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Abstract

Marketing theory is a concern among a growing number of scholars, especially in the 80s. But how has this concern transcended into marketing education, especially at the doctoral level? The purpose of this essay is to show how the present lack of a macromarketing focus in doctoral programs can be remedied by using a Bartellian marketing approach. Not only can this suggested approach broaden marketing education, it can also improve the marketing theorization process. Current trends in marketing education are also presented with implications for the future.

Introduction

In the 80s, we have seen an increase in interest on the part of marketing academics towards marketing theory. No less than a dozen books have been published in the area (e.g., Brown and Fisk 1984; Dholakia and Arndt 1985; Firtel, Dholakia and Bagozzi 1987; Fisk 1986; Hunt 1983; Lamb and Dunne 1980; Sheth and Garrett 1986). However, the interest in this area should not be misinterpreted as being solely a phenomenon of the eighties. A considerable number of volumes were also published in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s (e.g., Alderson 1957; Bakken 1953; Bartels 1962, 1970, 1976a; Cox and Alderson 1950; Cox, Alderson and Shapiro 1964; Fisk 1971; Halbert 1965; Schwartz 1963, 1965). The growing amount of literature in this body of marketing thought supports the contention that marketing theory was and continues to be an important area of concern for marketing scholars. But how has this interest transcended into marketing education, especially at the doctoral level? In other words, to what extent has marketing theory broadened doctoral marketing education in the 80s?

The purpose of this paper is essentially to probe the marketing education - marketing theory relationship from a macromarketing perspective. To accomplish that goal, the marketing philosophy of Professor Robert Bartels is presented primarily as a means to illustrate the extent to which his contributions can help broaden doctoral marketing education and strengthen the marketing theorization process. An assessment of current trends in doctoral marketing education is also presented. Finally, certain conclusions are made with respect to the future development of marketing thought and theory.

Bartellian Marketing Thought

Professor Bartels was, without a doubt, one of marketing's pioneers in the area of marketing thought and theory. He was first and foremost a marketier. More precisely, he was a macromarketer, a scholar interested in the study of marketing "in general".

As a generalist, Professor Bartels was unrelenting in his quest toward understanding marketing from a holistic perspective and the role marketing played in the economy and society. Thus, his macromarketing approach to the study of marketing is similar to Fisk's (1974) notion of marketing as a provisioning technology, and consistent with other scholars' view of marketing as a social process (Beckman 1963; Cox 1961, 1963; Dixon 1981, 1984).

The approach used by Professor Bartels in organizing the body of marketing thought over the last eighty years was essentially historical in nature (and chronological). That is, he selected a large number of scholars who contributed to the marketing literature and analyzed their contributions. Specific schools of thought were identified which over time have given the discipline its content, shape and structure. For example, functionalism, institutionalism, functionalism, and managerialism, among others, all represent major thought philosophies that have influenced research and teaching interests in marketing. The marketing literature selected was as broad as possible and included authors in areas such as advertising, personal selling, retailing, wholesaling, credit, and so forth. Professor Bartels was thus a specialist in the historical development of marketing thought. He was what Parker (1986) would call an intellectual historian or a historical marketer, using the Gay (1941) definition.

However, his work should not be confused with marketing history which is another, and sometimes complementary, scholarly area of marketing which also makes use of historical research methods and materials (Savit 1980). Perhaps one could refer to marketing historians as those concerned with marketing history, while historical marketers are those whose prime interests are in the history of marketing thought. In any case, marketing history concerns itself with the study of how the marketing process (i.e., institutions, participants, methods and practices) evolves over time as a result of environmental changes. More will be said later on about marketing history.

Bartellian marketing thought forces us to recognize the names and the respective contributions of scholars who have built and enlarged this body of thought with which we call marketing. Shapiro (1979) noted that too many marketing academicians today have a weak bibliographic base of past marketing scholars. At the very least, Bartellian marketing thought resolves this knowledge gap. After all, how can we be scholarly about marketing if we do not know the founding fathers of the discipline?

