Marketing Education Review

ISSN: 1052-8008 (Print) 2153-9987 (Online) Journal homepage: http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/mmer20

Understanding the History of Marketing Education to Improve Classroom Instruction

O. C. Ferrell, Joe F. Hair Jr., Greg W. Marshall & Robert D. Tamilia

To cite this article: O. C. Ferrell, Joe F. Hair Jr., Greg W. Marshall & Robert D. Tamilia (2015) Understanding the History of Marketing Education to Improve Classroom Instruction, Marketing Education Review, 25:2, 159-175, DOI: 10.1080/10528008.2015.1038963

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10528008.2015.1038963

Published online: 15 Jun 2015.

UNDERSTANDING THE HISTORY OF MARKETING EDUCATION TO IMPROVE CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION

O. C. Ferrell, Joe F. Hair, Jr., Greg W. Marshall, and Robert D. Tamilia

This article provides a review of the history of marketing education. Some of the pioneers who developed concepts and pedagogical material used in teaching marketing are identified and some schools of thought are reviewed, namely, the commodity, institutional, and functional schools, as well as marketing management. During the early part of the 20th century, a number of scholars contributed seminal ideas that laid the foundation of marketing thought. Their published texts influenced what was taught in the classroom. What we teach today reflects what previous thought leaders and textbook authors considered to be important for the dissemination of marketing knowledge to students. Educators need a historical background about the concepts they teach and the textbooks they use. This background will help put what we teach today in perspective. This overview should provide an opportunity to think critically about the challenges that marketing educators face in selecting and presenting content in the classroom.

Marketing education has historical foundations that are important in understanding the evolution of the discipline. Understanding the history of marketing education enables educators to improve their conceptual and analytical skills and provide students with meaningful insights about the nature, content, and scope of marketing and how past marketing thought leaders provided the conceptual foundations from which we now teach marketing. Most business students take the principles of marketing class that has been taught for more than 100 years. Marketing subjects now common to a concentration in marketing—including consumer behavior, marketing research, and managerial marketing, among others—are taken at face value without understanding how these topics evolved or why they became a part of the marketing curriculum. An understanding of the pioneers, environment, and trends that created contemporary marketing education will help educators to evaluate what we teach today and provide insights into the future of marketing education. After all, current fads taught in the classroom may not have a long life cycle, similar to topics no longer taught today but that were deemed pertinent 50 to 100 years ago (such as agricultural marketing). Marketing is a very practical discipline, and what is taught is highly influenced by changes in the economy, competitive behavior, technology, demographics, and even changes in laws that impact marketing practice. Our analysis attempts to provide an overview of how marketing education has evolved so that educators can understand how the content has changed over time. A historical perspective enables teachers of marketing to share with their students that many marketing concepts presented in current textbooks have a long history.

Thus, the purpose of this paper is to help teachers of marketing fulfill their two basic jobs. Cox (1961) outlined these two jobs as teaching marketing as management to equip students with the training needed to succeed in business, while also creating an understanding of marketing to help educators know more about the discipline itself, its genesis, its role in the economy, its thought leaders and the theories they espoused, and so forth. This second job can only help teachers be more knowledgeable about the discipline and more comfortable and credible in the classroom, given the broader perspectives they bring when teaching.

O. C. Ferrell (Ph.D., Louisiana State University), University Distinguished Chair of Business Ethics, Belmont University, Nashville, TN, oferrell@unm.edu.

Joe F. Hair, Jr. (Ph.D., University of Florida), Professor of Marketing and Professional Sales, Coles College of Business, Kennesaw State University, Kennesaw, GA, jhair3@kennesaw.edu.

Greg W. Marshall (Ph.D., Oklahoma State University), Charles Harwood Professor of Marketing and Strategy, Crummer Graduate School of Business, Rollins College, Winter Park, FL, gmarshall@rollins.edu.

Robert D. Tamilia (Ph.D., Ohio State University), Honorary Professor of Marketing, School of Business, University of Quebec at Montreal, Canada, rtamilia@yahoo.com.

Marketing Education Review, vol. 25, no. 2 (summer 2015), pp. 159–175.

ISSN: 1052–8008 (print) / ISSN 2153–9987 (online)
DOI: 10.1080/10528008.2015.1038963

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Instruction in marketing needs to be put into the appropriate context because the transfer of marketing knowledge from one generation to the next needs perspective. Marketing is often faddish, with the latest changes in business practices emphasized in teaching. By better understanding the history of marketing education, professors can strengthen their knowledge of the foundational principles and concepts that are the bedrock of our discipline. We do not suggest that the history of marketing education should be inserted into the curriculum, especially at the undergraduate level. However, it is important to inform students that the material they are learning from textbooks has a history and a context. What is learned now comes from the accumulated knowledge from previous scholars that is often tweaked and modified to reflect current social, technological, and business trends. In addition, our review is limited to content development and not on how pedagogy evolved.

While marketing has been practiced for thousands of years, marketing education at the university level has really only gained in prominence during the past 115 years. As a result, this overview examines marketing education since 1900. In compiling our overview, we collected research from individual scholars as well as marketing journals. Robert Bartels (1962, 1976) was a prolific marketing thought historian, reporting excerpts from correspondence with 17 pioneers of marketing thought in 1940 and 1941. The *Journal of Marketing* published 23 biographies of early pioneers of marketing between 1956 and 1962. Since then, many publications on pioneers in marketing have been published. Their contributions have greatly enriched our understanding of the discipline and their ideas that have contributed to the building blocks of what is taught today (e.g., Jones, 2012). However, only a few are cited in this paper for reasons of brevity.

Proceedings from the Conference on Historical Analysis and Research in Marketing (CHARM) have also contributed unique insights into the different periods of marketing history. More recently, since 2009, the *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing* has provided a considerable body of knowledge that merits careful consideration in reevaluating existing knowledge about marketing education and pioneers of marketing thought. The journal published a number of articles providing reflections and challenges about concepts taught in marketing (Domegan, 2010; Jones & Keep, 2009; Witkowski, 2010). Tadajewski and Jones's (2008) three-volume publication, *The History of Marketing Thought,* provides a significant contribution not only to marketing history but also scholarship related to the development of marketing education. This research indicates that many of the concepts have been used by economists, social thinkers, and even business practitioners for hundreds of years, and the materials used in the classroom from current textbooks were not necessarily created by such authors. In addition, the paper is not a review of the history of marketing thought. This is a very broad topic; we narrow this review to the history of marketing education over the last 115 years.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE HISTORY OF MARKETING EDUCATION

Marketing educators debate how marketing should be defined and the most important subjects to teach. Students without a firm grasp of marketing are likely to have little comprehension of how the subject relates to other business disciplines. To increase students' understanding of this crucial field of business, marketing educators must themselves have a thorough understanding of how the content that comprises marketing evolved. A marketing educator with a historical perspective on marketing education will be better prepared to provide insights and challenge existing concepts taught today. Conversely, without understanding the evolution of marketing, educators will be limited in understanding why we teach what we teach. Professors who know and appreciate the history of marketing education are better positioned to teach current content and anticipate the future.

Most important, some traditional concepts that are taught may need revision. Tamilia (2009) points out that the readings in Tadajewski and Jones (2008) dispel the myth of the periodization of marketing found in most principles textbooks. The idea that marketing evolved through three stages starting with the production era, followed by the sales era, and finally culminating to the marketing era in the 1950s, is considered a fallacy with empirical research disproving the existence of this popular three-stage model evolution of marketing (Fullerton, 1988). Yet the periodization of marketing is still covered in almost every principles of marketing text. Many of the concepts found in lectures and textbooks represent the observations and opinions of scholars who did not have access to the historical research published over the last 30 years. Conversely, the marketing theories of earlier scholars that have been ignored, and even discarded, could provide alternative views and expanded insights into the nature and scope of marketing. Today's marketing courses are taught more from a managerial, decision-oriented microperspective (i.e., at the firm level) that not all educators agree is the most superior method for teaching marketing. Understanding alternative methods and theories of marketing—such as a broader macroview of marketing—developed by marketing pioneers before marketing management became the only way to teach the discipline may cause contemporary marketing instructors to modify or at least reexamine the ways they teach the discipline.

