

ROLE ANALYSIS OF THE
DIRECTOR OF MARKETING RESEARCH
POSITION IN LARGE INDUSTRIAL FIRMS

Thesis for the Degree of D. B. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
James Richard Krum
1966



This is to certify that the
thesis entitled
ROLE ANALYSIS OF THE
DIRECTOR OF MARKETING RESEARCH POSITION
IN LARGE INDUSTRIAL FIRMS

presented by
JAMES RICHARD KRUM

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

D. B. A. degree in Marketing

Date Novembe

V — 040

ROOM USE ONLY

ed

ri

po

hal

st

ke

tw

of

pa

us

a

o

i

d

2

r

t

c

ABSTRACT

ROLE ANALYSIS OF THE DIRECTOR OF MARKETING RESEARCH POSITION IN LARGE INDUSTRIAL FIRMS

by James Richard Krum

The first phase of this inquiry determined the incidence of marketing research departments in large industrial corporations. Of 364 of the Fortune 500 firms responding to a mail survey, 297 (82 percent) had formal marketing research departments. The second phase of the study employed role theory to analyze the director of marketing research position in a sample of these firms. Fifty-two scaling items were used to determine the perceptions of the role of the director of marketing research by occupants of that position, their immediate superiors, and the users of the services of their departments. In addition, a group of scaling items ascertained the job satisfaction of the marketing research directors and another group of items determined how effective these marketing research directors were perceived to be by their role definers. The director of marketing research questionnaire and four role definer questionnaires were sent to 148 of the firms that responded to the first survey.

Macroscopic role analysis of the grouped responses of 76 marketing research directors, 50 superiors, and 138

users

the d

firm

direc

that

Also

the

ings

ingr

rain

ere

mal

his

ing

dat

sho

he

ti

di

wh

th

in

se

q

d

e

users revealed a high degree of consensus on the role of the director of marketing research in these large industrial firms. There was little disagreement that the job of the director of marketing research is to produce information that reduces the area of uncertainty in decision-making. Also, he must understand the objectives of management and the problems to be studied, be able to communicate his findings, and realize that executive judgment is an important ingredient in the decision-making process. However, certain areas of role ambiguity and role conflict were discovered. Specifically, there is ambiguity concerning the formal authority of the director of marketing research and his relationship to his superior, the desirability of meeting deadlines if he is not certain of the validity of his data, the price which the director of marketing research should pay to maintain his objectivity, and whether or not he should participate in certain politically expedient activities. The greatest conflict between marketing research directors and their role definers concerned the extent to which the marketing research directors should go beyond the typical staff prerogatives and actively participate in formulating marketing strategy for the firm.

In general, the marketing research directors were satisfied with the aspects of their jobs covered in the questionnaire and their role definers believed they were doing effective jobs. However, average satisfaction and effectiveness scores varied from item to item and a

signi

with

the p

and

sion

the

the

lati

into

of

mic

fre

ro.

tr.

re.

th

na

of

ou

s:

in

e.

significant number of research directors were dissatisfied with the part they play in formulating marketing strategy, the procedure for bringing problems to their departments, and the availability of time to improve themselves professionally. The role definers were dissatisfied most with the creativity of the marketing research departments and the timing of marketing research reports.

Microscopic analysis of the data concerned the relationships among consensus, satisfaction, effectiveness, interaction among the respondents in a firm, and homogeneity of their educational backgrounds. To be included in the microscopic analysis, completed questionnaires were needed from the director of marketing research and three or four role definers in the same firm; returns from 42 firms met this criterion. Seven of the eight hypotheses concerning relationships among these variables were not supported by the data. If these hypotheses derived from role theory had been applied to the relationship between the director of marketing research and the management of his firm without empirical verification, some highly misleading conclusions would have been advanced. In fact, the data collected in this study indicate that role theory is an oversimplified explanation of complex organizational relationships.

ROLE ANALYSIS OF THE
DIRECTOR OF MARKETING RESEARCH POSITION
IN LARGE INDUSTRIAL FIRMS

By

James Richard Krum

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Department of Marketing and Transportation Administration

1966

242239
4/19/61

rese

ing

many

ackn

Tha

Pro

per

In

of

in

ov

fu

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Professor Donald A. Taylor demanded the rigor in research design which befits a dissertation about marketing research directors. For these high standards and for many suggestions and constructive criticisms, I gratefully acknowledge the guidance of this ideal committee chairman. Thanks are also extended to Professor Thomas A. Staudt, Professor W. J. E. Crissy, and Dr. Carl Noble for their performance of the various tasks of committee members. In a broader sense, a dissertation marks the culmination of a doctoral program and reflects the formal and informal interaction with the faculty and fellow doctoral students over a three year period. I am truly indebted and grateful to many individuals whose names are not mentioned here.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF APPENDICES.	v
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
<div style="padding-left: 40px;"> Pioneers in Marketing Research Growth of Marketing Research Departments Explanations of Growth of Marketing Research Criticisms of Marketing Research Review of Related Studies Objectives of the Dissertation </div>	
II. SURVEY OF MARKETING RESEARCH DIRECTORS OF <u>FORTUNE</u> 500 FIRMS	25
<div style="padding-left: 40px;"> Description of the Study Extent of Marketing Research Departments Organizational Location and Size of Departments Backgrounds of Marketing Research Directors Reporting Patterns of Directors Positions Held by Former Directors How Marketing Research Directors Perceive Their Role </div>	
III. CONCEPTUAL APPROACH AND PROCEDURE OF THE INVESTIGATION	39
<div style="padding-left: 40px;"> Procedure of the Study Analysis of Non-response Characteristics of the Respondents </div>	
IV. MACROSCOPIC ROLE ANALYSIS	63
<div style="padding-left: 40px;"> Consensus on Role Expectations Interposition Analysis Hypotheses of Interposition Macroscopic Analysis Areas of Potential Role Conflict Areas of Role Ambiguity Intraposition Analysis </div>	

CHAPTER	Page
Job Satisfaction of Marketing Research Directors Perceived Effectiveness of the Marketing Research Department Comparison of Effectiveness and Satisfac- tion Responses Summary	
V. MICROSCOPIC ROLE ANALYSIS	118
Discussion of Measurements Hypotheses of Microscopic Role Analysis Summary	
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	137
Summary Conclusions Synthesis Recommendations Suggestions for Future Research	
APPENDICES.	160
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	220

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	Page
I. SURVEY OF <u>FORTUNE</u> 500 FIRMS.	160
Table 1. Percentage of Firms Having Marketing Research Departments	
Table 2. Levels of Management at which Marketing Research Directors Report	
Table 3. Reporting Patterns of Marketing Research Directors	
II. MACROSCOPIC ROLE ANALYSIS.	164
Table 1. Responses to Role Expectation Items	
Table 2. Marketing Research Directors' Responses to Satisfaction Items (Section II)	
Table 3. Role Definers' Responses to Effectiveness Items (Section II)	
Table 4. Role Definers' Responses to Effectiveness Items (Section III)	
III. MICROSCOPIC ROLE ANALYSIS.	180
Table 1. V, M, and D Scores for 42 Firms	
Table 2. Satisfaction and Effectiveness Scores for 42 Firms	
Table 3. Interaction and Education Scores for 42 Firms	
Table 4. Rank Correlation of V Scores and Effectiveness Scores	
Table 5. Rank Correlation of D Scores and Effectiveness Scores	
Table 6. Rank Correlation of V Scores and Satisfaction Scores	

Table 7. Rank Correlation of D Scores
and Satisfaction Scores

Table 8. Rank Correlation of Effective-
ness Scores and Satisfaction Scores

Table 9. Rank Correlation of V Scores
and Interaction Scores

Table 10. Rank Correlation of D Scores
and Interaction Scores

Table 11. Rank Correlation of D Scores
and Education Scores

IV. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS. 192

Exhibit 1. Questionnaire for Survey of
Fortune 500 Firms

Exhibit 2. Director of Marketing Research
Questionnaire, Role Analysis Survey

Exhibit 3. Role Definer's Questionnaire,
Role Analysis Survey

V. FIRMS INCLUDED IN ROLE STUDY 215

Bart

The

Cur

ma

as

ou

sc

tu

a

As

ti

-

(i

26

o

V

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In The Development of Marketing Thought, Robert Bartels stated:

In no other of the marketing literatures is the origin of an activity so generally referred to as that of marketing research in the writings pertaining to it. Numerous writers have pinpointed the beginning of marketing research at about 1910 and have attributed to Charles Parlin the inception of the work.¹

The marketing research department organized by Parlin at Curtis Publishing Company is recognized as the first formal marketing research activity. But marketing research as an activity seems to predate the work of Parlin. Numerous reports show that businessmen, consciously or unconsciously, were doing marketing research for at least a century before the work of Parlin. Paul D. Converse relates a story concerning the hiring of an artist by John Jacob Astor to sketch hats in the park in an attempt to determine the fashions of women's hats.² In their book, Economics

¹Robert Bartels, The Development of Marketing Thought (Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1962), p. 108.

²Paul D. Converse, "The Development of the Science of Marketing--An Exploratory Survey," Journal of Marketing, Vol. 10, No. 1 (July, 1945), p. 19.

of

and

to e

the

the

refe

one

mat

tur

Pic

of

in

in

co

in

ke

ag

ke

Ys

$\frac{1}{1}$

k
(

$\frac{1}{1}$

of American Industry,³ E. B. Alderfer and H. E. Michl indicated that the ready-made clothing industry was able to expand its market after the Civil War when it acquired the measurements of millions of soldiers collected by the government during the war. Lawrence Lockley makes reference to a summary conducted by N. W. Ayer and Son, one of the pioneer advertising agencies, to gather information on grain production for a manufacturer of agricultural machinery.⁴

Pioneers in Marketing Research

Indeed, Parlin seems to be acquiring a "halo-effect" of the type Frederick W. Taylor has attained in management literature. Several contemporaries of Parlin recognized the need for marketing research and also made significant contributions. J. George Frederick, in his book, published in 1957, lays claim to being the first practitioner of marketing and motivation research.⁵ While this claim is exaggerated, the fact remains that he founded the first marketing research firm (Business Bourse), in 1911, the same year in which Parlin started a department at Curtis Publishing

³E. B. Alderfer and H. E. Michl, Economics of American Industry (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957), p. 436.

⁴Lawrence C. Lockley, "Notes on the History of Marketing Research," Journal of Marketing, Vol. 14, No. 5 (April, 1950), p. 733.

⁵J. George Frederick, Introduction to Motivation Research (New York: Business Bourse Publishers, 1957), preface.

Comp

opul

two

will

need

fir

ter

Eve

sio

va

of

Pa

th

ga

in

Ny

St

Mc

W

A

t

-

h

Company. Marketing scholars were participating in or recognizing the need for marketing research during the first two decades of the current century. Harlow Gale, Walter Dill Scott, Arch Shaw, and C. S. Duncan are among the pioneers in marketing research. While Duncan contributed the first marketing research book in 1919, Shaw devoted a chapter of his book written in 1916 to analysis of the market. Even as early as 1869 Samuel Hugh Terry demonstrated considerable insight into the need for market information.⁶

The above discussion shows that numerous individuals, including some who are not mentioned, deserve a share of the credit for their pioneering work in marketing research. Parlin's significant contribution seems to be that he headed the first marketing research department in a business organization. According to Lockley, two early developments in manufacturing firms were the appointments of Paul H. Nystrom as manager of commercial research for the United States Rubber Company in 1915, and the formation of a commercial research department at Swift and Company by L. D. H. Weld in 1917.⁷ Weld has reported that by the year 1923, American Telephone and Telegraph had developed its activity to the point where it was split between a commercial survey

⁶Samuel Hugh Terry, The Retailer's Manual (Newark, New Jersey: Jennings Brothers, 1869).

⁷Lockley, op. cit., p. 735.

divi

orga

part

and

that

part

Free

cli

Com

dep

tne

ii

is

co

ma

Ge

fu

is

re

aj

i

-

s

l

division and a statistical department.⁸ Other firms which organized marketing research activities during the early part of this century include the General Motors Corporation and the Eastman Kodak Company. It should not be inferred that firms which lagged in the development of such a department were not doing marketing research. For example, Frederick has indicated to Lockley that two of his early clients were the Texas Company and the General Electric Company.⁹ The development of corporate marketing research departments was dependent upon finding an individual with the capabilities to handle such a job. Lack of such qualified individuals during the early decades of this century is indicated by the fact that two of the earliest corporate commercial research department directors were such eminent marketing pioneers as Paul Nystrom and L. D. H. Weld.

In measuring the growth of marketing research, the development of corporate staff activities devoted to this function will be used as a measuring stick. This approach is based on the assumption that while a firm may engage in marketing research by utilizing its own line executives, and outside sources such as advertising agencies or consulting firms, it is not likely that marketing research is

⁸L. D. H. Weld, "The Progress of Commercial Research," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 1, No. 2 (January, 1923), p. 179.

⁹Lockley, op. cit., p. 734.

play!

age

the

suin

ment

mark

L. D

the

Indy

Man

Mar

abo

Doc

ic

in

are

fi

ta

Gr

cc

in

by

f.

playing a significant role in providing information to management until at least one full-time individual is assigned the responsibility for this function. Therefore, the ensuing discussion deals with staff marketing research departments consisting of one or more individuals.

The information presented on the development of marketing research departments is based on the study by L. D. H. Weld conducted in 1923 and on later studies by the United States Department of Commerce (1939), the National Industrial Conference Board (1945 and 1954), the American Management Association (1953 and 1957), and the American Marketing Association (1957 and 1963). In addition to the above studies, references will be made to a study by Heusner, Dooley, Hughes and White which was conducted for the American Marketing Association in 1946. The method of collecting data used by these researchers has yielded results which are not comparable to the other studies; therefore, the findings of this study are omitted from the tabular presentation in Appendix I.

Growth of Marketing Research Departments

Table 1 in Appendix I indicates the percentage of companies having marketing research departments as reported in seven of the studies cited above. The trend suggested by these figures is substantiated by the following data from the most recent study by the American Marketing

Asso

the

done

fir

re:

th

tr

an

de

fr

an

P

Association,¹⁰ which reveal the dates of establishment of the 1186 research departments of firms included in the study done in 1963.

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Number of Departments Formed</u>
Before 1918	9
1918 to 1922	6
1923 to 1927	5
1928 to 1932	18
1933 to 1937	32
1938 to 1942	49
1943 to 1947	100
1948 to 1952	161
1953 to 1957	304
1958 to 1962	502

While the above table includes some nonmanufacturing firms, Twedt has reported that two-thirds of the marketing research departments in firms producing consumer goods and three-quarters of the departments in firms producing industrial goods were formed in the ten year period between 1953 and 1962.¹¹

To give some indication of when marketing research departments were organized in specific firms, data derived from studies by the National Industrial Conference Board and other sources are presented below.

¹⁰ Dik Warren Twedt (ed.), A Survey of Marketing Research (Chicago: American Marketing Association, 1963), p. 21.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 23.

de

tal

ti

su

na

Er

Er

Er

Er

Er

Er

Er

Er

Er

Er

Er

Er

Er

Er

Er

Er

<u>Date</u>	<u>Firm</u>
1915	United States Rubber Company
1917	Swift and Company
1926	Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company
1931	General Electric Company (Apparatus Department)
1935	Firestone Tire and Rubber Company
1936	Westinghouse Electric Corporation (Apparatus Division)
1940	B. F. Goodrich Company
1941	Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Company
1942	Sylvania Electric Company
1943	Coleman Company
1943	Wyandotte Chemicals Corporation
1946	Emory Industries, Inc.
1951	Lamson Corporation ¹²

The twenty-five years between the founding of the department at the United States Rubber Company and the establishment of a department by the last of the major rubber tire producers shows that some firms apparently competed successfully without a marketing research department for many years.

Explanations of Growth of Marketing Research

A variety of factors have been advanced to explain this growth pattern. The lack of individuals qualified to do marketing research work has already been mentioned. Lyndon O. Brown has reported that marketing research courses did not appear in university curriculums until the 1930's,

¹²G. Clark Thompson, Organization for Market Research (Part II, Operating Methods and Company Plans; New York: N.I.C.B., Studies in Business Policy, No. 19, 1946). National Industrial Conference Board, Marketing Business and Commercial Research in Business (New York: N.I.C.B., Business Policy Study, No. 72, 1955).

the first course being offered at Northwestern University in 1931.¹³ Another factor which explains the slow initial development of marketing research is that many executives did not, and many today apparently still do not, recognize the need for marketing research.

Additional perspective about the growth of marketing research can be gained by reviewing statements which have appeared in the literature over the years. In commenting on the need for marketing research, Weld said the following in 1923:

The fact that large-scale organization has taken the place of small units, that markets are so far-flung, that the merchandising machinery has become so complex renders it practically impossible for an executive to attend to both managerial details and to an accumulation and analysis of all the knowledge and data necessary for an enlightened policy.¹⁴

Weld also suggested that the trend toward government supervision of business demanded adequate presentation of facts.¹⁵

The authors of the study done in 1947 by the American Marketing Association also emphasized that the practice of marketing research tended to vary with the size of a company and the length of the channels of distribution. They also suggested that manufacturers of consumer goods were more likely to do marketing research than manufacturers

¹³Lyndon O. Brown, "The Acceptance of Marketing Research," Journal of Marketing, Vol. 16, No. 3 (January, 1952), p. 342.

¹⁴Weld, op. cit., p. 175.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 176.

of i
I st
uat
of
and
pro
pla
was
th
th
re
ti
to
co
of
de
fr
t
h
o
-
h
!

of industrial goods.¹⁶ The figures in Table 1 of Appendix I show that the most recent studies suggest that this situation is changing. However, Twedt found that manufacturers of consumer goods still tend to have larger departments and spend more on marketing research activities than do producers of industrial goods.¹⁷ A somewhat cynical explanation for the growth of marketing research departments was advanced by William A. Marsteller when he suggested that many of the corporate marketing research departments that came into existence in the 1940's were the causal children of high corporation taxes.¹⁸ It might be hypothesized that the business recessions of the 1950's caused executives to recognize the need for more information concerning the consumers of their products. Another plausible explanation of the recent growth in the formation of marketing research departments is that they accompany the trend toward the formation of high level marketing departments in place of the more limited sales departments. And possibly there has been a certain amount of faddism in the rapid formation of marketing research departments in recent years.

¹⁶W. W. Heusner, C. M. Dooley, G. A. Hughes, and P. White, "Marketing Research in American Industry," Journal of Marketing, Vol. 11, No. 4 (April, 1947), pp. 340-42.

¹⁷Dik Warren Twedt (ed.), A Survey of Marketing Research (Chicago: American Marketing Association, 1963), pp. 18 and 29.

¹⁸William A. Marsteller, "Putting the Marketing Research Department on the Executive Level," Journal of Marketing, Vol. 16, No. 1 (July, 1951), p. 56.

has

cent

to t

work

keti

char

disc

Alid

tem

roo

man

in

we

in

ro

th

Ma

go

in

e

P
I

E
I

From a more theoretical point of view, Herbert Simon has stated, "Most organizations, or particular decision-centers in organization, require information in addition to that which comes to them normally in the course of their work."¹⁹ This statement is particularly true of the marketing decision centers which must constantly be aware of changes in the environment in which the firm operates. In discussing the development of the marketing concept, Wroe Alderson places strong emphasis on formal planning and systematic problem solving. He comments, "The two vigorous roots from which formal planning grew are the use of product managers and of marketing research."²⁰ The product manager, in Alderson's view, "looks to the marketing research department for sorely needed answers to marketing questions."²¹ In a similar vein, John Howard contends, "The burgeoning role of market research departments in companies suggests that market research has become an integral part of the marketing executive's information system."²² This author goes on to point out, "One of the most complicated marketing problems has been the relation between the executive

¹⁹ Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior, 2nd ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1957), p. 167.

²⁰ Wroe Alderson and Paul E. Green, Planning and Problem Solving in Marketing (Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1964), p. 6.

²¹ Ibid.

²² John A. Howard, Marketing: Executive and Buyer Behavior (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), p. 11.

and the market researcher in the company."²³ Robert Kahn et al., in their book Organizational Stress, suggest a theoretical explanation for this problem. "Modern industrial organizations face the persistent dilemma of securing conformity to existing organizational procedures while simultaneously making allowances for adaptation to changing environmental conditions."²⁴ In discussing people concerned primarily with organizational adaptation at an earlier point in the book, these authors single out research engineers and the market research staff as examples.²⁵ They go on to say:

Such roles complement the more routine rules-oriented roles of the rest of an organization and increase the adaptive abilities of the organization as a whole. In a sense the innovative roles represent patterned organizational deviance. It is as if the bureaucracy, recognizing the dangers of rigidity, attempted to build into itself a capacity for change, but to do so in a way wholly consistent with bureaucratic structure and organization. What way could be more compatible than institutionalizing and assigning to certain organizational positions the functions of being flexible, sensing changes in the outside environment, and initiating appropriate responses in the organization? To a degree the solution works but with an almost inevitable cost. The persons who fill these organizationally created 'change' roles must become change oriented to fulfill the requirements of the role. Not to do so would constitute failure; yet in doing so such persons are likely to find themselves

²³Ibid., p. 40.

²⁴Robert L. Kahn, Donald M. Wolfe, Robert P. Quinn, J. Diedrick Snoek, Robert A. Rosenthal, Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964), p. 307.

²⁵Ibid., p. 99.

21

res

Wte

and

ti

su

of

ic

in

io

of

on

ne

su

re

fr

k

-

c

l

at loggerheads with the remainder of the organization--often including its largest and most powerful structures.²⁶

Criticisms of Marketing Research

The above discussion shows the need for marketing research, its historical development, the importance attributed to it by some students of business administration, and the problem which it faces in a bureaucratic organization. In light of the problem posed by Kahn, it is not surprising that many individuals have questioned the value of marketing research. Probably one of the best known criticisms of marketing research was sounded by John E. Jeuck in 1953. Jeuck reached the conclusion that "whether one looks at marketing institutions, which are really methods of marketing, or whether one looks at companies, or whether one is impressed with singularly successful product developments, he is led to believe that these critical and notable successes have relied little or not at all on marketing research to guide them."²⁷ Theodore Levitt has made the following critical comments in his book, Innovation in Marketing:

Some distressing and dangerous things have happened in market research in recent years which

²⁶Ibid., p. 126.

²⁷John E. Jeuck, "Marketing Research: Milestone or Millstone," Journal of Marketing, Vol. 17, No. 4 (April, 1953), pp. 381-87.

in

Gen

and

Gen

naic

er

al

r

i

-

y

h

h

h

h

seriously affect its utility for much of anything.²⁸

[Basically it lacks] imaginative audacity in the interpretation of data and events and in formulating positive action-oriented proposals for management's consideration.²⁹

In 1964, Sidney Furst, President of Furst Survey Research Center, Inc., and Milton Sherman, Vice-President of Benton and Bowles, edited a book entitled Business Decisions That Changed Our Lives. In the preface to the book the editors make the following revelations:

The book was originally conceived as a collection of management case histories in which the role of market research was particularly decisive. . . . After pursuing this approach for several weeks, we discovered, much to our professional chagrin, that market research as it is being practiced today really is not playing the decisive role we accorded it in the decision making process. Our discussions with various business executives revealed a much more complex and intricate process of decision making than we had imagined. In effect, we found out that marketing research has had only a limited value. For today's business executive it performs a confirming role, not a creative one.³⁰

Marketing research has not been without its defenders. In a direct reply to the Jeuck article, Ralph Westfall argued that Jeuck's primary criticism is that marketing research has been of little value in the making of decisions which alter the course of the business. Westfall

²⁸Theodore Levitt, Innovation in Marketing (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962), p. 16.

²⁹Ibid., pp. 187-88.

³⁰Sidney Furst and Milton Sherman (eds.), Business Decisions That Changed Our Lives (New York: Random House, 1964), p. vii.

con

and

the

will

part

sub

to

ed

of

an

Je

f:

in

pl

f

o

v

k

s

c

e

-

o

o

contended that the big change is a rare event in business and that most of the improvements in the method by which the marketing job is accomplished involve small changes which are quite unspectacular in nature. He concluded that many of these individually small improvements are the result of research. Westfall also believes that Jeuck failed to compare the products and institutions that have succeeded without research with those that have failed for lack of research.³¹

Harry V. Roberts also attempted to weaken Jeuck's argument with the following rejoinder: "To the extent that Jeuck's comments represent more than a criticism of the frequent use of more or less stereotyped methods in marketing research, they are seriously misleading. Research is probably more effective in unearthing new possibilities for action than in predicting the response to existing ones."³² Roberts is advocating the idea that the most valuable contribution of the research activity to the marketing department is its objective point of view which forces management to question assumptions that would not otherwise have been challenged. Steuart Henderson Britt presented an argument similar to that advanced by Roberts;

³¹Ralph Westfall, "Marketing Research--Milestone or Millstone, A Reply," Journal of Marketing, Vol. 18, No. 2 (October, 1953), p. 176.

³²Harry V. Roberts, "The Role of Research in Marketing Management," Journal of Marketing, Vol. 22, No. 1 (July, 1957), p. 29.

ne

atl

tio

vai

22

pe

's

ne

sh

th

to

tr

in

de

is

se

a

se

4

in

Mc

he believed that "marketing research is useful in calling attention to possible oversights, and in turning up additional facts which might not otherwise be discovered."³³

One of the most positive statements concerning the value of marketing research was advanced by Richard D. Crisp. Crisp believed that marketing research is emerging from a period of "troubled adolescence" and at the present time it "stands at the threshold of its most productive years."³⁴ He envisioned the emergence of an integrated approach that shifted the emphasis from techniques to management problems that marketing research could help to solve.³⁵ Britt came to a similar conclusion in his earlier article when he stated that marketing research facts reduce the area of uncertainty in management decisions and therefore allow management to make more useful judgments.³⁶

The position suggested by Roberts, Crisp, and Britt is appearing in the most recent editions of marketing research texts where the emphasis is on marketing research as a tool of management. The definition of marketing research

³³Steuart Henderson Britt, "Should You Fit the Research to the Budget?" Journal of Marketing, Vol. 20, No. 4 (April, 1956), p. 403.

³⁴Richard D. Crisp, "Company Practices in Marketing Research," in The Marketing Job (New York: American Management Association, Inc., 1961), p. 113.

³⁵Ibid., p. 114.

³⁶Britt, op. cit., pp. 401-403.

adva

ind

"Ma

pre

acq

fol

BAR

che

ce.

th

th

di

Re

t

t

t

t

t

advanced by Fred T. Schreier in his 1963 text presents an indication of this managerial approach. According to Schreier, "Marketing research describes, explains, evaluates, and predicts what people do, think, feel, and want when they acquire or distribute goods and when they prepare for and follow up these activities, and it serves as a basis for making marketing decisions."³⁷ Schreier indicates that these five functions form a "hierarchical order in which certain functions serve as bases for others. We can express this situation . . . by using terms of logic and say that the lower functions are necessary but not sufficient conditions for fulfillment of higher functions."³⁸

Review of Related Studies

A basic premise of this dissertation is that better tools of description, explanation, evaluation, and prediction are being developed by behavioral scientists and used by marketing researchers. When this assumption is made in the light of Schreier's framework, the significant question becomes whether this information is being used for making marketing decisions. As the above discussion has pointed out, there are differences of opinion on this issue. Five research reports which were directly or indirectly

³⁷Fred T. Schreier, Modern Marketing Research (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1963), p. 8.

³⁸Ibid., pp. 7-8.

concerned with this problem appear in the literature. A doctoral dissertation by Harry V. Roberts at the University of Chicago was concerned with defining the characteristics of marketing problems which make it easier or harder to obtain an economical solution by research.³⁹ Roberts' conclusions were reported in the article in the Journal of Marketing that was cited earlier in this chapter. A study for Marketing Science Institute by Patrick J. Robinson and David J. Luck, on the other hand, undertook a study of twelve firms and their advertising agencies to compare the theory and practice in making promotional decisions. These authors stated: "Experience and observation in this project underscore the apparent lack of a good approach to implementing research findings."⁴⁰ They also stressed the need for a clinical approach on the part of researchers and the need for better communications. These researchers also concluded: "The organizational relationships between the planner and his information sources were judged to be vital in enhancing, or detracting from, the information's utility."⁴¹ Thus Robinson and Luck have made a contribution by pinpointing some of the key variables in the problem. Their interest

³⁹ Harry V. Roberts, "The Role of Research in Marketing Management," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation (University of Chicago, 1955).

⁴⁰ Patrick J. Robinson and David J. Luck, Promotional Decision Making: Practice and Theory (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964), p. 17.

⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 33-34.

in marketing research, however, was only an incidental part of their inquiry.

Richard Crisp, in his second survey of the organization and operation of marketing research departments (1958), included the following open-end question in his mail questionnaire: "Do you encounter any difficulties in obtaining proper use of marketing research by executives in your company? If yes, give a brief outline."⁴² He found considerable dissatisfaction in answers to the question, and concluded: "To put it mildly, there seems to be something quite wrong in the relationship between the marketing research man and his colleagues in sales management and general management in many firms."⁴³

While the above three studies were only indirectly concerned with the relationship between marketing researchers and the users of their service, two recently reported studies have been directed specifically toward this issue. C. T. Smith, Market and Public Relations Research Administrator of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, presented a paper at the 13th Annual Marketing Conference of the National Industrial Conference Board entitled "What's Wrong with Marketing Research Today? Use and Support--Some Problems for Management and Researchers." To gather material

⁴²Richard D. Crisp, Marketing Research Organization and Operation, Research Study No. 35 (New York: American Management Association, Inc., 1958), p. 30.

⁴³Ibid., p. 33.

for his address, Smith sent a questionnaire to 66 members of the East and West Coast Council of Marketing Research Directors of the Conference Board and received 60 replies. His questionnaire contained statements of "problems and points of view which researchers may encounter in their dealings with their management associates."⁴⁴ For each of the 29 items, the respondent was presented with scales concerning how frequently the specific problem occurs and how bothersome the problem is to the researcher when it does occur. Smith grouped the questionnaire items into the following categories with the most bothersome problem category heading the list.