Bartellian marketing thought provides the basis for marketing theory development. In fact, Professor Bartels raised the marketing theorization process to new heights with his intellectual history approach. His work is replete with marketing theories or theorization about marketing which all doctoral students should not only be exposed to but be familiar with. For example, Bartellian marketing thought examines such fertile theoretical areas of marketing as marketing as a social process (Bartels 1961a, b, 1965), marketing and metatheory (Bartels 1970, 1971), general theory (Bartels 1968a, 1970, 1977b), and comparative marketing (Bartels 1963, 1968b, 1977a, 1980).

His marketing philosophy forces a scholar to become very knowledgeable about the content of marketing, notably macromarketing. Presumably, such is the goal of marketing education, especially at the doctoral level. After all, can one really theorize about a subject without having a thorough knowledge of its contents?

The not so unimportant consequence of the Bartellian marketing philosophy is that one is exposed to a broad range of topics pertinent to the study and understanding of marketing and marketing phenomena that otherwise would either be difficult or impossible. For example, an exposure to comparative marketing compels a student to ask fundamental questions about the universality of the marketing process and to what extent it can be used for human betterment and for modernization. The more we understand comparative marketing, the more we will un-
understand the role and impact of marketing in both the developing and developed economies. Comparative marketing forces the student to go back to marketing basics and to study the role of marketing in the economy over time. In other words, the use of historical methods and materials are essential in comparative marketing. And so is a thorough understanding of the commodity and the functional approaches to the study of marketing. These approaches are at the very roots of the marketing discipline. No wonder Buddewyn (1981) referred to comparative marketing as the marketing theory question par excellence.

The functional approach to marketing, labelled functionalism by Bartels, is fundamental toward understanding of not only comparative marketing but marketing in general. Under functionalism, the student of marketing seeks answers to such questions as what is marketing, what are the fundamental tasks of the marketing process, who performs those tasks, and what types of institutions emerge in our economy as a result. In essence, such questions are very similar to those asked by our early American marketing scholars such as Cherington, Shaw, Breyer, and Beckman.

Familiarity with this body of marketing thought (i.e., functionalism) should be standard pedagogical material part of any doctoral program. The reason is not only because it appeared early in the marketing literature, but also because its indispensable contributions toward an understanding of such topics as marketing channels, marketing exchanges, broadened marketing, institutionalism, and physical distribution (Revzan 1965; Tamilla and di Benedetto 1988). Ottosen (1969) went as far as to state that:

A valid argument might be developed that a student does not achieve complete understanding of marketing without an orderly study of each of its functions (p. 437).

When a Bartellian marketing philosophy prevails in marketing education, a student's exposure to Alderson's marketing thought is assured. Alderson (1957) was one of those few marketing scholars who provided the discipline with a formalized theory of marketing, with sufficient depth for his theory to be almost a general one (Hunt 1983). Alderson's market behavior theory draws heavily on functionalism, a popular social paradigm at the time he proposed his theory. His theory could even be labelled a marketing theory of the firm, which business policy students, among others, would find intriguing not only because of its systems approach, but also because of its managerial relevance.

Physical distribution is also germane under a Bartellian approach to marketing education because the values created by time and space separations represent the bulk of values added by the marketing process (Bartels 1976b). Converse (1954) referred to physical distribution as the other half of marketing suggesting that the supply side of the marketing process is as important as its demand side. Physical distribution introduces a student to the complex world of logistics, warehousing, and transportation. It also exposes the student to marketing geography with its content rich in theoretical insights about the impact of time and space factors on location analysis, the growth and evolution of regional and interregional trade, the spatial patterns of the wholesale and retail trade, and so forth (e.g., Vance 1970).

Finally, a student's understanding of marketing would not be complete under a Bartellian macromarketing approach if a discussion of the regulatory environment which affects the marketing process was not presented. According to Beckman (1963):

Obviously no marketing student's education could possibly be complete without a fairly comprehensive knowledge of the legal framework in which marketing functions must be performed and an understanding of how it is structured and implemented, with reasons therefor (p. 13).