A historical orientation can help professors understand that although we have new concepts, such as digital marketing, big data, or marketing analytics, many marketing concepts have existed for centuries. Bussière (2005) uses the term "forensic marketing" and advocates an analysis of marketing history with the idea that it will improve our analytical skills. A shared understanding of how the discipline evolved will help professors to communicate about marketing today (Savitt, 1980). Other scholars suggest that understanding the history of marketing education will contribute to an understanding of the complexity and ambiguity of real-world situations (Kantrow, 1986; Savitt, 1980). When teaching specific classes such as consumer behavior, marketing research, or the capstone strategy marketing class, educators have an opportunity to point out how subdisciplines evolved and how various thought leaders contributed. For example, consumer behavior taught as a separate course within the marketing curriculum became a reality only in the late 1960s (Mittelstaedt, 1990). Gaining an understanding of marketing's origins and patterns of change can help establish an identity for the discipline by providing greater clarity of the role of marketing in the firm and its interface with society.

Numerous scholars argue that knowledge of the history of marketing education—including the different schools of marketing thought throughout the 20th century—can enhance teaching by avoiding overly simplistic frameworks about marketing. For example, reducing marketing to the four elements of the marketing mix (the 4Ps; product, place, price, and promotion) in a simplistic view of decision making ignores the more complete macro social process necessary for marketing to be a part of the economic system (Tamilia, 2009). This is another example of how marketing education sometimes relies on simplistic teaching devices rather than covering the complexities that drive marketing decisions and the role that marketing plays in society. Marketing involves more than just a market exchange process that includes an environment comprised of cooperative participants such as producers and retailers. Over time, different interpretations of marketing influenced the way marketing was defined, classified, and organized for teaching. Definitions of marketing provided the institutions with what material to cover in the classroom. As mentioned earlier, these definitions have undergone numerous changes throughout the years. For example, the AMA (American Marketing Association) provided three different definitions of marketing between 1985 and 2007. Just as marketing practitioners are continually adapting their perspectives of marketing, so must educators continue to reshape what topics are important to teach in the classroom. Our study provides an overview of some of the landmark events in marketing education that can provide a holistic foundation for educators to enhance their teaching.

THE DISCIPLINE OF MARKETING EVOLVES FROM ECONOMICS

In the United States, marketing first became a subject of academic interest at universities in the early part of the 20th century. Early scholars of marketing education owe a lot to the contributions of economic theory to the development of the discipline of marketing. After all, economics became its own unique social science after Adam Smith published the *Wealth of Nations* in 1776 (Tamilia, 2009). For a long time, marketing was predominately associated with economics—it was even referred to as applied economics. Early definitions of marketing theories were described as "modifications of applications of older economic theories" (Converse, 1951, p. 2). Another prominent scholar commented that a "worthwhile approach to the study of marketing or trade is through an economic analysis of the behavior of the individual firm under monopolistic or heterogeneous competition in the context of the local market, the regional market, and interregional marketing or trade" (Grether, 1950, pp. 122–123).

The first marketing course offered at an American university was in 1902 at the University of Michigan

(Jones & Shaw, 2002). Bartels (1962) argued that many business activities were well known before marketing became an established holistic discipline to be studied and taught, such as advertising, retailing, wholesaling, pricing, sales, and so forth. He postulated that when these separate tasks were grouped together, they were actually part of the same market process, called marketing. This resulted in the establishment of a "new" academic discipline having content and scope along with intellectual boundaries. Given its close association to the development of a market economy, it is understandable that economic thought contributed much toward marketing's growth as a discipline. In fact, most marketing textbook writers and even teachers of marketing were often referred to as marketing economists. This occurred until the 1950s when marketing sought out other social disciplines to understand consumer behavior better.

The newly created discipline of marketing began its academic independence from formal economics almost as soon as it was created when the National Association of Teachers of Marketing and Advertising was established in 1915. This group joined others, and by 1937, it had morphed into the American Marketing Association, which is still the premier professional marketing group known worldwide. Cox (1961) argued that marketing's close ties with economics were not entirely satisfactory despite economics providing the very foundations of marketing thought. As the discipline evolved and matured, Cox (1961) predicted that students of marketing would need more training in sociology, psychology, anthropology, and certainly mathematics. His prediction proved to be true because the behavioral sciences gained momentum after the post–World War II period. Marketing was one discipline, among many others, that benefited from the contributions made in these sciences. What Cox failed to recognize was that too much of a good thing might impact the very foundations of marketing and what is taught in the classroom. The more emphasis given to the behavioral sciences in marketing, the less influence economic thinking would have on the training of educators and what they teach in the classroom. Marketing textbooks are now almost devoid of the fundamental economic principles upon which marketing as a discipline was established in the first place. Marketing has grown as a science as a result of the contributions of the behavioral sciences, but this shift has caused some pedagogical issues.

Before this paradigm shift occurred, from the 1950s and beyond, the marketing aspects of the economy (and not the firm) were very much in vogue, with an emphasis on the importance of distribution in the economy. The growing economic gap between the making of goods and their costly distribution, that is, their availability to business buyers and consumers, was a major concern for government officials and marketing scholars alike. The savings realized in making goods due to mass production efficiencies were lost when distributing such goods to consumers. Thus, marketing and distribution were terms that were used interchangeably in the classroom, and the question "Does distribution cost too much?" preoccupied the discipline for decades. This "marketing in the economy" theme was linked with economic preoccupations of productivity and efficiencies in the economy, a macroview of marketing that is still relevant today. Fortunately, supply chain management has now assumed this challenging and complex marketing responsibility. However, the marketing curriculum is sorely lacking in offering courses on logistics and supply chain management. Fragmentation and specialization of the marketing discipline have resulted in such courses being taught by other business departments and even outside schools of business (Stock & Whitney, 1989). In fact, supply chain management (logistics) is now a separate discipline almost independent of marketing.

Early courses in distribution proved to be precursors of today's unique marketing education. Examples of these early marketing classes include Distributive and Regulative Industries of the United States taught at the University of Michigan in 1902 and the Distribution of Products taught at the University of Pittsburgh in 1906. Marketing then evolved into more specialized course offerings, including Principles of Advertising, Marketing Problems, and Sales. While Harvard University and the University of Wisconsin made significant contributions toward the first marketing courses, it was schools such as Ohio State University and Northwestern University that made the most impact (Bartels, 1962). For instance, between 1905 and 1921, Ohio State taught courses in distribution, commercial credit, advertising, salesmanship, wholesaling, and retailing. The subjects of these courses at Ohio State were viewed as important activities of the marketing discipline. In 1915–1916, the school's course entitled "Mercantile Institutions" was changed to

"Marketing" (Bartels, 1962, pp. 22–23). Ohio State University can be credited with significantly advancing the field of marketing as a business major.

Due to the relative newness of these topics as components of the discipline of marketing, professors were often required to perform research and write their own materials to help them teach the course (Bartels, 1962, pp. 30–32). This led them to incorporate both older marketing theories and new concepts into their teaching. It was an exciting time in the world of business education. As the marketing course developed, students were being offered the chance to pursue higher level degrees in business. In 1902, seven students received their Masters of Commercial Science diplomas at Dartmouth, the precursor to the M.B.A. (Daniel, 1998, p. 15). Harvard launched the first M.B.A. program in 1908 with only 15 faculty members. The M.B.A. reached Europe in 1957 when INSEAD offered the M.B.A. in France. Today, the M.B.A. is the second most popular postgraduate degree in American education (*Economist* staff, 2013), and the marketing concentration is present in most graduate business programs.

EARLY PIONEERS WHO ADVANCED MARKETING EDUCATION

Although not all early pioneers of marketing education can be covered, there were many contributors from several disciplines that were particularly important in defining and shaping marketing education in the early years. Our selection of pioneers, while not comprehensive, has been chosen to represent different perspectives in the development of marketing education. Without these early innovators, it is likely that marketing would not have become the discipline that it is today.

In 1906, for example, Samuel Sparling wrote what was probably the first principles of management textbook. This book is the result of Sparling's course on Business Organization and Management given at the University of Wisconsin. The table of contents includes the management of farming, factories, legal issues, accounting, and marketing. The marketing topics covered a wide range of subjects, from notions about the "distributive industries," such as wholesaling, retailing, and direct selling, to topics covering the market, exchange, sales force management, advertising, and credit and collections (service sector). Surprisingly, one third of the book is on channels of distribution (Sparling, 1906). It is probably one of the first texts outlining and discussing many of marketing's various subtopics.

It has only been during the last 200 years that the term "marketing" has been used in our literature. A search of 90 economics journals indicates that the term marketing was mentioned in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* in 1887 (Stevens, 1887, p. 55). A publication in 1814 (*Agricultural Gentleman,* 1814, p. xxiv) used the term marketing. The first book with marketing in its title was *Cotton: Its Cultivation, Marketing, Manufacture, and the Problems of the Cotton World* (Burkett & Poe, 1906). It would be around 1910 before the term "marketing" was used to explain the integration of selling, distribution, advertising, and commerce in a course at the University of Wisconsin. This definition of marketing was a landmark event because it made the concept of marketing applicable to business education at the university level. Business education has been around a lot longer, with business/commercial handbooks made available to merchants as early as the 16th century (Shaw, 1995). Not surprisingly, these handbooks contained much information on the practice of marketing and other business functions, which helped medieval merchants understand the various markets in which they were selling.