<u>Problem</u> ^a	<u>Bothers</u> ^b	<u>Happens</u> ^c
Not thinking of the researcher as a full member of the team	70%	53%
Not using research findings effectively	59	35
Not allowing enough time to do a good job	51	49
Not taking the research approach seriously	51	29

^aThe table contains problem categories. A specific question is presented in note d for clarification purposes. Source: See footnote 44.

^bThe percentage of respondents who were bothered "a lot" or a "fair amount" by this type of problem.

^cThe percentage of respondents who said that this type of problem happens "very often" or "fairly often."

⁴⁴C. Theodore Smith, "What's Wrong with Marketing Research Today? Use and Support--Some Problems for Management and Researchers," Paper presented at 13th Annual Marketing Conference of the National Industrial Conference Board, October 20, 1965.

Not supporting research budgets and manpower needs	38	28
The fuzzy approach to research ^d	34	35
Underestimating the importance of research know-how	28	21
Not giving credit to research	25	32
Checking unnecessarily often on progress of specific projects	4	4

^dOne of the questionnaire items included in this category was "Not being willing to listen to necessary technical explanations."

The contribution of Smith's study is to present some recent data on the problems which are most troublesome to a select group of marketing researchers. He concluded, "The thing that concerns them most is finding themselves in situations which they feel limit the quality and usefulness of what they are doing."⁴⁵

Kenn Rogers of City College of New York reported on "a pilot study designed to examine the researcher's role and its relationships with the marketer and with others, both within the same, and in separate organizational structures."⁴⁶ Extending over a five-year period, the study included interviews with 84 researchers, 16 of whom were studied in depth over periods of two to ten months when the author was a consultant to the firms involved; additionally, the researcher's manager was also interviewed in 24 of the cases. The sample for the study included marketing

⁴⁵Smith, op. cit., p. 14.

⁴⁶Kenn Rogers, "The Identity Crisis of the Marketing Researcher," Commentary, Vol. 8, No. 1 (January, 1966), pp. 3-15.

in the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Kenya, and Tanzania. Both socio-psychological and psychoanalytical concepts were employed by Rogers. Significant findings of this research project include the following.

Market research findings in each instance played an important part in the formulation of the marketing plan of these organizations. Frequently, however, marketers considered the validity of these findings as debatable. Initially, their anxieties were focused on the data and their interpretations, but subsequently included the role and competence of the researcher and his employees.⁴⁷

Mutual judgments of marketers' and researchers' competence generally indicated that the marketer's judgment of the researcher's work depended on the information provided, the form in which it was presented and the working compatibility between the marketer and the researcher.⁴⁸

Frequently, marked anxiety prevailed between marketer and researcher. It seemed to be engendered by the perception of each towards the other's technical competence and performance.⁴⁹

Researchers claimed that marketers neither understand nor appreciate research; do not permit researchers to acquaint themselves with all the relevant aspects of the problem; do not provide adequate resources in expenditure or time for "good research". . . . Often they felt they were expected to furnish convincing reasons for what they thought were "wrong decisions". . . . They were often accused of not understanding the complexities of practical marketing problems and of being over-ambitious empire builders.⁵⁰

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 5.

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰Ibid., pp. 6-7.

123

SEP

ti

re

pe

as

ar

ci

Co

a

ti

r

t

n

i

i

f

r

f

r

f

r

f

r

f

r

f

r

f

Rogers concluded that these criticisms of marketing researchers are not always justified but that marketers seemed to compensate for their inability to operate creatively in their markets by acting negatively towards market research. "Rather than utilising the functioning but imperfect tools of market research, they experienced them as additional threats and defended, against their mounting anxieties by projecting the feelings of their own inadequacies onto the researchers and their scientific methods."⁵¹ Concerning the researchers, he concluded that "there was a critical confusion about the identity of their roles and the principles that govern the acceptable conduct in these roles."⁵²

Rogers' study represents an important contribution to the sparse literature concerning the relationship between marketing researchers and the people they serve. While its scope is broad, it cuts across cultural lines; this international dimension represents an important limitation for purposes of generalizing on the role of the marketing researcher in this or any other country.

Objectives of the Dissertation

The above studies and articles have described several problems which hinder the effective use of marketing

⁵¹Ibid., p. 12.

⁵²Ibid.

re

us

ci

se

ti

ci

in

st

s

t

c

d

r

r

l

research in the decision making process. This dissertation uses role analysis, a conceptual approach developed in social psychology, to study systematically the marketing research function in large industrial firms. The dissertation explores: (1) perceptions of the role of the director of marketing research by occupants of that position, their immediate superiors, and members of management who use the services of the marketing research departments; (2) job satisfaction of the marketing research directors; and (3) the effectiveness of marketing research departments as perceived by the immediate superiors of marketing research directors and by users of the services of the marketing research department.

The five specific objectives of this study are:

1. To determine the degree of consensus between management and the director of marketing research on significant dimensions of the role of the latter in large industrial firms.
2. To determine areas of role consensus, role conflict, and role ambiguity.
3. To determine the extent to which the marketing research department is perceived to be effective by line management.
4. To determine the marketing research director's degree of satisfaction with his role.
5. To determine the relationships among consensus, perceived effectiveness, and job satisfaction.

ive

na

der

be

ls

re

de

at

si

R

E

I

Primary emphasis is placed on the relationship between the director of marketing research and members of management served by his department. Little attention is devoted to the role of the research analyst and other members of the research department. The focus of the study is limited further to the non-routine activities of the research department; the gathering of sales statistics for determining market share and other routine statistical operations of many research departments is disregarded. The sample is composed of firms from the Fortune 500 list. Results of a preliminary survey of marketing research directors in the Fortune 500 firms are discussed in Chapter II.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF MARKETING RESEARCH DIRECTORS OF FORTUNE 500 FIRMS

The studies discussed in Chapter I used samples composed of industrial firms of all sizes and in some cases included non-manufacturing firms; thus no data were available on the status of marketing research activities in large industrial firms which are the focus of the dissertation. To fill this void, a mail survey was undertaken to determine the extent to which these firms have marketing research departments and to gather information about the departments that do exist and their directors. This chapter presents the methodology and results of the mail survey and makes certain comparisons with the earlier studies.

Description of the Study

The 500 largest industrial firms in the United States as listed in the July, 1965, issue of Fortune magazine were selected as the universe for this study.¹ Of the 500 questionnaires which were mailed in July, 1965, with a follow-up in November, 1965, 374 responses have been

¹"Directory of the 500 Largest Industrial Corporations," Fortune, Vol. 72, No. 1 (July, 1965), pp. 149-68.

received. Of those returned, 364 were usable and are included in the tabulations presented in this chapter and in Appendix I. The questionnaires were completed by the corporate director of marketing research, if such a position existed in the firm. In a few firms where a central marketing research department did not exist, the questionnaire was filled in by the marketing research director of the firm's largest operating division that had a marketing research department. Where firms did not have a marketing research department, the questionnaire was completed by an officer of the company.

No attempt was made to estimate responses for the 136 firms from the Fortune list that did not reply. Pertinent to the problem of non-response, however, is the fact that 83 percent of the 307 firms that replied to the original mailing had a marketing research department, while only 75 percent of the 57 firms that replied to the follow-up had one. This leads to the conclusion that firms with a marketing research department were more likely to respond to the questionnaire than were firms without such a department; thus it is not possible to generalize about all the firms on the Fortune list.

The term marketing research director is used to refer to all respondents to the questionnaire who indicated that they had responsibility for the marketing research activity. In actual practice, position title varied somewhat from company to company. While "marketing research

manager" was the most common title, the terms "commercial," "business," and "economic" were sometimes used in place of marketing, and the term "analysis" was sometimes substituted for "research." Some combination of these terms was used as the title of the individual who headed the marketing research function by about three-fourths of the firms. But some firms assigned supervision of the employees engaged in marketing research to the director of market planning, product planning, or commercial planning; or to the director of marketing services. Further, these activities were the direct responsibility of the director of marketing, marketing manager, director of sales, or some comparable position in a number of firms. Undoubtedly some of this latter group of positions were line in nature; but in some firms the term "marketing manager" was used for a headquarters staff position with responsibility for various marketing services including marketing research. Finally, a small number of respondents occupied positions outside the marketing department, such as chief accountant, treasurer, director of technical services, or director of special projects.

This variety of titles indicates that the marketing research function is organized differently in different firms. While differences in organization are discussed specifically later, it should be recognized that the above variations in title may bias the data to some extent. Undoubtedly this represents a limitation of the study; the business world, unfortunately, is not always made up of

units which fit a desired classification scheme.

Extent of Marketing Research Departments

Almost 82 percent of the 364 responding firms had a formal marketing research department somewhere in the organization. As might be expected, the larger firms were more likely to have such a department; more than 90 percent of the firms with annual sales of over \$400 million had a department, while only 77 percent of the firms with under \$400 million in sales had a formal research activity. The latter group contained no firms with less than \$97 million in sales.

No relationship was found between the type of product a firm produced and the existence of a marketing research department. Of 101 firms that termed themselves as being primarily manufacturers of consumer goods, 83 percent reported having a marketing research department, whereas 81 percent of the 172 firms that were primarily manufacturers of non-consumer products reported such departments. Of the 90 firms that indicated heavy commitments to both product categories, 82 percent had a marketing research department.

To show perspective, the results of the current study are compared with the findings of seven previous studies in Table 1 of Appendix I. Beyond recognizing a trend among firms doing sufficient marketing research to justify departments of their own, it is dangerous to make any additional generalization from this table for the following

reasons. The data are based on mail questionnaire surveys of selected samples of firms. For example, L. D. H. Weld sent a "list of questions" to 200 large companies, the great majority of which were national advertisers. He received replies from 62 firms, 18 of which had marketing research departments in 1923. The American Management Association sample in 1953 was made up of members of the Association, which is far from being typical of manufacturing firms. But the sample for the 1957 study was selected randomly from a standard business directory, which included many smaller firms. Thus the apparent decrease in firms with research departments can be explained largely by the differences in the methods of sample selection. Also, some of the studies included non-manufacturing firms, thus introducing a bias into any comparison with the present study.

Other weaknesses of these studies for purposes of comparability include the variations in sample size, the problem of no response, and the problem of definitions. With the exception of the present study, all projects of this type received a response of less than 50 percent. With regard to definitions, categories in the American Marketing Association studies were combined in an attempt to make the data comparable with the present study. Even with these problems inherent in the interpretation of this table, the trend toward the formation of marketing research departments seems undeniable.

Page 1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Organizational Location and Size of Departments

The following tabulation shows how firms with formal marketing research departments described their marketing research functions.

<u>Description</u>	<u>Percent of firms</u>
A central marketing research department doing work for entire company	62
A central department, but with regional or divisional units elsewhere	26
Regional or divisional units, without headquarters departments	12
No response	1
Total	<u>101%</u>
Base	297

Of significance is the finding that 74 percent of the consumer goods firms reported having a central department doing work for the entire firm, whereas only 56.5 percent of non-consumer goods manufacturers and 59.5 percent of firms producing both types of products reported such an arrangement. This finding suggests that many manufacturers of industrial goods tended to be in a variety of businesses, which would dictate greater decentralization of the marketing research function. On the other hand, many consumer goods producers sold a variety of products to the same market, thus allowing for a centralized marketing research activity.

While there was considerable variation in the size of marketing research departments from company to company, an examination of the following figures reveals that 40 percent of the departments had from one to five employees devoting full time to marketing research activities.

<u>Number of full-time employees</u>	<u>Percent of firms</u>
1 - 5	40
6 - 10	23
11 - 15	12
16 - 20	5
21 - 30	9
31 - 40	2
41 - 50	2
51 - 74	4
75 or more	2
No response	1
Total	<u>100%</u>
Base	297

At the other extreme, less than six percent had more than 50 marketing research employees. Those firms with both a central department and one or more regional or divisional marketing research departments tended to have the greatest number of marketing research employees; 23 percent had more than 20 employees. Conversely, almost 70 percent of firms having a central department doing work for the entire company had fewer than ten employees engaged in this activity.

Backgrounds of Marketing Research Directors

The formal education of marketing research directors is presented in the following tabulation.

<u>Education</u>	<u>Percent of firms</u>
High school	1
Attended college	4
Bachelor's degree	46
Master's degree	39
Doctoral degree	10
No response	--a
Total	<u>100%</u>
Base	297

^aOne director failed to respond to this question.

The questionnaire also elicited the following data concerning the last position held by these individuals before becoming directors of marketing research.

<u>Position</u>	<u>Percent of firms</u>
Marketing research position (same firm or other manufacturer)	56
Other staff marketing or sales position	9
Line marketing or sales position	10
Staff general management position	8
Position with consulting firm, research firm, advertising agency, etc.	8
Other positions	6
No response	3
Total	<u>100%</u>
Base	297

A cross-classification of these two variables indicates that 60 percent of those directors whose previous position was in the line marketing category had a bachelor's degree or less. On the other hand, two-thirds of those directors holding a master's degree occupied a marketing research position before being elevated to director. Somewhat unexpectedly, the previous positions of the 24 directors who held doctorates were quite varied, with only 38 percent indicating that they were promoted to their present position from a marketing research position.

The number of years these men had held the position of director of marketing research varied, as can be seen in the following figures.

<u>Years</u>	<u>Percent of firms</u>
Less than two years	31
Two but less than four years	25
Four but less than six years	14
Six but less than eight years	8
Eight but less than twelve years	11
Twelve years or longer	10
No response	--a
Total	99%
Base	297

^aOne director failed to respond to this question.

An interesting relationship was found when these figures were cross-classified with the education of the respondents. Although only one-third of these directors with master's degrees had their positions for more than four years, one-half of those with bachelor's degrees had occupied the position for four years or longer. Thus newer marketing research directors tended to have graduate degrees. The survey results also indicate that 115 (39 percent) of these directors initiated the marketing research department in their respective firms. One-half of this particular group of respondents reported that they had held their position less than four years; thus a significant proportion of the firms surveyed, 57 out of 297, had research departments that were not more than four years old.

Reporting Patterns of Directors

The marketing research department was typically found in the marketing or sales department. This conclusion is illustrated in Table 2 of Appendix I, which shows the level of management at which marketing research directors

report. When the data are broken down into firms where the current director started the department and those where the department was in existence before the present occupant filled the position, significant differences in reporting patterns emerge. Only 17.5 percent of directors who did not start the department reported to top management, whereas 32 percent of the individuals who initiated new departments reported to a top or general management official. At the same time, fewer department initiators reported to marketing management officials. As was pointed out earlier, the departments headed by their founders tended to be a newer group of departments than those started by someone before the present occupant of the position--with half of them being less than four years old. So the data suggest a trend toward having the marketing research director report to top or general management rather than marketing management. This conclusion must be considered as tentative, however, since the trend is not revealed by the comparison in Table 3 of Appendix I of six studies which included organizational considerations.

Positions Held by Former Directors

Of the 297 marketing research directors responding to the questionnaire, 183, or 61 percent of the total, indicated that someone occupied the position before them. The following figures reveal where their predecessors are at present.

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Percent of firms</u>
With the same firm	44
With another firm	43
Retired or deceased	13
No response to this question	--a
Total	100%
Base	183

^aOne director failed to respond to this question.

Of the 23 directors who replied that their predecessor was retired or deceased, 14 indicated that he held no other position before retirement. In other words, these 14 men finished their careers as directors of marketing research. The position currently held or held before retirement by the remaining 169 former marketing research directors is presented below.

<u>Type of position</u>	<u>Percent of firms</u>
Staff marketing or sales	14
Line marketing or sales	21
Staff general management	19
Line general management	10
Marketing research position (another manufacturer)	12
Consulting or research firm	8
Other	9
No response to this question	7
Total	100%
Base	169

The following lists give some indication of specific positions included in the first four categories of the table.

Staff Marketing or Sales Positions: Assistant to Group Vice President, Marketing; Manager of Consumer Services; Director of Marketing Services; Director of Market Planning; Director of Planning and Distribution.

Line Marketing or Sales Positions: Assistant Regional Manager, Marketing; Regional Sales Manager; Vice President, Marketing; Director of Marketing; Sales Manager.

Staff General Management Positions: Manager, Product Engineering Department; Director of Analytical Services; Vice President, Director of Planning; Manager, Government Services; Planning Manager; Director, Corporate Public Relations; Liaison between Marketing and Production; Corporate Secretary.

Line General Management Positions: Senior Operating Vice President; General Manager, Operating Division; President, International Division; Vice President, Purchases; Assistant Division Manager; President.

Although there was no typical pattern of promotion from the position of marketing research director, a significant number, 30 percent, had moved into line management positions; the proportion was even higher for individuals who stayed with the same firm; 38 percent occupied line management positions. Thus varied opportunities for advancement apparently are open to the marketing research director.

How Marketing Research Directors Perceive Their Role

In an attempt to determine how these directors of marketing research perceived their role in the firm, the following question was asked: "How would you rate your role as director of marketing research on the following scale?" The seven-point scale is duplicated below with the breakdown of the number of directors who circled each number.

	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Percent of firms</u>
Largely research and advisory role	1	14
	2	18
	3	17
Intermediate	4	23
	5	14
	6	10
Largely a marketing policy-making role	7	2
No response to this question		1
Total		99%
Base		297

There was a greater tendency for respondents to circle a number near the lower end of the scale, indicating that these individuals thought of their positions as being largely research and advisory in nature. Many respondents chose the intermediate position of the scale, indicating that their position as director was equally weighted on both aspects of the scale or that they were ambivalent in their responses. On the other hand, 26 percent saw their role as being toward the policy-making end of the scale.

The mean response of the 297 directors was 3.4 with a rather large dispersion, as shown in the above figures. The organizational location of the marketing research department and the position held by the predecessor to the respondent helps to explain this variation. The mean response to the role question for directors reporting to top management was 3.7, while the mean for those reporting to an engineering, development, research, or planning official was 2.95. Likewise, those directors whose predecessor was now in a line management position gave a mean response of 4.2, compared with 2.8 for those directors whose predecessor had stayed in research work with another manufacturing firm or with a consulting or research organization.

If these results are a valid measurement of the directors' feelings concerning their role, it seems that the job of marketing research director varies from company to company; while the director might be exercising the typical staff prerogatives of doing research and offering advice

in one firm, this individual plays an active part in making marketing policy in other firms. Because of the complexity of the relationship between marketing researchers and management, no generalization about the role of marketing research departments can be made from one survey question. Chapter III, therefore, presents the procedure for a detailed analysis of the role of the marketing research director in large industrial corporations.

CHAPTER III

CONCEPTUAL APPROACH AND PROCEDURE OF THE INVESTIGATION

The conceptual approach for this study was borrowed from the field of social psychology. The research design has been derived largely from the following two studies:

Gross, Mason and McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis (Studies of the School Superintendency Role), New York: John Wiley, 1958.

Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal, Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity, New York: John Wiley, 1964.

The following series of quotations from each source will give the reader some insight into the concepts of role analysis. Gross surveyed the literature of role and came to the following conclusion. "Three basic ideas which appear in most of the conceptualizations considered, if not in the definitions of role themselves, are that individuals: (1) in social locations (2) behave (3) with reference to expectations."¹ These authors consider the above to be the three crucial elements for role analysis and go on to say, "People do not behave in a random manner; their behavior is influenced to some extent by their own expectations and

¹Neil Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 17.

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

those of others in the group or society in which they are participants."² Later on they indicate, "Regardless of their derivation, expectations are presumed by most role theorists to be an essential ingredient in any formula for predicting social behavior. Human conduct is in part a function of expectations."³ The Gross group has concluded that "the degree of consensus on expectations associated with positions is an empirical variable, whose theoretical possibilities until recently have remained relatively untapped."⁴

The Kahn group states the same propositions in a somewhat different way:

Each individual responds to the organization in terms of his perception of it. . . . The objective organization and the psychological organization of a person may or may not be congruent depending on his ability and opportunity to perceive organizational reality. Thus for any person in the organization there is not only a sent role, consisting of the pressures which are communicated by members of his role set, but also a received role, consisting of his perceptions and cognitions of what was sent. How closely the received role corresponds to the sent role is an empirical question for each focal person and set of role senders, and will depend on properties of senders, receivers, substantive content of the sent pressures, and the like.⁵

They go on to point out that each individual plays some

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 18.

⁴Ibid., p. 43.

⁵Robert L. Kahn, Donald M. Wolfe, Robert P. Quinn, J. Diedrick Snoek, and Robert A. Rosenthal, Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964), p. 16.

part in defining his own role.

In a sense, each person is a "self-sender," that is, a role-sender to himself. He, too, has a conception of his office and a set of attitudes and beliefs about what he should and should not do while in that position. He has some awareness of what behavior will fulfill his responsibilities, lead to the accomplishment of the organizational objectives, or further his own interests. He may even have had a major part in determining the formal responsibilities of his office. Through a long process of socialization and formal training he has acquired a set of values and expectations about his own behavior and abilities.⁶

These authors then proceed to discuss role conflict and role ambiguity. Role conflict occurs when "various members of the role set may hold quite different role expectations toward the focal person. At any given time they may impose pressures on him toward different kinds of behavior. To the extent that these role pressures give rise to role forces within him, he will establish a psychological conflict."⁷

In regard to ambiguity they state: "Certain information is required for adequate role performance. . . . Ambiguity in a given position may result either because information is nonexistent or because existing information is inadequately communicated."⁸

When discussing the relationship between conflict and ambiguity, the authors concluded: "If a role is ambiguous for the focal person, it probably is so for many of

⁶Ibid., p. 18.

⁷Ibid., pp. 18-19.

⁸Ibid., pp. 22-23.

his role senders as well. Conflicting pressures might be more likely under such circumstances, because the senders are unaware of the inconsistency in their demands."⁹ The authors point out that one should not assume that role conflict and ambiguity are necessarily dysfunctional to the organization.

To regard conflict simply as a disruption of an otherwise harmonious way of life is to overlook the fact that conflict often provides the basis for individual achievement and social progress. The same can be said for ambiguity, for while ambiguity implies a disorderliness that is antithetical to the very idea of organization, it also permits a kind of flexibility that can facilitate adaptation to changing circumstances.¹⁰

In determining the breeding grounds of ambiguity and conflict in an organization, Kahn concluded:

The major organizational determinants of conflict and ambiguity include three kinds of role requirements: the requirement for crossing organizational boundaries, the requirement for producing innovative solutions to nonroutine problems, and the requirement for being responsible for the work of others.¹¹

The director of marketing research role meets all three requirements; thus we should expect to find role ambiguity and conflict or, stated differently, lack of role consensus. By the use of effectiveness and satisfaction instruments, it will be possible to get some measurement of the effects of conflict and ambiguity on the marketing research function

⁹Ibid., p. 89.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 54.

¹¹Ibid., p. 381.

in a firm.

Using the context of role theory, this study is designed to ascertain the following about the director of marketing research role:

1. The degree of role consensus (absence of role conflict and ambiguity) among role definers and between the director of marketing and those who define his role.

2. The degree to which the director of marketing research is perceived to be effective.

3. The role satisfaction of the director of marketing research.

The literature search and five exploratory interviews produced the following areas of potential role ambiguity and role conflict:

1. The role of the director of marketing research in decision making.

- a. The importance attributed to research information.
- b. The use of the research report.
- c. The backing (power) of the research department.
- d. The extent to which the judgment of the researcher is valued.
- e. Enlargement of the functions of the marketing research department.

2. The role of the director of marketing research in originating and defining problems to be studied.

- a. Clinical approach vs. engineering approach toward problems brought to the department.
- b. Initiative in soliciting problems or undertaking research without a specific request.

3. The value placed on objective, scientific research.

- a. The sense of timing of the research department.
- b. A "managerial" orientation vs. an "ivory tower" orientation.

4. Political considerations.

- a. The importance of maintaining an ongoing relationship between researcher and management.
- b. Providing data to "support" management decisions.

The above sources of potential conflict and ambiguity were developed into specific role expectation items for the survey of marketing research directors and their role definers.

Procedure of the Study

The investigation of the role of the director of marketing research developed out of the survey of the Fortune 500 firms that is discussed in Chapter II. The original study yielded 297 replies from individuals responsible for the activities of the marketing research departments in their firms. Since there is considerable variety in the titles attached to these positions, the sample for the second study was limited to those individuals whose title included the term "research" or "analysis." The implicit assumption behind this decision is that these individuals devote most of their time and effort to directing the marketing research department while an official such as the director of marketing services devotes only part of his attention to research activities. Since the original questionnaire did not require that the respondent sign it, the role investigation sample was limited to those respondents to the initial questionnaire who voluntarily signed the questionnaire and have the term research or analysis in

their titles; 153 firms met both of these qualifications. Directors of marketing research and role definers were interviewed in five of these firms for purposes of developing and pretesting the role analysis instruments which were then sent to the remaining 148 firms.

Exhibits 2 and 3 of Appendix IV contain the two role analysis instruments. Examination will show that the first 52 role expectation items are common to both schedules. The remaining items in Exhibit 2 are concerned with the degree of satisfaction of the director of marketing along with classification and identification data. The role definer's instrument (Exhibit 3) contains two sections dealing with how effective the researcher is perceived to be and two sections devoted to classification and identification of respondents.

A package of five schedules was sent to the director of marketing research of each of the 148 firms on April 18, 1966, with the request that he complete the researcher's schedule and give one of the other schedules to his superior and the remaining three schedules to individuals who use the services of the marketing research department. Each respondent was instructed to mail the completed questionnaire to the university upon completion. Follow-up letters were sent to the directors who had not responded on May 16th and June 9th. Final tabulations of the data include all responses which were received by July 30, 1966. Of the firms contacted, usable responses were received from 77,

or 52 percent of them. A total of 264 usable questionnaires--76 from marketing research directors, 50 from their immediate superiors, and 138 from other role definers--were received and included in the tabulations; this represents a return of 35.7 percent of the maximum possible sample size if five returns had been received from each firm. The following figures show the groupings of the sample on the basis of returns per firm.

<u>Returns</u>	<u>Number of firms</u>
Researcher and 4 role definers	19
Researcher and 3 role definers	23
Researcher and 2 role definers	14
Researcher and 1 role definer	10
Researcher only	10
Two role definers only ^a	1
Total	<u>77</u>

^aAn incomplete schedule was received from the director of marketing research of this firm but was not included in the tabulations.

Three unsigned questionnaires from role definers are included in some of the tabulations but are not included in the above breakdown of firms. A list of the 88 cooperating firms including the above 77 and the five which were interviewed is presented in Appendix V. No identification of the individuals or firms will be made in the text of the dissertation since anonymity was guaranteed to all respondents.

Analysis of Non-response

Information gathered from the survey of the Fortune 500 firms makes it possible to compare the respondent and

non-respondent groups on certain significant dimensions to get an indication of the bias which resulted from the self-selection on the part of the 77 firms that participated in the role analysis survey. This comparison of the respondent group and the non-respondent group turned up certain differences. While there was no systematic difference between the two groups in sales volume or number of marketing research employees, the following figures show that the respondent group was more heavily weighted toward producers of non-consumer goods than the non-respondent group.

<u>Product category</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Non-respondents</u>
Primarily consumer goods	26.0%	27.1%
Primarily non-consumer goods	48.0	41.4
Heavy commitment to both types	26.0	31.4
Total	100.0%	99.9%
Base	77	71

The backgrounds of the cooperating market research directors also differed somewhat, as can be seen in the following breakdown of the last positions held by these directors before assuming their present position.

<u>Previous position</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Non-respondents</u>
Marketing research position (same firm or other manufacturer)	56.6%	62.0%
Other staff marketing or sales position	18.4	5.6
Line marketing or sales position	7.9	7.0
Staff general management position	6.6	7.0
Position with consulting firm, research firm, or advertising agency	3.9	11.3
Other positions	6.6	2.8
No response to this question	--	4.2
Total	100.0%	99.9%
Base	76	71

Si-

(73

of

in

a

re

ne

ni

ir

tl

c

L

T

P

S

E

T

V

Significantly more of the directors who did not respond (73.3 percent versus 60.5 percent) were appointed director of marketing research from a marketing research position in their present firm, another manufacturing firm, or from a position with a consulting or research firm. Thus the respondent group is more heavily weighted toward relative newcomers to the marketing research activity, with a significant number coming from other staff marketing positions.

Consistent with the above comparison is the finding that the non-respondent group of directors have held their position longer than the responding directors; this comparison follows.

<u>Years as Director of Marketing Research</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Non-respondents</u>
Less than two years	39.5%	23.9%
Two but less than four years	22.4	23.9
Four but less than six years	10.5	12.7
Six but less than eight years	9.2	11.3
Eight but less than twelve years	7.9	15.5
Twelve years or longer	10.5	12.7
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Base	76	71

Whereas 39.4 percent of the non-respondents have held their positions eight years or more, only 27.5 percent of the respondents have achieved this degree of seniority.

The education of the two groups of directors shows the following interesting differences.

<u>Educational Attainment</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Non-respondents</u>
High school	2.6%	--
Attended college	3.9	--
Bachelor's degree	47.4	45.1%
Master's degree	38.2	45.1
Doctoral degree	7.9	9.9
Total	100.0%	100.1%
Base	76	71

The differences presented thus far show that respondents have relatively less education than non-respondents, have fewer years' experience as director of marketing research, and as a group have relatively less experience in marketing research work. A final comparison shows that 30 percent of the respondent group and 46.5 percent of the non-respondent group initiated the marketing research activity in their respective firms. One conclusion which can be drawn from these comparisons is that individuals who find their role to be somewhat ambiguous took an interest in the survey and thus were willing to devote time to the questionnaire. This ambiguity could be due to lack of marketing research experience, less education, fewer years on the job, or assuming a position where certain role expectations have been built up around the capabilities and interests of a predecessor. On the assumption that marketing research is not as well integrated in firms producing non-consumer goods, this conclusion seems consistent with the proportionately greater number of producers of non-consumer goods in the respondent group.