In other words, the legal provisions which govern market behavior are simply viewed as another domain of marketing thought worthy of pedagogical pursuit. Many other macro-marketing topics could be presented to further illustrate that the scope of marketing is not limited to managerial marketing (e.g., marketing productivity, marketing integration, marketing ethics).

In summary, Bartels' intellectual history introduces the student of marketing to some of those scholars and their topics who have contributed to marketing thought and theory. It provides the basis from which a student can assess the impact some authors and/or topics have had (and are continuing to have) on the discipline. It helps the student recognize all those schools of thought (and their respective contributors) which have influenced and structured marketing. In essence, it shows the student where we have been in thought and theory and where we are now in terms of research priorities and teaching interests. This is essentially the legacy of Bartellian marketing thought.

Some areas of marketing content were briefly discussed if only to show the scope of the marketing discipline. It was my purpose to remind the marketing community that some of these areas are legitimate marketing topics worthy of scholarly pursuit and classroom discussion.

This author has been teaching a doctoral seminar on marketing thought and theory for the past five years using a Bartellian approach. More specifically, while an emphasis is given to marketing's intellectual history, marketing history is also discussed. We have already seen how the former can substantially broaden and deepen doctoral marketing education. The next section discusses the extent to which marketing history also expands marketing education and contributes to scholarly endeavors.

Marketing History

Marketing history can lead to an improved understanding of the marketing process not from a micro perspective but rather from a macro one. Specifically, Sturdivant (1964) stated that with marketing history:

The student is more keenly aware of the economic nature of marketing. And perhaps even more important, the student sees marketing as much more than marketing management per se. He views marketing as a system and sees how that system interacts with its total environment to effect dramatic changes in the nation and the world (p. 583).

Marketing history forces us to think about market evolution and market structures. Markets change over time as a result of changes in demand and supply conditions caused by shifts in technology, population, competition, laws and so forth.

Market dynamics supported Professor Bartels' beliefs that not only is marketing theory being practiced but practice is also being theorized (Bartels and MacNab 1973). In fact, Hollander (1980) argued that marketing thought and theory would gain significantly if marketing scholars spent more time and efforts studying marketers, that is those engaged in the practice of marketing.
The study of marketing practitioners by marketing historians is bona fide historical research because of the need to understand the environmental and intellectual forces that produce such individuals. It also requires an understanding of the institution and institutional framework in which such individuals worked (through biographies and company histories).

Apart from the study of practitioners, marketing history also deals extensively with the historical developments of markets and their structural changes over time. The historical study of markets often implies a study about marketing and wholesaling sectors over time. For example, a number of business and economic historians (e.g., Westerfield 1915; Atherton 1939; Porter and Livasy 1971) have shown the important role channel members have played in shaping the type of market economy we now all seem to take for granted.

An historical analysis of the commercial structure of our economy forces us to think of why and how department stores, supermarkets, chain stores, discount stores, leased departments, franchising, and other vertical marketing systems emerge in the market. Such analyses seek answers to fundamental questions such as "why and how middlemen emerge in the marketplace when production and consumption are separated by time and space" (Sheth and Garrett 1986, p. 241).

Traditionally, economics has always taken a scholarly view of economic history. Parker (1986) goes as far as to state that without history, an economist is not a well-rounded scholar: Economic history forms in fact one leg of the chair on which an educated economist must sit to do useful work. Without some knowledge of the field, its methods and its problems, an economist misses one dimension in his training - a dimension with qualities of both breadth and depth. Such an economist becomes a shallower, narrower analyst with feeble capabilities for adapting the theory and statistics he has mastered to new and strange social environments (pp. 8-9).

What is true for economists is also true for marketers and marketing education. Marketing history can be a very humbling experience, especially for young marketing scholars. For example, the discovery that many concepts of marketing which abound in current textbooks were fully developed prior to the 1930s is very significant from a pedagogical point of view. In addition, to realize that the marketing concept, broadened marketing, segmentation, services marketing, packaging and so forth were concerns of both the practitioner and the scholar at the turn of this century (and even hundreds of years ago) can only make us wonder of how far we have really progressed (Hollander 1986; Savitt 1980). Marketing history helps put concepts of marketing into their proper time frame.