Ralph Starr Butler was one of the first scholars to conceive of a greater definition of marketing (Harvard Business School, n.d.). Butler believed that marketing went beyond activities such as distribution and selling that involved planning and coordination—what he saw as "the 'binding force' in marketing, of management of the complicated relations among the various 'factors in trade' that must be considered first by the distributor who wishes to build his campaign with care" (Bartels, 1962, p. 161). When Ralph Starr Butler attempted to organize a course integrating distribution, personal selling, advertising, and pricing at the University of Wisconsin, he used the term "Marketing Methods" for his 1911 class pamphlets. These pamphlets were published and became some of the first principles of marketing teaching materials. Ralph Starr Butler's six pamphlets evolved into a book titled *Marketing Methods* (vol. 5, 1918, available at www.archive.org).

As one of the first marketing textbooks, Butler's work can be compared to more current marketing texts to investigate the evolution of marketing education. *Marketing Methods* includes many of the topics found in today's marketing principles texts, including the concepts of exchange, channels, retailing, pricing, product, purchasing, branding, and advertising, similar to topics covered by Sparling (1906). Some of the chapters include "Study of the Product," "Study of the Market," "The Complete Campaign," and "The Cost of Competitive Selling"—not dissimilar to many chapter titles today but without the emphasis on managerial decision making pertinent to a firm. After all, the theory of monopolistic competition from which modern marketing management is based was developed only in the 1930s (e.g., Chamberlin, 1933). It is also interesting that at 21 chapters, Butler's book has about the same number of chapters as found in today's principles of marketing texts, and almost every topic we discuss in class today was at least touched on briefly in Butler's book. Regarding marketing ethics, for example, he commented, "honesty and the desire to give the consumer a little bit better than a square deal are characteristics of modern successful merchandising. . . . No business can continue to make large sales on the basis of misrepresentation" (Butler, 1918, p. 115). This was possibly an early conceptualization of the marketing concept. Although services marketing did not emerge as a major topic in the field until the early 1980s, Butler discussed service competition and related this topic to price competition. Therefore, although marketing education has changed dramatically over the last century, many of the core topics deemed important for marketing scholarship remain the same.

Arch Shaw's article, "Some Problems in Market Distribution" (1912), viewed the marketing process as being made up of two major marketing tasks: a demand creation task (demand stimulation) and a physical supply one (making goods available to the market). Both tasks needed to be synchronized to achieve some balance for efficiency purposes (Copeland, 1958, pp. 313–315). Shaw's article viewed marketing as demand creation and physical supply along with their interdependencies with the intent "to establish an application of economic theory to marketing problems . . . from a management point of view, of distribution policies, price policies, and their relation to policies of demand simulation." Shaw's research also gave rise to the theory of "the market contour" (Copeland, 1958, pp. 315), which recognizes that the market consists of many different "economic and social strata" that product distributors must consider when selling. Distributors must take the different needs and situations—the strata—of the market into account to succeed (Shaw, 1915, p. 101). Marketing educators can recognize Shaw's "market contour" theory as the description of the concepts of market segmentation and target marketing expanded on by later pioneers.

Melvin T. Copeland was a marketing pioneer, and with Malcolm McNair and Paul Nystrom, made Harvard the leading academic institution on retail and wholesale distribution problems and issues. Moreover, Copeland was also a leading pioneer in the development and classification of buying motives. Consumer motivation was not well developed then, and buying motives were used as a precursor approach toward the study of consumer behavior. Copeland's contributions helped pave the way for later educators to add more of these social aspects of marketing into their curricula. He was also a contributor to the commodity school of thought and popularized a classification scheme still found in textbooks today separating goods into convenience, shopping, and specialty goods (Copeland, 1923).

The 1910s and 1920s were an important time for marketing education as pioneers of marketing published textbooks that enabled the discipline to be incorporated more and more into college courses. Bartels (1962) called this period the golden age in the development of the discipline. Textbooks such as Fowler's (1911) *Practical Salesmanship: A Treatise on the Art of Selling Goods,* Hoyt's (1913) *Scientific Sales Management*, and Cherington's (1920) *The Elements of Marketing* provided teachers of marketing with the basic pedagogical material to teach the field. Note that textbooks of the period need not have "marketing" in the title but were still considered marketing textbooks.

A textbook titled *Principles of Marketing* was published by Paul Ivey in 1921. Fred Clark followed in 1922 with the second book of the same name. The first textbook with the term "marketing management" in its title was by Percival White (1927). It is considered seminal by some scholars because White incorporated Frederick Taylor's principles of scientific management in marketing (Jones & Tadajewski, 2011). It would take another 30 years before marketing textbooks fully embraced the managerial approach (Alderson, 1957). The first coauthored book titled *Principles of Marketing* was by Maynard, Weidler, and Beckman, published in 1927. This book went through nine editions until 1973 and was one of the most widely used textbooks ever. Another successful early text was Paul Converse's

Elements of Marketing, published in 1930. Early marketing textbooks approached the subject matter by focusing on commodities, institutions, and functions, among other material presented. Surprisingly, these three topics are still present in textbooks today. For example, commodities refer to product categories and brands; institutions refer to the various marketing organizations involved in the marketing process such as types of retailers, types of wholesalers, and other agents (e.g., marketing research firms, ad agencies, transportation carriers, etc.), and marketing functions refer to the ubiquitous managerial functions of marketing known as the 4Ps. Previously, marketing functions were defined in broader terms reflecting marketing in the economy perspective, while today's marketing functions are more micro and refer to the manager's set of available marketing decision-making tasks under the firm's control.

Up until the 1950s, marketing scholars believed that descriptive knowledge about marketing organizations, their structures, and their activities was necessary to learn more about the marketing process in order to teach it (Hollander, 1997). The post–World War II period resulted in numerous changes in American society and the world of business. A discussion of these changes is beyond the scope of this paper. Suffice it to say that it marked the beginning of the baby boom, with many scientific breakthroughs in technology and material sciences, the invention of the computer, and the growing importance of operations research and the emergence of the behavioral sciences. Business education was not immune to such changes. The Ford Foundation and Carnegie Corporation Reports on business education urged a major revision in the training of business educators and changes in pedagogical material (Surface, 1960). Business education was suffering from low academic standards and excessive vocational focus with too many specialized courses that had little academic value. Business courses were not analytical enough, were too descriptive, and were deficient in quantitative methods and the decision sciences. They were also lacking in the behavioral sciences, with few courses focused on developing the managerial decision-making skills of students. The Reports recommended that educators be exposed to other disciplines (the interdisciplinary approach), which would result in more managerial-oriented research. Authors such as Philip Kotler, Wroe Alderson, and John Howard were Ford Fellowship recipients, which enabled them to study marketing by incorporating more decision sciences and behavioral sciences into marketing, as recommended by the Reports.

The descriptive approaches to marketing education, prevalent since the early 1900s, soon fell out of favor as a result of these Reports. Hollander pointed out that the academic shift from macro descriptions of the marketing aspects of the economy to firm-level micro-management decision modeling was the most basic evolution of general marketing texts over the first 50 years of marketing (Hollander, 1997). Some scholars, such as Beckman (1963) and Cox (1961), were concerned about the radical changes occurring in the way marketing was being studied and taught. Cox (1961) even indicated that the new managerial emphasis narrowed the scope of marketing. They argued that marketing should incorporate multiple perspectives and that a macromarketing approach need not be abandoned, even in a principles of marketing class. Beckman (1960, 1963) felt that teaching marketing from only one perspective (that is, managerial marketing) would prevent the "full coverage and complete accuracy demanded" in such a course (Beckman, 1960, p. 133).

An emphasis on marketing management research and education starting from the 1960s attracted a new breed of marketing educators, namely, behavioral scientists and modelers. These new teachers of marketing were unlike the previous generation, with many unfamiliar with marketing's past contributions to marketing thought, education, or even the pedagogical material that had been developed over the previous 50 years. Nowadays, marketing management, intermingled with a heavy dose of the behavioral sciences and consumer modeling, is omnipresent in the curriculum, which has been fragmented into numerous specialized domains. Few students today are exposed to the broader dimensions of marketing. Macromarketing, as a school of marketing thought, is now relegated as a subfield of marketing, occupying a modest position in the training of both teachers and students (Wilkie & Moore, 2003, 2012).

SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT USED TO STUDY MARKETING

The marketing literature before the 1950s presented the study of marketing based on the commodity, institutional, or functional schools of thought, among other topics covered in class. Each of these study approaches had a profound influence on marketing education but did not lead to the managerial school of marketing, as stated earlier. Other factors contributed to the rise of marketing management as almost the only way to teach marketing and conduct research.

The early use of commodities enhanced the study of marketing by focusing on products such as corn, oil, or any other class of product. The commodity approach is still used for services. For example, health-care marketing uses a commodity framework for research and education. However, not many texts continue to emphasize the commodity approach in marketing research. Despite the decreasing interest in the commodity approach to marketing, its influence over marketing education is profound (Zinn & Johnson, 1987).

Marketing scholar R. F. Breyer was a strong advocate of the commodity approach. He pioneered its popularity, believing that it was "the only feasible method of presenting effectively a number of important aspects of marketing, e.g. the distribution channels" (Breyer, 1931, p. v; Zinn & Johnson, 1987, p. 136). It is important to note that the term "commodity" had a different meaning than it does today, referring to producer (industrial) and consumer goods. Thus, despite its limitations, in earlier times, commodity marketing encompassed a wider range of products than its current definition of homogenous goods (Mount, 1969).

Scholars E. A. Duddy and D. A. Revzan (1953) defined the commodity approach as a method "in which the commodity serves as a focus around which to organize the details of the institutional and management aspects of marketing" (p. 15). That is, the emphasis during this time period in marketing education was on the product itself. Scholars appreciated the commodity approach for its simplicity, but the repetition inherent in describing each different commodity and its failure to consider other marketing functions led to its decline in popularity (Zinn & Johnson, 1987).

Early marketing scholars adapted the institutional approach developed by economists and applied it to marketing to classify and study the various organizations that make up the marketing process, such as retailers, wholesalers, and other economic agencies involved in bringing goods and services from origin to destination. Census data on the distributive trades came into existence only in 1929. Before, knowledge about the extent and impact of these economic organizations were hard to come by and relied on private sources. Nystrom's *Economics of Retailing* (1915) was probably the first comprehensive text on the state of retail institutions in the United States.

His work adopts an inductive methodology to describe the retail industry, starting from the history of the retail and distribution industry and proceeding to address individual experiences of store managers (Jones & Monieson, 1987, p. 157). Similar texts that utilize an institutional approach to describe the operations of channel members contributed to an in-depth understanding of the different institutions making up the marketing field. Today's educators continue to teach the importance of middlemen and institutions in the marketing channel, but not to the same degree as was done before the 1950s.

Despite the limitations of the institutional approach to the study of marketing, it can still provide a generalized view of marketing. It can also contribute to political and public policy perspectives (Jones & Monieson, 1987). Marketing and public policy research examines social, economic, and political phenomena associated with an institutional approach. In addition, the modern stakeholder orientation in marketing takes an institutional approach by identifying stakeholders such as regulators, communities, suppliers, and others that influence the marketing process (Ferrell et al., 2010). This has provided students, scholars, and practitioners with additional insights in the marketing field.

Three scholarly works contributed greatly in expanding the study of marketing via the functional approach. Arch W. Shaw's 1915 *Some Problems of Market Distribution* created a list of what he called "the functions of the middleman," including sharing of risks; transporting; financing; selling of risks; and assembling, assorting, and reshipping (p. 76). Shaw determined that middlemen tend to specialize in these different functions, contributing to industries such as insurance and banking. In his 1916 text *The Marketing of Farm Products,* L. D. H. Weld also separated functions by middlemen. In a later article, however, Weld chose to separate functions by marketing, which he delineated into assembling, storage, assumption of risks, financing, rearrangement, selling, and transportation. In 1919, a pamphlet titled "Marketing Functions" split up product marketing into standardizing, assembling, selling, transporting, storing, financing and risking, and dispersing (Elsworth & Gatlin, 1919; Faria, 1983). Clearly, there was no pure consistency among these functional classification schemes, although commonalities of particular functional elements existed.

In spite of the positive contributions the functional approach has had on marketing education, one problem is the difficulty in agreeing on which functions to adopt. Of course, the same problem occurred when critics questioned whether the marketing mix only had 4Ps or more. Although each of the three frameworks was influential in its own way, inherent flaws and the continual evolution of the marketing field led to other approaches that predominate today—the managerial school and the consumer behavior school (2013).

RISE OF MANAGERIAL MARKETING

The period of marketing from about 1955 to the 1970s witnessed the growing importance of a more managerial approach in marketing education. This approach already existed in marketing education under sales management (Tosdal, 1921). Harry Tosdal's presentation of sales management was in fact marketing management (Cunningham, 1958). The expression "marketing management" was seldom used in the marketing curricula before the 1950s (Breen, 1959; La Londe & Morrison, 1967). Few textbooks actually had such a title (except White, 1927). Sales management was also a marketing topic that was suited for managerial decision making: How to select, train, pay, and motivate people; how to select sales territories; and so forth. This does not mean that management was not part of marketing education prior to the 1950s or 1960s. In fact, Harvard case studies introduced in the curriculum in the late 1910s demonstrated that teachers of marketing knew very well they were training business students, despite parts of textbooks organized under commodity, institutional, and functional approaches. In fact, Tosdal insisted that sales management was broader than just the management of the sales force, even though his various texts were titled sales management. Thus, sales management was not a spin-off of marketing management. The expression "marketing management" replaced sales management in the 1960s by marketing academicians who were often reluctant to adopt the term.

The origin of the term "marketing mix" is open to debate. Some believe it was coined by Neil Borden in his 1953 American Marketing Association presidential address (Borden, 1965). Yet Cunningham (1951) used the term appropriately in his article. Although the concept of managerial marketing was already taking the lead, Alderson's 1957 *Marketing Behavior and Executive Action* fired the biggest salvo toward a true paradigm shift in marketing education. It was Alderson who "with one sweeping stroke created a new pattern for considering marketing management" as the framework for teaching (Bartels, 1976, p. 178). Alderson's text identifies the importance of the environment in marketing and diverged from a more economic approach by incorporating perspectives from psychology, sociology, anthropology, political science, and physical sciences into the marketing discipline (Bartels, 1976). Alderson has been called the father of modern marketing (Lazer & Pirog, 2007).

Kelly and Lazer (1958) published a managerially focused reading book for courses and seminars (Lazer, 2013, p. 237). The book was well received, and another edition was released in 1960 with more of an acceptance of managerial marketing as an emerging framework for marketing courses. At the same time, Lazer became interested in social issues and ethics as they relate to managerial marketing. This resulted in an M.B.A. seminar in the late 1950s on marketing ethics and the quality of life. This first marketing ethics course was taught at Michigan State University (Lazer, 2013, p. 237). Under his leadership, Lazer was able to advance marketing education into new areas of exploration at Michigan State.

Although the actual marketing activities as they were practiced before this period changed little, the teaching of how they are approached and managed in the organization was changing. The marketing management school became the premier method of teaching marketing as a decision-making process (Shaw & Jones, 2005; Webster, 1992). Thus, marketing management sought to describe the process of planning and executing marketing activities under four categories, referred to as the marketing mix. The most popular organizational description of the marketing mix is the 4Ps described in E. Jerome McCarthy's 1960 *Basic Marketing*—product, place, price, and promotion. McCarthy needs to be credited for placing the marketing mix in a framework as the first principles of marketing textbook.

The marketing concept, a term first coined by General Electric (GE) in 1950, has been presented in most introductory marketing textbooks as a pillar of marketing thought and theory, at least in education. Yet its origin is practitioners-based in response to post–World War II changes in the economy. The marketing concept was soon wholeheartedly accepted by marketing educators in the late 1950s, after being amply discussed in trade journals by practitioners. The marketing concept took on a life of its own, going beyond GE's original meaning of the term. It led to its link with the three-era model of marketing thought—the P-S-M eras (production, sales, and marketing eras) first proposed by Keith (1960). Current marketing textbook writers as well as some marketing educators have refused to abandon the three-era model. Yet the marketing concept (or any of its newer versions) was interpreted as a new business philosophy without any empirical evidence supporting its newness. The marketing concept is not a new approach to marketing or business; it was practiced long before GE first proposed it in the 1950s (Hollander, 1986; Jones & Richardson, 2007). The marketing concept also coincided with the rise of the marketing mix (the 4Ps) as a better way to plan, manage, and implement the various marketing activities at the firm level. The fast adoption of the marketing mix, especially in marketing education (roughly less than 10 years—from the 1950s to the early 1960s), indicated a profound change in the way marketing was being taught in the classroom.