An additional verification of the above conclusion was found in the different attitudes encountered in the directors of marketing research who were contacted. While all five directors who were contacted agreed to the interview without hesitation, those researchers who seemed to be well established in their positions considered the interview as a service to the interviewer. On the other hand,

a d

a b

ve

be

es

de

fo

fo

is

tu

u

s

t

k

n

v

a recently appointed marketing research director who has a background in scientific research and development and verbalized some reservations about his qualifications to head a marketing research department seemed to be interested in the interview to learn from someone from the academic community. He even offered to come to East Lansing for a second interview if additional information was needed for the survey.

If this conclusion concerning the above differences is accurate it means that the sample is somewhat biased toward research directors who find their role to be ambiguous. Since role ambiguity is one of the dimensions under study, this possible bias limits the ability to generalize to a larger group.

While the above differences in the two groups must be recognized, they do not represent the only reasons for non-response. In five instances, firms either sent back the questionnaire package or wrote a letter indicating that the addressee of the survey material was no longer with the firm. Thus turnover accounts for part of the non-response. In eight other instances, however, the successor to a departed marketing research director cooperated with the role analysis survey. To update the classification data on these eight firms, copies of the questionnaire for the Fortune 500 survey were sent to these new marketing research directors. Their answers are included in the above tabulations which compare the respondent and non-respondent groups.

far

no

on

th

Al

t

I

n

A few firms refused to respond since they felt that many of the role definition items in the questionnaire were not applicable to their particular operation. For example, one official with the title, Manager, Market Research, wrote the following.

For your personal information, a small group here operating under a market research department title is actually concerned with a wide variety of product planning, marketing services, and other sales staff and administrative functions. Actually, Market Research is performed mostly as a merged part of the operation of several sales divisions and the divisional general management. Under these conditions, meaningful answers to your questions can not be given.¹²

And a letter from a director of economic research contained these comments.

If you will review the information given to you in the earlier questionnaire, you will see that I am basically a staff economist without a department staff and that my responsibilities are not within the area of marketing research as generally understood in the business world.¹³

The Director of Marketing Analysis of a firm with fifty marketing research employees wrote:

I am very sorry, but we cannot respond to your recent request in a suitable manner. My own department is responsible for monitoring various kinds of divisional quantitative and analytical functions including measurements, forecasting, planning, etc. It is not, therefore, a market research department, per se.

¹²No citation since respondents to the survey were guaranteed anonymity.

¹³No citation since respondents to the survey were guaranteed anonymity.

an

a

ex

p.

a

m

e

A

S

.

n

All our major divisional market research departments are "atypical" because they are part of a division responsible only for marketing or a division responsible only for development. Inclusion of their answers would tend to distort your survey.¹⁴

And a major organization change in one firm was cited as a reason for non-response, as can be seen in the following excerpts from a letter.

We now have five separate "information and analysis" departments reporting to the general manager of five of our newly created "markets divisions."

The marketing research function is one part of each information and analysis department--but we no longer are using the departmental title of marketing research.

All of this is quite a change from a centralized marketing research department.¹⁵

Problems of time, the number of similar requests received, and the confidentiality of the material requested were also mentioned as reasons for refusing cooperation. One researcher wrote:

After internal discussions here, I find that I am still bound by a firm policy of my management, not to take part in any surveys or projects requiring the releasing of information on our inside operations, nor of the role of this department in the corporation structure.¹⁶

And the following two comments show that a period of peak industrial production is not an ideal one for soliciting

¹⁴No citation since respondents to the survey were guaranteed anonymity.

¹⁵No citation since respondents to the survey were guaranteed anonymity.

¹⁶No citation since respondents to the survey were guaranteed anonymity.

CC

CC

W

C

b

u

.

cooperation from business executives.

Unfortunately, your second request for survey material is impossible to comply with. The business pace of the last two months has grown at such a rate that I do not believe the Director of Marketing or three of my peers could spend the one-half hour to fill out the survey.¹⁷

Due to the intense pressure on our executives, I have elected not to request them to each fill out one of your questionnaires. . . . I am sorry that we did not respond, however, you will have to appreciate that all our efforts are being expended in the effort to make _____ a highly profitable company.¹⁸

The figures on page 46 show that in ten instances completed questionnaires were received from researchers who apparently elected not to ask their role definers to complete a schedule. The following comments were written by researchers who returned the blank role definer schedules.

Your 4 yellow copies are enclosed. I have no intention of imposing them on my associates. It seems to me that you want all of your thesis data to be handed to you in a nice neat form ready for analysis. This is not my idea of the kind of effort that should be required for a doctoral dissertation.¹⁹

I am returning the questionnaires which you wish the top executives of our company to complete. I do not feel that it is appropriate to ask them

¹⁷No citation since respondents to the survey were guaranteed anonymity.

¹⁸No citation since respondents to the survey were guaranteed anonymity.

¹⁹No citation since respondents to the survey were guaranteed anonymity.

On

re

co

an

tr

os

Ev

f

st

e

w

n

o

C

r

s

v

to undertake your request.²⁰

One plausible interpretation of this action is that the research directors in question did not feel sufficiently confident of their positions that they wanted their superior and other members of management to evaluate them.

The above discussion shows that generalizing about the reasons for non-response and the magnitude or direction of the bias which results from it is almost impossible. Even if complete returns had been received from all 148 firms contacted, this group was not a randomly selected sample from a larger population. Thus statistical inference techniques to make generalizations concerning all firms with marketing research directors on the Fortune list are not applicable. The results of the study can be applied only to the responding firms which are listed in Appendix V.

Characteristics of the Respondents

Some characteristics of the marketing research director respondents and the firms they represent were presented in the preceding comparison of the respondent group with the non-respondent group. Additional information about the directors and their functions was gathered in the classification section of the role analysis instrument and thus was not available for comparison with the non-respondent

²⁰No citation since respondents to the survey were guaranteed anonymity.

group. The following table shows the age of the marketing research department in the 76 firms from which a usable response was received from the director of marketing research.

<u>Age of department</u>	<u>Percent of firms</u>
Less than two years	7.9
Two but less than four years	9.2
Four but less than six years	5.3
Six but less than eight years	14.5
Eight but less than twelve years	15.8
Twelve years or more	47.4
Total	<u>100.1%</u>
Base	76

Thus almost half of the departments have been in operation for at least twelve years. The directors were also asked how long they have been assigned (either as director or in another position) to the marketing research department in the firm. Answers to this question show considerable dispersion.

<u>Years' experience in the department</u>	<u>Percent of directors</u>
Less than two years	19.7
Two but less than four years	22.4
Four but less than six years	11.8
Six but less than eight years	10.5
Eight but less than twelve years	13.2
Twelve years or more	22.4
Total	<u>100.0%</u>
Base	76

Question 72 of the director's questionnaire sought information concerning the proportion of the department's time which is annually devoted to special project type studies as opposed to continuing type data gathering projects which tend to be more routine in nature. Since the questionnaire was designed primarily to examine the role of the researcher in problem solving situations, this is

an important dimension of the sample. The following figures show that the majority of the directors responded that their departments devote the largest proportion of their time to non-routine activities as defined in the question.

<u>Proportion of department's time devoted to special project studies</u>	<u>Percent of directors</u>
None	--
Less than 20%	7.9
At least 20% but less than 40%	10.5
At least 40% but less than 60%	19.7
At least 60% but less than 80%	34.2
At least 80% but less than 100%	25.0
100%	<u>2.6</u>
Total	99.9%
Base	76

A finding of the study, which is a byproduct of the methodology employed, is the classification data concerning the individuals whom the marketing research directors designated as their role definers. A common assumption is that a staff department like marketing research operates to support the line management decision-maker. To check the validity of this assumption, the titles of the responding superiors and other role definers were classified into categories which include a line-staff dichotomization. While any such classification scheme is arbitrary, the following results for all role definers are interesting.

<u>Classification of titles of role definers</u>	<u>Superiors</u>	<u>Other role definers</u>
Top management	8.0%	1.5%
Other general or corporate management	10.0	16.1
Sales or marketing line management	32.0	23.4
Sales or marketing staff management	40.0	24.8
Product manager or other product affiliation	2.0	18.2
Development, planning, engineering, or research official	6.0	10.9
Financial management	2.0	1.5
No response to this item	--	3.6
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Base	50	137

If the first three categories above are classified as line management and the remaining categories as staff positions, the figures show that half of the responding superiors of marketing research directors are in line management and that only 40 percent of the other role definers occupy line management positions. Three of the 50 superiors reported that they are also users of the services of the marketing research department. Since one of these individuals occupies a line position and two occupy staff positions, shifting their responses to the user category would have little effect on the percentage breakdown.

The fact that so many staff individuals are the clients of the marketing research department suggests that much marketing research data may be filtered before it gets to the decision-maker. The sales or marketing staff category, for example, includes advertising managers, merchandising managers, and marketing or commercial development officials. Undoubtedly, some of these officials in given

firms have limited decision-making authority, but in many instances they are limited to a planning and recommendation type of function. This is also true of non-marketing staff positions such as development and planning departments. The existence of this proliferation of staff departments results in a more complicated decision-making process than the relatively simple model of a marketing researcher taking problems posed by a member of line management to whom he eventually submits a final report of his findings.

Other classification items in the role definer schedule help to describe the profile of this group of respondents. In answer to question 77 regarding their relationship to the director of marketing research, 64 percent of the users indicated that the marketing research department does research studies for them, and only two percent reported that they received only secondary data from the marketing research department, while 24 percent are receiving both primary and secondary data. And almost ten percent reported other relationships with the director of marketing research, such as serving on committees with him, or did not respond to this question. These figures seem to correlate with the proportion of the departments' time devoted to special project studies as reported by the marketing research directors.

In response to question 75--"In your work, what kind of products are you primarily concerned with?"--the following information was obtained.

A

GE

OT

CE

WE

SY

CL

a

e

v

C

a

h

Q

h

:

<u>Product category</u>	<u>Percent of role definers</u>
Consumer products	38.3
Non-consumer products	35.6
Both consumer and non-consumer products	26.1
Total	100.0%
Base	188

A comparison with the breakdown of the marketing researchers' descriptions of the type of goods produced by their firms on page 47 shows some marked differences in the first two categories.²¹ While only 26 percent of the responding firms were categorized as primarily manufacturers of consumer goods, 38.3 percent of the role definers are primarily concerned with consumer goods in their work. The comparison also shows a disproportionately small number of role definers in the non-consumer goods category. This finding is verified by the fact that nine of the ten firms from which only the marketing researcher questionnaire was received are producers of non-consumer goods and the tenth produces both consumer and non-consumer goods. Credence is thus given to the suggestion earlier in this chapter that marketing research departments are not as well integrated in firms producing non-consumer goods.

Other classification items include the education of the role definers, the length of time they have had official contact with the marketing research department, and

²¹The bases are different since the number of co-operating role definers from a firm varied from zero to four.

en

ed

As

di

ti

ti

ke

2

6

1

1

(

1

1

their marketing research experience. The breakdown of the education of the role definers follows.

<u>Educational attainment</u>	<u>Percent of role definers</u>
High school	3.2
Attended college	18.1
Bachelor's degree	56.4
Master's degree	18.6
Doctoral degree	3.7
Total	<u>100.0%</u>
Base	188

As would be expected, the educational level of the research directors shown on page 48 is significantly higher than that of the role definers.

Three questions were used to determine how long the role definers have had official contact with the marketing research department, with the following results.

<u>Contact with marketing research</u>	<u>Percent of role definers</u>
Less than two years	14.9
Two but less than four years	16.5
Four but less than six years	17.6
Six but less than eight years	12.8
Eight but less than twelve years	21.3
Twelve years or longer	17.0
Total	<u>100.1%</u>
Base	188

This information will be used in the measurement of interaction in a later chapter. The final classification item revealed that 21 percent of the role definers have had marketing research experience in their present firm or in another firm at some time in their careers.

The above differences must be kept in mind when reading the analysis and interpretation of the data in the next three chapters. Rather than their being one homogeneous

position of marketing research director, there are undoubtedly 76 different positions in 76 firms. This was definitely the case in the five firms interviewed where one director viewed his role as "the voice of the consumer" and was primarily concerned with conducting market surveys. In another case the director of marketing research was the coordinator of a number of decentralized marketing research departments. In a third, the work of the department was apparently to catalog data received from outside syndicated sources and to issue it to whoever might request it. A fourth director of marketing research appeared to be serving as a staff assistant to the president and only part of his activities were in the marketing domain. Finally, the fifth individual interviewed was an acting director who was groping for recognition and a definition of his role in the firm. In answer to a question, he stated the belief that his marketing research department might easily be eliminated in the next corporate cost-cutting campaign.

The danger in grouping respondents is greater for the role definers who occupy a variety of positions and have an even greater variety of backgrounds. It must be remembered that they have all been selected by the director of marketing research for inclusion in the study. While he could not choose his superior, he did have the freedom of whether to include him in the survey. Thus the sample of role definers is made up of individuals with whom the

director of marketing research has sufficient rapport to ask a favor. When their perception of his effectiveness and the degree of consensus on his role are considered, the built-in bias resulting from this method of selection cannot be overlooked.

The differences within the samples, of course, should help to explain some of the variance which exists in the data. So in addition to the methodology for the macroscopic and microscopic analyses which are described in Chapters IV and V, numerous cross-classifications have been computed and are reported when significant differences are found.

re

is

ke

rc

Ma

ac

in

1

2

CHAPTER IV

MACROSCOPIC ROLE ANALYSIS

Attention in this chapter is focused on all of the respondents to the questionnaire; specifically, interest is centered on the definition of their role by the 76 marketing research directors and the expectations of the 188 role definers pertaining to the role of the director of marketing research. Thus the data have been aggregated according to position with emphasis placed upon the following:

1. Intraposition consensus

- A. Among the directors of marketing research
- B. Among their superiors
- C. Among other role definers (product managers, sales managers, advertising managers, etc.)

2. Interposition consensus

- A. Between directors of marketing research and their superiors
- B. Between directors of marketing research and other role definers
- C. Between superiors and other role definers.

The 50 men to whom the marketing research directors report were separated from the 138 other role definers for purposes of this analysis, because their respective relationships with the director are essentially different. A superior has the authority to prescribe certain expectations for

the

def

men

ket

is

wh

us

am

ma

wh

tz

we

it

be

ti

h

w

t

t

v

n

h

v

the director of marketing research, while the other role definers use the services of the marketing research department but hold no direct authority over the director of marketing research. A partial exception to this generalization is found in the budget of the marketing research department, which is allocated as a cost item to the departments that use its services. Here, a given product manager, for example, may be in a position to influence the director of marketing research to a greater extent than in the case where the budget of the marketing research department is treated as administrative overhead for the marketing department or the firm as a whole. Regardless of this possibility at the time of writing the proposal, there seemed to be sufficient differences in the role relationship between the director of marketing research and the individual who has line authority over him, and those individuals with whom the director assumes strictly a staff relationship, to treat them as separate categories. As the sample for the study turned out, only three of the superiors were also users of the services of the marketing research department, making this another important dimension of the differences between the two categories into which the role definers were separated for purposes of analysis.

Using the above framework, the following statistics were computed for each role expectation item:

1. The mean score and the variance for:

- A. All directors of marketing research
 - B. All superiors
 - C. All other role definers (users)
2. Kolmogorov-Smirnov D values to determine whether statistically significant differences exist between the answers of each of the following groups to a given item:
- A. The directors of marketing research and their superiors
 - B. The directors of marketing research and other role definers (users)
 - C. Superiors and other role definers (users)

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test was chosen for this analysis because Siegel indicated that it seems to be more powerful than the chi-square test.¹ This is particularly true for the relatively small samples on which this study is based. In describing the test, Siegel stated:

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test is a test of whether two independent samples have been drawn from the same population (or from populations with the same distribution). The two-tailed test is sensitive to any kind of difference in the distribution from which the two samples were drawn.²

Thus we are testing the null hypothesis that the directors of marketing research, their superiors, and the other role definers all hold the same expectations concerning the role of the director of marketing research; i.e., they are members of the same population as far as their beliefs concerning the role of the director of marketing research. While the samples which will be tested are not truly independent

¹Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), p. 136.

²Ibid., p. 127.

of

te

ab

le

fe

wi

ot

co

d

q

n

t

l

of each other as the test assumes, the application of the test to the data is not invalidated because it is reasonable to expect the differences in related samples to be less than those from independent samples. Thus those differences which do turn out to be statistically significant will disprove the general hypothesis of similarity. In other words, the lack of independent samples means that certain statistically significant differences may not be discovered by this method; however, there is no reason to question the validity of those differences which are designated as statistically significant by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

Since the data included 49 superiors who could be paired with the marketing research directors who reported to them and 134 other role definers who could be paired with the director of marketing research in the same firm, it was also possible to use the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed ranks test to determine the number of role expectation items on which the differences between the samples were statistically significant.³ While the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test compares distributions of responses on a given item, the Wilcoxon test concentrates on differences between paired respondents in a firm. For example, in the following hypothetical distribution of responses, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov

³Ibid., pp. 75-83.

D S

far

Mar

Sup

If

sw

an

to

W

re

re

o

i

t

P

c

s

D statistic would be zero, indicating no significant difference.

<u>Samples</u>	<u>AM</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>Responses</u>		<u>AMN</u>
			<u>MMN</u>	<u>PSN</u>	
Marketing research directors	5	10	5	0	0
Superiors	5	10	5	0	0

If each of the five marketing research directors who answered "absolutely must" were paired with a superior who answered "may or may not," these differences in the responses to this hypothetical question would be discovered by the Wilcoxon test. If all of the data consisted of pairs of respondents, therefore, the Wilcoxon test would be the correct one to use.

Table 1 of Appendix II presents the distributions of scores of the marketing research directors, their superiors, and their other role definers for the 52 role expectation items. In addition to these distributions, the table presents the means, variances, and the significance of the differences between samples, as computed by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for all the data, and the Wilcoxon test for the matched pairs included in these distributions. Table 2 of this appendix contains the responses of the 76 marketing research directors to questions 53 through 68, which concern their degree of satisfaction with different aspects of the role. Finally, Tables 3 and 4 give the answers of the superiors and other role definers to items 53 through 70, which determined their perception of the effectiveness of the marketing research department. After a discussion

of

will

Con

is

de:

po

to

di

di

co

be

no

ti

a

o

i

t

t

k

t

of the role expectation items, a section of this chapter will be devoted to the satisfaction and effectiveness items.

Consensus on Role Expectations

To get an indication of the extent to which there is consensus or lack of consensus among the samples of role definers and the directors of marketing research (interposition consensus), it would have been possible simply to determine the proportion of items for which a significant difference exists. However, this procedure overlooks the dimension of intraposition consensus for the groups being compared. The fact that no significant difference exists between the responses of two groups on a given item does not necessarily mean that each group is in agreement on the item; it may simply mean that similar patterns of disagreement exist. Thus to give a more accurate indication of the degree of consensus from a macroscopic point of view, it was desirable to examine both the interposition and intraposition dimensions. In the following breakdowns of the 52 role expectation items, the distinction was made between high intraposition consensus (H) and low intraposition consensus (L) by ranking the 52 items for each position on the basis of the variance and cutting in the middle; i.e., the 26 items with the lowest variance scores are considered as having high intraposition consensus while the 26 items with the highest variance scores are considered as having low intraposition consensus. Whether or not a

significant difference exists between positions was determined by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test, using .05 or lower as the criterion for significance. The classification of all role expectation items according to consensus within each of the samples and according to whether or not there is a significant degree of disagreement between the directors of marketing research and the superiors follows.

<u>Disagreement between the two samples</u>	<u>H_{dmr}H_s</u>	<u>H_{dmr}L_s</u>	<u>L_{dmr}H_s</u>	<u>L_{dmr}L_s</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Nonsignificant	19	4	3	20	46
Significant	3	0	1	2	6
Totals	22	4	4	22	52

The above table shows that significant differences exist between the directors of marketing research and their superiors on only six (11.5 percent) of the 52 role expectation items. Three of the six items represent questions where the variance for both samples is relatively high. On only two of the items, therefore, is there a combination of a low variance within the samples and a significant difference representing definite divergence of opinion between the two samples. The dimensions of these differences are discussed later in the chapter.

In contrast to the above consensus, the following table shows that significant differences were found between the directors of marketing research and the users of the services of their department for 17 (32.7 percent) of the 52 items.

Disagreement between the two samples	$H_{dmr} H_{ord}$	$H_{dmr} L_{ord}$	$L_{dmr} H_{ord}$	$L_{dmr} L_{ord}$	Totals
Nonsignificant	14	3	3	15	35
Significant	$\frac{7}{21}$	$\frac{2}{5}$	$\frac{2}{5}$	$\frac{6}{21}$	$\frac{17}{52}$
Totals	21	5	5	21	52

In this comparison, as in the above comparison of the directors and their superiors, the sums of the columns show that when the dispersion of the responses to a given item was fairly high for the marketing research directors, it also tended to be fairly high for the role definers; and when dispersion of answers to an item was low for one group, it also tended to be low for the other group. Again in the analysis of these differences later in the chapter interest will center on those six items where the variance of responses is relatively low for both groups and a significant difference between the groups exists.

The above discussion raises the question of whether there are significant differences between the views of the superiors and the other role definers on their expectations concerning the role of the director of marketing research. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of the significance of the differences between these two groups of role definers indicates that for the 52 role expectation items none of the differences were significant at the .05 level, thus leading to the conclusion that there is more agreement between the superiors and other role definers on the definition of the role of the director of marketing research than there is between either of these groups and the occupants of the

for

with

re-

in

gi

ag

ce

In

i

ti

r

r

F

t

r

.

focal position.

Two cautions must be advanced before proceeding with the macroscopic analysis of the data. While the data represent research directors and role definers from 77 large industrial corporations, the number of responses from a given firm varied from one to five. These data have been aggregated into three categories to draw conclusions concerning intrapositional and interpositional differences. In regard to the analysis of the interpositional differences, it might be argued that comparisons should be limited to the paired responses between a given director of marketing research and his role definers. This approach has been rejected since 25 directors of marketing research are not paired with their superiors and would be eliminated from the analysis of the superior-director of marketing research relationship, while 15 directors would be eliminated from the director of marketing research-other role definer comparison for the same reason.

The effect of this decision to use all the data rather than simply the matched pairs is illustrated in Table 1 of Appendix II, where the number of significant differences discovered by the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed ranks test is appreciably greater than those computed by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The number of items (out of the 52) for which statistically significant differences were found by the two methods of computation are presented in the following table.

Number of items showing sig-
nificant differences between
marketing research directors
and:
Superiors Other role definers

All respondents (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test)	6 ^a	17 ^b
Paired respondents:		
Kolmogorov-Smirnov test	1 ^c	13 ^d
Wilcoxon test	13 ^c	35 ^d

^aIncludes 76 marketing research directors and 50 superiors.

^bIncludes 76 marketing research directors and 138 other role definers.

^cIncludes 49 marketing research directors and 49 superiors paired from 49 firms.

^dIncludes 59 marketing research directors and 134 other role definers paired from 59 firms.

The discrepancy between the Kolmogorov-Smirnov scores for the different samples is explained by the fact that the score required for significance decreases as the sample sizes increase; thus equal D scores for a given item might test as significant for all respondents and not significant for paired respondents. And the fact that the number of significant differences more than doubled when the Wilcoxon test was used indicates a significant lack of agreement between respondents in the same firm. Therefore, the decision to use all of the data for the interpositional analysis introduces a downward bias in the number of items for which significant differences are reported.

The other caution concerns the fact that considerable consensus exists between the research directors and their role definers on the 52 role expectation items. The

to

gr

it

pe

Ne

Ne

Ve

o:

er

t

g

re

a

re

e

t

c

v

h

following Pearsonian correlation coefficients show the degree of association between the mean responses to the 52 items by the three samples and also the similarity in dispersion as measured by the variance.

<u>Measurement</u>	<u>Correlation coefficients for responses of directors of marketing research and:</u>	
	<u>Superiors</u>	<u>Other role definers</u>
Means	.938	.904
Variance	.785	.775

With this degree of agreement between the occupants of the focal position and their role definers, the differences on most items are quite small--in most cases less than a .5 difference between the average responses of the groups being compared. Since there are no items where the marketing research director has taken one point of view and his role definers the opposite point of view ("absolutely must" versus "absolutely must not"), the differences to be emphasized typically represent questionnaire items where the modal group from one sample believed that occupants of the focal position "absolutely must" do a certain thing while the modal group from a different sample thought that he "preferably should" do it. In interpreting the data, therefore, the assumption is that significant differences exist among the various points on the scale. "Absolutely" gives the connotation of an imperative, while "preferably" states a preference but gives the occupant of the focal position some latitude in deciding what to do. Thus the nature of the interpositional analysis is to magnify those

differences which do exist. And in reading the remainder of this chapter, the fact of general agreement among the respondents to the survey should be remembered.

Interposition Analysis

The job expectation schedule contains 52 statements concerning the role of the director of marketing research. Similarities can be found among a number of the statements where, in effect, the intention was to investigate a given dimension of the job in different ways. Implicit in this schedule are certain ideas concerning the response of a director of marketing research to an item or group of items compared to the response of his superior and other role definers. These ideas in effect represent the writer's concept of the ways the above individuals look at the director of marketing research position; the ideas can thus be stated in the form of hypotheses to be tested by the responses to a specific item or groups of items. The mean scores and Kolmogorov-Smirnov D values were used to determine the extent to which the data support a given hypothesis. It should be made clear that, while statistical data are being used to check the accuracy of these hypotheses, they are not statistical hypotheses in the technical sense.

Hypotheses of Interposition Macroscopic Analysis

Hypothesis 1. Directors of marketing research will place more emphasis than their role definers on the need

to maintain an interest in a study after a final report has been submitted.

The questionnaire items which are directly or indirectly related to this aspect of the role are presented below along with the mean response of the three groups of respondents.

<u>Items</u>	<u>Mean response of:</u>		
	<u>D.M.R.</u>	<u>Sup.</u>	<u>O.R.D.</u>
6. Maintain an active interest in a study until after the recommendations are implemented by management.	1.53	1.66	1.87*
15. After a study is completed, accept the judgment of the marketing executive who requested the study as final.	2.82	2.76	2.49
16. Take on temporary line management responsibilities from time to time to implement his research findings if there is no one else in the firm qualified to do so.	2.80	3.30	3.33*
31. Report apparent resistance to the acceptance of marketing research findings to his superior.	2.43	2.06	2.27
33. Consider the job of his department to be completed when the research report has been submitted to management.	4.14	3.90	3.86
38. Persuade marketing management to accept marketing research findings.	1.93	2.40*	2.28
50. Check periodically with the executive to whom a report has been submitted to see whether the report is being used.	2.05	2.22	2.23

*Responses are significantly different from those of the directors of marketing research at the .05 level.

While all three respondent groups recognized the

need for follow-up, the hypothesis is supported by the direction of the average responses to these items. For example, the modal response of the marketing research directors to question 6 shows that the typical director believed he absolutely must "maintain an active interest in a study until after the recommendations are implemented by management." On the other hand, the modal response of both groups of role definers was "preferably should," with a statistically significant difference emerging in the comparison of the researchers and users of the department's services. The greatest divergence of opinion occurred on the responses to question 16, where considerable dispersion among the answers of the marketing research directors centered around the modal response that he may or may not "take on temporary line management responsibility from time to time to implement his research findings if there is no one else in the firm qualified to do so." On the other hand, the most prevalent group of role definers felt that the researcher preferably should not take on line responsibilities. On two of the above items, the responses of the superiors deviated from the pattern. The responses to question 31 show that superiors would like feedback when marketing researchers are experiencing resistance to their findings, while question 38 indicates the superiors' reluctance to have the director "persuade marketing management to accept marketing research findings." But, in general, all three groups recognized that the job of the marketing research department

is not completed when the research report is submitted to management; the average responses of the marketing research directors portray a more active role after the study is completed, as predicted by Hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 2. Directors of marketing research will place more emphasis than their role definers on the professional and methodological aspects of the job.

Various professional and methodological dimensions of the role were covered in the following statements.

<u>Items</u>	<u>Mean response of:</u>		
	<u>D.M.R.</u>	<u>Sup.</u>	<u>O.R.D.</u>
2. Write articles for professional journals in the fields of marketing or research methodology which will be of benefit to marketing researchers in other business organizations.	2.77	3.00	2.91
8. Critically review past studies to determine whether the methodology might have been improved.	1.59	1.64	1.51
13. Make contributions to the development of marketing theory.	2.24	2.38	2.20
18. Devote part of his time and resources to improving his methodological approach to problems.	1.62	1.62	1.75
23. Have the final say concerning the methodology which will be used on a given study.	1.71	1.86	2.06
30. Include a detailed discussion of research methodology in all marketing research reports.	3.42	3.28	3.17
40. Be able to utilize the most advanced research methods if sufficient time and money are available for a particular study.	1.80	1.74	1.60
44. Read most of the professional journals in his field.	2.17	2.22	2.02

46.
res
ing

47.
exc
pri
of

of

the

ro

pe

th

es

ha

sh

oc

g

s

T

t

h

c

f

r

v

.

