1. Introduction to *Teaching Marketing*

Ross Brennan and Lynn Vos

Marketing involves a vast range of participants, processes and perspectives. Linguistically it is used interchangeably as a verb – “to market” ideas, people, places, products or services, and a noun – “marketing” – all of the activities involved in transferring goods and services from producer to buyer or user such that mutually beneficial, voluntary exchange takes place. With the publication of Wroe Alderson’s (1957) work *Marketing Behavior and Executive Action*, marketing as a discipline moved from a focus on distribution and the classification of relevant institutions to that of the marketing manager or seller’s perspective (see Wooliscroft in Chapter 7 of this volume). The breadth of topics and processes considered as part of the discipline grew as Alderson’s work began an expansion of the field from mainly theoretical perspectives drawn from economics to include insights from many social and behavioural science disciplines (Shaw and Lazer, 2007). By the 1960s, this influx of ideas led to increased and more disciplinary diverse research into the mind and actions of the consumer, thus establishing the second most prominent school of thought after marketing management, that of consumer behaviour. In the 1970s the societal view of marketing and wider, more reflective and critical schools of thought, including macromarketing were growing sub-fields, including research into what Wilkie and Moore (1999) refer to as the broader, complex and evolving effects of the aggregate marketing system within and across societies that bring up questions of ethics, sustainability, moral responsibility, inequalities and failures in development (Hill and Martin, 2014).

Thus, marketing can be viewed as an integrating discipline (Bedeian, 2005) whose practical and research outputs have a large footprint. It edges into other fields of thought and inquiry and other fields edge into marketing, the outcome of which is to broaden both theory and practice. For deep knowledge and understanding of consumers, marketing scholars draw upon research in sociology, the neurosciences and clinical, cognitive and social psychology; for understanding of markets and exchange, macro, micro and now behavioural economics; for perspectives on evolving trends, not to mention the discipline itself, history. This is to name only a few and leaves out theoretical perspectives native to the discipline developed in marketing science, industrial marketing and marketing theory, among others; areas of interest explored further

in chapters within this work (see the chapters by Bennett, by Brennan, and by Tynan and Heath). As a field, marketing is rich in ideas that are complex and contradictory and as a discipline these characteristics make it rich in the potential for both disciplinary and cross-disciplinary research, theory formulation and testing. Thus, Wilkie and Moore (1999: 198) remind us why researchers and educators are drawn to marketing: it is “among the most stimulating, complex and intellectually challenging of academic areas in a university setting” (as quoted in Chapter 3 by Tynan and Heath).

The complexity of marketing is also demonstrated in how it is practised across industries, organisations, societies, groups and/or by individuals. A vast and diverse array of functions, roles, processes and perspectives make up the marketing space. In one scenario a customised solution is being offered as “a team of professionals from an IT vendor work ... alongside a complementary team from a manufacturing organisation ... to deliver an enhanced logistics and inventory control system” (Brennan in Chapter 7). In another, a well-known producer of breakfast cereals is grappling with modifying its product line to address governmental and consumer concerns about sugar intake while reconsidering how it promotes its highly profitable range of high sugar cereals to its core customer groups. In yet another, a government body has invested millions first to understand the reasons behind COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy, then to develop online and offline messaging to encourage all citizens to get vaccinated.

As a function, the boundaries of marketing are fluid and thus within any organisation its constituent parts may fall to or be claimed by other functional areas, often so much so that the value contributed by marketing is questioned – someone else is doing sales, products are developed within the operations department, marketing research is commissioned out, logistics is managed within the supply chain, technologists and data analysts are deciding on the software and systems to best track and identify patterns in consumer data, and public relations is managing the bulk of external communications. The fact that marketing functions are often distributed across multiple departments rather than conducted exclusively in a marketing department is one of many issues that create challenges for marketing educators. The question arises – how can we tackle this breadth and complexity in the undergraduate marketing curriculum without under-representing the key ideas, perspectives, theories and processes that make up the field? Too often, unfortunately, the curriculum is modularised into narrow functional areas such as market research, marketing communications, and digital marketing; this approach may provide students with an overview of these areas and some technical skills but risks leaving them with a narrow and impoverished perspective on marketing.

Boundary issues are also present regarding who claims to speak authoritatively on the subject. Far more than other professional subjects – finance,

architecture, biology, for instance – those who write and speak about marketing appear to come from all walks of life. A quick internet search brings up not millions, but billions of documents related to marketing, many of which greatly oversimplify complex ideas in terms of both understanding and application. The ease with which such works can be found creates additional challenges for marketing educators whose students generally have great facility searching for ideas and concepts through the main internet providers, but less with library databases or with discriminating between a credible, well researched source and a derivative, monetised source whose ideas are greatly simplified, misleading and often wrong. How often, for example, is social marketing confused with social media marketing, the opportunities in a SWOT analysis viewed as strategic alternatives, and/or the product-market development vectors of Igor Ansoff (1957) misunderstood, to name only a few of the more basic marketing ideas found in a quick internet search?