The next major evolution in marketing management was the concept of market orientation (MO). Businesses with a market orientation view customers and competitors as the market focus (Narver & Slater, 1990). MO supporters propose that because customers and competitors appear to have the most financial impact on an organization, they should be the main focus when investigating the marketing environment (Ferrell, Gonzalez-Padron, Hult, & Maignan, 2010, pp. 94–95). Market orientation was an extension or restatement of the marketing concept placed in a strategic framework that includes organizationwide decision making. Market-oriented organizations are characterized by offering "continuously superior customer value" (Slater & Narver, 1995, p. 63). MO is thus credited with giving rise to customer relationship management in marketing education. Earlier marketing scholars had identified customer relationships as important almost 100 years earlier.

This greater emphasis on the customer prompted marketers to increase their market intelligence generation, dissemination, and responsiveness. Kohli and Jaworski (1990) propose that market intelligence requires marketers not only to monitor environmental forces but also to use this intelligence to formulate strategies to meet customers' current and future needs (p. 3). Anticipating customer needs became an important component of market research and intelligence gathering. Identifying customers and carefully monitoring the competition, collecting information, and using market intelligence to offer products that meet customer needs became the strategic focus of many firms (Kohli & Jaworksi, 1990). It also led to a greater emphasis on market research and statistical analysis in university marketing courses.

Marketing's overall role in an organization, including its relationship with other areas of the firm, continues to evolve. The notion of "marketing as strategy" means that marketing is becoming more of a true boardroom topic in firms today, complete with the understanding that the analysis needed to be able to make the best decisions about investments of firm resources toward the development of products and markets for the future is likely the most important strategic decision a firm's leadership can make (Kumar, 2004). Most principles of marketing courses use a managerial or strategic framework, and most undergraduate programs require a marketing strategy course, often offered as a "capstone" course.

CONSUMER BEHAVIOR BREAKS ITS OWN GROUND IN MARKETING EDUCATION

During the 1950s, marketers began to incorporate social science disciplines/behavioral sciences such as psychology, sociology, and anthropology into marketing education. This expansion into the social sciences enabled marketers and marketing scholars to determine "with more accuracy the subjective factors affecting consumption, upon which sound marketing plans could be based" (Bartels, 1976, p. 132). Before this period, these social sciences had not provided the tools and concepts required for examining what motivates people to purchase or avoid purchasing certain products. The advancements made in the social sciences during the postwar period saw a shift toward investigating why people purchase specific items as well as the meanings they assign to different brands (Karesh, 1995). Fullerton (2011) claims that this new type of marketing research—referred to as "motivational research"—was the precursor to the study of consumer behavior. Consumer behavior as a college course and as the focus of research took off during the 1950s and 1960s.

In 1955, "The Product and the Brand" was published in *Harvard Business Review* by Burleigh Gardner and Sidney Levy. This article provided a clear definition of brand image as the "sets of ideas, feelings, and attitudes that consumers have about brands" (p. 35). This view contrasted with the mass marketing theory (which viewed brands as homogenous) and held that different brands appeal to different people (Karesh, 1995). Wroe Alderson also made a significant contribution with works such as his *Marketing Behavior and Executive Action* (1957). Like Gardner and Levy, Alderson believed that consumer demand for certain brands and products was heterogeneous. Alderson's theory about the heterogeneity of supply and demand could be seen as precursors to market segmentation and niche marketing taught in marketing courses today (Green & Goodman, 2012). This emphasis on consumers and the meaning they give to certain brands were major drivers of motivational research.

Despite the growing interest in motivational research, college courses at the time focused on social sciences but not so much on consumer behavior (Fullerton, 2011). However, a number of articles and books appeared introducing concepts that would prove integral to advancing the study of consumer behavior at universities as well as in firms. George Katona is believed to be the forerunner of behavioral economics and published *Psychological Analysis of Economic Behavior* in 1951. The Advertising Research Foundation's 1954 publication *The Language of Dynamic Psychology* introduced concepts such as motivation, frame of reference, and aided recall (Fullerton, 2011; Wulfeck & Bennett, 1954). Morgan (1958) introduced the concept of reference groups, whereas Pierre Martineau (1958) described the importance of lifestyle and self-concept to consumer motivation. W. H. Whyte (1954) began to examine how people in the same social class tended to exhibit similar values and preferences. This discovery of the importance of social class, further investigated by W. Lloyd Warner and Pierre Martineau, would become an important variable of consumer behavior in college textbooks (Fullerton, 2011).

In many ways, consumer behavior disrupted the idea of the "rational man" taught in economics courses. Because motivation often occurs in the unconscious as well as the conscious, the idea that consumers make choices based on rational thought processes began to be questioned (Fullerton, 2011). This recognition led to changes in market research education. For instance, when learning how to conduct surveys, marketing students are often taught to ask questions that are more projective and qualitative to try to uncover a respondent's unconscious motivations. Psychological and sociological variables were added to demographic variables as a way to differentiate consumers (Karesh, 1995). Focus groups and surveys were popular forms of studying consumer motivations (Fullerton, 2011) and were incorporated into classroom teaching.

The 1960s saw the rise of consumer behavior (Fullerton, 2013). During this time, consumer behavior was starting to gain prominence at the university level. In 1961, James Engel developed an article describing the importance of motivation research (Engel, 1961). Perry Bliss's 1963 textbook *Marketing and the Behavioral Sciences* was used in graduate courses. Robert Holloway's and Tod White's 1964 article "Advancing the Experimental Method in Marketing" helped to make experimental studies an important part of consumer behavior research. Myers and Reynolds' *Consumer Behavior and Marketing Management* (1967) would be the first textbook to incorporate the word "consumer behavior" in the title (Mittlestaedt, 1990). In 1965, James F. Engel, David T. Kollat, and Roger D. Blackwell taught a Ph.D. course on consumer behavior, followed by the publication of their seminal book *Consumer Behavior* three years later (1968), the first marketing-based textbook on consumer behavior (R. Blackwell, personal communication, May 22, 2013). In their book, the authors proposed a model for consumer decision making and stressed the importance of sociocultural and psychological variables in the decision-making process (Engel, Kollat, & Blackwell, 1968; Morris, Winter, & Beutler, 1976). Their book helped make consumer behavior an important marketing subdiscipline. Howard and Sheth's (1969) *Theory of Buyer Behavior* also created much discussion and debate that advanced consumer behavior research. While their theory was later revised, it became the focal point for launching this new area of consumer behavior research in marketing.

Mittelstaedt (1990) notes that although much research in the 1950s was qualitative, the trend during the 1960s and 1970s was toward more quantitative approaches. However, he also identified a gap in economics and consumer behavior. A bellwether event in the evolution of marketing education was the launch of the *Journal of Consumer Research* (*JCR*) in 1974. The *JCR* and its sponsoring organization, the Association for Consumer Research (ACR), created a highly visible raison d'être for consumer behavior as the most populated subfield of marketing scholars. Based on historical data from the annual AMA Sheth Foundation Doctoral Consortium, over the past 10 years, approximately one third of all marketing dissertations represented at the Consortium were consumer-behavior focused. Consumer behavior is solidified as a powerhouse in marketing education. Most marketing programs require an undergraduate consumer behavior course, or the course is offered as an elective.

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS IN MARKETING EDUCATION

Quantitative analysis in marketing has advanced over the last 100 years and is now a core driver of academic research and marketing education. Richard Germain (1989) examined quantitative analysis in marketing literature from the early twentieth century. In-depth quantitative analysis methods were notably absent from marketing research textbooks from 1915–1937. Some of the most important statistical analysis tools for marketing research, including survey designs and sampling, were developed by market researchers and the U.S. Census Bureau from the 1910s to the 1930s. In 1911, Charles Coolidge Parlin headed the very first Division of Commercial Research in the United States, part of the Advertising Department of The Curtis Publishing Company. The creation of such a departmental function was revolutionary for American business. Parlin not only invented the scope and technique of this new private sector market activity but also its name. Commercial research would soon be referred to as market research, and finally, as marketing research. Parlin also pioneered in interviewing techniques, and his numerous market studies surveyed consumers, wholesalers, retailers, and dealers in an effort to give the Curtis Company a market edge sufficient to convince advertisers to advertise in their publications for specific products and markets (Assael, 1978). The annual C.C. Parlin Marketing Research Award sponsored by the AMA for the best research article is a tribute to this pioneer in marketing. More recently, Ward (2009) has gone further by documenting how much the marketing discipline has contributed to the development of market research methods and techniques. Prior to World War II, inferential statistical methods were also developed by British statistician Sir Ronald Fisher. These technical methods and tools would eventually become an integral part of the discipline, especially when the contributions of the behavioral sciences surged in marketing from the 1960s and beyond. After all, the behavioral sciences are research based, with the use of statistical methods to evaluate empirical data, supporting or rejecting the hypotheses under study.