Even the legal and regulatory developments rely extensively on marketing history. As Doody (1963) explains: The sequential nature of legislation makes this unavoidable to some extent. Further, our en-

tire legal system is oriented to precedent and past rulings (p. 246).

Finally, the importance of marketing history to the development of marketing theory cannot be overemphasized (Doody 1964; Kirkpatrick 1980; Savitt 1980). How can we cope with the present and think imaginatively about solving future marketing problems if we do not understand our marketing past? Marketing history is certainly one domain within marketing which can significantly broaden the scope of marketing education. It can also prepare students to become not only better theoreticians but research scholars and intellectual historians as well.

Current Status Of
Doctoral Marketing Education

We have seen that Professor Bartels was a scholar specializing in marketing. The marketing discipline, unfortunately, seems to be losing this orientation as a result of specialization toward consumer research, methods and methodologies, andmicromarketing concerns (Arndt with Dholakia and Fisk, p. 1980). The explosive growth in the number of specialized marketing journals having such a narrow focus is certainly not helping the study of marketing in general. The sheer number of journals makes it much harder for anyone to keep up-to-date with marketing in general, let alone with one's own niche in marketing (Gerber and Hilder 1984). It becomes even harder to have an overall intellectual view of marketing. The past president of the AMA recently stated: We cope by specializing. Specialization is a natural and healthy response to an increasing complex discipline. There are, however, some dangers. One is that too many of us become "super specialists" leaving too few generalists. Marketing needs generalists as well as specialists; it needs scholars whose specialty is marketing rather than a subset of marketing (Berry 1986, p. 1).

I could not agree more with Berry's comments that marketing needs scholars whose raison d'être is the study of marketing. However laudable such comments are, unless current doctoral programs can produce such scholars, I am afraid the status quo will remain as will be shown.

The trend toward specialization is not unique to marketing (Parker 1986). But as Supple (1982) stated "specialization has its costs, most notably in the avoiding of big and interesting questions" (p. 201). If marketing is to ask those "big and interesting questions", a more micromarketing orientation à la Bartels will need to be taken not only in research but in marketing education as well. But as Bartels (1983) noted, marketing thought seminars have virtually disappeared from doctoral programs. They have been replaced by theory construction courses stressing philosophy of science issues, according to surveys reported by Capella (Capella and Moronick 1979; Capella, Robin, and Moronick 1986).

Furthermore, doctoral programs do not offer marketing history, comparative marketing and other such courses or training. Yet these subfields of marketing provide a knowledge base which is at the heart of the discipline. Why marketing history is still not part of marketing education is a mystery. After all, a true sign that a discipline has achieved scholarly and scientific status is the importance it attaches to its historical roots. Twenty-five years ago, Shapiro (1964) stated that the neglect of marketing history was simply due to a lack of interest on the part of scholars. He added:

509
Nothing in the training of aspiring teachers of marketing is designed to acquaint them with either the nature or the uses of historical material... Nor, until quite recently, have the publishers of business texts and the editors of business journals shown any great interest in such material. Students of marketing are thus encouraged to write in more popular areas and to abandon any further attempts at exploring or contributing to the literature of marketing history (pp. 568-569).

Shapiro's astute observations are as true today and they were back then. Marketing history is still one of marketing's dark continents exactly as Cox (1980) stated it almost thirty years ago.

The macromarketing thrust of these topics tell marketers that in order to have a holistic understanding of marketing, a student needs familiarity and training with economic and business history, historical and humanistic research methods (Despande 1983; Peter and Olson 1983; Hirschman 1986). It also implies a rapprochement with economics and its allied disciplines such as economic anthropology, economic sociology, economic geography, urban and development economics, and even farm economics.