46. Solicit suggestions concerning research methodology from the marketing manager who requested the study. 3.25 2.92 2.85**

47. Use standards of scientific excellence and objectivity as the primary basis to evaluate the work of his department. 2.65 2.35 2.45

**Responses are significantly different from those of the directors of marketing research at the .01 level.

These responses show substantial agreement among the marketing research directors and the two samples of role definers on most professional and methodological aspects of the role. However, the average responses of the three groups are not completely consistent with this hypothesis. In the replies to question 30, for example, almost half of the marketing research directors believed that they should not "include a detailed discussion of research methodology in all marketing research reports," while the modal group of role definers responded "may or may not" and a substantial group of users responded "preferably should." The answers of the occupants of the focal position reflected their awareness of the criticism that marketing researchers hide their findings in technical jargon. The reactions of the samples to question 40 are also inconsistent with Hypothesis 2; the modal group of users thought that the marketing research department "absolutely must be able to utilize the most advanced research methods if sufficient time and money are available for a particular study," while the modal group of researchers occupied the "preferably should" category. A similar pattern of replies to question

tha

na

60

a

ha

ti

be

fl

in

in

r

t

r

c

c

t

s

p

44 concerning the reading of professional journals indicates that users expect technical competence on the part of the marketing research department. On the other hand, question 60 of the marketing research directors' schedule shows that a substantial number were dissatisfied with the time they have to develop themselves professionally. Further, question 5 shows that most researchers believed that they should be involved in formulating marketing strategy. Thus a conflict emerges between the demands of the job in a fast moving competitive environment and the need to continually improve themselves professionally. At least some of the respondents subjugated the need for technical competence to the day-to-day demands of the job. However, item 23 reveals that they were not anxious to share their role in deciding upon research methodology, and only 16 percent of the directors believed that they should be obligated to "solicit suggestions concerning research methodology from the marketing manager who requested the study." But users of the services of the marketing research department disagree with the director on this item; 40 percent indicated that their suggestions should be sought. Finally, in response to question 47, a larger proportion of the role definers than of the marketing research directors thought that the latter should "use standards of scientific excellence and objectivity as the primary basis to evaluate the work of his department." Thus Hypothesis 2 is not supported by the data. While the differences on all but one of these

items are too small to be statistically significant, the researchers seemed less concerned with technical competence than their role definers. And they did not as a group identify strongly with academic researchers who are interested in developing marketing theory (see items 2 and 13).

Hypothesis 3. Directors of marketing research and role definers will be equally concerned about having the researcher understand the problem before beginning the research.

Mean responses to questions 7 and 25, which are directly concerned with this issue, and questions 45 and 46, which are indirectly related to it, are presented below.

<u>Items</u>	<u>Mean response of:</u>		
	<u>D.M.R.</u>	<u>Sup.</u>	<u>O.R.D.</u>
7. Become familiar with the objectives of management in a given area before beginning a marketing research project in that area.	1.37	1.38	1.31
25. Consult at length with the executive requesting a study to make certain he understands the problem before conducting the actual research.	1.33	1.26	1.21
45. Question the soundness of the objectives which a member of marketing management may bring to bear on a problem being studied by the marketing research department.	2.35	2.38	2.35
46. Solicit suggestions concerning research methodology from the marketing manager who requested the study.	3.25	2.92	2.85**

**Responses are significantly different from those of the directors of marketing research at the .01 level.

The data support this hypothesis with the modal groups from all three samples in agreement on the "absolutely

must" response for questions 7 and 25, which pertained directly to this facet of the role. Additionally, the majority of respondents recognized the right of the marketing researcher to "question the soundness of the objectives which a member of management may bring to bear on a problem being studied by the marketing research department." But, as pointed out in the discussion of Hypothesis 2, views diverged on the issue of the researcher seeking suggestions on methodology from management. In general, however, researchers and their role definers concurred on the necessity of having the researcher understand the problem before beginning a study.

Hypothesis 4. Directors of marketing research will place more importance on their role in formulating marketing strategy than will their role definers.

The following ten items apply to the role of the marketing research department and its director in the decision-making process.

<u>Items</u>	<u>Mean response of:</u>		
	<u>D.M.R.</u>	<u>Sup.</u>	<u>O.R.D.</u>
3. Measure his performance primarily by the extent to which marketing research results are used in decision-making.	2.00	2.35	2.36
5. Be involved in formulating marketing strategy for the firm.	1.79	2.14	2.21*
9. Produce information which reduces the area of uncertainty in management decisions.	1.21	1.28	1.39

14. Be able to translate marketing research results into positive courses of action for management to follow.	1.43	2.02**	2.12**
17. Initiate changes in the marketing strategy of the firm whenever possible.	2.67	2.98	3.38**
24. Take the initiative in finding ways to improve the marketing efforts of the firm.	1.67	1.94	2.22**
34. Conduct research for every major marketing decision where a choice must be made between feasible alternative courses of action.	2.89	3.06	3.05
35. Initiate a procedure for bringing marketing problems to the attention of the firm.	1.93	2.18	2.18
42. Serve on committees which formulate marketing strategies.	1.96	2.18	2.37**
48. Restrict his activities to doing research and offering advice only when called upon by management.	4.08	3.90	3.82*

*Responses are significantly different from those of the directors of marketing research at the .05 level.

**Responses are significantly different from those of the directors of marketing research at the .01 level.

The average responses to these items substantiate Hypothesis 4 and expose significant differences in the three perceptions of the role of the marketing research director. While his right "to be involved in formulating marketing strategy for the firm" is asserted in the answers of the role definers to question 5, 40 percent of the users had reservations concerning the propriety of his serving "on committees which formulate marketing strategies" (item 42) or taking "the initiative in finding ways to improve the marketing efforts of the firm" (item 24). And only 22 percent

of the users subscribe to the stronger phrasing of item 17: "Initiate changes in the marketing strategy of the firm whenever possible." In addition, item 14 uncovered a reluctance on the part of 30 percent of the users and 24 percent of the superiors to expect the director of marketing research to "be able to translate marketing research results into positive courses of action for management to follow." Thus many users of the services of the marketing research department and a fair number of the officials to whom the director reported limited his role to the typical staff function, while occupants of the focal position aspire to have a voice in formulating marketing strategy for the firm.

Hypothesis 5. On the questions concerning judgment, role definers will place a greater emphasis on executive judgment than will the directors of marketing research, while the directors will place more emphasis on their own judgment than will the role definers.

Questions 4, 10, 15, and 45 were concerned with executive judgment, while questions 32 and 39 were designed to uncover attitudes concerning the creativity and judgment of the director of marketing research.

<u>Items</u>	<u>Mean response of:</u>		
	<u>D.M.R.</u>	<u>Sup.</u>	<u>O.R.D.</u>
4. Realize that he does not have a monopoly on information which is relevant to a particular decision.	1.47	1.39	1.50
10. Recognize the value of executive judgment in decision making.	1.14	1.54*	1.38

15. After a study is completed, accept the judgment of the marketing executive who requested the study as final.	2.82	2.76	2.49
32. Be creative as well as objective in analyzing the results of a marketing research study.	1.59	1.80	2.02**
39. Make recommendations for action based on his own judgment as well as marketing research findings.	2.12	2.58	2.56*
45. Question the soundness of the objectives which a member of marketing management may bring to bear on a problem being studied by the marketing research department.	2.35	2.38	2.35

*Responses are significantly different from those of the directors of marketing research at the .05 level.

**Responses are significantly different from those of the directors of marketing research at the .01 level.

Hypothesis 5 is supported in part, since responses to items 32 and 39 disclose significant differences between the users and the researchers concerning the value of the judgment and creativity which the marketing researcher may employ in his work; the views of the superiors are between those of the other samples. But the half of the hypothesis concerning executive judgment is left in doubt by the relatively small differences in the responses to item 4 and the fact that both samples of role definers were less forceful in prescribing the need for the director of marketing research to "recognize the value of executive judgment in decision making" in responding to item 10. This may mean that a substantial minority of the role definers feel that the activities of the marketing research department should not be restricted by executive judgment. The researchers,

on

is

ex

di

st

th

th

t

r

t

c

a

l

i

e

t

s

l

l

c

on the other hand, readily admit that their information is only one input in the decision-making process and that executive judgment is also important. While these represent different interpretations of statement 14, the responses show that the role definers do not place a greater emphasis than the marketing research directors on executive judgment; thus the first part of Hypothesis 5 is not supported.

Hypothesis 6. Role definers will be more concerned than the directors of marketing research with getting the research results in time.

Questions 12 and 41 deal with the relationship between timing and accurate information, while item 22 concerns planning to meet the future information needs of management.

<u>Items</u>	<u>Mean response of:</u>		
	<u>D.M.R.</u>	<u>Sup.</u>	<u>O.R.D.</u>
12. Offer early indications of findings to management when requested even though a conclusive investigation may prove them to be wrong.	2.84	2.58	2.67
22. Anticipate future decisions and have information ready when requested by management.	1.88	2.38*	2.35**
41. Furnish marketing research results at the time requested regardless of whether he has sufficient information to feel confident of its validity.	3.63	3.80	3.93

*Responses are significantly different from those of the directors of marketing research at the .05 level.

**Responses are significantly different from those of the directors of marketing research at the .01 level.

ca-

re-

vi-

er-

on-

pr-

ma-

ga-

be-

hi-

me-

ti-

e-

s-

m-

h-

s-

t-

r-

s-

r-

The above averages are misleading for item 12 because the distributions of the answers of the marketing research directors and their superiors are almost bimodal, with large groups in both the "preferably should" and "preferably should not" categories. The modal group of users, on the other hand, thought the director of marketing research preferably should "offer early indications of findings to management when requested even though a conclusive investigation may prove them to be wrong." While the differences between the samples are not statistically significant, the high dispersion within the samples proves there is no agreement on this item. The variation is somewhat less among the answers to question 46, with 60 percent of the researchers and 70 percent of the users designating a "preferably should not" or "absolutely must not" answer. The lower mean response for the researchers as compared with the higher average score for item 12 indicates that some researchers may be consigned to meeting deadlines even if they are reluctant to offer early indications of findings. The existence of a "timing" issue is illustrated further in the responses of the marketing research directors to item 63, where more than one-fourth were dissatisfied with "the time deadlines which are placed on marketing research activities" and the responses to item 55 of the role definer's schedule, which reveals that almost one-fourth of the users were dissatisfied with the "timing of marketing research reports." A possible solution to this problem,

as

re-

de-

we-

in

be-

co-

ge-

Ma-

ic

Ma-

ti-

a

h-

b

a

s

t

f

o

o

o

as suggested in item 22, was favored by 90 percent of the researcher sample, but less than 65 percent of the role definers. With these indications of interpositional as well as intrapositional disagreement, the timing of marketing research reports is definitely an area of conflict; however, the hypothesis that role definers will be more concerned than the directors of marketing research with getting the research results in time is not supported. Many researchers were aware of this criticism of their service and realized that if they are to play a role in decision making, the information must be furnished in time. However, their ability to do this is dependent upon their receiving a request for information in time, as discussed in the next hypothesis.

Hypothesis 7. Directors of marketing research will be more concerned than their role definers about having a procedure to bring major decisions to the marketing research department.

The mean responses of the marketing research directors and the two groups of role definers are presented below for the four items concerned with this hypothesis.

<u>Items</u>	<u>Mean response of:</u>		
	<u>D.M.R.</u>	<u>Sup.</u>	<u>O.R.D.</u>
22. Anticipate future decisions and have information ready when requested by management.	1.88	2.38*	2.35**
29. Request permission from a member of marketing management before initiating a study concerning his operation.	2.24	2.26	1.89

35
EAS
of

37
for
by

of

of

it

ti

me

f

d

i

f

o

l

a

m

f

c

v

35. Initiate a procedure for bringing marketing problems to the attention of his department.

1.93 2.18 2.18

37. Get approval from his superior for all research studies undertaken by his department.

2.97 2.41 2.28*

*Responses are significantly different from those of the directors of marketing research at the .05 level.

**Responses are significantly different from those of the directors of marketing research at the .01 level.

Pertaining directly to this aspect of the role, item 35 shows fair agreement among the three samples, with the modal group from each responding that the director of marketing research preferably should "initiate a procedure for bringing marketing problems to the attention of his department." The means show, of course, that the marketing researchers were somewhat stronger in their desires for such a procedure. And as pointed out in the discussion of Hypothesis 6, a number of superiors and users were reluctant to have the researcher "anticipate future decisions and have information ready when requested," although the modal group from this sample feels he should. The need to maintain control over this staff department was the topic of items 22 and 37. While the modal group of researchers were ambivalent concerning the need to get their superiors' approval before starting a research study, the responses of both groups of role definers were scattered over the first three points on the scale. Thus no clear-cut role expectation emerged from this item; however, the direction of the responses is consistent with the emerging pattern

of directors who want greater freedom of operation for their departments. The responses to question 29 show that superiors and researchers are in agreement that the researcher preferably should "request permission from a member of marketing management before initiating a study concerning his operation," while a larger proportion of the users consider this to be imperative. So the relatively small differences that exist on these items support the hypothesis that directors of marketing research will be more concerned than their role definers about having a procedure to bring major decisions to the marketing research department.

Hypothesis 8. Directors of marketing research will place greater emphasis on maintaining their objectivity than will their role definers.

Since it is an axiom that researchers should be objective, it was necessary to measure this aspect of role by constructing the following statements about some causes and effects of objectivity.

<u>Items</u>	<u>Mean responses of:</u>		
	<u>D.M.R.</u>	<u>Sup.</u>	<u>O.R.D.</u>
19. Provide information to support decisions which have already been made by a marketing executive.	3.07	3.10	3.14
20. Resist involvement in policy making to maintain his objective approach to problems.	3.79	3.18*	2.90**
21. Withhold certain marketing research information when it is expedient to do so.	4.04	4.20	4.41**

28
in
th

52
to
de
in

of

of

w

e

f

o

m

t

b

a

f

y

a

.

28. Give his frank opinion to marketing executives even if it will hurt their position in the firm. 1.97 1.88 1.78

52. Separate himself from the day-to-day operations of the marketing department to protect his objectivity in approaching problems. 3.29 3.14 3.03

*Responses are significantly different from those of the directors of marketing research at the .05 level.

**Responses are significantly different from those of the directors of marketing research at the .01 level.

When presented with these alternatives, researchers were not nearly as concerned with objectivity as the hypothesis suggested. The modal group of researchers differed from that of the role definers in saying that the director of marketing research preferably should not "resist involvement in policy making to maintain his objective approach to problems" (item 20), and 52 percent of the researchers believed that it is not appropriate for a director to "separate himself from the day-to-day operations of the marketing department to protect his objectivity in approaching problems" (item 52). Accordingly, many research directors are rejecting the "ivory-tower" approach if it is required to maintain objectivity. On the other hand, a truly objective researcher would "let the chips fall where they may." The responses to questions 19, 21, and 28 reveal that marketing research directors were more willing than their role definers to see occupants of the focal position occasionally do the expedient thing to maintain a favorable relationship with management, thus sacrificing their reputation

fo

sh

fo

oc

is

or

w:

(:

f

s

s

m

s

t

r

r

r

r

r

r

r

r

r

r

r

r

r

r

r

r

r

for objectivity. Therefore, the responses to all five items show that role definers placed greater emphasis on the need for researchers to maintain their objectivity than did the occupants of the focal position. While this hypothesis is not supported, the apparent conflict is not a crucial one; practically all of the role definers were satisfied with the "objectivity of the marketing research department" (item 60), and all but 4 of the 76 researchers were satisfied with the extent to which they are able to pursue research studies objectively (item 53).

Hypothesis 9. With regard to evaluation of the marketing research department, directors of marketing research will place heavier emphasis on scientific excellence than will the role definers, while role definers will be more concerned with the data's usefulness than will the marketing research directors.

Questions 3 and 11 were concerned with the contribution of marketing research to the firm, while question 47 posed the criterion of scientific excellence.

<u>Items</u>	<u>Mean responses of:</u>		
	<u>D.M.R.</u>	<u>Sup.</u>	<u>O.R.D.</u>
3. Measure his performance primarily by the extent to which marketing research results are used in decision-making.	2.00	2.35	2.36
11. Be responsible for showing the contribution of marketing research to the profitability of the firm.	2.11	2.54	2.37
47. Use standards of scientific excellence and objectivity as the primary basis to evaluate the work of his department.	2.65	2.35	2.45

Although none of the differences in the responses to these three items are statistically significant, the hypothesis is not supported by the trends of the answers. And, in effect, directors of marketing research believed their departments should be evaluated more on the basis of their contributions to decision making than on the criteria of scientific excellence and objectivity. This is consistent with the rejections of Hypothesis 2 dealing with professional and methodological aspects of the role and Hypothesis 8 concerning objectivity. The strong need again emerges for the researchers to have their departments play a role in the decision-making process.

Areas of Potential Role Conflict

To continue the interpositional analysis, an examination of the role expectation items on which there is significant agreement within the samples but significant disagreement between the samples (for example: $L_{dmr}L_s$, Significant) will identify some areas of potential role conflict. Only items 10 and 14 were included in this category for the comparison of the responses of all the directors of marketing research and the superiors.⁴ Item 14 shows that the modal group of researchers reported they

⁴When using 49 pairs of marketing research directors and their superiors from the same firms and the Wilcoxon test of significance, the following five items were included in the $L_{dmr}L_s$, Significant category: items 1, 2, 10, 14, and 43.

abs

re:

fo

er

no

of

of

So

th

es

ti

m

e

d

t

a

t

s

s

r

absolutely must "be able to translate marketing research results into positive courses of action for management to follow," while the modal group of superiors answered "preferably should" to this item. In response to item 10, the modal groups for both samples believed that the director of marketing research absolutely must "recognize the value of executive judgment in decision making." But 17 of the 50 superiors were in the "preferably should" category on this item and five circled "may or may not." Thus the largest difference between the definitions of the role by these two groups revolves around the relationship between the marketing researcher and the decision maker. The researchers looked upon themselves as active participants in the decision-making process who are able to come up with positive courses of action which an executive may or may not accept. Many superiors, on the other hand, seemed concerned that the marketing research department preserve its staff status and objectively present facts as they see them. Since it is then up to the executive to take these facts and make the decision, the researchers, according to the superiors, must not be overly concerned with executive judgment.

The marketing research directors and the users of their services disagreed on six items on which there was substantial intrapositional consensus.⁵ As in the

⁵When pairing the 59 marketing research directors with the 134 users from the same firms, and using the

disagreement with the superiors, the conflict revolves around the extent to which the marketing research department should go beyond the traditional prerogatives of a staff department. Items 5 and 42, for example, indicate that many users do not believe it is necessary for researchers to participate in formulating marketing strategy. There was also reluctance to have the research department expand its scope of operations by anticipating future decisions and having information ready when requested by management (item 22) or enlarging the marketing research function by moving into other areas of the firm where the capabilities of the department can be used (item 43). In addition, only 38 percent of the users believed the director of marketing research absolutely must "help management define the problems to be studied" (item 1), and only 30 percent thought he absolutely must "maintain an active interest in a given study until after the recommendations are implemented by management" (item 6). Thus the users asserted their decision-making authority and limited the role of the marketing research department, while the directors believed the roles of their departments should be expanded. This conclusion is supported by the finding that 20 percent of the marketing research directors are dissatisfied with the extent to which the capabilities of their departments are being

Wilcoxon test of significance, the following 13 items were included in the L_{dmr}L_{ord}, Significant category: items 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 22, 35, 42, 43, 44, 50, and 51.

use

rep

Ar

we

a

pe

te

fo

pl

u

used by their firms (item 68), while less than 20 percent reported being very well satisfied with this criterion.

Areas of Role Ambiguity

Role analysis is concerned with role ambiguity as well as role conflict. Symptoms of role ambiguity include a high variance among the answers of respondents and a propensity for a bimodal distribution or for responses to center around the "may or may not" point on the scale. The following five items met these criteria for all three samples and represent the areas of greatest role ambiguity uncovered by the questionnaire.

- 12. Offer early indications of findings to management when requested even though a conclusive investigation may prove them to be wrong.
- 19. Provide information to support decisions which have already been made by a marketing executive.
- 37. Get approval from his superior for all research studies undertaken by his department.
- 47. Use standards of scientific excellence and objectivity as the primary basis to evaluate the work of his department.
- 52. Separate himself from the day-to-day operations of the marketing department to protect his objectivity in approaching problems.

There are three additional items where the role definers varied their responses enough to produce uncertainty on an occupant of the focal position who is trying to define his role.

- 17. Initiate changes in the marketing strategy of the firm whenever possible.
- 20. Resist involvement in policy making to maintain his objective approach to problems.

of

gu

re

re

to

ai

a

v

a

F

t

s

l

v

49. Have the final say in committing corporate funds for the services of outside marketing research agencies.

These eight items cover many dimensions of the role of the director of marketing research and show that ambiguity as well as conflict exists in the definition of this role. Questions 37 and 49, for example, pertain to his relationship with his superior and the extent of the director's formal authority. Question 12 reveals predictable ambiguity on the timing issue while items 20, 27, and 52 apply to the issue of objectivity that was discussed previously. And item 17 shows that the role definers disagree about the amount of initiative the marketing research department should take. Finally, ambiguity in the role of the marketing research director is caused by the political issue of providing information to support decisions which have already been made by a marketing executive (item 19).

Intraposition Analysis

To conclude the analysis of the role expectation items, the intrapositional analysis will emphasize the activities which most of the members of a given sample agree that the director of marketing research must do. Examination of these items for all three samples gives a positive expression of the expectations which the majority of the members of a sample hold for the occupant of the focal position. Looking first at the director of marketing research sample, the following eight items are listed in descending order of the mean responses with the range from a mean of

1.14 for item 10 to 1.41 for item 1.

10. Recognize the value of executive judgment in decision-making.
27. Place strong emphasis on the understandability of the final report.
9. Produce information which reduces the area of uncertainty in management decisions.
25. Consult at length with the executive requesting a study to make certain he understands the problem before conducting the actual research.
6. Maintain an active interest in a given study until after the recommendations are implemented by management.
7. Become familiar with the objectives of management in a given area before beginning a marketing research project in that area.
14. Be able to translate marketing research results into positive courses of action for management to follow.
1. Help management define the problems to be studied.

Since most of the 76 directors of marketing research are in agreement that these are aspects of the role which the occupant of the focal position must fulfill, the list produces this profile of necessary dimensions of that role. The director of marketing research must understand the objectives of management in a problem area and participate in clearly defining the problem to be studied. The purpose of the information provided by his department is to reduce the area of uncertainty in management decisions; thus results of a marketing research study must be translated into positive courses of action and clearly presented to management. While he must recognize the value of executive judgment in decision making, he must also have the right of

for

are

in

gr

no

ti

re

or

r

o

c

c

v

.

.

follow-up after a study to see that the recommendations are being used by management.

The dimensions of the role which are not included in this profile aid in understanding the sentiments of this group of respondents. The above list of eight items makes no mention of methodology, professional considerations, timing of research reports, creativity or judgment of the researcher, political considerations, marketing strategy, or evaluation of the marketing research department. These represent the areas of disagreement and ambiguity among occupants of the focal position in large industrial firms.

The replies from the role definers showed greater dispersion than the answers from the marketing research directors. Thus fewer items of intrapositional agreement were found. For the 50 superiors, a large proportion of the respondents agreed that the director of marketing research absolutely must meet the following role expectations. For the six items the means ranged from 1.24 for item 27 to 1.54 for item 10.

27. Place strong emphasis on the understandability of the final report.

25. Consult at length with the executive requesting a study to make certain he understands the problem before conducting the actual research.

9. Produce information which reduces the area of uncertainty in management decisions.

7. Become familiar with the objectives of management in a given area before beginning a research project in that area.

36. Be responsible for all contract marketing research conducted by outside research firms.

10. Recognize the value of executive judgment in decision making.

Five of these six items also were included on the list derived from the responses of the marketing research directors. Item 36 was not on that list because there was a divergence of opinions among marketing research directors concerning the necessity of their being responsible for contract research conducted by outside firms. And the two items which appear on the researchers' list but not on the superiors' list pertained to suggesting positive courses of action to management and maintaining interest in studies after submitting the final report. Thus researchers and superiors agree on the role of the marketing research directors up to the point of preparing the final report.

Most of the other role definers agreed that the following five items must be expected from an occupant of the focal position; the mean scores ranged from 1.21 to 1.51.

25. Consult at length with the executive requesting a study to make certain he understands the problem before conducting the actual research.

27. Place strong emphasis on the understandability of the final report.

7. Become familiar with the objectives of management in a given area before beginning a research project in that area.

10. Recognize the value of executive judgment in decision-making.

9. Produce information which reduces the area of uncertainty in management decisions.

Although there are fewer items of agreement for this sample of users, the items coincide with items on the other two lists, indicating that there is basic agreement in these firms that the job of the director of marketing research is to produce information that reduces the area of uncertainty in decision-making. Also, he must understand the objectives of management and the problems to be studied, be able to communicate his findings to management, and realize that executive judgment is an important ingredient in the decision-making process. Beyond this core of agreement, however, the interpositional analysis shows that significant areas of disagreement exist among the samples of role definers.

Job Satisfaction of Marketing Research Directors

Items 53 through 68 of the director of marketing research schedule concern the degree to which directors of marketing research were satisfied with various aspects of their jobs (see Table 2 of Appendix II for the distributions of responses). The average satisfaction score for the 16 items is 1.9, meaning that the 76 respondents as a group were slightly better than "fairly well satisfied" with their roles. To appreciate the dispersion behind this average, the 16 items, ranked from highest to lowest satisfaction, are presented below with the mean responses and the variance for the 76 directors of marketing research.

<u>Job satisfaction items</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Variance</u>
53. The extent to which we are able to pursue research studies objectively.	1.58	.43
62. The support I receive from my superior and other high level executives.	1.59	.59
64. My freedom to follow up reports to see whether they are being used by management.	1.62	.56
65. The open-mindedness of executives to marketing research findings.	1.75	.46
59. The extent to which marketing executives are receptive to honest opinions on all subjects.	1.76	.58
61. The extent to which I can help define the problems to be studied by my department.	1.78	.60
67. Management's attitude concerning the value of marketing research.	1.79	.65
58. The amount of contact I have with marketing executives.	1.80	.80
54. Acceptance of marketing research results by management.	1.82	.45
66. The location of the marketing research department in the corporate organization structure.	1.91	.94
57. The budget I have to run my department.	1.97	.72
68. The extent to which the capabilities of my department are being used by the firm.	2.08	.61
63. The time deadlines which are placed on marketing research activities.	2.11	.55
56. The part I play in formulating marketing strategy.	2.25	.65
55. The procedure for bringing problems to the marketing research department.	2.28	.55
60. The time I have available to improve myself professionally.	2.46	.84

fu

vi

ir

fi

al

g

o

m

t

R

s

v

c

For a marketing research department to be successful, it must develop working relationships with many individuals in the corporation while maintaining a degree of independence to objectively pursue research studies. The first ten items on the above list pertain to various formal and informal relationships that must be developed to integrate smoothly the marketing research department into the organizational framework of the firm. The fact that the mean scores for these ten items are less than or equal to the average response of 1.9 for all 16 items indicates that marketing research directors on the whole are fairly well satisfied or very well satisfied with their relationships with other individuals in the firm. With the exception of items 58 and 66, where the variance of scores is relatively high, less than one director out of seven was dissatisfied with these aspects of their associations with other individuals or groups in their firms. Specifically, the modal groups of respondents were very well satisfied with the ability of their departments to pursue research studies objectively, the support they received from their superiors and other high level executives, and their freedom to follow up reports. Also, the modal groups were fairly well satisfied with the open-mindedness of executives to marketing research findings, the extent to which marketing executives are receptive to honest opinions on all subjects, the extent to which they are able to help define the problems to be studied by their departments, management's

attitude concerning the value of marketing research, and the acceptance of marketing research results by management.

While the modal group of respondents also reported being very well satisfied with the amount of contact they have with marketing executives, 18 percent of the directors were dissatisfied with this aspect of their role. However, only one of the 14 directors who report to top management or another high general management official was dissatisfied with his contacts with marketing executives, while 20 percent of the 55 research directors who report to a marketing official were dissatisfied with this dimension of their role. This breakdown suggests that researchers who report to a line management official outside the marketing department maintain a peer relationship with marketing officials while research directors located in the marketing department hold more of a subordinate status. The peer relationship would be desirable for the researcher to achieve his desired role of participant in the formulation of marketing strategy.

The modal group of researchers also were very well satisfied with the location of the marketing research department in the corporate organization structure; but 20 percent of the respondents were not satisfied with this formalized relationship. Of the 16 dissatisfied directors, none reported to top management, one reported to a divisional vice-president, five reported to a line marketing official,

se

to

th

fo

ac

se

th

t

l

t

w

k

c

c

c

c

seven reported to a staff marketing official, two reported to commercial development officials, and one reported to the financial vice-president. For these 76 firms, therefore, marketing research directors who reported to top management or a high general management official were better satisfied with this organizational arrangement than the marketing research directors who fell organizationally in the marketing department.

Only two of the six items at the bottom of the above list of satisfaction items pertain to relationships. While the modal group of marketing research directors were fairly well satisfied with the part they play in formulating marketing strategy, almost 35 percent reported that they were dissatisfied with this aspect of their role. More than one-third of the directors were dissatisfied with the procedure for bringing problems to their departments, while only nine of the 76 respondents were very well satisfied with this procedure. These findings are consistent because marketing research directors cannot play an active role in formulating marketing strategy if important marketing problems are not brought to the attention of their department.

Items 57, 60, and 63 apply to the resources of time and money that are necessary to successfully manage a marketing research department. Twenty percent of the marketing research directors were dissatisfied with their department budgets and almost 30 percent were dissatisfied with

the
with
the
pro
the
de
pa
we
pe
be
w
Th
a
s
p
r
t
t
t
a
e
r

the time deadlines placed on marketing research activities, with 46 percent of the respondents indicating dissatisfaction with the time they have available to improve themselves professionally. The greatest indication of problems with time and budgets was found in the newer marketing research departments. Sixty percent of the directors of the 36 departments that have been established for 12 years or more were satisfied with their time deadlines, while only 35 percent of the directors of the 17 departments that have been in existence for less than six years were satisfied with the deadlines placed on their research activities. The same trend was found in the relationship between the age of the marketing research departments and the directors' satisfaction with the time they have to improve themselves professionally. In a similar vein, 86 percent of the directors of the 36 oldest departments were satisfied with their budgets while only 65 percent of the directors of the 17 newest departments reported being satisfied with their budgets. These correlations imply that the proper allocation of time and financial resources improves as executives gain experience with the use of a marketing research department.

Finally, the modal group of marketing research directors was fairly well satisfied with the extent to which the capabilities of their departments were being used by their firms, with somewhat less than 20 percent being very well satisfied and about 20 percent indicating

dissatisfaction. This item symbolizes the frustration of a minority of the respondents who envision larger roles for their departments than have been realized. A cross-tabulation of the responses to this item with the reporting patterns of the directors indicates that all 14 directors who reported to top management or to a high general management official were satisfied with the use of their departments' capabilities, while one-fourth of the directors who reported to a marketing official were dissatisfied. Although the sample is small, the relationship between satisfaction of the director of marketing research and their reporting pattern is clear. Research directors who reported to top management or another general management official were better satisfied with their contributions to the firm than were those directors who reported to a marketing official.