That the discipline is subject to such profound simplification, where core ideas and concepts are made into simple formulae for success and then repurposed and repeated in hundreds of internet blogs and videos is an issue that marketing educators must explore and allow students to reflect on. As Brennan points out, however, marketing “scholars [appear] less inclined to defend their conceptual domains against the abuses of journalistic commentators than scholars in most other fields” (Brennan, 2012: 5). Perhaps the problem stems from how marketing ideas are typically introduced to students – we remind them that they too are customers, and thus already familiar with many aspects of the discipline. While helpful in engaging students early on, this approach can quickly narrow the scope of examples and ideas presented, thus contributing to the abridged and often less complicated view of marketing that they encounter in other fora. In seeking to build student interest, the rich theoretical perspectives inherent in areas such as macromarketing, networked business relationships, critical consumption and other areas where the final customer is not the central focus become less prominent in the curriculum and in so doing, give students less knowledge and value than they deserve from this rich and composite discipline.

The challenge of how to structure and what to include in the marketing curriculum is complicated by different perspectives within the discipline over the purpose of a marketing education, including how it should be taught and who the priority stakeholder or stakeholders should be – questions that come up time and time again in the marketing education literature, reaching back to the commentaries of the earliest educators. In Chapter 7 on teaching marketing history, Wooliscroft reminds us that almost 120 years has passed since university scholars began to organise, research and teach concepts in marketing. Although marketing ideas have been written about and debated “back to the ancient Greek Socratic philosophers, Plato and Aristotle [who] discussed ...

issues, such as how marketing was integrated into society” (Shaw and Jones, 2005: 241), when Hagerty (1936) taught one of the first classes in marketing, a three-hour course at Ohio State University in 1905, there was almost no available literature upon which to base his teaching. It took some years before the discipline developed scholarly perspectives and academic literature for the development of theory and for use in the classroom. Thus, Hagerty would spend any free time he had conducting interviews with “prominent men in different lines of mercantile trade in Philadelphia and in New York City” (Hagerty, 1936: 23) at department stores, in intermediary institutions including “manufacturer’s agents, brokers, jobbers and travelling salesmen” (p. 22) to find examples and ideas to build the new curriculum.

The fact that marketing academics turn to industrial practice and practitioners as sources of classroom as well as research ideas, and that much scholarly research in the field seeks to grapple with business problems is to be expected given the professional nature of the discipline. However, as with other disciplines with a substantial practitioner community, there is a need to strike a balance in academic research and curriculum design between serving the interests of practitioners (by, for example, delivering skilled graduates and useful research) and serving the wider interests of both students and other stakeholders.

Indeed, the question of *what* to teach in marketing, or what counts as marketing knowledge, is an epistemological debate of long standing, reflected even in the Hagerty (1936) article. At the broadest level, marketing educators (and researchers) deliberate over whether to focus on teaching students *how* to do marketing (practical/applied) (e.g. Walle, 1991; Hulbert and Harrigan, 2011; Koch, 2013) or whether to focus on teaching *about* marketing (marketing as theory, as social function, and from a critical perspective) (Catterall et al., 2002; Hill and McGinnis, 2007). Certainly, a review of the top marketing education journals bears this out.

In terms of the “how to” end of the spectrum, the literature in marketing education over the past four decades (the main period for which marketing education has had dedicated journals), produces a steady stream of calls for change because, the authors claim, the marketing curriculum, current at their time of writing, is failing to meet the needs of industry or to develop the knowledge and skills required by employers. This pressure for change is more often than not presented as an imperative; the language in article titles or abstracts implying that failure to consider the proposed innovations could have significant, negative consequences for both students and the discipline. Examples include Stanton’s (1988) call for serious “restructuring”, Koch’s (1997) “designing a new logic and structure”, Pharr and Morris’s (1997) “time to rethink marketing education”, Smart et al.’s (1999) call to “increase its relevancy”, Hulbert and Harrigan (2011) proposing “a new marketing DNA”

and more recently, the “need for radical innovations” (Schlegelmilch, 2020). The urgency and frequency of these calls implies that the relevance of what we teach our students and the relevance of research to solve current business problems is constantly under question and scrutiny. Is this simply the nature of a professional discipline or is there something more to it? It could be argued that all professional disciplines taught in research institutions are by nature, both ahead of and behind the sectors they serve. Ahead of, given that research into innovative practices are not restricted by the immediacy of earnings requirements, and researchers have the luxury of testing new theories and ideas over time; and behind what industry professionals see as their imperatives, particularly as technology develops at the pace of Moore’s law while curriculum innovations in academic institutions follow other conventions and patterns that take time, involve so many stakeholders and have different aims and objectives. The former issue that argues for academic research as a real benefit to industry is held back by the opaque nature of most research output and its non-industry-friendly structure and language. It’s not so much that things are lost in translation, but that they are simply never translated into useful or implementable ideas for business.