However, the re-introduction of economic thinking into marketing will not be easy given the present dominance of consumer behavior in the discipline. Ever since schools of business separated from economics departments (Bormann 1957), and the aftermath of the Ford and Carnegie Foundation reports (Otteson 1959; Surface 1960), marketing has been moving away from studying economic market problems toward more social psychological ones (Westing 1977; Dholakia 1985; LaLonde 1984). The rich intellectual rewards to be gained from a more balanced approach would seem to be self-evident (Tamila and di Benedetto 1965). However, the marketing identity crisis of the 70s (Bartels 1974), and its prolongation into the 80s (Bartels 1983; Fennell 1987; Hirschman 1987) seems to preclude a return to economic thinking in marketing, at least for the present time.

Positioning marketing as part of our economic and social systems implies that it can be studied as an initiator and a contributor to the betterment of the human condition. One is tempted to say that this macro view of marketing is scholarly in the behavioral sciences tradition for it seeks not only knowledge for knowledge sake, but tries to understand the big questions of man and society.

Many of the macromarketing topics discussed thus far under a Bartellian philosophy do not lend themselves very well to the logical empiricism paradigm so well entrenched in marketing (Kirkpatrick 1982; Fullerton 1987). Until researchers in marketing are more willing to accept a research tradition other than logical empiricism, it is doubtful if scholarly pursuits in teaching and research will broaden sufficiently to accommodate many of the macromarketing topics presented here.

Capella, Robin and Maronick (1985) recently showed approval toward the demise of intellectual history in doctoral programs. Specifically, they stated:

The shifting emphasis from the descriptive and historical approaches to the nature of theory approach appears to be a positive step toward developing better qualified theorists in marketing (p. 89).

But is it in the best interest of broadening doctoral marketing education to let marketing thought courses disappear from Ph.D. programs? Is it possible then to replace such a course with one focused on theory construction and philosophy of science issues? It is perhaps indicative of the times when even Ohio State, the school traditionally known as the bastion of marketing thought simply because Professor Bartels taught there during all of his academic life, has recently changed the content of its theory course to reflect a content "comme les autres".

Also, a theory construction seminar has more affinity with methods and methodologies than with marketing thought and theory development. Arndt (1985) stated that marketers' concerns about methods is so overwhelming that the discipline suffers from "methoditis". We could also add "microthis" and "consumer research-itis" as well. A recent survey by Jackson, Mokwa, and Buckles (1986) showed that 87 percent of the questions asked in a typical comprehensive marketing exam were in the areas of consumer research, methods and micro-marketing. Only 13 percent of the questions could be considered marketing thought and theory. These numbers are very revealing because they corroborate what I have been saying. They also indicate that perhaps we are paying lip service to marketing theory in our doctoral programs in spite of our scholarly efforts to write about it. In other words, we write about marketing theory but we do not teach it. Yet Professor Bartels once stated:

Along with the continuing need to write better marketing theory there is equally great need to teach it (1977b, p. 550)

A rejection of marketing history and the history of marketing thought not only dangerously narrows the scope of marketing but also constrains unnecessarily the knowledge base from which theory development and theory building can take place.

A recent survey showed that too many marketers believe that theory development does not take place in marketing. Rather, theories are borrowed from the social sciences and are simply applied in a marketing context (Cappella, Robin, and Maronick 1987). If some marketing scholars honestly believe that social psychology and other allied fields are the only sources suitable for marketing thought and theory, what happens to (doctoral) marketing education, and to the numerous topics suggested here which expand knowledge development in marketing?

Obviously research in those neglected areas have not ceased because marketers no longer seem to be interested in them. In fact, they are being researched by nonmarketers, that is by scholars outside the mainstream of current marketing thought. That is precisely why Bartels (1983) asked the very probing question about whether or not marketing was defaulting its responsibilities in teaching and research.

The recent AMA report on doctoral training in marketing recommended the acceptance of more nonbusiness doctorates under the condition that they undergo "a relatively short (perhaps one year) program designed to reorient individuals already holding a Ph.D. in a field related to marketing" (Tybout 1987, p. 17).