Perceived Effectiveness of the Marketing Research Department

To ascertain the role definers' perceptions of the effectiveness of the marketing research department, Sections II and III of their schedule contained statements concerning different aspects of the job of the marketing research department (distributions of responses to these items are presented in Tables 3 and 4 of Appendix II). Although a different scale was employed in each section, maximum satisfaction with the effectiveness of the marketing research department would have been registered by recording a "1" for every statement, except 67 and 70, where a response

of "4" designated maximum satisfaction. To calculate an average satisfaction score over all 18 items for all respondents, the actual responses for items 67 and 70 were subtracted from 5 to bring these negative items into agreement with the other effectiveness items. Following this procedure, the average effectiveness score for the superiors was 1.75 and the average score for the role definers was 1.86. With the exception of item 54, the mean responses of the superiors were slightly lower than the mean responses for the other role definers for all items; but the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test disclosed that none of these differences were statistically significant.

Since the differences between the responses of the superiors and the users were too small to be statistically significant at the .05 level, the discussion of perceived effectiveness treats all role definers as a group. The ten items in Section II of the questionnaire covered various dimensions of the marketing researcher's role; these statements, the mean responses, and variances are presented below in descending order of satisfaction.

<u>Perceived effectiveness items (Section II)</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Variance</u>
60. Objectivity of marketing research department.	1.56	.39
56. Marketing research department's understanding of problems studied.	1.63	.33
54. Understandability of marketing research reports.	1.68	.40

53. The value of marketing research information.	1.70	.41
58. Proper use of research methodology.	1.74	.39
61. Soundness of recommendations.	1.78	.36
59. Relevance of marketing research data to decisions.	1.81	.32
57. Return on investment in marketing research.	1.85	.48
62. Creativity of marketing research department.	2.06	.52
55. Timing of marketing research reports.	2.11	.55

The "objectivity of the marketing research department" is the only one of the above items with which the modal group of respondents was very well satisfied; just nine users and one superior reported being dissatisfied with this aspect of the performance of the role. However, the modal groups of role definers were fairly well satisfied with the work of the marketing research department on the remaining nine items. Moreover, less than ten percent of the respondents were dissatisfied with the marketing research departments' understanding of problems studied, the value of their information, their use of research methodology, the soundness of their recommendations, and the relevance of marketing research data to decisions. The greatest dissatisfaction was recorded for the last three items, with 14 percent of the respondents being dissatisfied with the return on investment in marketing research, and almost 23 percent registering dissatisfaction with the

ti

of

wi

Th

re

ti

m

d

t

z

r

c

timing of marketing research reports. Almost 25 percent of the respondents indicated that they were dissatisfied with the creativity of the marketing research department. Thus, out of the ten dimensions of the job of the marketing research department which were included in Section II of the role definers' schedule, the superiors and users were most satisfied with the objectivity of the marketing research departments and were most dissatisfied with their creativity.

The items in Section III were designed to ascertain the respondents' degree of agreement, with eight statements about the effectiveness of the marketing research department in their firms. These items are listed below in descending order of perceived effectiveness, which is also ascending order of the mean scores when the responses to items 67 and 70 are subtracted from five.

Perceived effectiveness items (Section III) Mean Variance

70. Much of the data which the marketing research department comes up with I know from experience cannot be true.	3.59	.49
69. I have as much confidence in the results of studies by our marketing research department as I do in the results of studies by outside research firms.	1.45	.39
66. A business as complex as this one would have a difficult time operating without the marketing research department.	1.58	.57
64. We would have made some very bad mistakes if we would not have had the marketing research department.	1.94	.70
67. If we had no marketing research department, our decisions would have been about the same.	3.00	.56

68. The marketing research function is a well integrated part of the marketing activity of the firm.	2.02	.88
65. The marketing research department plays an important part in initiating changes in the marketing strategies of the firm.	2.16	.82
63. The marketing research department often comes up with valuable alternative courses of action which were never before considered by management.	2.49	.65

Almost 70 percent of the role definers disagreed strongly with the statement that "much of the data which the marketing research department comes up with I know from experience cannot be true." Sixty-two percent of the respondents agreed strongly that they have as much confidence in the results of studies by their marketing research departments as they do in the results of studies by outside research firms. These results correlate with the order of effectiveness items in Section II and prompt the broader conclusion that most role definers are confident that the marketing research department in their firms does objective work and the data it provides are valid and accurate.

Item 66 shows that the modal group of respondents agreed strongly with the statement that a business as complex as this one would have a difficult time operating without the marketing research department. However, about one-fourth of the role definers disagreed with the idea that some bad mistakes would have been made if they had not had the marketing research department, while the same proportion agreed that without a marketing research department,

their decisions would have been about the same. This is consistent with the finding that 30 percent of the role definers thought the marketing research department was not a well-integrated part of the marketing activity of their firms. Again the location of items 65 and 63 at the bottom of this list is compatible with the earlier conclusion that a substantial minority of the respondents are dissatisfied with the creativity of the marketing research department. Almost 33 percent of the role definers did not agree that "the marketing research department plays an important part in initiating changes in the marketing strategies of the firm." And less than eight percent agreed strongly with the statement that "the marketing research department often comes up with valuable alternative courses of action which were never before considered by management," while 44 percent of the respondents expressed disagreement with this statement.

Two classification items on the role definer's schedule revealed differences in the responses of subsamples to the perceived effectiveness items. Seventy-two respondents who were concerned primarily with consumer goods in their work gave the marketing research department an average effectiveness score of 1.76 for the 18 items; but the average effectiveness score for the 67 respondents who were concerned primarily with non-consumer goods was 1.96. For the items in Section II of the questionnaire, the largest differences between the responses of the two subsamples

showed that the non-consumer group was less satisfied with the marketing research department's understanding of problems studied, with the relevance of marketing research data to decisions, and with the soundness of its recommendations. While 81 percent of the consumer goods respondents indicated that "the marketing research department is a well integrated part of the marketing activity of the firm," only 51 percent of the non-consumer goods role definers subscribed to this statement. A similar divergence of opinion occurred for statement 66, where 97 percent of the consumer goods respondents and 76 percent of the non-consumer goods role definers agreed that "a business as complex as this one would have a difficult time operating without the marketing research department." Since the survey of the Fortune 500 firms revealed that marketing research departments are as widespread in producers of non-consumer goods as they are in producers of consumer goods, it is important to note that these departments were rated as somewhat less effective by role definers who are concerned primarily with non-consumer goods in their work.

The other significant breakdown of the effectiveness items revealed that 40 role definers with marketing research experience perceived the marketing research departments to be less effective than their counterparts who have never worked in marketing research. Over the 18 items, the average effectiveness score of the subsample with marketing research experience was 1.93, compared with 1.80

for the subsample without that experience. Members of the former group were particularly critical of the clarity of marketing research reports, the marketing research departments' understanding of the problems studied, and the creativity of the marketing research departments. Twenty-two percent of them were dissatisfied with the return on investment in marketing research, compared with 11 percent of the respondents without marketing research experience. Additionally, 37 percent of the marketing research experience subsample agreed with the statement that "if we had no marketing research department, our decisions would have been about the same," while 25 percent of the other subsample supported this statement. One interpretation of these results is that these 40 role definers who have worked in a marketing research department recognize its shortcomings to a greater extent than someone who has never worked in marketing research. Nevertheless, they are prescribing higher standards for the work of marketing research departments; thus the influx of individuals with marketing research experience into positions with decision-making responsibility should provide a force to upgrade the work of marketing research departments.

Comparison of Effectiveness and Satisfaction Responses

While most of the items in the satisfaction section of the director of marketing research schedule are not directly comparable to the effectiveness items on the role

definer's schedule, comparisons are possible where items from the different schedules deal with the same subject. The most striking comparison is the similarity of items with low and high mean scores for the two groups of respondents. Specifically, the directors of marketing research were well satisfied with their ability to conduct research studies objectively and the role definers were well satisfied with the objectivity of the marketing research departments. At the other extreme, many occupants of the focal position and many role definers expressed dissatisfaction with the timing dimension. Also, many marketing research directors were dissatisfied with the part they played in formulating marketing strategy, and many role definers expressed disagreement with the statement that "the marketing research department plays an important part in initiating changes in the marketing strategies of the firm."

The location of the marketing research department in the corporate organization structure contributes to the successful fulfillment of its role. The information collected from the marketing research directors suggests that directors who reported to top management or some other high level management official were better satisfied with their location in the corporate organizational structure than their counterparts who report to marketing management. In response to statement 68, the role definers recorded the extent of their agreement with the statement that "the marketing research function is a well integrated part of

the

ro

si

ke

is

lo

fi

wo

ti

ri

ni

wo

ni

ni

ni

ni

ni

ni

ni

ni

ni

ni

ni

ni

ni

ni

ni

ni

ni

the marketing activity of the firm." The responses of 55 role definers who disagreed with this statement were classified according to the organizational location of the marketing research departments in their firms. This breakdown is compared in the following table with the organizational location of the marketing research departments in the 67 firms from which at least one role definer's questionnaire was received to determine what deviations occurred from the frequencies which would be expected if there were no relationship between the organizational location of the marketing research department and role definers' agreement with item 68.

<u>Reporting pattern of director of marketing research</u>	<u>All firms with role definer respondents</u>	<u>Role definers who disagreed with item 68</u>
Top management	10.5%	12.7%
Other general management	10.5	14.5
Marketing line management	34.3	20.0
Marketing staff management	35.8	40.0
Research, development, or planning management	5.9	5.5
Financial management	3.0	7.3
Total	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>
Base	67	55

Although the bases are different and the data are not strictly comparable, it does suggest that marketing research departments that report to top management, other general management, or financial management are not considered by the role definers to be as well integrated in their firms as those departments which are located in the marketing department. Research departments whose directors report to a line marketing management official were considered

to
de:
it
co
to
is
di
o:
a
l
k
o
M
:

to be the best integrated since the responses of these role definers demonstrated a relatively small disagreement with item 68. These data are not congruent with the earlier conclusion that marketing research directors who report to high level general management officials are better satisfied with their contributions to the firm than were those directors who reported to a marketing official. This lack of agreement suggests that marketing research directors aspire to the status which comes from reporting to a high level official, while many role definers feel that the marketing research departments are better integrated in the organization of the firm if their directors report to a marketing line official such as the marketing vice-president.

Summary

The responses of 76 marketing research directors, 50 superiors, and 138 other role definers revealed a high degree of consensus on the role of the director of marketing research in large industrial firms. There was little disagreement that the job of the director of marketing research is to produce information that reduces the area of uncertainty in decision-making. Also, he must understand the objectives of management and the problems to be studied, be able to communicate his findings to management, and realize that executive judgment is an important ingredient in the decision-making process. However, certain areas of role ambiguity and role conflict were discovered.

Spe
ity
sh
if
wh
ta
ce
ce
re
r
s
s
f
l

Specifically, there is ambiguity concerning the formal authority of the director of marketing research and his relationship to his superior, the desirability of meeting deadlines if he is not certain of the validity of his data, the price which the director of marketing research should pay to maintain his objectivity, and whether or not to participate in certain "politically expedient" activities. The greatest conflict revolved around the extent to which the marketing research directors should go beyond the typical staff prerogatives and actively participate in formulating marketing strategy for the firm. Of nine hypotheses concerning responses of marketing research directors and their role definers to specific items, four were supported, one was supported in part, and four were not supported by the data.

When considered as groups, the marketing research directors were satisfied with the aspects of their jobs covered in the questionnaire and their role definers believed they are doing effective jobs. However, average satisfaction and effectiveness scores varied from item to item and a significant number of research directors were dissatisfied with the part they play in formulating marketing strategy, the procedure for bringing problems to their departments, and the availability of time to improve themselves professionally. The role definers were dissatisfied most with the creativity of the marketing research departments and the timing of marketing research reports.

CHAPTER V

MICROSCOPIC ROLE ANALYSIS

Microscopic analysis, as the name implies, concerns the relationship between consensus, satisfaction, effectiveness, and other variables in a single firm. To be included in the microscopic analysis, completed schedules were needed from the director of marketing research and three or four role definers in the same firm. Returns from 42 firms comprised the sample for the microscopic analysis.

While these 42 firms do not differ substantially from the 35 firms which are excluded from this part of the analysis, there are two differences worth noting. The 42 firms were more heavily weighted toward consumer goods producers than the total number of respondents as illustrated in the following figures.

<u>Product category</u>	<u>Microscopic analysis:</u>	
	<u>Firms included</u>	<u>Firms excluded</u>
Consumer goods	33.3%	17.1%
Non-consumer goods	40.5	57.1
Heavy commitment to both types of products	26.2	25.7
Totals	100.0%	99.9%
Base	42	35

Also, 29 of the 42 firms included in the microscopic analysis report to a marketing official and another nine report to an engineering, research, or development official

whi

ref

the

in

To

Of

Ma

En

O

N

D

i

i

I

S

while only two of these directors of marketing research report to top management or other general management of the firm; a comparison follows of the reporting patterns in firms excluded from this analysis.

<u>Report to:</u>	<u>Microscopic analysis:</u>	
	<u>Firms included</u>	<u>Firms excluded</u>
Top management	4.8%	14.3%
Other corporate or general management	--	17.1
Marketing or sales management	69.0	60.0
Engineering, development, research, or planning official	21.4	5.7
Other	4.8	--
No response to this question	--	2.9
Totals	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>
Base	42	35

Discussion of Measurements

Before stating hypotheses, the measurements used in the microscopic analysis must be examined. The following hypothetical responses to role expectation items (see Exhibit 2 of Appendix IV for scale) by the researcher and his three role definers will be used to explain the three measurements of consensus.

<u>Question</u>	<u>Dir. of M.R.</u>	<u>Responses:</u>			<u>Measurements:</u>		
		<u>Dir. of Mktg.</u>	<u>Prod. Mgr.</u>	<u>Sales Mgr.</u>	<u>V</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>D</u>
A	1	2	2	2	0	1.00	1.00
B	3	5	1	2	4.33	.11	4.44
C	2	2	2	2	0	0	0
D	3	5	4	3	1.00	1.00	2.00
E	2	2	1	1	.33	.44	.77
F	4	5	4	3	1.00	0	1.00
G	4	2	4	3	1.00	1.00	2.00
H	4	2	3	3	.33	1.77	2.10
I	1	2	1	2	.33	.44	.77
J	3	2	2	3	.33	.44	.77
Totals					<u>8.65</u>	<u>6.20</u>	<u>14.85</u>

ti

Th

ar

T

R

R

The variance was the basic measurement used to quantify differences in responses to the role expectation items. The letters (V, M, and D) which are used in this connection are defined as follows:

V = the variance of the role definers' responses on each item computed from the following formula:

$$V = \frac{\sum (\bar{X} - x)^2}{N - 1}$$

M = the square of the difference between the response of the director of marketing research and the mean response of the role definers.

D = V + M (the overall between position consensus).

These three measures were calculated for each of the 52 role expectation items. The V score is a measure of agreement among the role definers concerning a given expectation item. By summing the V scores over all the expectation items, a measure of aggregate consensus among the role definers within a given firm emerged. The degree of consensus varied from firm to firm; thus firms were ranked from high consensus (1) to low consensus (42) on the basis of the aggregate V scores; the aggregate V scores are presented in Table 1 of Appendix III, while the rankings of the firms according to these scores can be found in Table 4. The following compares the actual range of the V scores for the 42 firms with the possible range of consensus among the role definers.

Possible range: .00 to 277.33

Actual range: 21.67 to 71.00

The
ti
an
wo
mu
mu
es
al
o
i
s
t
o
r

The low extreme of the possible range represents a situation where all role definers in a given firm give the same answer on each of the 52 items while the high extreme score would occur when two role definers designate "absolutely must" and the other two role definers designate "absolutely must not" for each item. The difference between the highest and lowest V score for the actual range is 49.33 or about 18 percent of the maximum possible difference. Another indication of the difference between the extreme points in the actual range of V scores is found in the actual responses. In the case of the firm with the lowest V score, the three role definers all circled the same scaling code on 14 of the 52 items. At the other extreme, the three responding role definers in the firm with the highest V score agreed on only five of the role expectation items.

The D score, on the other hand, is a measure of the consensus between the director of marketing research and his role definers within the firm. Being composed of M, a measure of the difference between the response of the director of marketing research and the mean response of the role definers, and V, the variance of the role definers' responses, the D score thus reflects the fact that consensus between a focal position and its role definers within a role set is a function of the consensus among role definers as well as the difference between the focal person's response and the average response of his role definers. If the V score were not accounted for in the between position

con

the

to

an

0;

wh

Ac

at

tl

i

9

t

t

t

c

v

consensus measure, identical M scores would be found for the following situations: if the marketing research director's response is 3, role definers' responses of 1, 2, 4, and 5 or 3, 3, 3, and 3 would both produce an M score of 0; however, the D score would be much larger for the case where there is lack of consensus among the role definers. Again the D scores were summed over the 52 items to give an aggregate measurement of the degree of consensus between the director of marketing research and his role definers in a single firm. Aggregate D scores along with the aggregate M scores are presented in Table 1 of Appendix III and the ranked D scores can be found in Table 5.

A comparison of the actual and possible ranges of the M scores indicates fairly great consensus between the director of marketing research in a firm and the average responses of his role definers.

Possible range: .00 to 832.00

Actual range: 19.56 to 97.81

In the case of the M score, the actual range is less than ten percent of the maximum possible range of 832, which would have occurred if the marketing research directors and their role definers had been at opposite ends of the scale on each role expectation item.

The D score, representing the sum of the V and M scores, has the same range of scores as the M score in that the V score must be zero to get the maximum disagreement between the director of marketing research and his role

def

abo

tra

Th

tr

di

ti

Q

definers. The actual range of scores on this measure is about 14 percent of the maximum possible range, as illustrated by the following figures.

Possible range: .00 to 832.00

Actual range: 51.83 to 168.67

These differences in role consensus between firms with extreme D scores are portrayed below by the responses of the director of marketing research and the role definers for the first ten items of the questionnaire.

<u>Question</u>	<u>Firm with lowest D score</u>				<u>Manager M.R.</u>
	<u>Exec. V.P. Marketing</u>	<u>Product Manager</u>	<u>Product Manager</u>	<u>Product Manager</u>	
1	1	1	2	2	1
2	3	2	3	3	3
3	2	3	3	3	3
4	1	1	1	3	1
5	3	2	2	1	2
6	2	2	2	2	2
7	2	1	1	1	1
8	2	1	2	2	1
9	1	1	1	1	1
10	1	2	1	1	1

<u>Question</u>	<u>Firm with highest D score</u>			
	<u>Manager Comm. Devp.</u>	<u>Manager Comm. Devp.</u>	<u>Manager Spec. Prod.</u>	<u>Manager M.R. & Devp.</u>
1	2	1	3	1
2	3	3	2	4
3	2	1	5	3
4	1	1	1	4
5	2	2	2	2
6	2	1	3	2
7	3	1	2	2
8	2	1	1	1
9	2	3	1	2
10	2	1	1	1

The hypotheses to be tested in the microscopic analysis deal with the relationship between consensus as measured by V and D and job satisfaction, perceived effectiveness,

in

Th

a

Ve

F

F

V

c

s

interaction, and level of education of the respondents.

The computation of a hypothetical satisfaction score for a director of marketing research is presented below.

<u>Scale^a</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>V F</u>
Very well satisfied	1	8	8
Fairly well satisfied	2	5	10
Fairly dissatisfied	3	3	9
Very dissatisfied	4	--	--
Totals		<u>16^b</u>	<u>27</u> 16 = 1.69 ^c

^aScale is found in items 53 through 68 of Exhibit 1 of Appendix IV.

^bRepresents number of items on the job satisfaction schedule.

^cRepresents average satisfaction score.

The following figures illustrate the computation of the effectiveness scores.

<u>Scale^a</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>V F</u>
Very well satisfied	1	27	27
Fairly well satisfied	2	21	42
Fairly dissatisfied	3	6	18
Very dissatisfied	4	--	--
Totals		<u>54^b</u>	<u>87</u> 54 = 1.59 ^c

^aScale is found in items 53 through 80 of Exhibit 2 of Appendix IV.

^bRepresents 18 effectiveness items for each of three role definers.

^cRepresents average effectiveness score.

Both the average satisfaction and average effectiveness scores were ranked from highest satisfaction (1) and highest effectiveness (1) to lowest satisfaction (42) and lowest effectiveness (42). These rankings appear in Table 8 of Appendix III while the raw scores are recorded in Table 2.

The possible satisfaction scores for the director of marketing research range from "very well satisfied" with all aspects of his role, which are covered in questions 53 to 68, to the other extreme where he is "very dissatisfied" with all aspects of his role; a comparison of these extreme possibilities with the actual range of scores for the 42 directors of marketing research follows.

Possible range: 1.00 to 4.00

Actual range: 1.19 to 3.44

The following distribution of these scores shows that the dispersion is not as great as the range of scores suggests.

<u>Satisfaction score</u>	<u>Number of firms</u>
Less than 1.5	9
1.5 but less than 2.0	21
2.0 but less than 2.5	7
2.5 but less than 3.0	2
3.0 or greater	3
Total	<u>42</u>

In only three of the 42 firms, the director of marketing research responded that he was sufficiently dissatisfied with his job to yield an average score of three or higher--"fairly dissatisfied" to "very dissatisfied." Two additional directors were between the ambivalent and "fairly dissatisfied" range, while seven other respondents were between the midpoint of the range and the "fairly well satisfied" point, leaving 30 of the 42 respondents who were at least "fairly well satisfied" with their jobs.

Cross-classifications of the satisfaction ranks of the 42 firms with certain data about the respondents

from the firms suggests that directors in older marketing research departments tend to be more satisfied than those in newer departments and that directors in firms producing consumer goods are somewhat more satisfied than their counterparts in firms producing non-consumer goods. These conclusions can only be considered as tentative due to the concentration of firms in the satisfaction range of the scale and the high dispersion of scores on the cross-classification tables.

The average effectiveness scores, with the same range as the satisfaction scores, showed even less dispersion.

Possible range: 1.00 to 4.00

Actual range: 1.33 to 2.51

In fact, the average scores of the role definers in 31 of the 42 firms reveal that they are fairly well satisfied or very well satisfied with the performance of different aspects of the role of the marketing research department, with the role definers in the remaining 11 firms being fairly well satisfied to ambivalent. Thus none of the composite scores for the role definers is in the dissatisfied range for any of the firms included in the microscopic analysis. Again the older departments were perceived as somewhat more effective than the newer departments; but perceived effectiveness rankings do not seem to be related to the type of product produced. These conclusions are subject to the limitations mentioned above.

Interaction scores were based on two factors: (1) the age of the marketing research department, and (2) the amount of contact the respondents have had with the marketing research department. In arriving at an interaction score, the age of the department and the number of years the current director has been in the department were given a double weighting, as demonstrated in the following example.

	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Interaction score</u>
Department is 12 years old	6	2	12
Director has been in department 3 years	2	2	4
Superior has had contact with department for 6 years	4	1	4
Product manager has had contact with department for 8 years	5	1	5
Sales manager has had contact with department for 2 years	2	$\frac{1}{7}$	$\frac{2}{7}$
Totals		$\frac{1}{7}$	$\frac{27}{7} = 3.86^a$

^aAverage interaction score.

The average interaction scores for each firm, ranked from greatest interaction (1) to least interaction (42), can be found in Table 9 of Appendix III and the raw interaction scores are shown in Table 3.

The interaction scores spread out over the maximum possible range of 1.00 (where the departments were established less than two years) to 6.00 (where all of the respondents have had contact with the department for at least 12 years). The following distribution of interaction scores discloses significant spread of the firms on this dimension.

<u>Average years of interaction</u>	<u>Number of firms</u>
Less than two years	4
Two but less than four years	5
Four but less than six years	13
Six but less than eight years	11
Eight years or longer	9
Total	42

Finally, the homogeneity of educational backgrounds was determined by taking the average of the squared differences between the educational background of the director of marketing research and each role definer; hypothetical computations of this measurement follow.

<u>Role definer</u>	<u>Education of role definer</u>	<u>Education of dir. of M.R.</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Squared difference</u>
A	1	5	-4	16
B	2	5	-3	9
C	3	5	-2	4
D	3	5	-2	4
				$\frac{33}{4} = 8.25^a$

^aAverage squared educational difference.

Raw education scores are contained in Table 3 and rankings of firms on the basis of the education score in Table 11 of Appendix III.

The raw education scores ranged from seven scores of .00 (where all the respondents from the firm have attained the same level of education) to 5.00 (where the director of marketing research holds a master's degree while two of the role definers have not gone beyond high school and the other two have bachelor's degrees). This highest education score is considerably below the maximum possible score of 16.00.

24

e:

of

a

a

c

b

h

Hypotheses of Microscopic Role Analysis

Role theory was used to develop a series of hypotheses about the relationships between the above measures of consensus, satisfaction, effectiveness, interaction, and education for the 42 firms included in the microscopic analysis part of the study. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was employed to find the degree of association between these measurements and thus to test the following hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1. The greater the consensus among the role definers, the greater will be the perceived effectiveness of the director of marketing research by the role definers; i.e., there is a positive correlation between the V scores and the average effectiveness scores.

Table 4 of Appendix III presents the paired rankings of the 42 firms on these dimensions and the Spearman rank correlation coefficient of $-.024$ which can be interpreted to mean that the data show no relationship between consensus among role definers on their expectations for the director of marketing research and the degree to which he is perceived to be effective by these role definers. The rejection of this hypothesis shows that role definers in a given firm may vary in their perception of the effectiveness of the marketing research department even if they are in substantial agreement on the dimensions of his role. To take one example, firm 155 was ranked sixth on the basis of the V score, showing high agreement on role expectations,

but it ranked last on the effectiveness measurement. The following effectiveness scores for each of the four role definers from this firm show considerable disagreement on the perceived effectiveness of the director of marketing research.

<u>Role definer</u>	<u>Average effectiveness score</u>
Manager, Market Development (superior)	1.89
Vice-President	2.61
Vice-President, Sales	2.06
Manager, Sales of a Product Line	3.50

While the immediate superior of the director of marketing gave a fairly high rating to the performance of the marketing research department, one of the users of the services of the department is not at all impressed with its effectiveness. Specifically, he is very dissatisfied with the objectivity and creativity of the marketing research department, the soundness of its recommendations, and the return on the firm's investment in marketing research.

The pattern suggested in this example of a high rank on the measurement of consensus among the role definers and a low score on effectiveness does not hold true for all the firms; if it did there would be a high negative correlation between these measurements. The actual correlation coefficient is not significantly different from zero, showing that the two sets of ranks are not associated. Thus knowing how great is the consensus on role expectations in a given firm is of no value in predicting the effectiveness of the marketing research department as perceived by these role definers.

Hypothesis 2. The greater the consensus between the director of marketing research and his role definers, the greater will be the perceived effectiveness of the director of marketing research by the role definers; i.e., there is a positive correlation between the D scores and the average effectiveness scores.

While the Spearman coefficient of .113 reported in Table 5 of Appendix III shows a positive correlation between the D scores and the average effectiveness scores, a "t" test shows that a rank correlation coefficient of this magnitude should not be considered significantly different from zero. Thus Hypothesis 2 is not supported by the data.

Table 5 shows that the firm with the highest D score was ranked twenty-seventh on the effectiveness measurement. Thus the fact that the director of marketing research and his role definers are in substantial agreement on the role of the former does not mean that the research department is necessarily perceived as effective. Knowing the degree of consensus between the director of marketing research and his role definers, therefore, is of no value in predicting the effectiveness of the marketing research department as perceived by these role definers.

Hypothesis 3. The greater the consensus among the role definers, the greater will be the job satisfaction of the director of marketing research; i.e., there is a positive correlation between the V scores and the average

sa

co

fr

tl

e

d

t

r

r

c

e

c

satisfaction scores.

The correlation of these two variables yielded a coefficient of $-.275$ which is not significantly different from zero at the $.05$ level. Table 6 of Appendix III shows that the marketing research director with the next to lowest satisfaction score (firm 293) has designated three role definers who are in substantial agreement in their expectations concerning his role. More than consensus among role definers, therefore, is required to make marketing research directors happy with their roles. In fact, some directors are well satisfied even where there is substantial disagreement among their role definers. The fact that the correlation coefficient turned out to be negative suggests the existence of an inverse relationship between consensus among the role definers and the job satisfaction of the director of marketing research.

Hypothesis 4. The greater the consensus between the role definers and the director of marketing research, the greater will be the job satisfaction of the director of marketing research; i.e., there is a positive correlation between the D scores and the average satisfaction scores.

Again a negative relationship between these measurements has been found with a correlation coefficient of $-.318$ (see Table 7), which is significantly different from zero at the $.05$ level using the "t" test. As a case in point, the firm where the marketing research director is most satisfied with his role ranked thirtieth on the D score, showing

significant disagreement between the research director and his role definers on the role of the former. Thus this hypothesis was not supported and the data suggest the opposite relationship: the greater the lack of consensus between the role definers and the director of marketing research, the greater will be the job satisfaction of the director.

Hypothesis 5. The greater the perceived effectiveness of the director of marketing research by his role definers, the greater will be the job satisfaction of the director of marketing research; i.e., there is a positive correlation between the average effectiveness scores and the average job satisfaction scores.

The rankings of the firms and correlation coefficient of .312 are presented in Table 8 of Appendix III. Being significantly different from zero at the .05 level, this is the only hypothesis of the microscopic analysis which is supported by the data. While this statistic is sufficiently different from zero, it still is of sufficiently low magnitude to support only the cautious conclusion that some relationship exists between the factors that determine the role definers' perception of the effectiveness of the marketing research department and the job satisfaction of the director of marketing research.