Clearly, however, there are those marketing scholars who believe that relevance to industry is a *sine qua non* of academic marketing research. And relevance to industry is often interpreted simplistically as providing guidance on effective marketing strategies for marketing practitioners. However, academic research need not serve a narrow interest group, and marketing practitioners are by no means the only people with an interest in marketing research anyway. As in other disciplines, there is no reason why academic marketing research cannot pursue the goal of understanding marketing better for purely scientific reasons, with scientific knowledge as the ultimate goal. Furthermore, a wide range of stakeholders besides marketing practitioners have interests in understanding marketing, since the marketing system interacts extensively with other important social systems, as summarised by Wilkie and Moore (1999) and considered within the sub-field of macromarketing. Clearly, policy-makers, regulators and consumer groups have considerable interest in marketing research. Indeed, other stakeholders whose interests may not be directly aligned with the capitalist paradigm also have an interest in serious research into marketing principles and practice. Likely examples are groups such as Extinction Rebellion, in connection with such issues as the contribution of marketing activity to climate change, and Black Lives Matter, in connection with issues like the representation of people of colour in advertising and marketing campaigns.

In the context of marketing education, this “relevance debate” is rather different since marketing students must be considered the primary stakeholder group. The question is not *if* the interests of marketing students should be given

priority, but what those interests are and how they should be prioritised. Just as there are those who argue that academic marketing research should primarily serve the interests of marketing practitioners, so there are those who argue that marketing education should serve the interests of marketing students by endowing them with skills and knowledge that marketing practitioners claim to find useful. The common feature becomes the positioning of the marketing academy as a service industry to marketing practice: to deliver research and graduates that practitioners perceive to be useful. Just as this argument can be contested for research, so it can be contested for education. It is students' interests that are the priority, not practitioners' interests. First, there are those students who study marketing without the desire to become marketing professionals, for whom a narrowly defined industry-designed curriculum is pointless and unnecessarily restrictive. Secondly, there are the many students who will pursue a career that is broadly in marketing, but not narrowly within the confines of a conventional consumer-marketing context. Thirdly, it is important to remember that marketing educators are the responsible education professionals, and while it is important to listen to marketing practitioners, it is also important to remember that they are not education professionals. One can ask the practitioner what skills and knowledge they consider useful in the workplace today and what they expect to be useful tomorrow. However, one cannot ask the practitioner what the curriculum should look like to prepare students for the marketing workplace of today, and to endow them with the lifelong learning skills and growth mindset required to thrive in future years. The former is a question on which marketing practitioners can provide an informed opinion. The latter is a matter of expert educational design.

Thus, the objectives of education, be it in marketing or other disciplines, are not the same as the objectives of those managing organisations and unless that education is called training and is situated within and created by or in collaboration with an organisation or industry association, the objectives will never be the same. Education in the formal sense serves society, not a particular industry or individual target audiences, although professional disciplines add the latter groups as important stakeholders. Whatever the discipline, education is about developing citizens who have the capacity to think more broadly about issues within and beyond a discipline, and the broad subject matter and theoretical perspectives that come under the subject area of marketing attest to this.

Even as four decades of scholarship has many claims that the marketing curriculum does not meet the needs of industry stakeholders and that academic marketing research, as narrowly defined, is not useful to practitioners, marketing degrees nevertheless continue to draw students in large numbers, suggesting that students find the subject compelling and of sufficient interest to invest their resources. It is also one that may offer an interesting and rewarding career for many students. Of course, in terms of educational design, teachers

of marketing must remain open to improving and upgrading the curriculum to reflect new research and to address broad and changing trends in the marketing system. As Wilkie and Moore (1999: 198) remind us, “marketing’s contributions (1) accumulate over time, (2) diffuse through a society, and (3) occur within the context of everyday life [all of which] can make them hard to discern at any given time”. They caution that as commentators and presumably as educators, we bring four perceptual barriers to understanding how these contributions can affect the discipline: “time, system limits, culture and personal experience” (p. 199). Time can make it difficult to discern the emergence and ultimate effects of these shifts and contributions. They may arise suddenly and have long effects, such as COVID, or emerge slowly over time but with increasing urgency for action, such as climate change and the need for diversity. System limits make it challenging to understand whether important trends emerge exclusively from actions within the marketing system, from the effects of other aggregate systems such as finance or technology or from systems interacting with each other – the interaction of marketing and technology systems today being an example. Cultural barriers remind us that marketing is a “social institution that is highly adaptive to its cultural and political context” and thus varies greatly in the world in terms of its stage of development and how it is applied, thus “we must take care to distinguish which lessons are generalisable and which are not (Wilkie and Moore, 1999: 199) but also to broaden the geographical scope of cases and examples we use in the classroom (Wilson, Chapter 11). Finally, our own personal experiences, preferences and scholarly interests can keep us so focused that we are imperceptive of or less interested in change, developments and effects, small or large that could be considered, not only so our students are better prepared for marketing careers, but so they are better prepared as thinkers, problem solvers and citizens.

Thus, educators need to consider where we can enrich our students’ understanding in a changing world where marketing actions or inactions, both at the individual and systemic levels have a role to play. Sometimes this means focusing on particular skills, such as numeracy, given that solving both company and society level issues requires more and more sophisticated quantitative and research skills; at other times building in more opportunities for students to consider ethics, development, social and sustainability issues; and at still others to examine the growing role of technology in marketing decision making, customer responsiveness and innovation. In addition to theory and content we should also reflect continuously on how we teach and make use of the vast and growing evidence-base about ways to improve our pedagogy. Most importantly, however, we must continue to develop our students’ breadth of knowledge across the broad and complex field of marketing and to use our teaching opportunities to challenge them and to develop their critical and

higher-level thinking skills. These are among the main objectives of this edited work.