The importance of quantitative analysis in education grew with the increasing use of statistical analysis by organizations. The Depression during the 1930s alerted businesses to the need for quantitative information as a way to remain competitive (Hovde, 1936). Organizations began to realize that to continue selling products to cash-strapped consumers, they would need a better understanding of potential markets, the best methods to sell to these markets, ways to improve selling methods, ways to improve the products and packaging to appeal to these markets, and the demand for certain products. Thus, quantitative analysis helped organizations to better understand consumer behavior and the economics of consumer demand to survive during a difficult period of U.S. history. The pressure to incorporate statistical analysis into marketing courses began to increase.

Bartels (1976) noted that empirical research such as statistical analysis was not often discussed in marketing research education before the 1950s. One of the earliest texts was *Statistical Techniques in Market Research* (1949) by Robert Ferber, which provided the foundation for the teaching of marketing research for the next decade. Quantitative techniques were used in fields such as accounting and operations research, but it was not until the 1960s that quantitative models and advanced mathematics began quickly spreading into the marketing field. Harvard Business Professor Robert D. Buzzell indicated in his 1964 book *Mathematical Models and Marketing Management* that marketing models using quantitative methods were becoming increasingly important to the marketing discipline due to, among many reasons, a greater need for marketing research in companies, the competitive value of such models, and the need to go beyond conventional methods in marketing decision making. Buzzell recognized that the complexities of marketing, including the external environment and behavioral relationships with stakeholders, required the use of marketing models for decision making (Bartels, 1976).

Other major textbooks published during the 1960s that dealt with quantitative analysis include Ralph Day's 1964 *Marketing Models: Quantitative and Behavioral;* Paul Green and Donald Tull's 1966 *Research for Marketing Decisions;* conference papers by Bass, King, and Pessemier (1968) on consumer behavior, normative models, and simulation; and Casher's 1969 *Marketing and the Computer,* which demonstrated how computers could be used for different marketing research activities. To summarize quantitative developments in the 1960s, three major topics were explored: justifications for the use of quantitative tools in marketing, explanations of the various methods, and interpretations of where they would be most useful in marketing (Bartels, 1976).

Material on quantitative methods in marketing education, including more accurate approaches to measuring marketing phenomena, exploded during the 1970s. This emergence was facilitated by the availability of computer hardware and statistical software, as well as many more textbooks and articles. Jum C. Nunnally (1978) published a classic book on psychometric theory and measurement, and Gilbert Churchill and J. Paul Peter published seminal articles on measurement, including construct development and scale reliability, in the *Journal of Marketing Research* (1979). The first edition of perhaps the most widely referenced statistical methods in marketing textbooks was published in the late 1970s—*Multivariate Data Analysis* (1979), by Joe Hair, Rolph Anderson, and Ron Tatham (all editions 130,000+ citations). The success of the book was due to the simple writing style and the absence of formulas—an approach that appealed to a much broader market.

The 1980s began with another classic book by Richard Bagozzi, *Causal Models in Marketing* (1980) on structural equation modeling (SEM). This text, targeted for graduate education, introduced the most advanced statistical method available at that time, and its application became widespread in marketing research based on the availability of LISREL software. Two popular undergraduate texts published in the 1980s include one authored by Aker and Day, *Marketing Research* (1983), and another by Churchill, *Marketing Research: Methodological Foundations* (1987). About 75 percent of the content of these books focused on questionnaire design and data collection. The remaining 25 percent was a nonrigorous treatment of basic statistics as well as multiple regression and other multivariate methods.

Starting in the 1990s, the application of quantitative methods in marketing education expanded rapidly. A major reason for this is because software became adapted for use on laptops, which faculty and many students increasingly used in their teaching and research. A second, and perhaps more important reason, is that statistical software became much more user friendly based on "point and click" and "drag and drop" Windows programs and later graphical interfaces. In addition to more widespread use, quantitative methods in marketing became more sophisticated. By the year 2000, more than 50 percent of all articles in the more prestigious peer-reviewed marketing journals applied covariance-based structural equation modeling (CB-SEM), and most of the remaining articles used other techniques such as multiple regression, exploratory factor analysis, MANOVA (multivariate analysis of variance), and so forth. Indeed, very little qualitative research was being published in marketing journals, and marketing research courses seldom covered qualitative research methods.

From 2000 on, marketing education textbooks, journal articles, and teaching practices increasingly incorporated quantitative methods. Much of the emphasis was on building and refining predictive marketing models to provide more accurate knowledge about customer purchase behavior. This trend was facilitated by the availability of much more data, particularly data made possible by the emergence of the Internet, search engine giants such as Google, and social media Web sites such as Facebook. Previously little-used methods such as partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) were applied and taught much more widely (Hair, Sarstedt, & Ringle, 2011; Hair, Sarstedt, Ringle, & Mena, 2012). It appears that marketing education will become more quantitative in the future. Almost every undergraduate marketing program requires a marketing research course with a strong quantitative emphasis. Currently, many programs are teaching marketing analytics to help utilize big data that has recently evolved. Quantitative analysis is becoming popular in all marketing courses.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR MARKETING EDUCATION

Up to now, we have provided an overview of marketing's evolution as an academic discipline. With its roots in economics, marketing has achieved recognition in business schools as a core functional area of importance. Marketing is an important functional component of a business for developing relationships with consumers and creating revenue. It can also be applied in nonbusiness organizations and other activities that attempt to reach consumers. Marketing remains somewhat fragmented, with many subtopics that tend to create silos not only among researchers and educators but also among students of marketing. Still, many of the core concepts that are taught in classes today were developed in the early part of the 20th century by pioneers in marketing education. The idea that certain concepts such as the marketing mix, the marketing concept, service marketing, and relationship marketing were only discovered in the last 50 years has been significantly questioned by those that study the history of marketing thought. While the history of marketing education should be much broader than just understanding consumer behavior, managerial decision making, and marketing research, we restricted our in-depth coverage to these areas, as well as principles of marketing. These topics are usually associated with required courses taught in many universities for marketing majors.

While these courses are essential for marketing majors, they tend to focus on more of a micromarketing approach incorporating specific theories and concepts that have been accepted as the most valid among alternatives. In effect, these theories and concepts are those that have "won" and displaced other theories in the past century. A survey of principles of marketing courses by Tamilia and Veilleux (2007) found that the first course taken in marketing has an almost exclusive managerial orientation. As this paper demonstrates, however, marketing's past was macro in perspective. Textbook authors were not fixated on managerial marketing decision making. Students then recognized that marketing was not just a micromanagerial function task within a firm but was an integral part of our economic system and society, with many important questions and issues that still need to be analyzed from a macromarketing perspective. Marketing management as a managerial demand lessens the value of marketing as a social and economic force in society. Kotler (2011) points out that a microapproach to marketing assumes infinite resources and zero environmental impact. He feels that marketers need to reexamine their theory and practices to balance growth goals with the pursuit of sustainability, demarketing, and social marketing to meet new challenges.

Marketing's overall role in an organization, including its relationship with other areas of the firm, continues to evolve. The notion of "marketing as strategy" (Kumar, 2004) means that marketing is becoming more of a c-suite and boardroom topic in firms today, complete with the understanding that the analyses required to make the best decisions about investments of precious firm resources toward the development of products and markets for the future is one of the most important long-term strategic decisions a firm's leadership can make. On the other hand, Kotler and Reibstein (2013) report that chief financial officers have taken control of pricing and product development, while chief marketing officers are mostly focusing on communications and social media. At the corporate level, and possibly in the business school level, the understanding of marketing's role in the firm is not as clear. For the majority of undergraduate business students who are not marketing majors and will never take another marketing course beyond principles, the challenge for professors is how to convey the important strategic role of marketing in a course that traditionally is very tactically focused. Our treatment of the importance of marketing to nonmarketing majors is critical to their future business success. More quantitatively oriented business students can easily think marketing is inherently easy and straightforward, when it is actually subtle and complex. They believe it does not involve numbers, when in reality, marketing metrics may be central to a firm's market success.