Is one year sufficient to learn about a new field? Is the body of marketing knowledge so slim that only one year is needed to learn about it? Who determines which fields are related to marketing? If nonbusiness doctorates imply those already trained with either a market or an economic orientation, then such scholars as economic geographers, economic anthropologists and the like would be a welcome addition to the discipline. However, if nonbusiness doctorates imply more social psychologists and the like then perhaps the AMA recommendation needs to be reexamined. After all, a balance among the types of nonbusiness doctorates allowed to teach marketing is as important as the numbers.

510
The composition and number of nonbusiness doctorates notwithstanding, is this recommendation healthy for marketing education and research? It would be less worrisome if current marketing doctorates were heavily trained in marketing before beginning. But it is evident from this paper that such is not the case. In fact, Murphy and Laczniak (1980) made the following observation after they analyzed doctoral marketing education in the United States:

There is very little agreement in specific areas that Ph.D. level studies in marketing should include. Perhaps this flexible approach to doctoral education is fitting and proper, however, the issue could stand additional analysis (p. 67).

If doctoral training for full-fledged marketing students is so flexible and unspecific, what happens to the training of nonmarketing doctorates? Murphy and Laczniak (1980) also report that marketing theory and research methods are the only two areas common in all doctoral programs in marketing. Thus, a marketing theory course needs to provide substantive material pertinent to the content of marketing which I feel is a prerequisite for theory development and theory building in marketing. To some extent, a Bartellian approach meets that requirement. But such a course no longer exists in doctoral programs. It raises the very important question as to when will doctoral students learn about micromarketing and the foundations of marketing thought given that micromarketing is the essence of all undergraduate and graduate marketing education. It seems rather unscholarly for marketing students to start to learn about their field only at the doctoral level, and that is not the case for all Ph.D. students. Is it any wonder why freshly-minted Ph.D.s are probably very knowledgeable in Kuelian or Lakatosian thought (Roberts 1984; Leong 1985), among others, but perhaps know little or nothing about Alderson, Bartellian or coxian marketing thought.

Conclusions

Marketing education is at a crossroad. The current trends in marketing may determine the type of marketing that we will teach well into the 21st century. However, the neglect of important topics in marketing will not disappear. They will be further developed by nonmarketers. And what do these trends ultimately mean to marketing and to marketing education? According to Bartels (1983):

Those with responsibility for the marketing discipline must consider whether marketing as now delimited is the whole or a part of what it should be. Unless it is enlarged to represent a broader view, marketing may be supplanted by another discipline whose domain includes more of what marketing should include. No one will make the decision but marketing scholars themselves (p.35).

Some marketing scholars have responded to Bartels' plea. For example, the Journal of Macromarketing is now an established journal which in effect legitimizes the need to broaden marketing. The current work of Jones (1987, 1988; Jones and Monieson 1987) is breaking new grounds in the history of marketing thought, assuring us of a continuation of the Bartellian tradition. The bi-annual marketing history conference which began in 1983 is further proof that some academics are genuinely interested in marketing history (Hollander and Savitt 1983; Hollander and Nevett 1985; Nevett and Hollander 1987). Furthermore, the contributions of Polley (1987) who, as curator of the History of Advertising Archives, illustrates very well one man's total commitment to scholarly pursuit in the field of advertising history. All of these efforts are unmistakable evidence that our discipline is maturing and achieving more scientific status because of the importance we are attributing to our historical roots. Finally, this set of Proceedings is yet another manifestation that macromarketing, in all of its dimensions, is gaining recognition and respect among other AMA colleagues.

All of these healthy signs notwithstanding, nothing compels me to be very optimistic about doctoral education in macromarketing. Our present research and educational focus simply cannot produce the numbers and types of macromarketing-oriented individuals sufficient to impact on the current micromarketing thrust of the discipline. Until a more equitable balance is reached between macromarketing and micromarketing, and between market problems and consumer behavior problems, research and interests in marketing will continue to be overwhelming on the side of consumer research, methods and micromarketing.
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