The work presented here should be of interest to both those new to teaching in marketing as well as more experienced educators who wish to enhance their teaching with new perspectives, teach new courses or assist in curriculum development. Many chapters provide examples and exercises that can be used in the classroom, suggest pedagogical approaches upon which to structure the teaching and learning, and all contain rich reference lists to allow educators to build their current courses or develop new ones. Given how diverse the field of marketing is, this work is not exhaustive in terms of subjects that are currently taught or could be taught. However, the chapters that make up the book provide many insights into subjects that make up the curriculum of most marketing programmes and also ones that, while not ubiquitous, could enrich the students' learning, understanding and critical thinking skills if added to a programme.

In Chapter 2 Anita Peleg advocates "ethics and responsibility from the outset". A wealth of research-informed advice and teaching resources on the subject of teaching ethics and related topics (such as CSR and sustainability) can be found in the marketing education literature (Allan and Wood, 2009; Nicholson and DeMoss, 2009; Beggs, 2011; Donoho and Heinze, 2011; Donoho et al., 2012). Prominent voices have called for the comprehensive integration of ethics, CSR and sustainability into the marketing curriculum (Beggs, 2011; Rundle-Thiele and Wymer, 2010). Despite the following rather pessimistic finding: "Studies of ethics education have shown that ethics training does not result in improved moral reasoning (ethical judgment) by students" Beggs (2011: 49), Beggs (2011) also cites evidence that ethics education can make a difference to students' ethical reasoning. However, he argues that the teaching of marketing ethics should not be explicitly flagged as such; ethical dilemmas are context-specific, and in the real world they do not come fully marked up as requiring ethical consideration. Hence, Beggs' advocacy of *seamless* integration of ethics into the curriculum: embedding ethical discussions into the discussion of traditional marketing topics as a natural part of the curriculum. In her chapter, "Ethics and responsibility from the outset", Peleg follows the same line of argument but takes it a great deal further and provides a detailed template for the implementation of such ideas. Influential organisations support this approach (for example, the UN Global Compact Principles for Responsible Management Education and the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB International)), major employers consider ethics and social responsibility to be a key component of the business school curriculum, and business students expect opportunities to study these topics (Crane, 2004; Reynolds and Dang, 2017). Consequently, Peleg proposes that in *every* taught marketing module responsible principles

and practice should be considered alongside profitable economic outcomes; ethics and social responsibility should become central and not be considered as an option or a bolt-on extra in the curriculum. Specific examples and case studies are used to illustrate how this can be achieved in the practice of marketing education.

Caroline Tynan and Teresa Heath discuss how to teach marketing theory and critical thinking in Chapter 3. Building on a theme prominent in other chapters in this work, Tynan and Heath advocate developing students' critical thinking skills, in this case through grappling with the origins, development and diversity of marketing theory. The authors explore how teaching marketing theory allows students to develop not only higher-level thinking skills but also the confidence and facility to critique the discipline so they can both apply marketing concepts and processes under expected, typical conditions and, when these ideas fall short or do not work, adapt them or try something else. This facility comes from having had opportunities to question the received wisdom. They note, quite rightly, that many marketing programmes unfortunately take a "theory-light" approach to the discipline because educators assume that students find theory and theory formulation challenging and thus err on the side of teaching techniques and skills that when separated from the originating theories appear to students as immutable and determinate. Tynan and Heath argue that it is all a matter of how educators introduce theory, its purposes, uses and value. The authors provide recommendations on how to introduce the value of theory in marketing, first by having students consider the purpose of theory and theory formation, second by considering widely known theories and the significant contributions these theories have made to our lives, and third to consider how even well-known fictional detectives such as Sherlock Holmes use theories to solve their cases. Marketing has a rich theoretical heritage, with research grounded in diverse epistemological positions using a wide range of methodologies. Students are able to consider the main theoreticians whose work has made the field of marketing so rich and diverse and the course can also give them a solid grounding in philosophical perspectives that shape researchers' methods, thus going much further than most marketing research modules in providing insights and understanding relevant to their major project and/or dissertation work. In demonstrating that theories are all around us and a part of most solutions and innovations, Tynan and Heath also remind educators that theories and how they are tested should not be presented in unnecessarily complex ways that may appear obscurantist and intimidating to students.