CONCLUSION

This article provides an overview of the history of marketing education. We have emphasized the importance of knowledge about the history of marketing education to enhance greater understanding in teaching marketing topics. We do not suggest incorporating the history of marketing education into a class module for undergraduates or M.B.A. students, but a module could be useful for marketing Ph.D. students. As marketing becomes a more mature and respected discipline, we need to document and understand its past. Many of our foundational concepts were developed in the first half of the 20th century. While these concepts have become more refined and grounded, they remain the foundations of most of the concepts and terminology used in marketing today. Most of the chapters in current principles of marketing textbooks deal with strategic managerial techniques and skills to achieve an objective. In the first half of the 20th century, textbooks were more macro-focused and linked marketing more to the economy and society.

Doctoral students in marketing should have the opportunity to explore the history of their discipline. They should know about historical research, the history of marketing education, the history of marketing practice, and the history of marketing thought (Hunt, 2010). Shelby Hunt notes, "probably less than six doctoral programs include seminars on marketing history" (Hunt, 2010, p. 443). Since most Ph.D. programs do not include this course, marketing professors will not be able to place today's teaching resources into proper perspective. Doctoral students are on the front line in teaching undergraduates and need to appreciate how foundational concepts evolved over time.

Conducting research on the history of marketing education involves subjective decision making about the most important events that have shaped our discipline. In this review, we have mainly relied on books, articles, and personal communications that attempt to document what was most important in the development of the discipline. There is always the possibility of errors or omissions from the sources that we utilize. We also engaged in Internet searches in attempts to validate and extend knowledge. Hopefully, this review will encourage others to challenge, question, or extend what we report.

This review of the history of marketing education provides an overview of some of the pioneers, concepts, frameworks, and major developments in advancing the marketing discipline. The academic community, especially doctoral students and new faculty, can gain perspective by knowing more about the history of marketing education. A discipline that ignores its history will not have a benchmark to determine its challenges and opportunities for progress.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge Jennifer Sawayda for her assistance with research and editing, and Roger Blackwell, Ph. D., for his insights concerning the history of consumer behavior.

REFERENCES

Agricultural Gentleman. (1814). A defense of the land-owners and farmers of Great Britain. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/60201983

Aker, D., & Day, G. S. (1983). *Marketing research*. New York: Wiley.

Alderson, W. (1957). *Marketing behavior and executive action*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

Assael, H. (Ed.). (1978). *The collected works of C.C. Parlin*. New York: Arno Press.

Bagozzi, R. P. (1980). *Causal models in marketing*. New York: Wiley.

Bartels, R. (1962). *The development of marketing thought*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

Bartels, R. (1965). Development of marketing thought: Brief history. In G. Schwartz (Ed.), *Science in marketing* (pp. 47–59). New York: John Wiley.

Bartels, R. (1976). *The history of marketing thought* (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Grid.

Bass, F. M., King, C. W., & Pessemier, E. A. (1968). *Application of the sciences in marketing management*. New York: John Wiley.

Beckman, T. (1960). The subject matter mastery approach to the teaching of general marketing. In R. Hill (Ed.), *Marketing concepts in changing times* (pp. 131–113). Chicago: American Marketing Association.

Beckman, T. (1963). A challenge for a reappraisal of the basic nature and scope of marketing. In W. Decker (Ed.), *Emerging concepts in marketing* (pp. 3–15). Chicago: American Marketing Association.

Bliss, P. (1963). *Marketing and behavioral sciences*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Borden, N. H. (1965). The concept of the marketing mix. In G. Schwartz (Ed.), *Science in marketing* (pp. 386–397). New York: John Wiley.

Breen, J. (1959). History of the marketing management concept. In L. Stockman (Ed.), *Advancing marketing efficiency* (pp. 458–461). Chicago: American Marketing Association.

Breyer, R. F. (1931). *Commodity marketing*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book.

Burkett, C. W., & Poe, C. H. (1906). *Cotton: Its cultivation, marketing, manufacture, and the problems of the cotton world*. London: Archibald Constable.

Bussière, D. (2005). Forensic marketing: The use of the historical method in a capstone marketing course. *Journal of Marketing Education*, *27*(1), 61–67.

Butler, R. S. (1918). *Marketing methods*. Retrieved from http://www.archive.org

Buzzell, R. D. (1964). *Mathematical models and marketing management*. Boston: Harvard Business School.

Casher, J. D. (1969). *Marketing and the computer*. Braintree, MA: D. H. Mark.

Chamberlin, E. (1933). *The theory of monopolistic competition*. New York: Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cherington, P. (1920). *The elements of marketing*. New York: Macmillan.

Churchill, G. A. (1987). *Marketing research: Methodological foundations*. Chicago, IL: Dryden Press.

Churchill, G. A., & Peter, J. P. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *16*(1), 64–73.

Clark, F. E. (1922). *Principles of marketing*. New York: MacMillan.

Converse, P. D. (1930). *Elements of marketing*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Converse, P. D. (1951). Development of marketing theory: Fifty years of progress. In H. G. Wales (Ed.), *Changing perspectives in marketing* (pp. 1–31). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Copeland, M. T. (1923). Relations of consumers' buying habits to marketing methods. *Harvard Business Review*, *1*(April), 282–289.

Copeland, M. T. (1958). A pioneer in marketing: Arch W. Shaw. *Journal of Marketing*, *22*(3), 313–315.

Cox, R. (1961). How mature is our marketing philosophy? In M. Bell (Ed.), *Marketing: A maturing discipline* (pp. 123–133). Chicago: American Marketing Association.

Cunningham, R. (1951). Evaluation of census tracts. *Journal of Marketing*, *15*(4), 463–470.

Cunningham, R. (1958). Pioneers in marketing: Harry R. Tosdal. *Journal of Marketing*, *21*(1), 65–67.

Daniel, C. A. (1998). *MBA: The first century*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses.

Day, R. L. (Ed.). (1964). *Marketing models: Quantitative and behavioral*. Scranton, PA: International Textbooks.

Domegan, C. (2010). The history of marketing thought: A teaching reflection. *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing*, *2*(4), 457–466.

Duddy, E. A., & Revzan, D. A. (1953). *Marketing: An institutional approach*. New York: McGraw Hill Book.

Economist staff. (2013). Management change. *The Economist*, 80.

Elsworth, R. H., & Gatlin, G. O. (1919). *Marketing functions*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Market and Crop Estimates, Division of Cooperative Relations.

Engel, J. F. (1961). Motivation research: Magic or menace? *Michigan Business Review*, *13*, 28–32.

Engel, J. F., Kollat, D. T., & Blackwell, R. D. (1968). *Consumer behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Faria, A. J. (1983). The development of the functional approach to the study of marketing to 1940. In S. C. Hollander & R. Savitt (Eds.), *First North American Workshop on Historical Research in Marketing* (pp. 160–169). East Lansing, MI: Board of Trustees, Michigan State University.

Ferber, R. (1949). *Statistical techniques in market research*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ferrell, O. C., Gonzalez-Padron, T. L., Hult, G. T. M., & Maignan, I. (2010). From market orientation to stakeholder orientation. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *29*(1), 93–96.

Fowler, N. (1911). *Practical salesmanship: A treatise on the art of selling goods*. Boston: Little Brown.

Fullerton, R. (1988). How modern is modern marketing? Marketing's evolution and the myth of the production era. *Journal of Marketing*, *52*(1), 108–125.

Fullerton, R. (2011). The birth of consumer behavior: Motivation research in the 1950s. In L. C. Neilson (Ed.), *Marketing history in the New World* (pp. 61–68). New York: CHARM Association.

Fullerton, R. (2013). The birth of consumer behavior; motivation research in the 1940s and 1950s. *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing*, *5*(2), 212–222.

Gardner, B. B., & Levy, S. J. (1955). The product and the brand. *Harvard Business Review*, *33*(2), 33–39.

Germain, R. D. (1989). The adoption of statistical methods in market research: 1915–1937. In T. Nevett, K. R. Whitney, & S. C. Hollander (Eds.), *Marketing history: The emerging discipline* (Vol. 4, pp. 317–330). East Lansing: Board of Trustees, Michigan State University.

Green, P., & Goodman, C. (2012). *The Wroe Alderson Distinguished Lecturer Series*. Retrieved from https://marketing.wharton.upenn.edu/events/wroealderson/#Excerpts

Green, P., & Tull, D. (1966). *Research for marketing decisions*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Grether, E. T. (1950). A theoretical approach to the analysis of marketing. In R. Cox & W. Alderson (Eds.), *Theory in marketing* (pp. 113–123). Chicago, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. (1979). *Multivariate data analysis: With readings*. Tulsa, OK: PPC Books.

Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2011). Partial least squares structural equations modeling: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, *18*(2), 139–152.

Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Mena, J. (2012). An assessment of the use of partial least squares path modeling in marketing research. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, *40*(3), 414–433.

