), which is slightly more macro than the actions of a particular firm (B3). The factor analysis also indicates that respondents are keying on the underlying constructs of impacts and consequences (factor 4). Note that the consequences factor includes both the consequences of marketing on society and the consequences of society on marketing (the next proposition).

---

1Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for items A5, A6, A9 and A10 is .724.
2Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for items A8 and C2 is .810.
3Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for items A1, A2, A4, A5 and A7 is .761.
4Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for items A3, B1 and B3 is .647.
Proposition 5

Proposition 5 asserts that studies examining the impact of society on marketing are macro. Item A9, the impact of technology on marketing systems, provides the clearest test of the proposition, and this item is exclusively macro. Nevertheless, studies exploring the impacts of society on particular firms (items E3 and E4) are exclusively micro. Similarly, studies of the consequences of society on industries (items C5 and C8) are mixtures of micro and macro. Therefore, it would appear that there is an underlying level of aggregation criterion at work. The consequences of society (1) on marketing in general are macro, (2) on industries are both macro and micro, and (3) on firms are micro.

Proposition 6

Proposition 6 says that the study of the marketing activities of individual, profit-sector organizations is micro. Items E3, E4, E6, E7, E15, E16 and E17 provide overwhelming affirmative evidence. Studies that are positive (E3, E4, E6, E7 and E16) are micro, as well as studies that are normative (E15 and E17). Similarly, both studies that adopt the perspective of the firm (E7) and studies that explore the impact on firms of government regulation (E3 and E4) are micro.

Proposition 7

Proposition 7 suggests that the study of the marketing activities of individual, nonprofit-sector organizations is micro. The results overwhelmingly support the proposition. Of the eight nonprofit-sector items, five are exclusively micro (E1, E5, E9, E10 and E13), two are mostly micro (D5 and D6), and only one (C10) is a mixture of macro and micro. Item C10, exploring how nonprofit organizations use marketing, is probably more macro than the other items because of an implicit level of aggregation criterion. That is, respondents are probably reacting as if the phrase in general appeared at the end of the item. The factor analysis provides further support that studies of the practices of nonprofit-sector organizations are micro. All eight of the nonprofit-sector items load on the first factor. Note that the not-for-profit items include a wide range of organizations: hospitals (E5), museums (E9), social agencies (E13), social causes (E1 and D5) and governmental agencies (D6 and E10). Some items are positive (D6, E1 and E9) and some are normative (E5, E10, E13). All the practices, activities and perspectives of these nonprofit-sector organizations are micro.

Proposition 8

According to proposition 8, studies of the marketing practices of specific industries are micro. A priori, using a level of aggregation criterion, one would expect that studies adopting the perspective of a particular industry would be micro, but not quite as micro as studies adopting the perspective of a particular firm since industries would be an intermediate marketing system. The results seem to support this view. Four items examine the marketing practices and perspectives of specific industries, D3, D7, D9 and E11. Only the final item, studying how the steel industry should segment its market, is exclusively micro. The others reside in the mostly micro category. This is in contrast to the fact that all seven (E3, E4, E6, E7, E15, E16 and E17) of the items identifying a for-profit organization perspective or activities were classified as exclusively micro. Note that both factors 7 and 8 have a strong industry orientation.

Proposition 9

The final proposition says that studies of consumer behavior are micro. Items D2, E2 and E14 examine and support the proposition. Even here an implicit level of aggregation criterion can be observed. Although all three items are micro, the study of individual consumers (E14) appears to be more micro than the role of learning theory (E2), which appears to be more micro than general models of consumer behavior (D2).

Model Development and Conclusion

How should the universe of marketing phenomena, issues and research be partitioned into its macro and micro elements? Since we have explored the positive issue of how marketers distinguish macromarketing from micromarketing, it is time to address the normative issue of what criteria should be used to develop a complete taxonomy of macromarketing versus micromarketing. Using Sokal and Sneath’s (1963) terminology, the research results clearly indicate that a monothetical taxonomy will not be sufficient. That is, a taxonomical system relying on a single criterion

---

* Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for items E3 and E4 is .680.
* Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for items C5 and C8 is .600.
* Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for items E3, E4, E6, E7, E15, E16 and E17 is .751.
* Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for items C10, D5, D6, E1, E5, E9, E10 and E13 is .877.
* Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for items D3, D7, D9 and E11 is .647.
* Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for items D2, E2 and E14 is .727.
### TABLE 3
**Macromarketing/Micromarketing: The Systems/Perspectives/Consequences Taxonomical Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units of Analysis</th>
<th>&quot;Studies of&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Total societal system and nonmarketing societal subsystems</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Total marketing system&quot;</td>
<td>A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Intermediate marketing systems&quot;</td>
<td>Al*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Individual-organization marketing systems&quot;</td>
<td>I*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Total consumption system&quot;</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Household consumption systems&quot;</td>
<td>A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Individual consumer behavior&quot;</td>
<td>A*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;From the Perspective of&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Consequences on&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where A designates macromarketing, I designates micromarketing, Al designated a mixture of both macro and micro, and X means not applicable.