In Chapter 4 Michael Harker and Andrew Paddison explore the marketing curriculum. They begin their investigation of the marketing curriculum with some fundamental questions: what is a curriculum, is there an established curriculum in marketing, what does it look like, and how is it changing? A review

of 29 published studies of the marketing curriculum reveals that there is a core to the marketing curriculum, comprising the topics of marketing principles, marketing communications, marketing research and strategic marketing. Beyond this there are established topics (the standard curriculum) including well-established subject matter such as consumer behaviour, international marketing, e-marketing and retail marketing. Harker and Paddison express surprise (which may be shared by many readers) that consumer behaviour seems to fall outside the core although inside the standard curriculum. Harker and Paddison then turn to current developments in the UK marketing curriculum based on a survey of departments carried out on behalf of the Academy of Marketing. Consumer behaviour seems now to be establishing itself in the core marketing curriculum. Of increasing popularity in the curriculum are e-marketing (now usually referred to as digital), client-based projects, critical marketing, and issues around marketing and society, including marketing ethics. Declining in popularity are subjects that require numeracy skills (which many will regard as unfortunate since marketing decisions often require quantitative reasoning), and that take a broader organisational perspective on marketing (such as business-to-business marketing). However, there is evidence that certain marketing subjects, notably digital and international marketing, are increasingly being distributed across the curriculum and, therefore, subsumed into other topics. The supposition here is that curriculum designers increasingly see marketing as an inherently international and digital discipline so that these components must be ubiquitous in the curriculum. On the other hand, and perhaps surprisingly, there is no evidence of the same effect in the case of marketing ethics and sustainability despite prominent calls for this to happen (Peleg makes a persuasive case in Chapter 2).

Lynn Vos examines the educational value of marketing simulation games in Chapter 5. Along with other authors in this collection, Vos grounds her teaching recommendations within an explicit pedagogical approach. Authentic learning recommends applied tasks that can lead to deeper learning when students are given sufficient practice, challenge, formative feedback and time for reflection (Newmann et al., 1996; Gulikers et al., 2006; Herrington and Herrington, 2006; Ashford-Rowe et al., 2014; Lincoln and Cassidy, 2018; Villarroel et al., 2018). Marketing simulation games are by nature active learning tools that mirror elements of real-world business decisions while removing the main risks associated with decision making in practice, and thus simulations fulfil a core requirement of authentic learning – a simulated experience from the work environment that can develop students' higher-level thinking skills. Vos argues that simulation games offer other elements of effective pedagogy that are much discussed in the literature but not often practised simultaneously within a single module. She demonstrates how games allow students to practise their understanding of core concepts over a number

of game iterations – something that our time-strapped curriculum does not always permit (Ericsson et al., 1993). Simulations also provide for a mediated learning environment where the game or the tutor can add graduated levels of complexity such that the students are regularly challenged to learn more and in greater depth while being given regular feedback on their progress with both game-generated reports (financial, sales, distribution effectiveness, customer satisfaction, among others) and tutor debriefing (Fanning and Gaba, 2007; Dieckmann et al., 2009). Moreover, given the number of rounds or iterations of the game, simulations provide ongoing opportunities for students to reflect on their approaches to decision making and to consider what they need to improve upon. In addition to demonstrating the inherent pedagogic values of simulations, Vos also argues strongly for a key learning benefit of simulations that is often assumed to occur over the course of a student's degree but is not always achieved – that of integration of learning (Kuh, 2008; Barber, 2014). Ideally, as students pass through their learning experience, they are deemed to be integrating the knowledge gained in one subject with that of another, such that when they graduate, they are able to skilfully deploy and weave together knowledge and learning from across modules to effectively and efficiently solve the kinds of cross-functional, multidisciplinary problems they will encounter in practice. Vos demonstrates that simulation games are one of the few learning tools that allow students to integrate their learning from across a range of marketing modules and other courses to actively develop cross-functional and critical thinking skills.

In Chapter 6 Andrew Corcoran offers those new to teaching consumer behaviour a guide to getting started. He begins by reminding us that of all the schools of thought within marketing, consumer behaviour is probably the most cross-disciplinary, with educators and researchers either coming from or grounding their research in different discipline areas. As Shaw and Jones (2005: 261) remind us, “[b]ecause it deals with human behavior, consumer behavior is one of marketing's most eclectic schools of thought” and as the field developed, many well-known theorists in psychology, sociology and economics, among other disciplines, have contributed ideas to our understanding of buyer behaviour. The main journals in the field, the *Journal of Consumer Psychology* and the *Journal of Consumer Research*, are highly esteemed by scholars and “recognised world-wide as exemplars of excellence” by the Chartered Association of Business Schools (charteredabs.org); both publish articles by researchers from across the social sciences. Certainly the field is rich in theory and models of decision making and buyer behaviour and Corcoran provides an overview of some of the best known and widely used, including Lavidge and Steiner's (1961) Hierarchy of Effects Model, Dewey's (1910) five stage consumer decision-making process, Maslow's (1943) Hierarchy of Needs, and McGuire's (1974) drives and motives. The author provides many

helpful exercises and activities to use in the classroom, in addition to providing a structure for how the module could be taught, including learning outcomes, topics and core readings.