Harvard Business School. (n.d.). History. Retrieved from http://www.hbs.edu/about/facts-and-figures/Pages/history.aspx

Hollander, S. (1986). The marketing concept: A déjà vu. In G. Fisk (Ed.), *Marketing management technology as a social process* (pp. 3–29.). New York: Praeger.

Hollander, S. (1997). Is that going to be on the exam? Almost 50 years of general marketing textbooks. In D. G. Brian Jones & P. Cunningham (Eds.), *Marketing history knows no boundaries* (Vol. 8, pp. 43–45). East Lansing: Board of Trustees, Michigan State University.

Holloway, R. J., & White, T. (1964). Advancing the experimental method in marketing. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *1*(1), 25–29.

Hovde, H. T. (1936). Recent trends in the development of marketing research. *The American Marketing Journal*, *3*(January), 3–19.

Howard, J. A., & Sheth, J. N. (1969). *Theory of buyer behavior*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Hoyt, C. W. (1913). *Scientific sales management: A practical application of the principles of scientific management to selling*. New Haven, CT: G. B. Woolson.

Hunt, S. D. (2010). Doctoral seminars in marketing theory. *Historical Research in Marketing*, *2*(4), 443–456.

Ivey, P. W. (1921). *Principles of Marketing*. New York: Ronald Press.

Jones, D. G. B. (2012). *Pioneers in marketing: A collection of biographical essays*. New York: Routledge.

Jones, D. G. B., & Keep, W. (2009). Hollander's Doctoral Seminar in the History of Marketing Thought. *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing*, *1*(1), 151–164.

Jones, D. G. B., & Monieson, D. D. (1987). Origins of the institutional approach in marketing. In T. Nevett & S. Hollander (Eds.), *Marketing in three eras* (Vol. 3, pp. 149–168). East Lansing: Board of Trustees, Michigan State University.

Jones, D. G. B., & Richardson, A. J. (2007). The myth of the marketing revolution. *Journal of Macromarketing*, *27*(1), 15–24.

Jones, D. G. B., & Shaw, E. (2002). History of marketing thought. In B. Weitz & R. Wensley (Eds.), *Handbook of marketing* (pp. 39–65). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jones, D. G. B., & Tadajewski, M. (2011). Percival White (1887–1970): marketing engineer. Marketing Theory. *11*(4), 455–78.

Kantrow, A. M. (1986). Why history matters to managers. *Harvard Business Review*, *64*(January/February), 81–88.

Karesh, M. A. (1995). The social scientific origins of symbolic consumer research: Social Research, Inc. In K. M. Rassuli, S. C. Hollander, & T. R. Nevett (Eds.), *Marketing history: Marketing's greatest empirical experiment* (Vol. 7, pp. 95–111). East Lansing: Board of Trustees, Michigan State University.

Keith, R. J. (1960). The marketing revolution. *Journal of Marketing*, *24*(3), 35–38.

Kohli, A. K., & Jaworski, B. J. (1990). Market orientation: The construct, research propositions, and managerial implications. *Journal of Marketing*, *54*(2), 1–18.

Kotler, P. (2011). Reinventing marketing to manage the environmental imperative. *Journal of Marketing*, *75*(4), 132–135.

Kotler, P., & Reibstein, D. (2013). Does your company really need a marketing department? *Marketing News* (December), 20–21.

Kumar, N. (2004). *Marketing as strategy: Understanding the CEO's agenda for driving growth and innovation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

La Londe, B. J., & Morrison, E. J. (1967). Marketing management concepts yesterday and today. *Journal of Marketing*, *31*(January), 9–13.

Lazer, W. (2013). William Lazer: Reflections on my career. *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing*, *5*(2), 231–243.

Lazer, W., & Pirog, S. F. (2007). Wroe Alderson: Father of modern marketing. *European Business Review*, *19*(6), 440–451.

Martineau, P. (1958). Social classes and spending behavior. *Journal of Marketing*, *23*(2), 121–130.

Maynard, H. H., Weidler, W. C., & Beckman, T. N. (1927). *Principles of marketing*. New York: Ronald Press.

McCarthy, E. J. (1960). *Basic marketing: A managerial approach*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

Mittelstaedt, R. (1990). Economics, psychology, and the literature of the subdiscipline of consumer behavior. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *18*(4), 303–312.

Morgan, J. M. (1958). A review of recent research on consumer behavior. In L. H. Clark (Ed.), *Consumer behavior: Research on consumer reactions* (pp. 93–218). New York: Harper.

Morris, E. W., Winter, M., & Beutler, I. F. (1976). A normative deficit model of consumer behavior. In B. B. Anderson (Ed.), *Advances in consumer research* (Vol. 3, pp. 161–165). Cincinnati, OH: Association for Consumer Research.

Mount, P. R. (1969). Exploring the marketing approach in developing marketing theory. *Journal of Marketing*, *33*-(April), 62–64.

Myers, J. H., & Reynolds, W. H. (1967). *Consumer behavior and marketing management*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Narver, J. C., & Slater, S. F. (1990). The effect of marketing orientation on business profitability. *Journal of Marketing*, *54*(April), 20–35.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nystrom, P. H. (1915). *The economics of retailing*. New York: Ronald Press.

Peter, J. P. (1979). Reliability: A review of psychometric basics and recent marketing practices. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *16*(1), 6–17.

Savitt, R. (1980). Historical research in marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, *44*(Fall), 52–58.

Shaw, A. W. (1912). Some problems in market distribution. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *26*(4), 703–765.

Shaw, A. W. (1915). *Some problems in market distribution*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shaw, E. (1995). Lessons from the past: Early marketing textbooks from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries. In K. Rassuli, S. Hollander, & T. Nevett (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Historical Research in Marketing and Management Thought: Marketing history: Marketing's greatest experiment* (pp. 59–70). East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Shaw, E., & Jones, D. G. B. (2005). A history of schools of marketing thought. *Marketing Theory*, *5*(3), 239–181.

Slater, S. F., & Narver, J. C. (1995). Market orientation and learning organization. *Journal of Marketing*, *59*(3), 63–74.

Sparling, S. E. (1906). *Introduction to business organization*. New York: Macmillan.

Stevens, A. C. (1887). Futures in the wheat market. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *2*(1), 37–63.

Stock, J., & Whitney, K. (1989). A historical assessment of the development of the discipline of logistics: An appraisal and a critique. In T. Nevett, K. Whitney, & S. Hollander (Eds.), *Marketing history: The emerging discipline* (pp. 54–73). East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Surface, J. (1960). The Carnegie and Ford Foundation Studies and marketing education. In R. Hancock (Ed.), *Dynamic marketing for a changing world* (pp. 219–225). Chicago: American Marketing Association.

Tadajewski, M., & Jones, B. (Eds.). (2008). *The history of marketing thought*. London: Sage.

Tamilia, R. D. (2009). An overview of the *History of Marketing Thought*. *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing*, *1*(2), 346–360.

Tamilia, R. D., & Veilleux, S. (2007). Teaching macromarketing at the undergraduate level: A needed reality in the 21st century? In *Proceedings of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada*, *28*(3), 39–57.

Tosdal, H. (1921). *Problems in sales management*. Chicago: A. W. Shaw.

Ward, D. (2009). Capitalism, early market research, and the creation of the American consumer. *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing*, *1*(2), 200–223.

Webster, F. E., Jr. (1992). The changing role of marketing in the corporation. *Journal of Marketing*, *56*, 1–17.

Weld, L. D. H. (1916). *The marketing of farm products*. New York: MacMillan.

White, P. (1927). *Scientific marketing management: Its principles and methods*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Whyte, W. H. (1954). The consumer in the new suburbia. In L. H. Clark (Ed.). *Consumer Behavior*, (pp. 1-14). New York: New York University Press, 1–14.

Wilkie, W. L., & Moore, E. S. (2003). Scholarly research in marketing: Exploring the "4 eras" of thought development. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *22*(2), 116–146.

Wilkie, W. L., & Moore, E. S. (2012). Expanding our understanding of marketing and society. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *40*(1), 53–73.

Witkowski, T. H. (2010). The marketing discipline comes of age, 1934–1936. *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing*, *2*(4), 370–387.

Wulfeck, J. W., & Bennett, E. M. (1954). *The language of dynamic psychology: As related to motivation research*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Zinn, W., & Johnson, S. D. (1987). The commodity approach in marketing research. In T. Nevett & S. Hollander (Eds.), *Marketing in three eras* (Vol. 3, pp. 135–148). East Lansing: Board of Trustees, Michigan State University.