"The total marketing system of a society.
Marketing subsystems such as channels of distribution, retail systems, wholesale systems and industries.
Individual organizations including for-profit firms, not-for-profit organizations and social causes.
The total pattern of consumers' purchases throughout society.
The buying behaviors and patterns of behaviors of households.
The buying behaviors and patterns of behaviors of individual consumers.
The classifications in column 2 are based on a level of aggregation criterion. For example, "Studies of the total marketing system are macro," and "Studies of individual consumer behavior are micro."
Columns 3 and 4 are, respectively, the perspective of society and the perspective of the firm criteria. For example, studies of intermediate marketing systems from the perspective of society are macro, and the perspective of the firm are micro.
Classifications in columns 5 through 11 are based on the consequences of each unit of analysis in column 1 on each unit of analysis in columns 5 through 11. For example, the consequences of the total marketing system on the total societal system are macro, and the consequences of individual organization marketing system on individual consumer behavior are micro.
Classification derived from the research results. Other classifications are extensions of the research results.

(like perspective of society) for classification will not provide a complete, unambiguous partitioning of the universe of marketing phenomena. In large part, many of the problems in the literature concerning the distinction between macromarketing and micromarketing have developed from ill-guided efforts to find a single classificatory criterion. A polythetic (multiple criteria) taxonomical system will be required.

Based on the research results reported in this study, the authors propose the polythetic taxonomical model displayed in Table 3. The model suggests that three classificatory criteria are both necessary and sufficient to specify the macromarketing/micromarketing dichotomy: level of aggregation, perspective of, and consequences on. The first criterion asks the taxonomical question, "What is the level of aggregation of the unit of analysis?" Seven units of analyses are proposed: (1) the total societal system and its nonmarketing societal subsystems; (2) the total marketing system; (3) intermediate marketing systems, such as channels of distribution, retail systems, wholesale systems and industries; (4) organizational marketing systems, such as for-profit firms, not-for-profit organizations and social causes; (5) the total consumption system, i.e., the total pattern of consumers' purchases throughout society; (6) household consumption systems—the buying behaviors and patterns of behaviors of households; and (7) individual consumer behavior—the buying behaviors and patterns of behaviors of individual consumers. Note that there are three levels of aggregation of both marketing systems and consumer systems.

The second column of the model classifies each unit of analysis using a level of aggregation criterion. Therefore, the study of the total marketing system of a society is macro. The asterisk indicates that the classification is supported by the results reported in this study. Column 2 also shows that the study of intermediate marketing systems is a mixture of macro and micro and that both the study of individual organizations and individual consumers are micro. Again, the asterisks indicate that these conclusions spring directly from the results of the study.

The model also incorporates numerous extensions of the underlying logic of the classificatory criteria. Extending the logic of the level of aggregation criterion suggests that studies of the total consumption system are macro and studies of household consumption systems are micro. Note that household consumption systems are roughly analogous to individual organi-
zation marketing systems and that the total consumption system is analogous to the total marketing system.

The second criterion asks, "Is the unit of analysis being viewed from the perspective of society or the perspective of the individual organization?" Column 3 of the model indicates that whenever any marketing unit of analysis is investigated from the perspective of society, the investigation is macro. For example, the research results clearly show that when one examines the social desirability of marketing organizations and systems, the research is macro. Similarly, Column 4 indicates that whenever one examines an issue from the perspective of the firm, the research is micro.

The third criterion asks, "Is the study investigating the consequences of one unit of analysis (e.g., the total marketing system) on another unit (e.g., society)?" The final seven columns of the model employ the consequences on criterion. For example, the study of the consequences of the total marketing system on society is macro; the study of the consequences of intermediate marketing systems on the total marketing system is macro; the study of the consequences of individual-organization marketing systems on intermediate marketing systems is a mixture of both macro and micro; and so on, throughout the table.

The model is not only completely consistent with how respondents actually classified the issues, but also is consistent with the criteria respondents suggested should be used to distinguish macromarketing from micromarketing. Respondents were asked to propose their own definitions of macromarketing and micromarketing. Of the 237 who responded to the question, 40.1% suggested a society perspective, 38.0% suggested level of aggregation, 25.3% suggested consequences on society, 19.8% suggested marketing systems and 8.9% suggested consequences on marketing.

The ultimate test of any taxonomical model is not whether phenomena can be classified, but rather is it useful to do so? The answer appears to be strongly affirmative. The macromarketing/micromarketing dichotomy has been previously used (Hunt 1976) to help resolve the "Is marketing a science?" debate and the nature of marketing controversy. As White (1978) has observed, the development of a taxonomical model to differentiate macromarketing from micromarketing should facilitate communication among marketers. An analysis of the model displayed in Table 3 suggests areas where additional research would be fruitful. For example, over the last two decades almost all research conducted by marketers on consumer behavior has been micro in nature. Almost all research has focused on purchase behavior as the ultimate dependent variable. The model points out that many consumer behavior research areas are macro in nature and are worthy of investigation. The model also includes the concept total marketing systems. Although this concept is not new, it is the authors' judgment that the characteristics of a society's total marketing system have not been adequately explored. For example, how does one differentiate the total marketing system from the total economic system? We believe this issue is important and worthy of much more attention than it has received in the past.

In conclusion, marketers can and do categorize marketing phenomena, issues and research by way of the macromarketing/micromarketing dichotomy. Using the three criteria of level of aggregation, perspective of, and consequences on, a taxonomical model can completely specify the various kinds of marketing studies. The macromarketing/micromarketing dichotomy has been useful in resolving controversies in marketing. The taxonomical model developed herein facilitates communication among marketing researchers and points out potentially fruitful areas for further research.
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