Hypothesis 6. There is a direct relationship between interaction and consensus.

ti

se

ar

by

b

s

r

c

f

h

A. Consensus among role definers (V) and interaction scores are positively correlated.

B. Consensus between the director of marketing research and his role definers (D) and interaction scores are positively correlated.

Neither of the interaction hypotheses was supported by the data and, in fact, the relationships turned out to be negative rather than positive as hypothesized. Table 9 shows that length of interaction and consensus among the role definers (V) have a Spearman correlation coefficient of $-.307$, which is significantly different from zero at the $.05$ level. The correlation coefficient between the D scores and the interaction scores of $-.196$ (see Table 10) is not significantly different from zero. Thus a prime tenet of role theory concerning the relationship between interaction and consensus is not supported by these data.

Hypothesis 7. The greater the homogeneity of educational backgrounds between the director of marketing research and his role definers, the greater will be the role consensus; i.e., the D scores and the homogeneity of educational backgrounds are positively correlated.

With a correlation coefficient of $-.085$, this hypothesis is not supported by the data. Thus differences or lack of differences between the educational attainment of the director of marketing research and his role definers are not related to the degree of role consensus in these 42 firms.

Summary

Responses from three or four role definers in addition to the director of marketing research were received from 42 firms, which make up the sample for the microscopic role analysis. The three measures of consensus (V, M, and D) showed that a fair amount of consensus exists among the role definers, and between the role definers and the director of marketing research on the 52 role expectation items which were common to both questionnaires. While there were no cases of perfect consensus, all three measures turned out to be significantly lower than the theoretical maximum scores which would have occurred if extreme positions ("absolutely must" versus "absolutely must not") had been taken on the same items by different individuals in a firm.

Average scores on the 16 job satisfaction items showed that the marketing research directors in 30 of the 42 firms were either very well or fairly well satisfied with their roles, while only three of the directors were at the other extreme, expressing dissatisfaction with their roles. On the whole, the role definers were well satisfied with the performance of the marketing research department, with the lowest satisfaction score for the 42 firms being 2.51 or the theoretical midpoint of the four point satisfaction scale. Other measurements included length of interaction among the respondents in a firm and homogeneity of their educational backgrounds. Of the eight hypotheses concerning relationships among these variables, the

Spe
bu
ti
ti
th
we
no
t
w
a
t
c
c
f
c

Spearman correlation coefficient revealed a significant, but not high, positive association between perceived effectiveness on the part of the role definers and job satisfaction on the part of the director of marketing research, thus supporting this hypothesis. Five other hypotheses were not supported since the correlation coefficients were not significantly different from zero. And these two statistically significant negative correlations occurred which were the opposite of the hypothesized relationships: (1) an inverse relationship between the job satisfaction of the director of marketing research and D, the measurement of consensus between the role definers and the director of marketing research, and (2) a negative relationship between the measurement of interaction and V, the measurement of consensus among the role definers.

S

i

C

A

T

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The establishment of marketing research departments in American corporations has paralleled the development of marketing as a discipline. The earliest marketing research departments in industrial firms were formed by such pioneers in marketing thought as Paul H. Nystrom and L. D. H. Weld. While the growth of marketing research departments was persistent during the second 25 years of this century, it was not until the decade of the 1950's that marketing research departments became common in a majority of large industrial firms. This rapid increase in number of departments during the past fifteen years has accompanied the widespread acceptance of the marketing concept with its emphasis on market information. Wroe Alderson has specified the use of marketing research as a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for the implementation of the marketing concept. The survey of the Fortune 500 firms indicated that approximately four out of every five industrial firms that responded had fulfilled this necessary condition of a market orientation by 1965.

Many people have questioned whether these marketing

re

so

is

be

in

te

ye

un

p

p

o

v

l

f

c

c

s

research departments have an impact on planning and problem solving in their firms. John E. Jeuck's article in 1953 is the most lucid negative response to this question. He believed that few, if any, of the notable successes in business were aided by marketing research. In more specific terms, marketing researchers have been criticized over the years for their "ivory tower" approach, their failure to understand management's point of view, their inability to produce information in time for a decision to be made, their preoccupation with research techniques, their concealment of results in technical jargon, their depreciation of the value of executive experience, and, more recently, their lack of imagination and creativity. From a more theoretical viewpoint, social scientists have questioned whether objective, scientific research can be conducted in a bureaucratic organization. In their book, Organizational Stress, Robert L. Kahn et al. concluded that change-oriented roles in a bureaucracy, such as that of a marketing researcher, are not well defined, i.e., ambiguous, and that successful performance of these roles brings the individual into conflict with the remainder of the organization. Thus these individuals infer that there is likely to be relatively little consensus concerning the role of the marketing researcher in bureaucratic corporations.

While the problem of integrating marketing research into the decision-making processes of an organization has been discussed for years, few reports of empirical studies

of this problem are available. This dissertation was designed to partially fill that void. Role theory was adopted as the conceptual approach to study the position of the director of marketing research in large industrial corporations. A mail survey of occupants of this focal position, their immediate superiors, and the users of the services of marketing research departments produced information about expectations for the role of the director of marketing research, job satisfaction of the directors, and the effectiveness of marketing research departments as perceived by the role definers of the directors. Macroscopic analysis of these data treated all marketing research directors as one sample and all role definers as another sample, and then determined whether they came from the same universe of opinions concerning expectations for the role of the director of marketing research. The following hypotheses were checked against the responses of these groups to specific questionnaire items to determine the congruence between the data and the hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1. Directors of marketing research will place more emphasis than their role definers on the need to maintain an interest in a study after a final report has been submitted. Supported.

Hypothesis 2. Directors of marketing research will place more emphasis than their role definers on the professional and methodological aspects of the job. Not supported.

Hypothesis 3. Directors of marketing research and

role definers will be equally concerned about having the researcher understand the problem before beginning the research. Supported.

Hypothesis 4. Directors of marketing research will place more importance on their role in formulating marketing strategies than will their role definers. Supported.

Hypothesis 5. On the questions concerning judgment, role definers will place a greater emphasis on executive judgment than will the directors of marketing research, while the directors will place more emphasis on their own judgment than will the role definers. Supported in part.¹

Hypothesis 6. Role definers will be more concerned than the directors of marketing research with getting the research results in time. Not supported.

Hypothesis 7. Directors of marketing research will be more concerned than their role definers about having a procedure to bring major decisions to the marketing research department. Supported.

Hypothesis 8. Directors of marketing research will place greater emphasis on maintaining their objectivity than will their role definers. Not supported.

Hypothesis 9. With regard to evaluation of the marketing research department, directors of marketing research will place heavier emphasis on scientific excellence

¹The second part of the hypothesis was supported, but the first part was not supported.

than will the role definers, while role definers will be more concerned with the data's usefulness than will the marketing research directors. Not supported.

With the above areas of agreement and disagreement between the aggregate samples of marketing research directors and role definers recognized the microscopic role analysis concentrated on the degree of role consensus in individual firms and its relationship to job satisfaction, perceived effectiveness, interaction, and education of the respondents. Role theory suggested the following hypotheses which were tested by rank correlations of measurements of these variables for 42 firms, from which a response had been received from the director of marketing research and three or four role definers.

Hypothesis 1. The greater the consensus among the role definers, the greater will be the perceived effectiveness of the director of marketing research by the role definers; i.e., there is a positive correlation between the V scores and the average effectiveness scores. Not supported.

Hypothesis 2. The greater the consensus between the director of marketing research and his role definers, the greater will be the perceived effectiveness of the director of marketing research by the role definers; i.e., there is a positive correlation between the D scores and the average effectiveness scores. Not supported.

Hypothesis 3. The greater the consensus among the

role definers, the greater will be the job satisfaction of the director of marketing research; i.e., there is a positive correlation between the V scores and the average satisfaction scores. Not supported.

Hypothesis 4. The greater the consensus between the role definers and the director of marketing research, the greater will be the job satisfaction of the director of marketing research; i.e., there is a positive correlation between the D scores and the average satisfaction scores. Not supported.²

Hypothesis 5. The greater the perceived effectiveness of the director of marketing research by his role definers, the greater will be the job satisfaction of the director of marketing research; i.e., there is a positive correlation between the average effectiveness scores and the average job satisfaction scores. Supported.

Hypothesis 6. There is a direct relationship between interaction and consensus.

A. Consensus among role definers (V) and interaction scores are positively correlated. Not supported.³

B. Consensus between the director of marketing research and his role definers (D) and interaction scores

²The rank correlation yielded a statistically significant negative association between these two variables.

³The rank correlation yielded a statistically significant negative association between these two variables.

are positively correlated. Not supported.

Hypothesis 7. The greater the homogeneity of educational backgrounds between the director of marketing research and his role definers, the greater will be the role consensus; i.e., the D scores and the homogeneity of educational backgrounds are positively correlated. Not supported.

Conclusions

Numerous conclusions have been drawn from the study and presented throughout the text. They are summarized below in the framework of the study's five objectives.

Objective 1. To determine the degree of consensus between management and the director of marketing research on significant dimensions of the role of the latter in large industrial firms.

The macroscopic role analysis showed that significant intrapositional and interpositional consensus concerning the expectations for the director of marketing research were held by occupants of the focal position, the men to whom they reported, and the users of the services of marketing research departments. With the exception of a few items where the answers were widely distributed, the modal responses of the above groups did not differ by more than one point on the five point scale, i.e., "absolutely must" versus "preferably should." There were no statistically significant differences between the responses of the two

groups of role definers to any of the expectation items. Thus the responses of the superiors and the responses of the other role definers can be considered as having been drawn from the same universe of beliefs concerning the role of the director of marketing research. However, there were statistically significant differences between the views of the role definers and the marketing research directors. Using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test and the .05 significance level, the responses of the 50 superiors were significantly different from the responses of the 76 marketing research directors on 6 (11.5 percent) of the 52 role expectation items. The views of the 138 users were significantly different from those of the 76 directors on 17 (32.7 percent) of the items. Thus, when the data were aggregated according to positions, it revealed relatively little disagreement between the marketing research directors and the men to whom they reported, and moderate disagreement between the directors and the users of their departments' services.

The microscopic role analysis concentrated on consensus among role definers and between role definers and the director of marketing research. While the degree of role consensus varied from firm to firm, the actual ranges of scores for 42 firms were less than 20 percent of the ranges that would have occurred if extreme points of view had been expressed by the respondents in a given firm. Thus there were no cases of extreme disagreement among members of a given role set.

ex

se

ti

ic

m

t

d

m

a

t

s

r

l

The study revealed more agreement concerning the expectations for the role of the director of marketing research than was anticipated from reading Kahn. Most of the differences which occurred represented shadings of opinions rather than markedly different points of view. Most marketing research directors have a realistic picture of their role in these large industrial firms. And most role definers have a reasonable idea of what to expect from the marketing research department. There are, however, some areas of role ambiguity and role conflict. No human relationship ever reaches perfect equilibrium. Nor is it desirable that such an equilibrium should be achieved in the relationship between the marketing research director and his role definers.

Objective 2. To determine areas of role consensus, role conflict, and role ambiguity.

There was general agreement among all role definers that the purpose of marketing research is to "produce information which reduces the area of uncertainty in management decisions." In doing this, most respondents agreed that the researcher must consult with an executive before starting a research project to be sure that he understands the objectives of the executive and the problem which must be solved. When the research is completed, strong emphasis must be placed on the understandability of the research report and on the importance of executive judgment in the decision-making process. In addition, most marketing research

di

in

ar

of

t

a

b

p

r

c

.

directors believed that research results must be translated into positive courses of action for management to follow and that the marketing research director must have the right of follow-up after a study is completed. In addition to these imperatives, all three groups of respondents generally agreed that the director of marketing research should be up-to-date on research methodology and should review past studies to determine whether the methodology might have been improved.

Role ambiguity centered on the formal authority of the marketing research director and his relationship to his superior, the desirability of meeting deadlines if he is not certain of the validity of his data, the price which the director of marketing research should pay to maintain his objectivity, and the question of whether to participate in politically expedient activities, such as providing information to support decisions which have already been made by a marketing executive. Also, all groups of respondents disagreed about the use of scientific excellence and objectivity as the primary basis to evaluate the work of the marketing research department.

The greatest role conflict concerned the extent to which the director of marketing research should go beyond the typical staff prerogatives and actively participate in formulating marketing strategy. While most directors favored enlargement of their activities and an active role in this regard, many users of their services seemed

jealous of their decision-making authority and believed that the activities of the marketing research department should be limited to research and recommendations. For example, the modal group of users believed that the marketing research director may or may not "take the initiative in finding ways to improve the marketing strategy of the firm." On the other hand, the superiors thought the research director should take this initiative, but only on the basis of research findings. The superiors seemed less concerned with the judgment of the marketing researcher than with his ability to objectively study problems facing the firm.

Objective 3. To determine the extent to which the marketing research department is perceived to be effective by management.

Two groups of items on the schedule completed by the role definers sought out their perceptions of the effectiveness of the marketing research departments in their firms. The average responses of the role definers over all the effectiveness items showed that superiors perceived the marketing research departments to be slightly more effective than did the users. However, no statistically significant differences between the responses of these two groups were found for any of the 18 effectiveness items. Analysis of the data also showed that role definers who were concerned primarily with consumer goods in their work gave the marketing research department a somewhat higher effectiveness score than role definers who were concerned

pr

de

ce

le

ir

de

o

i

i

r

t

r

c

primarily with non-consumer products. However, 40 role definers who have had marketing research experience perceived their marketing research departments to be somewhat less effective than their counterparts who have never worked in a marketing research department.

Looking at specific items, the modal groups of role definers were very well satisfied with "the objectivity of the marketing research department" and fairly well satisfied with the "marketing research department's understanding of problems studied," the "timing of marketing research reports," "the value of marketing research information," the "proper use of research methodology" by these departments, the soundness of their recommendations, the relevance of their data to decisions, the "return on investment in marketing research," their creativity, and the "timing of marketing research reports." Some respondents, of course, were dissatisfied with the performance of marketing research departments on each of these criteria, with more than 20 percent of the role definers expressing dissatisfaction with the "creativity" and "timing" dimensions. This dissatisfaction with creativity was manifested by the disagreement of about one-third of the role definers with the statement that "the marketing research department plays an important part in initiating changes in the marketing strategies of the firm" and the disagreement of almost 44 percent of those respondents with the statement that "the marketing research department often comes up with valuable alternative

CC

Ma

f.

re

i

G

S

t

t

I

Y

courses of action which were never before considered by management." In another vein, 30 percent of the role definers disagreed with the statement that "the marketing research function is a well integrated part of the marketing activity of the firm."

Thus the macroscopic analysis showed that most role definers were satisfied with the work of the marketing research departments, while a substantial minority believed that marketing research could make a greater contribution to their firms. This conclusion is illustrated by the comments of one director of marketing who was interviewed. He rated his firm's marketing research department high on objectivity and professional competence, but hoped they would do more innovative work in the future. He believed that the marketing research department should continually prod management with new ideas to keep them from becoming complacent.

For the microscopic role analysis, an average effectiveness score for all the role definers in a given firm was calculated. While the possible range of these scores went from "very well satisfied" to "very dissatisfied" (1.0 to 4.0), the actual scores for the 42 firms ranged from 1.33 to 2.51. Thus the role definers in most of these firms were very well satisfied or fairly well satisfied with the performance of their marketing research departments, with the lowest score of 2.51 (the theoretical midpoint of the 4 point scale) revealing that none of these departments

was perceived as ineffective.

Objective 4. To determine the marketing research director's degree of satisfaction with his role.

The average response of the 76 marketing research directors to the 16 job satisfaction items was 1.9 on the 4 point satisfaction scale. While this response reveals that the respondents as a group were fairly well satisfied with their roles, there was significant dispersion from item to item and from firm to firm. The latter variation was shown by the satisfaction scores for the 42 marketing research directors included in the microscopic role analysis; these scores ranged from 1.19 to 3.44 (possible range: 1.00 to 4.00). Thirty of the 42 directors were in the "satisfied" range of the scale, three were in the "dissatisfied" range, and the remaining nine directors were in the middle range of the scale. Thus the satisfaction scores of the marketing research directors showed greater dispersion than the effectiveness scores of the role definers in these same firms.

Responses to individual items revealed that most research directors were satisfied with their ability to pursue research studies objectively, the support received from superiors and other high level executives, and their freedom to follow up reports. The modal group of research directors was fairly well satisfied with the open-mindedness of marketing executives, the value which they placed

on marketing research, and the acceptance of marketing research results by management. While the researchers were also generally satisfied with the extent to which they could help define the problems to be studied by their departments, 34 percent were dissatisfied with the procedure for bringing problems to the marketing research departments. Areas of significant variation from director to director included: (1) the part played in formulating marketing strategy (34 percent dissatisfied); (2) the budgets for their departments (21 percent dissatisfied); (3) their contact with marketing executives (18 percent dissatisfied); (4) the time available to improve themselves professionally (46 percent dissatisfied); and (5) the location of the marketing research department in the corporate organization structure (21 percent dissatisfied). While the dispersion of responses was smaller, 28 percent of the marketing research directors were dissatisfied with the time deadlines which were placed on marketing research studies.

Thus, the macroscopic role analysis has shown that marketing research directors were generally satisfied with the acceptance of marketing research in their firms, their relationships with other executives, and the climate for conducting objective research. There was significant dissatisfaction with budgets of time and money and with the location of the marketing research department in the corporate organizational structure. When the satisfaction items and the role expectation items are both considered,

however, the most significant dissatisfaction pertained to the procedure for bringing problems to the attention of the marketing research department and the role of the director of marketing research in formulating marketing strategy.

Objective 5. To determine the relationships among consensus, perceived effectiveness, and job satisfaction.

The theory of role prompted a number of hypotheses concerning relationships among these variables which were tested in the microscopic part of the analysis. A statistically significant, but low, positive correlation was found between the satisfaction of the director of marketing research and the extent to which he is perceived to be effective by his role definers. Contrary to Hypothesis 4, the data revealed a statistically significant inverse relationship between the job satisfaction of the director of marketing research and the degree of consensus between the director and his role definers. Three other hypotheses concerning relationships among the two measures of consensus, job satisfaction, and perceived effectiveness were not supported since the rank correlation coefficients were not significantly different from zero.

If role theory had been applied to the relationship between the director of marketing research and the management of his firm without empirical verification, some highly misleading conclusions would have been forthcoming from this dissertation. For example, as a result of the

microscopic role analysis, there is no justification to recommend the need for greater consensus concerning the role of the director of marketing research. In fact, the data collected in this study indicates that role theory is an oversimplified explanation of complex organizational relationships.

Synthesis

Do marketing research departments have an impact on planning and problem solving in their firms? This is the basic question which prompted this investigation. The research shows that marketing research departments are making a definite contribution to their firms; however, both the research directors and their role definers agreed that the contribution could be significantly greater. Before presenting specific recommendations for expanding the impact of marketing research departments, it is necessary to state generalizations concerning some of the popular explanations for the ineffectiveness of marketing research in light of the present study.

Objective marketing research can be accomplished in a bureaucratic business organization. Most marketing research directors were well satisfied with their ability to do objective research and most role definers were well satisfied with the objectivity of the marketing research departments. The fact that researchers occasionally must do the politically expedient thing to maintain a favorable

WC

20

SC

W

S

d

S

E

f

N

.

working relationship with management was not perceived as adversely affecting their objectivity.

Marketing researchers are aware of the need to present their research findings clearly and most role definers were satisfied with the understandability of marketing research reports. If any improvements are to be made, role definers would appreciate more information concerning research methodology in the research reports.

Director of marketing research is not a dead-end position in many firms. The Fortune 500 survey revealed that 30 percent of the former marketing research directors now occupy line management positions in industry. With upward mobility from this position, better qualified individuals should be attracted to marketing research.

Marketing research directors are aware of the need to provide information in time to make decisions. In fact, they were more willing than their role definers to meet deadlines, even if they are not confident of the validity of their data. A significant problem in this regard is the lack of a procedure to bring problems to the marketing research departments. In many cases deadlines are not met because a request for information was received too late.

Most marketing research directors are not preoccupied with research techniques at the expense of understanding management problems. Directors tend to identify more with management than with academic researchers. The hypotheses concerning the emphasis researchers place on professional

an

by

ti

ic

by

n

n

i

e

c

c

s

and methodological aspects of their roles were not supported by the data. In fact, role definers placed more emphasis than did researchers on the need for up-to-date methodological approaches to problems. This can be explained partially by the fact that many researchers indicated that they do not have the time to keep up on advances in research techniques.

Marketing research directors realized that their information is only one input in the decision-making process. Sixty-five of the 76 respondents believed the director of marketing research absolutely must "recognize the value of executive judgment in decision making" and the remaining 11 answered "preferably should" to this item.

Marketing research directors recognized the need to look at problems from management's point of view and to provide information which meets the needs of management. Only nine of the 188 role definers were dissatisfied with the "marketing research department's understanding of problems studied."

Directors of marketing research are not "ivory tower" idealists. They are eager to become involved in the formulation of marketing strategy since they recognize that such involvement enables them to bring problems to their departments in time to do sound research and to make recommendations that deal with variables that management can control. Such involvement is not without its dangers, however. Wroe Alderson has stated: "Something is to be said for allowing

marketing research to remain purely objective, rather than having to defend a plan as the product manager does."⁴ Thus there should be a point beyond which the marketing research director should not become involved in formulating marketing strategy. Recognizing the frustrations of pure staff work and the desire to have one's ideas put into effect, many research directors should eventually be promoted into positions with decision-making responsibility. This procedure may not be applicable for the small number of marketing research directors who view themselves as professional researchers; but in most instances, periodic promotion of the marketing research director will enable marketing research departments to maintain the proper balance between objectivity and involvement in strategy formulation. This practice has the additional advantage of placing men with marketing research experience in management positions. These individuals will use the services of the marketing research department intelligently and, as the survey shows, they will also exact higher standards of service from research departments. In the long run, higher standards will undoubtedly improve the effectiveness of the marketing research activity.

⁴Wroe Alderson and Paul E. Green, Planning and Problem Solving in Marketing (Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1964), p. 7.

Recommendations

These generalizations and other findings of the study induced the following specific recommendations for improving the contribution of marketing research to the decision-making process.

1. The marketing research director should report to either the director of marketing or to a high-level general management official.

2. The formal authority and responsibilities of the marketing research director should be clearly delineated. Specifically, his relationship to his superior, his authority to undertake studies on his own initiative, and his responsibility for the services of outside marketing research agencies should be defined.

3. The director of marketing research should serve on committees which formulate marketing strategy.

4. A workable procedure for bringing problems to the attention of the marketing research department should be devised.

5. The marketing research director should have the right of follow-up after a report has been submitted.

6. The marketing research director and members of his department should be given time off periodically to keep up-to-date on advances in research methodology.

7. Researchers should have the right to question the objectives of management in a problem area before beginning research on that problem.

8. Researchers should be open to suggestions concerning research methodology from members of management for whom they are doing research.

9. Researchers must be creative in analyzing the results of their investigations and in analyzing the overall marketing effort of the firm. They should not hesitate to suggest changes which they believe are justified.

10. The marketing research director and members of his department should be considered for promotion to positions with decision-making responsibilities.

Suggestions for Future Research

This study was limited to the role of the marketing research director. Similar studies of the roles of marketing research analysts and users of the services of the marketing research department would also be valuable. With 60 percent of the users who responded to this study occupying staff positions, there is also a need to investigate the complex decision-making process to determine methods for better integration of marketing research into this process. Related to this question of integration is the need for a more detailed investigation to determine the ideal location of the marketing research activity in the corporate organizational structure. While this study has shown that it is preferable to have the director of marketing research report to a line management official, there is still the question of whether his superior should be the

top marketing executive or a high level general management official. Research into these areas would undoubtedly yield additional recommendations to improve the effectiveness of marketing research departments.

APPENDIX I

SURVEY OF FORTUNE 500 FIRMS

Table 1

PERCENTAGE OF FIRMS HAVING MARKETING RESEARCH DEPARTMENTS
(Compiled from eight studies: 1923 to 1965)

Year	Source of study	Number of returns	Percentage with research departments ^a
1923	L.D.H. Weld ¹	62 ^b	29%
1939	U.S. Department of Commerce ²	556 ^b	32
1945	National Industrial Conference Board ³	154 ^b	49
1953	American Management Association ⁴	180 ^b	69
1957	American Management Association ⁵	239 ^b	51
1957	American Marketing Association ⁶	315 ^c 480 ^d	78 ^c 81 ^d
1963	American Marketing Association ⁷	315 ^c 520 ^d	83 ^c 83 ^d
1965	Present study	101 ^c 172 ^d 90 ^e	83 ^c 81 ^d 82 ^e

^aA department is defined as one or more staff individuals responsible for marketing research.

^bRespondents included a limited number of non-manufacturing firms.

^cManufacturers of consumer goods.

^dManufacturers of non-consumer (industrial) goods.

^eManufacturers of both consumer and non-consumer goods.

¹L.D.H. Weld, "The Progress of Commercial Research," Harvard Business Review, I (January, 1923), 179.

²E. S. Moulten, Marketing Research Activities of Manufacturers, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, United States Department of Commerce, Marketing Research Series No. 21, April, 1939.

³G. Clark Thompson, Organization for Market Research (Part I, Industry Experience), Studies in Business Policy, No. 12, New York: National Industrial Conference Board, Inc., 1945.

⁴Richard D. Crisp, Company Practices in Marketing Research, Research Report No. 22, New York: American Management Association, 1953.

⁵Richard D. Crisp, Marketing Research Organization and Operation, Research Study Number 35, New York: American Management Association, 1958.

⁶American Marketing Association, A Survey of Marketing Research, Chicago: American Marketing Association, 1957.

⁷Dik Warren Twedt (ed.), A Survey of Marketing Research, Chicago: American Marketing Association, 1963.

Table 2

LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT
AT WHICH MARKETING RESEARCH DIRECTORS REPORT

Management level	All firms	New position ^a	Old position ^b
Top management ^c	15%	22%	11%
Other corporate or general management	8	11	7
Sales or marketing management	61	53	66
Development, research planning	14	13	14
Other	1	2	1
No response to this question	<u>1</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>2</u>
Totals	100%	101% ^d	101% ^d
Base	297	114	183

^aNew position is defined as one where the current marketing research director had no predecessor.

^bOld position is defined as one where the current marketing research director had a predecessor.

^cTop management is defined as board chairman, president, and executive vice president.

^dRounding error.

Table 3

REPORTING PATTERNS OF MARKETING RESEARCH DIRECTORS
(Compiled from six studies: 1923 to 1965)

Year	Source of study	No. of firms with research department	Percentage reporting to:		
			General management ^a	Marketing management	Others
1923	L.D.H. Weld ¹	18	50%	50%	
1945	National Industrial Conference Board ²	154	39	31	30%
1957	American Management Association ³	123	18	63	19
1957	American Marketing Association ⁴	185 ^b 260 ^c	27 ^b 25 ^c	65 ^b 59 ^c	8 ^b 16 ^c
1963	American Marketing Association ⁵	246 ^b 413 ^c	18 ^b 12 ^c	64 ^b 67 ^c	18 ^b 21 ^c
1965	Present study	83 ^b 136 ^c 74 ^d	23 ^b 27 ^c 18 ^d	69 ^b 56 ^c 64 ^d	8 ^b 17 ^c 19 ^d

^aIncludes top management and other non-functional executives such as manager of an operating division.

^bManufacturers of consumer goods.

^cManufacturers of non-consumer (industrial) goods.

^dManufacturers of both consumer and non-consumer goods.

¹L.D.H. Weld, "The Progress of Commercial Research," Harvard Business Review, I (January, 1923), 180.

²G. Clark Thompson, Organization for Market Research (Part I, Industry Experience), Studies in Business Policy, No. 12, New York: National Industrial Conference Board, Inc., 1945.

³Richard D. Crisp, Marketing Research Organization and Operation, Research Study Number 35, New York: American Management Association, 1958.

⁴American Marketing Association, A Survey of Marketing Research, Chicago: American Marketing Association, 1957.

⁵Dik Warren Twedt (ed.), A Survey of Marketing Research, Chicago: American Marketing Association, 1963.

APPENDIX II

MACROSCOPIC ROLE ANALYSIS

Table 1

Responses To Role Expectation Items

Items	Sample	Mean	Var.	N	Responses				Significance Tests	
					AM	PS	MAN	PSN	AMN	Samples K.-S. Wil.
(1) Help management define the problems to be studied.	D	1.41	0.27	73	44	28	1	0	0	D-S n.s.
	S	1.75	0.45	48	18	24	6	0	0	D-U .05
	U	1.81	0.55	137	52	60	24	1	0	S-U n.s.
(2) Write articles for professional journals in the fields of marketing or research methodology which will be of benefit to marketing researchers in other business organizations.	D	2.77	0.38	73	0	23	45	4	1	D-S n.s.
	S	3.00	0.38	48	0	8	33	6	1	D-U n.s.
	U	2.91	0.26	137	1	22	103	11	0	S-U n.s.
(3) Measure his performance primarily by the extent to which marketing research results are used in decision-making.	D	2.00	0.83	76	23	36	13	2	2	D-S n.s.
	S	2.35	1.11	49	9	23	11	3	3	D-U n.s.
	U	2.36	1.24	136	31	54	30	13	8	S-U n.s.
(4) Realize that he does not have a monopoly on information which is relevant to a particular decision.	D	1.47	1.16	76	59	9	1	3	4	D-S n.s.
	S	1.39	0.66	49	37	7	4	0	1	D-U n.s.
	U	1.50	0.94	138	99	22	8	5	4	S-U n.s.
(5) Be involved in formulating marketing strategy for the firm.	D	1.79	0.54	76	28	38	8	2	0	D-S n.s.
	S	2.14	0.63	49	9	27	10	3	0	D-U .05
	U	2.21	0.78	138	29	63	35	10	1	S-U n.s.
(6) Maintain an active interest in a given study until after the recommendations are implemented by management.	D	1.53	0.36	76	40	32	4	0	0	D-S n.s.
	S	1.66	0.51	50	22	25	1	2	0	D-U .05
	U	1.87	0.53	137	41	77	16	2	1	S-U n.s.