The topic of Chapter 7, by Ben Wooliscroft, is teaching marketing history. Few programmes in marketing include a dedicated course in marketing history, although elements may be discussed in contemporary issues or theory modules. Wooliscroft, who has been teaching the history of marketing thought for the past two decades, argues that students benefit from having a better understanding of how their discipline evolved because, after all, one of the key objectives of dedicated study in a particular field is to develop both the capacity and confidence to critique its theoretical foundations while also moving the field forward over time (Shaw and Jones, 2005; Hunt, 2011; Wooliscroft, 2011). For example, understanding how we came to teach marketing from a predominantly management perspective in contrast to looking at marketing from a broader societal perspective provides opportunities for students to understand how particular ideas become dominant in a discipline, thus allowing them to question not only why such ideas come to the forefront but also that other schools of thought might offer important insights and approaches to marketing problems from both theoretical and applied perspectives (Tadajewski, 2006). Wooliscroft suggests that students read from seminal works such as Sheth et al. (1998) *Marketing Theory: Evolution and Evaluation*, Alderson's (1957) *Marketing Behaviour and Executive Action* in addition to works by Bagozzi (1975) on value creation, Hunt and Morgan (1996) on the resource advantage of the firm, Ehrenberg (1995) on marketing science, and Vargo and Lusch (2004) on value-in-use, to name just a few. His course begins with key organising questions such as "what is marketing?", "what is theory?" and the five main questions that structure the core text used in the course (Sheth et al., 1998), including identifying the proper domain(s) of marketing, what is or should be the dominant perspective in marketing (if any), and whether marketing is an art or a science. These are questions that students are unlikely to have considered as they move from one subject area to the next, semester after semester. He then suggests a structure for the course that follows the "School's" approach, so well laid out in Shaw and Jones (2005). As the students move through an understanding of foundational ideas by reading works by key scholars in earlier schools, including the commodities, institutional, functional schools through later schools including the dominant managerial school, the large consumer behaviour school and macromarketing, they consider the origins of concepts still predominant as organising principles in today's marketing textbooks while allowing them to think critically about how marketing scholars have grappled with key ontological and epistemological perspectives and theory, most of which have never fully achieved their original grand objectives. Thus, they are able to contemplate the kinds of

struggles for knowledge and knowing that confront thinkers in disciplines such as marketing, but more generally in all knowledge creation.

In Chapter 8, Ross Brennan considers the topic of teaching business-to-business marketing. Business-to-business marketing has never been the most popular course in the marketing curriculum, and indeed seems to be of diminishing importance in the curriculum, at least in the United Kingdom (according to Harker and Paddison in Chapter 4). One obvious reason for this relative unpopularity is that much business-to-business marketing fails to conform to the naive perception that many undergraduate students have of what marketing is. If you believe that marketing is something done to consumers by the providers of consumer goods and services in order to persuade them to buy, and therefore associate marketing with the characteristic embellishments of such practice (for example, an over-emphasis on the communications dimension of marketing, delivered through consumer media and emphasising affective rather than rational appeals), then this all makes sense. As Brennan points out, however, the characteristics of business markets and marketing are often very different from consumer marketing, both in practical and theoretical terms. One way to determine the most suitable approach to marketing starts with a contingency framework that identifies the key characteristics of markets, customers and customer relationships, and then suggests appropriate marketing strategies. Business-to-business markets are often characterised by enduring customer relationships involving multiple high-value transactions, within which trust and mutual dependence develop, leading to relationship-specific investments and mutual adaptations. Consequently, different theoretical frameworks, such as those of the IMP Group that focus on business-to-business relationships and the industrial networks of which they are a part (Håkansson, 1982; Håkansson and Snehota, 1995; Håkansson and Ford, 2002; Brennan et al., 2020), offer a sounder basis for both theorising and practical marketing strategy. From a pedagogic perspective, Brennan (Chapter 8) advocates a “deep end” rather than a “shallow end” approach to teaching business-to-business marketing. The deep end approach starts by focusing on business-to-business marketing situations that contingency frameworks show to be distinctly different from typical consumer marketing situations, so that students need to learn a distinctly different perspective on marketing and a new vocabulary suitable for the business-to-business context. This will better prepare the student to enter the professional world of business-to-business marketing than the simplistic notion that consumer marketing ideas can be easily transferred to the business marketing context.

Barbara Czarnecka and Maria Rita Massaro examine research methods teaching in Chapter 9. The subject of research methods is one that presents the marketing curriculum planner with particular dilemmas. Czarnecka and Massaro address these dilemmas, observing that on the one hand many

marketing students are poorly prepared to undertake a rigorous course in research methods, while on the other hand employers consistently demand that marketing graduates should be competent in analysing and interpreting data and turning the analysis into actionable plans. It is easy to see how this dilemma, if poorly handled, could be reduced to a competition between the desire to avoid upsetting the student-customer (who might want to avoid too much maths) and the desire to demonstrate key employability outcomes in the course design. However, as Czarnecka and Massaro argue, there really can be no doubt that research evidence in its many forms is playing an ever-increasing role in professional marketing practice, and so whatever the background or preferences of marketing students may be, the learning outcomes from a marketing course simply must include competence in the handling of marketing data. The only serious question is how to achieve this. From a pedagogic point of view Czarnecka and Massaro strongly advocate an active-learning approach to research methods, with the learning process centred on finding solutions to practical marketing problems. At all points in teaching research methods for marketing, students should be exposed to practical as well as theoretical material. Many students, in subsequent employment, will be expected to use big data, and so the inclusion of data analytics in the research methods course is imperative. However, despite the ever-increasing focus on big data and analytics, Czarnecka and Massaro are equally insistent that qualitative methods remain an important part of the marketer's armoury and must be included in the research methods curriculum. This includes both traditional qualitative methods (such as focus groups and semi-structured interviews) and the relatively new field of netnography, the adaptation of ethnographic techniques for use in the online world (Kozinets, 2002, 2019).