Table 1 (Continued)

Items	Sample	Mean	Var.	N	Responses				Significance Tests	
					AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN	Samples K.-S. Wil.
(7) Become familiar with the objectives of management in a given area before beginning a marketing research project in that area.	D	1.37	0.45	76	55	15	5	1	0	D-S n.s. n.s.
	S	1.38	0.44	50	36	9	5	0	0	D-U n.s. n.s.
	U	1.31	0.39	138	104	27	6	0	1	S-U n.s. ---
(8) Critically review past studies to determine whether the methodology might have been improved.	D	1.59	0.56	76	42	24	9	1	0	D-S n.s. n.s.
	S	1.64	0.44	50	23	22	5	0	0	D-U n.s. n.s.
	U	1.51	0.53	138	81	47	7	2	1	S-U n.s. ---
(9) Produce information which reduces the area of uncertainty in management decisions.	D	1.21	0.20	75	60	14	1	0	0	D-S n.s. n.s.
	S	1.28	0.29	50	38	10	2	0	0	D-U n.s. .01
	U	1.39	0.39	138	93	37	7	1	0	S-U n.s. ---
(10) Recognize the value of executive judgment in decision making.	D	1.14	0.13	76	65	11	0	0	0	D-S .05 .01
	S	1.54	0.46	50	28	17	5	0	0	D-U n.s. .01
	U	1.38	0.38	138	92	41	4	0	1	S-U n.s. ---
(11) Be responsible for showing the contribution of marketing research to the profitability of the firm.	D	2.11	0.82	76	22	28	23	2	1	D-S n.s. .05
	S	2.54	1.07	50	9	14	20	5	2	D-U n.s. n.s.
	U	2.37	1.18	137	34	43	40	15	5	S-U n.s. ---
(12) Offer early indications of findings to management when requested even though a conclusive investigation may prove them to be wrong.	D	2.84	1.46	75	12	20	16	22	5	D-S n.s. n.s.
	S	2.58	1.27	50	9	18	9	13	1	D-U n.s. n.s.
	U	2.67	1.17	138	18	51	34	29	6	S-U n.s. ---

Items	Sample	Mean	Var.	N	Responses				Significance Tests		
					AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN	Samples	K.-S. Wil.
(13) Make contributions to the development of marketing theory.	D S U	2.24 2.38 2.20	0.58 0.44 0.44	76 50 137	12 5 18	36 21 74	27 24 44	0 0 1	1 0 0	D-S D-U S-U	n.s. n.s. n.s.
(14) Be able to translate marketing research results into positive courses of action for management to follow.	D S U	1.43 2.02 2.12	0.46 0.63 0.94	76 50 138	48 13 41	25 25 54	2 10 31	0 2 10	1 0 2	D-S D-U S-U	.01 .01 n.s.
(15) After a study is completed, accept the judgment of the marketing executive who requested the study as final.	D S U	2.82 2.76 2.49	1.14 0.92 0.86	76 50 138	11 5 24	11 12 37	42 26 65	5 4 9	7 3 3	D-S D-U S-U	n.s. n.s. n.s.
(16) Take on temporary line management responsibilities from time to time to implement his research findings if there is no one else in the firm qualified to do so.	D S U	2.80 3.30 3.33	1.01 0.87 0.99	76 50 136	7 2 2	23 7 31	27 18 38	16 20 50	3 3 15	D-S D-U S-U	n.s. .05 n.s.
(17) Initiate changes in the marketing strategy of the firm whenever possible.	D S U	2.67 2.98 3.38	0.95 1.12 1.38	75 50 138	9 2 8	22 17 23	32 16 47	9 10 29	3 5 31	D-S D-U S-U	n.s. .01 n.s.
(18) Devote part of his time and resources to improving his methodological approach to problems.	D S U	1.62 1.62 1.75	0.51 0.32 0.58	76 50 138	37 21 57	33 27 63	4 2 15	2 0 2	0 0 1	D-S D-U S-U	n.s. n.s. n.s.

Items	Sample	Mean	Var.	N	Responses				Significance Tests		
					AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN	Samples	K.-S. Wil.
(19) Provide information to support decisions which have already been made by a marketing executive.	D	3.07	1.05	76	6	11	39	12	8	D-S	n.s.
	S	3.10	1.19	50	3	11	21	8	7	D-U	n.s.
	U	3.14	1.03	138	7	26	60	30	15	S-U	n.s.
(20) Resist involvement in policy making to maintain his objective approach to problems.	D	3.79	0.92	76	2	5	17	35	17	D-S	.01
	S	3.18	1.13	50	3	10	17	15	5	D-U	.01
	U	2.90	1.20	138	15	36	44	34	9	S-U	n.s.
(21) Withhold certain marketing research information when it is expedient to do so.	D	4.04	0.83	74	1	3	14	30	26	D-S	n.s.
	S	4.20	1.33	49	2	3	7	8	29	D-U	.01
	U	4.41	0.85	136	4	2	11	36	83	S-U	n.s.
(22) Anticipate future decisions and have information ready when requested by management.	D	1.88	0.35	76	17	52	6	1	0	D-S	.01
	S	2.38	0.98	50	7	25	13	2	3	D-U	.01
	U	2.35	0.70	138	15	73	41	5	4	S-U	n.s.
(23) Have the final say concerning the methodology which will be used on a given study.	D	1.71	0.58	76	33	34	8	0	1	D-S	n.s.
	S	1.86	0.49	50	16	25	9	0	0	D-U	.01
	U	2.06	0.99	138	45	55	27	7	4	S-U	n.s.
(24) Take the initiative in finding ways to improve the marketing efforts of the firm.	D	1.67	0.50	75	34	33	7	1	0	D-S	n.s.
	S	1.94	0.75	50	17	22	8	3	0	D-U	.01
	U	2.22	0.99	138	40	42	44	10	2	S-U	n.s.

Items	Sample	Mean	Var.	N	AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN	Samples	K.-S. Wil.
(25) Consult at length with the executive requesting a study to make certain he understands the problem before conducting the actual research.											
	D	1.33	0.33	76	55	17	4	0	0	D-S	n.s.
	S	1.26	0.20	50	37	13	0	0	0	D-U	n.s.
	U	1.21	0.27	138	114	21	1	2	0	S-U	---
(26) Expect all members of marketing management to utilize the services of the marketing research department.											
	D	2.46	1.00	76	11	33	21	8	3	D-S	n.s.
	S	2.58	1.60	50	10	17	14	2	7	D-U	n.s.
	U	2.37	0.94	138	23	62	36	13	4	S-U	---
(27) Place strong emphasis on the understandability of his final report.											
	D	1.14	0.15	76	66	9	1	0	0	D-S	n.s.
	S	1.24	0.31	49	40	6	3	0	0	D-U	n.s.
	U	1.24	0.37	138	112	23	1	0	2	S-U	---
(28) Give his frank opinion to marketing executives even if it will hurt their position in the firm.											
	D	1.97	0.85	74	26	29	15	3	1	D-S	n.s.
	S	1.88	0.57	49	17	21	11	0	0	D-U	n.s.
	U	1.78	0.78	137	64	45	23	4	1	S-U	---
(29) Request permission from a member of marketing management before initiating a study concerning his operation.											
	D	2.24	0.90	76	18	30	21	6	1	D-S	n.s.
	S	2.26	0.89	50	11	20	15	3	1	D-U	n.s.
	U	1.89	0.68	138	52	52	31	3	0	S-U	---
(30) Include a detailed discussion of research methodology in all marketing research reports.											
	D	3.42	0.78	76	3	5	31	31	6	D-S	n.s.
	S	3.28	0.70	50	2	4	24	18	2	D-U	.05
	U	3.17	0.86	138	6	23	58	43	8	S-U	---

Items	Sample	Mean	Var.	N	Responses				Significance Tests		
					AM	PS	M-M	PSN	AMN	Samples	K-S. Wil.
(31) Report apparent resistance to the acceptance of marketing research findings to his superior.	D	2.43	0.70	76	7	37	26	4	2	D-S	n.s.
	S	2.06	0.79	50	14	23	9	4	0	D-U	n.s.
	U	2.27	0.87	138	25	69	29	12	3	S-U	n.s.
(32) Be creative as well as objective in analyzing the results of a marketing research study.	D	1.59	0.83	76	45	23	4	2	2	D-S	n.s.
	S	1.80	0.98	50	23	20	2	4	1	D-U	.01
	U	2.02	1.12	138	48	60	15	9	6	S-U	n.s.
(33) Consider the job of his department to be completed when the research report has been submitted to management.	D	4.14	0.93	76	1	2	18	19	36	D-S	n.s.
	S	3.90	1.11	50	2	3	9	20	16	D-U	n.s.
	U	3.86	1.04	138	3	14	23	58	40	S-U	.05
(34) Conduct research for every major marketing decision where a choice must be made between feasible alternative courses of action.	D	2.89	1.04	75	5	23	27	15	5	D-S	n.s.
	S	3.06	0.79	50	0	13	26	6	5	D-U	n.s.
	U	3.05	0.82	138	3	33	67	24	11	S-U	n.s.
(35) Initiate a procedure for bringing marketing problems to the attention of his department.	D	1.93	0.46	76	19	44	12	1	0	D-S	n.s.
	S	2.18	0.60	50	8	27	14	0	1	D-U	.01
	U	2.18	0.76	138	27	72	28	9	2	S-U	n.s.
(36) Be responsible for all contract marketing research conducted by outside research firms.	D	1.63	0.58	76	37	33	4	1	1	D-S	n.s.
	S	1.48	0.50	50	31	15	3	1	0	D-U	.05
	U	1.75	0.82	138	69	43	19	6	1	S-U	n.s.

1-4540000
TELETYPE

2

Items	Sample	Mean	Var.	N	Response					Significance tests		
					AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN	Samples	K.-S.	Wil.

(37) Get approval from his superior for all research studies undertaken by his department.	D	2.97	1.15	76	6	19	29	15	7	D-S	n.s.	.05
	S	2.41	1.29	49	13	13	15	6	2	D-U	.05	.01
	U	2.28	1.14	138	43	31	49	12	3	S-U	n.s.	---
(38) Persuade marketing management to accept marketing research findings.	D	1.93	0.98	75	27	36	4	6	2	D-S	.05	.05
	S	2.40	0.86	50	8	20	17	4	1	D-U	n.s.	.01
	U	2.28	0.77	138	23	67	36	10	2	S-U	n.s.	---
(39) Make recommendations for action based on his own judgment as well as marketing research findings.	D	2.12	0.80	76	18	37	17	2	2	D-S	n.s.	.05
	S	2.58	1.06	50	7	19	13	10	1	D-U	.05	.01
	U	2.56	0.79	137	11	61	45	17	3	S-U	n.s.	---
(40) Be able to utilize the most advanced research methods if sufficient time and money are available for a particular study.	D	1.80	0.67	76	30	34	10	1	1	D-S	n.s.	n.s.
	S	1.74	0.52	50	20	24	5	1	0	D-U	n.s.	n.s.
	U	1.60	0.45	138	69	55	14	0	0	S-U	n.s.	---
(41) Furnish marketing research results at the time requested regardless of whether he has sufficient information to feel confident of its validity.	D	3.63	0.90	76	2	6	23	32	13	D-S	n.s.	n.s.
	S	3.80	1.10	50	2	3	12	19	14	D-U	n.s.	.05
	U	3.93	1.12	138	5	9	25	51	48	S-U	n.s.	---
(42) Serve on committees which formulate marketing strategies.	D	1.96	0.39	76	15	50	10	1	0	D-S	n.s.	n.s.
	S	2.18	0.56	50	9	24	16	1	0	D-U	.01	.01
	U	2.37	0.47	138	9	75	49	4	1	S-U	n.s.	---

Items	Sample	Mean	Var.	N	AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN	Significance Tests
(43) Enlarge the marketing research function by moving into other areas in the firm where the capabilities of his department can be used.	D S U	2.29 2.64 2.84	0.62 0.77 0.75	75 50 138	9 3 5	41 22 44	19 15 62	6 10 22	0 0 5	D-S D-U S-U n.s. .01 n.s. .05 .01 ---
(44) Read most of the professional journals in his field.	D S U	2.17 2.22 2.02	0.41 0.54 0.46	76 50 138	8 7 29	49 27 78	17 14 30	2 2 1	0 0 0	D-S D-U S-U n.s. n.s. n.s. n.s. .05 ---
(45) Question the soundness of the objectives which a member of marketing management may bring to bear on a problem being studied by the marketing research department.	D S U	2.35 2.38 2.35	0.78 0.85 0.70	74 50 136	13 7 20	27 23 60	31 16 46	1 2 9	2 2 1	D-S D-U S-U n.s. n.s. n.s. n.s. n.s. ---
(46) Solicit suggestions concerning research methodology from the marketing manager who requested the study.	D S U	3.25 2.92 2.85	0.91 1.14 0.98	76 50 138	4 5 8	8 11 48	36 21 46	21 9 29	7 4 7	D-S D-U S-U n.s. .01 n.s. n.s. .01 ---
(47) Use standards of scientific excellence and objectivity as the primary basis to evaluate the work of his department.	D S U	2.65 2.35 2.45	1.36 1.27 1.33	75 49 138	13 14 32	24 14 46	19 12 34	14 8 18	5 1 8	D-S D-U S-U n.s. n.s. n.s. n.s. .01 ---
(48) Restrict his activities to doing research and offering advice only when called upon by management.	D S U	4.08 3.90 3.82	1.03 0.95 0.80	76 50 137	2 0 1	5 5 13	9 11 24	29 18 71	31 16 28	D-S D-U S-U n.s. .05 n.s. n.s. n.s. .01 ---

Items	Sample	Mean	Var.	N	AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN	Samples	K.-S. wil.
(49) Have the final say in committing corporate funds for the services of outside marketing re-search agencies.	D	2.64	1.09	76	7	34	18	13	4	D-S	.05
	S	3.20	1.55	50	4	14	8	16	8	D-U	n.s.
	U	3.04	1.40	138	13	36	39	32	18	S-U	n.s.
(50) Check periodically with the executive to whom a report has been submit-ted to see whether the re-port is being used.	D	2.05	0.67	75	18	39	15	2	1	D-S	n.s.
	S	2.22	0.62	50	8	26	13	3	0	D-U	n.s.
	U	2.23	0.73	138	23	72	34	6	3	S-U	n.s.
(51) Look upon the members of his department as an im-portant source of manage-ment talent for the firm.	D	1.64	0.45	76	34	36	5	1	0	D-S	.05
	S	1.98	0.80	50	13	30	4	1	2	D-U	n.s.
	U	1.91	0.52	138	42	68	27	1	0	S-U	n.s.
(52) Separate himself from the day to day operations of the marketing department to protect his objectivity in approaching problems.	D	3.29	1.73	76	5	25	6	23	17	D-S	n.s.
	S	3.14	1.55	50	5	12	12	13	8	D-U	n.s.
	U	3.03	1.39	138	13	40	29	42	14	S-U	n.s.

Marketing Research Directors' Responses to Satisfaction Items (SectionII)

Items	Mean	Var.	N	Responses			
				VWS	FWS	FD	VD
(53) The extent to which we are able to pursue research studies objectively.	1.58	0.43	76	38	33	4	1
(54) Acceptance of marketing research results by management.	1.82	0.45	76	23	46	5	2
(55) The procedure for bringing problems to the marketing research department.	2.28	0.55	76	9	41	22	4
(56) The part I play in formulating marketing strategy.	2.25	0.65	75	12	37	21	5
(57) The budget I have to run my department.	1.97	0.72	76	23	37	11	5
(58) The amount of contact I have with marketing executives.	1.80	0.80	76	34	28	9	5
(59) The extent to which marketing executives are receptive to honest opinions on all subjects.	1.76	0.58	76	30	37	6	3
(60) The time I have available to improve myself professionally.	2.46	0.84	76	11	30	24	11
(61) The extent to which I can help define the problems to be studied by my department.	1.78	0.60	76	30	36	7	3

Items	Mean	Var.	N	Responses			
				VWS	FWS	FD	VD
(62) The support I receive from my superior and other high level executives.	1.59	0.59	76	42	25	7	2
(63) The time deadlines which are placed on marketing research activities.	2.11	0.55	76	15	40	19	2
(64) My freedom to follow up reports to see whether they are being used by management.	1.62	0.56	76	40	26	9	1
(65) The open-mindedness of executives to marketing research findings.	1.75	0.46	76	28	40	7	1
(66) The location of the marketing research department in the corporate organization structure.	1.91	0.94	76	31	29	8	8
(67) Management's attitude concerning the value of marketing research.	1.79	0.65	76	30	36	6	4
(68) The extent to which the capabilities of my department are being used by the firm.	2.08	0.61	76	15	45	11	5

Items	Sample	Mean	Var.	N	Responses			
					VWS	FWS	FD	VD
(53) The value of marketing research information.	Superiors Users	1.68	0.34	50	19	28	3	0
		1.71	0.44	138	54	72	10	2
(54) Understandability of marketing research reports.	Superiors Users	1.76	0.47	50	18	27	4	1
		1.64	0.38	138	59	69	10	0
(55) Timing of marketing research reports.	Superiors Users	2.08	0.48	50	9	29	11	1
		2.13	0.58	136	23	82	22	9
(56) Marketing research department's understanding of problems studied.	Superiors Users	1.58	0.29	50	22	27	1	0
		1.64	0.35	138	57	73	8	0
(57) Return on investment in marketing research.	Superiors Users	1.80	0.57	50	19	23	7	1
		1.87	0.45	133	37	78	16	2
(58) Proper use of research methodology.	Superiors Users	1.69	0.38	49	19	26	4	0
		1.75	0.40	133	46	75	11	1
(59) Relevance of marketing research data to decisions.	Superiors Users	1.80	0.33	50	14	32	4	0
		1.81	0.31	138	37	90	11	0
(60) Objectivity of marketing research department.	Superiors Users	1.48	0.30	50	27	22	1	0
		1.59	0.42	138	68	60	9	1
(61) Soundness of recommendations.	Superiors Users	1.69	0.30	49	17	30	2	0
		1.80	0.38	138	41	84	12	1

Items	Sample	Mean	Var.	N	Responses			
					VWS	FWS	FD	VD
(62) Creativity of marketing research department.	Superior Users	2.00	0.61	50	15	20	15	0
		2.08	0.49	137	24	82	27	4

Items	Sample	Mean	Var.	N	Responses			
					Ast	ASO	DSO	DSt
(63) The marketing re-search department often comes up with valuable alternative courses of action which were never before considered by management.	Superiors Users	2.24 2.57	0.52 0.67	49 138	5 9	30 61	11 48	3 20
(64) We would have made some very bad mistakes if we would not have had the marketing research department.	Superiors Users	1.88 1.96	0.64 0.72	50 138	18 46	21 57	10 29	1 6
(65) The marketing re-search department plays an important part in initiating changes in the marketing strategies of the firm.	Superiors Users	2.04 2.20	0.73 0.85	50 137	14 34	23 55	10 35	3 13
(66) A business as complex as this one would have a difficult time operating without the marketing research department.	Superiors Users	1.52 1.60	0.58 0.56	50 138	31 74	13 48	5 13	1 3
(67) If we had no marketing research department, our decisions would have been about the same.	Superiors Users	3.18 2.93	0.56 0.69	50 138	1 5	7 37	24 58	18 38

Items	Sample	Mean	Var.	N	Responses			
					Ast	ASo	DSO	DSt
(68) The marketing re-search function is a well integrated part of the marketing activity of the firm.	Superior Users	1.90 2.07	0.70 0.94	50 138	19 47	18 48	12 30	1 13
(60) I have as much confidence in the results of studies by our marketing research department as I do in the results of studies by outside re-search firms.	Superior Users	1.38 1.47	0.36 0.40	50 137	34 82	13 45	3 10	0 0
(70) Much of the data which the marketing re-search department comes up with I know from experience cannot be true.	Superior Users	3.76 3.53	0.31 0.54	50 137	1 4	0 8	9 36	40 89

APPENDIX III

MICROSCOPIC ROLE ANALYSIS

Table 1

**Microscopic Role Analysis
Raw Scores for 42 Firms**

<u>Firm Code</u>	<u>V Score</u>	<u>M Score</u>	<u>D Score</u>
75	25.333	26.500	51.833
79	43.333	86.444	129.778
99	37.000	37.333	74.333
101	34.000	21.500	55.500
102	41.000	41.000	82.000
103	46.583	97.813	144.396
113	44.000	78.000	122.000
121	41.000	45.667	86.667
122	35.667	19.556	55.222
126	37.000	37.000	74.000
134	50.000	33.333	83.333
143	21.667	37.222	58.889
155	33.083	39.938	73.021
157	59.417	72.688	132.104
161	37.250	47.313	84.562
164	64.000	83.333	147.333
168	57.333	58.111	115.444
171	41.833	39.625	81.458
172	49.167	34.125	83.292
179	38.333	68.111	106.444
214	44.917	45.063	89.979
215	71.000	97.667	168.667
216	46.667	61.222	107.889
217	49.500	72.875	122.375
218	60.333	59.111	119.444
220	29.167	50.125	79.292
224	38.000	40.667	78.667
229	43.333	65.444	108.778
238	62.000	61.333	123.333
241	32.667	25.889	58.556
244	44.417	29.938	74.354
245	55.667	58.222	113.889
247	36.583	28.813	65.396
250	43.583	65.563	109.146
260	46.417	63.938	110.354
261	54.000	39.000	93.000
264	36.667	63.222	99.889
282	33.333	59.444	92.778
287	51.333	66.500	117.833
293	25.667	54.222	79.889
301	40.250	71.563	111.812
356	39.333	76.000	115.333

Table 2

Microscopic Role Analysis
Raw Scores for 42 Firms

<u>Firm Code</u>	<u>Satisfaction Score</u>	<u>Effectiveness Score</u>
75	1.938	1.917
79	2.000	2.093
99	1.938	1.741
101	1.375	1.667
102	1.938	1.481
103	1.313	1.986
113	2.250	1.963
121	1.938	2.130
122	3.000	2.259
126	1.688	1.389
134	2.625	1.667
143	2.125	1.722
155	1.813	2.514
157	1.688	1.792
161	1.313	1.514
164	1.938	2.019
168	1.250	1.704
171	3.438	2.014
172	1.313	1.542
179	1.438	1.333
214	2.063	1.686
215	1.500	1.731
216	1.500	1.519
217	1.375	1.736
218	1.750	2.019
220	2.188	2.306
224	1.750	1.611
229	1.500	1.926
238	1.813	1.611
241	1.938	1.352
244	1.938	1.417
245	1.188	2.000
247	1.938	2.188
250	1.688	1.597
260	1.375	1.778
261	2.063	1.789
264	1.500	1.537
282	2.063	1.537
287	2.500	1.746
293	3.250	2.074
301	1.625	1.792
356	1.813	1.986

Table 3

Microscopic Role Analysis
Raw Scores for 42 Firms

<u>Firm Code</u>	<u>Interaction Score</u>	<u>Education Score</u>
75	1.000	1.250
79	3.429	0.000
99	3.571	1.000
101	5.500	0.500
102	6.000	0.333
103	1.875	1.750
113	3.000	3.000
121	2.000	1.000
122	2.000	3.667
126	2.857	0.000
134	3.286	1.333
143	2.000	1.000
155	4.750	0.250
157	4.875	0.250
161	5.500	1.000
164	5.143	0.000
168	5.143	0.333
171	1.875	1.500
172	4.750	3.250
179	3.714	1.000
214	3.500	4.500
215	4.000	1.000
216	4.143	4.667
217	4.125	0.000
218	3.571	2.000
220	3.875	0.000
224	4.857	2.000
229	2.571	0.667
238	5.000	1.333
241	3.000	1.000
244	4.750	3.750
245	4.143	0.667
247	3.500	0.000
250	1.000	1.500
260	5.000	0.500
261	5.500	0.500
264	4.286	2.000
282	4.286	3.000
287	5.375	0.500
293	3.857	1.333
301	3.750	0.000
356	3.875	5.000

Table 4

Rank Correlation of V Scores and Effectiveness Scores

<u>Firm Code</u>	<u>V Rank</u>	<u>Effectiveness Rank</u>
75	2.0	27.0
79	22.5	37.0
99	12.5	21.0
101	8.0	14.5
102	19.5	5.0
103	29.0	30.5
113	25.0	29.0
121	19.5	38.0
122	9.0	40.0
126	12.5	3.0
134	33.0	14.5
143	1.0	18.0
155	6.0	42.0
157	38.0	25.5
161	14.0	6.0
164	41.0	34.5
168	37.0	17.0
171	21.0	33.0
172	31.0	10.0
179	16.0	1.0
214	27.0	16.0
215	42.0	19.0
216	30.0	7.0
217	32.0	20.0
218	39.0	34.5
220	4.0	41.0
224	15.0	12.5
229	22.5	28.0
238	40.0	12.5
241	5.0	2.0
244	26.0	4.0
245	36.0	32.0
247	10.0	39.0
250	24.0	11.0
260	28.0	23.0
261	35.0	24.0
264	11.0	8.5
282	7.0	8.5
287	34.0	22.0
293	3.0	36.0
301	18.0	25.5
356	17.0	30.5

Spearman rank correlation coefficient = $-.024$

Table 5

Rank Correlation of D Scores and Effectiveness Scores

<u>Firm Code</u>	<u>D Rank</u>	<u>Effectiveness Rank</u>
75	1.0	27.0
79	38.0	37.0
99	9.0	21.0
101	3.0	14.5
102	15.0	5.0
103	40.0	30.5
113	35.0	29.0
121	19.0	38.0
122	2.0	40.0
126	8.0	3.0
134	17.0	14.5
143	5.0	18.0
155	7.0	42.0
157	39.0	25.5
161	18.0	6.0
164	41.0	34.5
168	32.0	17.0
171	14.0	33.0
172	16.0	10.0
179	24.0	1.0
214	20.0	16.0
215	42.0	19.0
216	25.0	7.0
217	36.0	20.0
218	34.0	34.5
220	12.0	41.0
224	11.0	12.5
229	26.0	28.0
238	37.0	12.5
241	4.0	2.0
244	10.0	4.0
245	30.0	32.0
247	6.0	39.0
250	27.0	11.0
260	28.0	23.0
261	22.0	24.0
264	23.0	8.5
282	21.0	8.5
287	33.0	22.0
293	13.0	36.0
301	29.0	25.5
356	31.0	30.5

Spearman rank correlation coefficient = .113

Table 6

Rank Correlation of V Scores and Satisfaction Scores

<u>Firm Code</u>	<u>V Rank</u>	<u>Satisfaction Rank</u>
75	2.0	26.5
79	22.5	31.0
99	12.5	26.5
101	8.0	7.0
102	19.5	26.5
103	29.0	4.0
113	25.0	37.0
121	19.5	26.5
122	9.0	40.0
126	12.5	16.0
134	33.0	39.0
143	1.0	35.0
155	6.0	21.0
157	38.0	16.0
161	14.0	4.0
164	41.0	26.5
168	37.0	2.0
171	21.0	42.0
172	31.0	4.0
179	16.0	9.0
214	27.0	33.0
215	42.0	11.5
216	30.0	11.5
217	32.0	7.0
218	39.0	18.5
220	4.0	36.0
224	15.0	18.5
229	22.5	11.5
238	40.0	21.0
241	5.0	26.5
244	26.0	26.5
245	36.0	1.0
247	10.0	26.5
250	24.0	16.0
260	28.0	7.0
261	35.0	33.0
264	11.0	11.5
282	7.0	33.0
287	34.0	38.0
293	3.0	41.0
301	18.0	14.0
356	17.0	21.0

Spearman correlation coefficient = $-.275$

Table 7

Rank Correlation of D Scores and Satisfaction Scores

<u>Firm Code</u>	<u>D Rank</u>	<u>Satisfaction Rank</u>
75	1.0	26.5
79	38.0	31.0
99	9.0	26.5
101	3.0	7.0
102	15.0	26.5
103	40.0	4.0
113	35.0	37.0
121	19.0	26.5
122	2.0	40.0
126	8.0	16.0
134	17.0	39.0
143	5.0	35.0
155	7.0	21.0
157	39.0	16.0
161	18.0	4.0
164	41.0	26.0
168	32.0	2.0
171	14.0	42.0
172	16.0	4.0
179	24.0	9.0
214	20.0	33.0
215	42.0	11.5
216	25.0	11.5
217	36.0	7.0
218	34.0	18.5
220	12.0	36.0
224	11.0	18.5
229	26.0	11.5
238	37.0	21.0
241	4.0	26.5
244	10.0	26.5
245	30.0	1.0
247	6.0	26.5
250	27.0	16.0
260	28.0	7.0
261	22.0	33.0
264	23.0	11.5
282	21.0	33.0
287	33.0	38.0
293	13.0	41.0
301	29.0	14.0
356	31.0	21.0

Spearman correlation coefficient = $-.318$

Table 8

Rank Correlation of Effectiveness Scores
and Satisfaction Scores

<u>Firm Code</u>	<u>Effectiveness Rank</u>	<u>Satisfaction Rank</u>
75	27.0	26.5
79	37.0	31.0
99	21.0	26.5
101	14.5	7.0
102	5.0	26.5
103	30.5	4.0
113	29.0	37.0
121	38.0	26.5
122	40.0	40.0
126	3.0	16.0
134	14.5	39.0
143	18.0	35.0
155	42.0	21.0
157	25.5	16.0
161	6.0	4.0
164	34.5	26.0
168	17.0	2.0
171	33.0	42.0
172	10.0	4.0
179	1.0	9.0
214	16.0	33.0
215	19.0	11.5
216	7.0	11.5
217	20.0	7.0
218	34.5	18.5
220	41.0	36.0
224	12.5	18.5
229	28.0	11.5
238	12.5	21.0
241	2.0	26.5
244	4.0	26.5
245	32.0	1.0
247	39.0	26.5
250	11.0	16.0
260	23.0	7.0
261	24.0	33.0
264	8.5	11.5
282	8.5	33.0
287	22.0	38.0
293	36.0	41.0
301	25.5	14.0
356	30.5	21.0

Spearman correlation coefficient = .312

Table 9

Rank Correlation of V Scores and Interaction Scores

<u>Firm Code</u>	<u>V Rank</u>	<u>Interaction Rank</u>
75	2.0	41.5
79	22.5	30.0
99	12.5	26.5
101	8.0	3.0
102	19.5	1.0
103	29.0	39.5
113	25.0	32.5
121	19.5	37.0
122	9.0	37.0
126	12.5	34.0
134	33.0	31.0
143	1.0	37.0
155	6.0	13.0
157	38.0	10.0
161	14.0	3.0
164	41.0	6.5
168	37.0	6.5
171	21.0	39.5
172	31.0	13.0
179	16.0	25.0
214	27.0	28.5
215	42.0	20.0
216	30.0	17.5
217	32.0	19.0
218	39.0	26.5
220	4.0	21.5
224	15.0	11.0
229	22.5	35.0
238	40.5	8.5
241	5.0	32.5
244	26.0	13.0
245	36.0	17.5
247	10.0	28.5
250	24.0	41.5
260	28.0	8.5
261	35.0	3.0
264	11.0	15.5
282	7.0	15.5
287	34.0	5.0
293	3.0	23.0
301	18.0	24.0
356	17.0	21.5

Spearman correlation coefficient = $-.307$

Table 10

Rank Correlation of D Scores and Interaction Scores

<u>Firm Code</u>	<u>D Rank</u>	<u>Interaction Rank</u>
75	1.0	41.5
79	38.0	30.0
99	9.0	26.5
101	3.0	3.0
102	15.0	1.0
103	40.0	39.5
113	35.0	32.5
121	19.0	37.0
122	2.0	37.0
126	8.0	34.0
134	17.0	31.0
143	5.0	37.0
155	7.0	13.0
157	39.0	10.0
161	18.0	3.0
164	41.0	6.5
168	32.0	6.5
171	14.0	39.5
172	16.0	13.0
179	24.0	25.0
214	20.0	28.5
215	42.0	20.0
216	25.0	17.5
217	36.0	19.0
218	34.0	26.5
220	12.0	21.5
224	11.0	11.0
229	26.0	35.0
238	37.0	8.5
241	4.0	32.5
244	10.0	13.0
245	30.0	17.5
247	6.0	28.5
250	27.0	41.5
260	28.0	8.5
261	22.0	3.0
264	23.0	15.5
282	21.0	15.5
287	33.0	5.0
293	13.0	23.0
301	29.0	24.0
356	31.0	21.5

Spearman correlation coefficient = $-.196$

Table 11

Rank Correlation of D Scores and Education Scores

<u>Firm Code</u>	<u>D Rank</u>	<u>Education Rank</u>
75	1.0	25.0
79	38.0	4.0
99	9.0	21.0
101	3.0	13.5
102	15.0	10.5
103	40.0	31.0
113	35.0	35.5
121	19.0	21.0
122	2.0	38.0
126	8.0	4.0
134	17.0	27.0
143	5.0	21.0
155	7.0	8.5
157	39.0	8.5
161	18.0	21.0
164	41.0	4.0
168	32.0	10.5
171	14.0	29.5
172	16.0	37.0
179	24.0	21.0
214	20.0	40.0
215	42.0	21.0
216	25.0	41.0
217	36.0	4.0
218	34.0	33.0
220	12.0	4.0
224	11.0	33.0
229	26.0	16.5
238	37.0	27.0
241	4.0	21.0
244	10.0	39.0
245	30.0	16.5
247	6.0	4.0
250	27.0	29.5
260	28.0	13.5
261	22.0	13.5
264	23.0	33.0
282	21.0	35.5
287	33.0	13.5
293	13.0	27.0
301	29.0	4.0
356	31.0	42.0

Spearman correlation coefficient = $-.085$

APPENDIX IV

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS



EXHIBIT 1

Questionnaire for Survey of
Fortune 500 Firms

DEPARTMENT OF MARKETING AND TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN

1. Please circle one code number which best describes your company's marketing research function:

- 1 A central marketing research department doing work for entire company
- 2 A central department, but with regional or divisional units elsewhere
- 3 Regional or divisional units, without headquarters department
- 4 No formal marketing research department

If alternatives 1 or 2 were circled, the remaining questions are to be completed by the head of the marketing research function of the corporation.