In Chapter 10 Ariadne Kapetanaki and Fiona Spotswood consider how to teach social marketing. Kapetanaki and Spotswood are strong advocates for the inclusion of social marketing in the marketing curriculum. First, they address some of the more widespread confusions about social marketing. Social marketing may well use social media as a component of the communications mix but be sure not to confuse social marketing with social media, or social media marketing. Rather, social marketing is the use of marketing tools and techniques alongside other mechanisms (such as health communication and health education) to bring about social and behavioural changes that benefit individuals and wider society. This correctly implies that there is an ethical dimension at the core of social marketing, and Kapetanaki and Spotswood explicitly link social marketing to issues of marketing ethics, environmental sustainability and macromarketing. It is easy to see how the marketing student, used to the idea that the purpose of marketing activity is to increase sales, profitability and shareholder value by delivering value to customers (Doyle, 2000), may initially find the idea of social marketing difficult. However, as

Kapetanaki and Spotswood argue, this is a rapidly growing area of marketing practice, the worth of which has been recognised by prominent scholars and marketing professionals for several decades (Kotler and Levy, 1969; Kotler and Zaltman, 1971; Andreasen, 1994). Certainly, a social marketing course within the marketing curriculum provides the opportunity to expose students to both fascinating theoretical ideas (for example, social cognitive theory and the health belief model) and important practical problems (for example, reducing alcohol abuse and risky sexual behaviours) that they might not otherwise encounter during their studies. Kapetanaki and Spotswood present a convincing argument that the inclusion of social marketing can provide a valuable broadening of the curriculum, an exciting intellectual challenge for students, and contribute to the university's employability agenda.

The subject matter turns to teaching international marketing in Chapter 11 by Jonathan Wilson. International marketing is a core subject within most undergraduate and postgraduate marketing programmes. Wilson argues for two major approaches when teaching the subject: first, that educators must broaden their repertoire of resources and examples to include a range of international conditions, brands and companies (Crittenden and Wilson, 2006; Leonidou et al., 2007; Malhotra et al., 2013; Vos, 2013) and second, that the educator use an explicit pedagogic approach to teaching and assessment – authentic learning – an approach also discussed in Chapter 5 on marketing simulation games. In developing his argument for the former, Wilson provides a historical overview of the discipline to demonstrate that while the learning resources and materials used in teaching have developed along with the shifts in global trade and the rise of global brands, they have not done so as comprehensively and thus do not always reflect the realities of today's global marketplace. Most textbooks and cases continue to come from either the US or a handful of Western European countries, yet in 2021, 53 of the world's top global brands have their origins in countries other than the US, with 11 of the top 20 brands by value from China (<https://brandirectory.com/rankings/global/table> 2021). This reality, Wilson argues, requires educators to move beyond the available textbooks to include academic journals and to develop activities that draw from a breadth of country examples, not only other country brands but also different approaches to international marketing that are shaped by unique cultural, economic and political factors. He adds two further arguments for broadening the range of cases and examples. First, he discusses the current student reality: most students today use or are familiar with brands from around the world – TikTok (China), Spotify (Sweden), Zara (Spain), Samsung (South Korea) and L'Oreal (France), to name just a few. Secondly, he reminds us that globalisation has also profoundly affected higher education. Before COVID restricted international travel, 80 per cent of students in most UK postgraduate marketing programmes were from Asian countries (HESA, 2019/20).

The majority of undergraduate marketing courses also include students from around the world. Thus, Wilson argues, not only do we have an obligation to broaden the perspectives taught, but we also have a wealth of diverse experiences to draw upon. Wilson's second discussion point is that of using an explicit pedagogy to enhance the teaching and learning in international marketing. Authentic assessment is a whole course pedagogy that begins with using examples from professional practice, or scenarios that students will encounter in the field in order to increase student interest and enhance employability (Lombardi, 2007; Fook and Sidhu, 2010; Herrington et al., 2010). He provides five useful learning exercises that educators can employ in the classroom and provides student outputs from the exercises, including details on how to deploy them for greatest learning effectiveness while also demonstrating the authentic learning principles that are enhanced through each exercise.

In Chapter 12, "Teaching marketing science", Dag Bennett argues passionately for the scientific method as a fundamental guiding force within marketing. While his principal audience is marketing educators, there can be no doubt that his message is relevant to the entire marketing community. Bennett's plea is for marketers to renounce and refrain from magical thinking, faddish ideas and thoughtlessly following the latest marketing fashion, and to replace this with rigorous, disciplined thinking grounded in evidence-based practice and logical analysis. So, for the purposes of this book, Bennett trenchantly represents and defends the marketing-as-science school of thought (Converse, 1945; Hunt, 1976). Indeed, it is plausible to argue that the third decade of the twenty-first century is as good a time as any to revisit the science/art debate in marketing (Brown, 1996). The dust has settled on the fad for postmodern marketing and, ironically, postmodern ideas have arguably been woven seamlessly into modern marketing practice. Bennett, coming at this issue from the perspective championed by the late Andrew Ehrenberg (Keng and Ehrenberg, 1984; Ehrenberg et al., 1990; Ehrenberg, 1995), presents scientific marketing concepts that can be taught in the classroom (such as double jeopardy and the duplication of purchase law), advocates pedagogic methods suitable for making these concepts accessible to marketing students, and more generally defends the idea that there are important, replicable, empirical generalisations in marketing. These generalisations, although not carrying the same weight as the fundamental laws of physics, nevertheless represent useful, basic building blocks of marketing knowledge that can help protect marketing students (and practitioners) against falsehoods and unsubstantiated claims to knowledge.