If alternative 3 was circled, the remaining questions are to be completed by the head of the marketing research function in the largest regional or divisional unit of the corporation.

If alternative 4 was circled, the individual filling out the questionnaire should skip to question 18.

Questions 2 through 17 are to be filled in by the marketing research manager or director.

2. What positions did you previously hold within the firm (please list your last three positions in reverse order -- placing your most recent position first):

3. If you are new in the firm, what outside position did you last hold?

Position

Type of Business

4. Please circle the following code which indicates the formal education you have completed (circle only one):

- 1 High school
- 2 Attended college
- 3 Bachelor's degree
- 4 Master's degree
- 5 Doctoral degree

5. How long have you held your present position (please circle one):

- 1 Less than two years
- 2 Two but less than four years
- 3 Four but less than six years
- 4 Six but less than eight years
- 5 Eight but less than twelve years
- 6 Twelve years or longer

6. How many employees in your company (or division) are assigned full-time to marketing research activities?

Number of marketing research employees

7. How would you rate your role as director of marketing research on the following scale? (Please circle one number)

Largely Research & Advisory Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Largely a marketing policy-making role
	Inter- mediate							

8. To whom do you report in the firm?

Title

9. Did the position you now hold or one similar to it (possibly with a different title) exist before you held the position?

- 1 Yes
2 No

10. If yes, circle the code number which applies to your immediate predecessor in the position.

- 1 He is still with the firm
2 He is retired (or deceased)
3 He is with another firm

11. If your predecessor is still with the firm, what position does he now hold?

Title

12. How would you classify this position? (please circle one)

- 1 Staff marketing (or sales) position
2 Line marketing (or sales) position
3 Staff general management position
4 Line general management position
5 Other

13. If your predecessor is now retired or deceased, did he hold any positions in your firm (or another firm) after being director of marketing research?

- 1 Yes
2 No

14. If yes, what was the highest position he held before retirement?

Title

15. How would you classify this position? (please circle one)

- 1 Staff marketing (or sales) position
- 2 Line marketing (or sales) position
- 3 Staff general management position
- 4 Line general management position
- 5 Other

16. If your predecessor is now with another firm, what position does he hold?

Title

Type of Business

17. How would you classify the position?

- 1 Marketing research position
- 2 Staff marketing (or sales) position other than marketing research
- 3 Line marketing (or sales) position
- 4 Staff general management position
- 5 Line general management position
- 6 Other

Questions 18 and 19 are to be completed by all respondents to the questionnaire.

18. Please circle one code number which best describes your corporation.

- 1 Primarily a manufacturer of consumer products
- 2 Primarily a manufacturer of non-consumer products
- 3 The firm is heavily engaged in manufacturing both consumer and non-consumer products

19. Please circle the code representing your company's sales for your last fiscal year (if you are representing a subsidiary, use the subsidiary's total).

- 1 Under \$100 million
- 2 \$100 million but under \$200 million
- 3 \$200 million but under \$400 million
- 4 \$400 million but under \$600 million
- 5 \$600 million but under \$800 million
- 6 \$800 million but under \$1 billion
- 7 Over \$1 billion

The following information is optional.

20. Your name _____

21. Your title _____

22. Your firm's name _____

23. Your address _____

EXHIBIT 2

Director of Marketing Research Questionnaire
Role Analysis Survey

Depar

As
prise, w
member
activity,
which i
leading

To
should h
No nam
sertation

The
each res
results c

Section I

Instruction
research d
be the ob
staff) to d
in your vi
represents
each item.

Instructions must
preferably should
May or may not

1 2 3

1 2 3

Department of Marketing and Transportation Administration

Graduate School of Business Administration

Michigan State University

East Lansing, Michigan

As part of our continuing interest in all phases of the business enterprise, we are gathering data from directors of marketing research and other members of management who are familiar with the marketing research activity. This information will be the basis for a doctoral dissertation which is designed to define the role of marketing research departments in leading industrial corporations.

To insure confidential treatment of your reply, the questionnaire should be returned directly to the university in the self-addressed envelope. No names of individuals or firms will be identified in the text of the dissertation. The research is not sponsored by any group or agency.

The success of this study is entirely dependent on the cooperation of each respondent. In appreciation of your participation, a summary of the results of the study will be sent to each firm. Thank you very much.

Section I

Instructions: The following items are concerned with the role of the marketing research department in your firm. We would like to know what you believe to be the obligation of the director of marketing research (or a member of his staff) to do or not to do the following things. In this section, we are interested in your view of the ideal director of marketing research. The following scale represents your feeling concerning each item. Please circle one code number for each item.

Absolutely must
Preferably should
May or may not
Preferably should not
Absolutely must not

- 1 Absolutely must
- 2 Preferably should
- 3 May or may not
- 4 Preferably should not
- 5 Absolutely must not

1 2 3 4 5 (1) Help management define the problems to be studied.

1 2 3 4 5 (2) Write articles for professional journals in the fields of marketing or research methodology which will be of benefit to marketing researchers in other business organizations.

(72) Some marketing research activities (such as sales forecasting and determining market share) are quite routine in nature while other activities (such as estimating the consumer acceptance of a proposed new product or determining size and characteristics of markets) are of the special project type which generally result in a report to the executive who requested the study. Please circle your best estimate of the *proportion of your department's time which is annually devoted to this latter type of special project studies* (circle only one).

- 1 None
- 2 Less than 20%
- 3 At least 20% but less than 40%
- 4 At least 40% but less than 60%
- 5 At least 60% but less than 80%
- 6 At least 80% but less than 100%
- 7 100%

Section IV

The following information will be treated with the strictest confidence.

(73) Your name

(74) Your title

(75) Your firm's name

(76) Your firm's address

EXHIBIT 3

Role Definer's Questionnaire

Role Analysis Survey

Department of Marketing and Transportation Administration

Graduate School of Business Administration

Michigan State University

East Lansing, Michigan

As part of our continuing interest in all phases of the business enterprise, we are gathering data from directors of marketing research and other members of management who are familiar with the marketing research activity. This information will be the basis for a doctoral dissertation which is designed to define the role of marketing research departments in leading industrial corporations.

To insure confidential treatment of your reply, the questionnaire should be returned directly to the university in the self-addressed envelope. No names of individuals or firms will be identified in the text of the dissertation. The research is not sponsored by any group or agency.

The success of this study is entirely dependent on the cooperation of each respondent. In appreciation of your participation, a summary of the results of the study will be sent to each firm. Thank you very much.

Section I

Instructions: The following items are concerned with the role of the marketing research department in your firm. We would like to know what you believe to be the obligation of the director of marketing research (or a member of his staff) to do or not to do the following things. In this section, we are interested in your view of the ideal director of marketing research. The following scale represents your feeling concerning each item. Please circle one code number for each item.

Absolutely must
Preferably should
May or may not
Preferably should not
Absolutely must not

- 1 Absolutely must
- 2 Preferably should
- 3 May or may not
- 4 Preferably should not
- 5 Absolutely must not

1 2 3 4 5 (1) Help management define the problems to be studied.

1 2 3 4 5 (2) Write articles for professional journals in the fields of marketing or research methodology which will be of benefit to marketing researchers in other business organizations.

Absolutely must
 Preferably should
 May or may not
 Preferably should not
 Absolutely must not

1 Absolutely must
 2 Preferably should
 3 May or may not
 4 Preferably should not
 5 Absolutely must not

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|---------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (3) Measure his performance primarily by the extent to which marketing research results are used in decision-making. | 1 2 3 4 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (4) Realize that he does not have a monopoly on information which is relevant to a particular decision. | 1 2 3 4 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (5) Be involved in formulating marketing strategy for the firm. | 1 2 3 4 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (6) Maintain an active interest in a given study until after the recommendations are implemented by management. | 1 2 3 4 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (7) Become familiar with the objectives of management in a given area before beginning a marketing research project in that area. | 1 2 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (8) Critically review past studies to determine whether the methodology might have been improved. | 1 2 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (9) Produce information which reduces the area of uncertainty in management decisions. | 1 2 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (10) Recognize the value of executive judgment in decision making. | 1 2 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (11) Be responsible for showing the contribution of marketing research to the profitability of the firm. | 1 2 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (12) Offer early indications of findings to management when requested even though a conclusive investigation may prove them to be wrong. | 1 2 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (13) Make contributions to the development of marketing theory. | 1 2 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (14) Be able to translate marketing research results into positive courses of action for management to follow. | 1 2 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (15) After a study is completed, accept the judgment of the marketing executive who requested the study as final. | 1 2 3 |

Absolutely must
 Preferably should
 May or may not
 Preferably should not
 Absolutely must not

1 Absolutely must
 2 Preferably should
 3 May or may not
 4 Preferably should not
 5 Absolutely must not

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (16) Take on temporary line management responsibilities from time to time to implement his research findings if there is no one else in the firm qualified to do so. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (17) Initiate changes in the marketing strategy of the firm whenever possible. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (18) Devote part of his time and resources to improving his methodological approach to problems. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (19) Provide information to support decisions which have already been made by a marketing executive. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (20) Resist involvement in policy making to maintain his objective approach to problems. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (21) Withhold certain marketing research information when it is expedient to do so. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (22) Anticipate future decisions and have information ready when requested by management. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (23) Have the final say concerning the methodology which will be used on a given study. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (24) Take the initiative in finding ways to improve the marketing efforts of the firm. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (25) Consult at length with the executive requesting a study to make certain he understands the problem before conducting the actual research. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (26) Expect all members of marketing management to utilize the services of the marketing research department. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (27) Place strong emphasis on the understandability of his final report. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (28) Give his frank opinion to marketing executives even if it will hurt their position in the firm. |

Absolutely must
Preferably should
May or may not
Preferably should not
Absolutely must not

- 1 Absolutely must
- 2 Preferably should
- 3 May or may not
- 4 Preferably should not
- 5 Absolutely must not

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (29) Request permission from a member of marketing management before initiating a study concerning his operation. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (30) Include a detailed discussion of research methodology in all marketing research reports. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (31) Report apparent resistance to the acceptance of marketing research findings to his superior |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (32) Be creative as well as objective in analyzing the results of a marketing research study. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (33) Consider the job of his department to be completed when the research report has been submitted to management. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (34) Conduct research for every major marketing decision where a choice must be made between feasible alternative courses of action. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (35) Initiate a procedure for bringing marketing problems to the attention of his department. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (36) Be responsible for all contract marketing research conducted by outside research firms. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (37) Get approval from his superior for all research studies undertaken by his department. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (38) Persuade marketing management to accept marketing research findings. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (39) Make recommendations for action based on his own judgment as well as marketing research findings. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (40) Be able to utilize the most advanced research methods if sufficient time and money are available for a particular study. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (41) Furnish marketing research results at the time requested regardless of whether he has sufficient information to feel confident of its validity. |

Absolutely must
 Preferably should
 May or may not
 Preferably should not
 Absolutely must not

- 1 Absolutely must
- 2 Preferably should
- 3 May or may not
- 4 Preferably should not
- 5 Absolutely must not

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (42) Serve on committees which formulate marketing strategies. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (43) Enlarge the marketing research function by moving into other areas in the firm where the capabilities of his department can be used. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (44) Read most of the professional journals in his field. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (45) Question the soundness of the objectives which a member of marketing management may bring to bear on a problem being studied by the marketing research department. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (46) Solicit suggestions concerning research methodology from the marketing manager who requested the study. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (47) Use standards of scientific excellence and objectivity as the primary basis to evaluate the work of his department. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (48) Restrict his activities to doing research and offering advice only when called upon by management. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (49) Have the final say in committing corporate funds for the services of outside marketing research agencies. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (50) Check periodically with the executive to whom a report has been submitted to see whether the report is being used. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (51) Look upon the members of his department as an important source of management talent for the firm. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (52) Separate himself from the day to day operations of the marketing department to protect his objectivity in approaching problems. |

Section II

Instructions: The following items are concerned with an evaluation of the effectiveness of the marketing research department in your firm. We would like your personal opinion concerning each statement. The following scale represents your degree of satisfaction with the performance of the department on each item. Next to each item listed, just circle the code number that best expresses your feeling.

Very well satisfied
Fairly well satisfied
Fairly dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied

- 1 Very well satisfied
- 2 Fairly well satisfied
- 3 Fairly dissatisfied
- 4 Very dissatisfied

- 1 2 3 4 (53) The value of marketing research information.
- 1 2 3 4 (54) Understandability of marketing research reports.
- 1 2 3 4 (55) Timing of marketing research reports.
- 1 2 3 4 (56) Marketing research department's understanding of problems studied.
- 1 2 3 4 (57) Return on investment in marketing research.
- 1 2 3 4 (58) Proper use of research methodology.
- 1 2 3 4 (59) Relevance of marketing research data to decisions.
- 1 2 3 4 (60) Objectivity of marketing research department.
- 1 2 3 4 (61) Soundness of recommendations.
- 1 2 3 4 (62) Creativity of marketing research department.

Section III

Instructions: The following items are also concerned with the effectiveness of the marketing research department. However, we are now interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement. Using the following scale, just circle the code number that best expresses your feeling on each item.

- | | Agree strongly | Agree somewhat | Disagree somewhat | Disagree strongly | |
|---|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | (63) The marketing research department often comes up with valuable alternative courses of action which were never before considered by management. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | (64) We would have made some very bad mistakes if we would not have had the marketing research department. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | (65) The marketing research department plays an important part in initiating changes in the marketing strategies of the firm. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | (66) A business as complex as this one would have a difficult time operating without the marketing research department. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | (67) If we had no marketing research department, our decisions would have been about the same. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | (68) The marketing research function is a well integrated part of the marketing activity of the firm. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | (69) I have as much confidence in the results of studies by our marketing research department as I do in the results of studies by outside research firms. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | (70) Much of the data which the marketing research department comes up with I know from experience cannot be true. |

Section IV

(71) How long have you held your present position (please circle one)?

- 1 Less than two years
- 2 Two but less than four years
- 3 Four but less than six years
- 4 Six but less than eight years
- 5 Eight but less than twelve years
- 6 Twelve years or more

(72) Have you had any official contact with the marketing research department in previous positions you have held in this firm?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

(73) If yes, over how many years have you had official contacts with the marketing research department in this firm (please circle one)?

- 1 Less than two years
- 2 Two but less than four years
- 3 Four but less than six years
- 4 Six but less than eight years
- 5 Eight but less than twelve years
- 6 Twelve years or more

(74) Please circle the following code which indicates the formal education you have completed (circle only one).

- 1 High school
- 2 Attended college
- 3 Bachelor's degree
- 4 Master's degree
- 5 Doctoral degree

(75) In your work, what kind of products are you primarily concerned with (please circle one)?

- 1 Consumer products
- 2 Nonconsumer products
- 3 Both consumer and nonconsumer products

(76) Have you ever worked in a marketing research position in this firm or in another firm?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

(77) What is your relationship to the director of marketing research in the firm at the present time (please circle *any* of the following which apply)?

- 1 I am his direct superior.
- 2 His department does research studies for me.
- 3 His department furnishes me with secondary data (trade information, etc., that they receive from outside sources).
- 4 Other (please specify)

.....
.....

Section V

The following information will be treated with the strictest confidence.

(78) Your name

(79) Your title

(80) Your firm's name

(81) Your firm's address

APPENDIX V

FIRMS INCLUDED IN

ROLE STUDY

Firms Included in
Role Analysis Study

Agway, Inc.

Air Reduction Company, Inc.

Aluminum Company of America

American Brake Shoe Company (Abex)

American Cyanamid Company

American Oil Company

Armour Grocery Products Company

The Black and Decker Manufacturing Company

Bristol-Meyers Company

Cabot Corporation

California Packing Corporation

Campbell Soup Company

Carborundum Company

Ceco Corporation

Certain-Teed Products Corporation

Cessna Aircraft Company

Champion Spark Plug Company

Continental Oil Company

Cummins Engine Company

Cutler-Hammer, Inc.

Detroit Steel Corporation

Dow Chemical Company

Eagle-Picher Company

The Emerson Electric Company

Falstaff Brewing Corporation

Firestone Tire and Rubber Company

Flintkote Company

Fruehauf Corporation

Gerber Products Company

Glidden Company

The B. F. Goodrich Company .

Granite City Steel Company

H. J. Heinz Company

Hooker Chemical Corporation

Houdaille Industries, Inc.

Hunt Foods and Industries, Inc.

I. T. E. Circuit Breaker Company

Interchemical Corporation

International Harvester Company

International Paper Company

International Pipe and Ceramics Corporation (Interpace)

International Shoe Company

Island Creek Coal Company

The Kendall Company

Kimberly-Clark Corporation

K. V. P. Sutherland Paper Company

Lowenstein (M.) and Sons, Inc.

Lukens Steel Company
Maremont Corporation
Maytag Company
Mead Corporation
National Cash Register Company
National Gypsum
Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation
Packaging Corporation of America
Parke Davis and Company
Pennsalt Chemicals Corporation
Pepperell Manufacturing Company
Phillips Petroleum Company
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Company
Pittsburgh Steel Company
Quaker Oats Company
Rath Packing Company
Rexall Drug and Chemical Company
Riegel Paper Corporation
Rockwell Manufacturing Company
Schlitz, (Jos.) Brewing Company
Smith Kline and French Laboratories
Standard Oil Company of California
Stanley Works
St. Regis Paper Company
Tidewater Oil Company

Union Tank Car Company

United Biscuit Company of America

United States Gypsum Company

U. S. Plywood Corporation

Upjohn Company

Vulcan Materials Company

Weyerhaeuser Company

Whirlpool Corporation

Witco Chemical Company

Worthington Corporation

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Alderfer, E. B., and H. E. Michl. Economics of American Industry. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957.
- Alderson, Wroe, and Paul E. Green. Planning and Problem Solving in Marketing. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1964.
- Bartels, Robert. The Development of Marketing Thought. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1962.
- Blankenship, A. B., and J. B. Doyle. Marketing Research Management. New York: American Management Association, 1965.
- Duncan, C. S. Commercial Research. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919.
- Frederick, J. George. Business Research and Statistics. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1920.
- Frederick, J. George. Introduction to Motivation Research. New York: Business Bourse, Publisher, 1957.
- Furst, Sidney, and Milton Sherman (eds.). Business Decisions that Changed Our Lives. New York: Random House, 1964.
- Gross, Neil, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Hollander, Stanley C. Business Consultants and Clients. East Lansing: Bureau of Business and Economic Research, Michigan State University, 1963.
- Howard, John A. Marketing: Executive and Buyer Behavior. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.
- Kahn, Robert L., Donald M. Wolfe, Robert P. Quinn, J. Dierick Snoek, and Robert A. Rosenthal. Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

- Levitt, Theodore. Innovation in Marketing. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.
- March, James G., and Herbert A. Simon. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.
- Robinson, Patrick J., and David J. Luck. Promotional Decision Making: Practice and Theory. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.
- Schreier, Fred T. Modern Marketing Research. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1963.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonpragmatic Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.
- Simon, Herbert A. Administrative Behavior, 2nd edition. New York: The Free Press, 1957.
- Terry, Samuel H. The Retailer's Manual. Newark, New Jersey: Jennings Brothers, 1869.
- Shaw, Arch Wilkinson. An Approach to Business Problems. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916.

Periodicals

- Alspaugh, R. B. "Present Status and Future Outlook of Consumer Research in Commercial Firms," The American Marketing Journal, Vol. II, No. 2 (April, 1935), pp. 80-84.
- Argyris, Chris. "Explorations in Consultant-Client Relationships," Human Organization, Vol. XX (Fall, 1961), pp. 121-33.
- Britt, Steuart Henderson. "Should You Fit the Research to the Budget?" Journal of Marketing, Vol. XX, No. 4 (April, 1956), pp. 401-03.
- Brown, Lyndon O. "Quantitative Market Analysis: Scope and Uses," Harvard Business Review, Vol. XV, No. 2 (Winter, 1937), pp. 233-44.
- Brown, Lyndon O. "The Acceptance of Marketing Research," Journal of Marketing, Vol. XVI, No. 3 (January, 1952), pp. 342-43.

- Bryson, Lyman. "Notes on a Theory of Advice," Political Science Quarterly, Vol. LXVI (September, 1951), pp. 321-29.
- Carlson, Robert O. "High Noon in the Research Marketplace," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. XXV, No. 3 (Fall, 1961), pp. 331-41.
- Coutant, Frank R. "Market Research Must Hold Executive Attention," Journal of Marketing, Vol. X, No. 3 (January, 1946), pp. 288-89.
- Coutant, Frank R. "Where Are We Bound in Marketing Research?" Journal of Marketing, Vol. I, No. 1 (July, 1936), pp. 28-34.
- Cherington, Paul T. "Trends in Marketing Research," Journal of Marketing, Vol. XI, No. 4, Part 2 (April, 1942), pp. 17-18.
- Converse, Paul D. "The Development of the Science of Marketing, An Exploratory Survey," Journal of Marketing, Vol. 10, No. 1 (July, 1945), p. 19.
- "Directory of the 500 Largest Industrial Corporations," Fortune, Vol. 72, No. 1 (July, 1965), pp. 149-68.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. "Explanations in Applied Social Science," Social Problems, Vol. III (January, 1956), pp. 169-80.
- Harper, Marion, Jr. "A New Profession to Aid Management," Journal of Marketing, Vol. XXV, No. 3 (January, 1961), pp. 1-5.
- Heusner, W. W., C. M. Dooley, G. A. Hughes, and P. White. "Marketing Research in American Industry: I," Journal of Marketing, Vol. XI, No. 4 (April, 1947), pp. 338-54.
- Heusner, W. W., C. M. Dooley, G. A. Hughes, and P. White. "Marketing Research in American Industry: II," Journal of Marketing, Vol. XII, No. 1 (July, 1947), pp. 25-37.
- Hovde, Howard T. "Recent Trends in the Development of Market Research," The American Marketing Journal, Vol. III, No. 1 (January, 1936), pp. 3-19.
- Jeuck, John E. "Marketing Research: Milestone or Millstone?" Journal of Marketing, Vol. XVII, No. 4 (April, 1953), pp. 381-87.

- Lockley, Lawrence C. "Notes on the History of Marketing Research," Journal of Marketing, Vol. XIV, No. 5 (April, 1950), pp. 733-36.
- Longman, Donald F. "The Status of Marketing Research," Journal of Marketing, Vol. XVI, No. 2 (October, 1951), pp. 197-201.
- Marsteller, William A. "Putting the Marketing Research Department on the Executive Level," Journal of Marketing, Vol. XVI, No. 1 (July, 1951), pp. 56-60.
- Moore, David G., and Richard Renck. "The Professional Employee in Industry," Journal of Business, Vol. XXVIII, No. 1 (January, 1955), pp. 58-66.
- Roberts, Harry V. "The Role of Research in Marketing Management," Journal of Marketing, Vol. XXII, No. 1 (July, 1957), pp. 21-32.
- Rogers, Kenn. "The Identity Crisis of the Market Researcher," Commentary, Vol. VIII, No. 1 (January, 1966), pp. 3-15.
- Sessions, Robert E. "A Management Audit of Marketing Research," Journal of Marketing, Vol. XIV, No. 4 (January, 1950), pp. 563-71.
- Shepard, Herbert A. "Patterns of Organizations for Applied Research and Development," Journal of Business, Vol. XXIX, No. 1 (January, 1956), pp. 52-58.
- Shepard, Herbert A. "Supervisors and Subordinates in Research," Journal of Business, Vol. XXIX, No. 4 (October, 1956), pp. 261-67.
- Thompson, F. L. "How Good Is Marketing Research?" Harvard Business Review, Vol. XXIV, No. 3 (Spring, 1946), pp. 453-65.
- Weld, L. D. H. "The Progress of Commercial Research," Harvard Business Review, Vol. I, No. 2 (January, 1923), pp. 175-86.
- Westfall, Ralph. "Marketing Research--Milestone or Milestone, A Reply," Journal of Marketing, Vol. XVIII, No. 2 (October, 1953), pp. 174-77.

Research Reports

- American Marketing Association. A Survey of Marketing Research. Chicago: American Marketing Association, 1957.

- Crisp, Richard D. Company Practices in Marketing Research, Research Report No. 22. New York: American Management Association, 1953.
- Crisp, Richard D. "Company Practices in Marketing Research," The Marketing Job. New York: American Management Association, Inc., 1961.
- Crisp, Richard D. Marketing Research Organization and Operation, Research Study No. 35. New York: American Management Association, Inc., 1958.
- Moulton, E. S. Marketing Research Activities of Manufacturers. United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Marketing Research Series No. 21, April, 1939.
- National Industrial Conference Board. Marketing, Business, and Commercial Research in Business. New York: National Industrial Conference Board, Business Policy Study No. 72, 1955.
- Phelps, D. M. Marketing Research, Its Function, Scope, and Method, Michigan Business Studies, Vol. VIII, No. 2. Ann Arbor: Bureau of Business Research, University of Michigan, 1937.
- Rewoldt, Stewart H. Economic Effects of Marketing Research, Michigan Business Studies, Vol. XI, No. 4. Ann Arbor: Bureau of Business Research, University of Michigan, 1953.
- Roberts, Harry V. "The Role of Research in Marketing Management." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1955.
- Smith, Theodore C. "What's Wrong with Marketing Research Today? Use and Support--Some Problems for Management and Researchers." Paper presented at the 13th Annual Marketing Conference of the National Industrial Conference Board, October 20, 1965.
- Thompson, G. Clark. Organization for Market Research (Part I: Industry Experience). New York: National Industrial Conference Board, Studies in Business Policy, No. 12, 1945.
- Thompson, G. Clark. Organization for Market Research (Part II: Operating Methods and Company Plans). New York: National Industrial Conference Board, Studies in Business Policy, No. 19, 1946.
- Twedt, Dik Warren (editor). A Survey of Marketing Research. Chicago: American Marketing Association, 1963.

ROOM USE ONLY

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03145 0855