REFERENCES

- Allan, D. and Wood, N.T. (2009). Incorporating ethics into the marketing communications class: The case of Old Joe and New Jo Camel. *Marketing Education Review*, 19(2), 63–71.
- Alderson, W. (1957). *Marketing Behaviour and Executive Action: A Functionalist Approach to Marketing Theory*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Andreasen, A.R. (1994). Social marketing: Its definition and domain. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 13(1), 108–114.
- Ansoff, I.H. (1957). Strategies for diversification. *Harvard Business Review*, 35(5), 113–20.
- Ashford-Rowe, K., Herrington, J. and Brown, C. (2014). Establishing the critical elements that determine authentic assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(2), 205–222.
- Bagozzi, R.P. (1975). Marketing as exchange. *Journal of Marketing*, 39(4), 32–9.
- Barber, J.P. (2014). Integration of learning model: How college students integrate learning. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2014(165), 7–17.
- Bedeian, A.G. (2005). Crossing disciplinary boundaries: A epilegomenon for Lockett and McWilliams. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14(2), 151–5.
- Beggs, J.M. (2011). Seamless integration of ethics. *Marketing Education Review*, 21(1), 49–56.
- Brennan, R. (2012). Educating professional marketers? *Marketing Education Digest*, 1(1), York, Higher Education Agency. Accessed 30 March 2020 at: <https://www.lynnvos.com/marketing-education-digests>.
- Brennan, R., Canning, L.E. and McDowell, R. (2020). *Business to Business Marketing* (5th edn). London: Sage.
- Brown, S. (1996). Art or science?: Fifty years of marketing debate. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 12(4), 243–67.
- Catterall, M., Maclaran, P. and Stevens, L. (2002). Critical reflection in the marketing curriculum. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 24(3), 184–92.
- Converse, P.D. (1945). The development of the science of marketing – an exploratory survey. *Journal of Marketing*, 10(1), 14–23.
- Crane, F.G. (2004). The teaching of business ethics: An imperative at business schools. *Journal of Education for Business*, 79(3), 149–51.
- Crittenden, V. and Wilson, E.J. (2006). Content, pedagogy, and learning outcomes in the International Marketing course. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 17(1–2), 81–101.
- Dewey, J. (1910). *How We Think*. Boston, MA: Heath.
- Dieckmann, P., Molin Friss, S., Lippert, A. and Ostergaard, D. (2009). The art and science of debriefing in simulation: Ideal and practice. *Medical Teacher*, 31(7), 287–94.
- Donoho, C. and Heinze, T. (2011). The personal selling ethics scale: Revisions and expansions for teaching sales ethics. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 33(1), 107–122.
- Donoho, C., Heinze, T. and Kondo, C. (2012). Gender differences in personal selling ethics evaluations. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 34(1), 55–66.
- Doyle, P. (2000). *Value-Based Marketing*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Ehrenberg, A.S. (1995). Empirical generalisations, theory, and method. *Marketing Science*, 14(3_supplement), G20–G28.

- Ehrenberg, A.S., Goodhardt, G.J. and Barwise, T.P. (1990). Double jeopardy revisited. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(3), 82–91.
- Ericsson, K.A., Krampe, R.T. and Tesch-Romer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review*, 100(3), 363–406.
- Fanning, R.M. and Gaba, D.M. (2007). The role of debriefing in simulation-based learning. *Simulation in Healthcare*, 2(2), 115–25.
- Fook, C.Y. and Sidhu, G.K. (2010). Authentic assessment and pedagogical strategies in higher education. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(2), 153–61.
- Gulikers, J.T.M., Bastiaens, T.J. and Kirschner, P.A. (2006). Student perceptions of assessment authenticity: Study approaches and learning outcome. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 32(4), 381–400.
- Hagerty, J.E. (1936). Experiences of an early marketing teacher. *Journal of Marketing*, 1(1), 20–27.
- Håkansson, H. (ed.) (1982). *International Marketing and Purchasing of Industrial Goods*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Håkansson, H. and Ford, D. (2002). How should companies interact in business networks? *Journal of Business Research*, 55(7), 133–9.
- Håkansson, H. and Snehota, I. (eds) (1995). *Developing Relationships in Business Markets*. London: Routledge.
- Herrington, J. and Herrington, A. (2006). Authentic conditions for authentic assessment: Aligning task and assessment. In A. Bunker and I. Vardi (eds), *Research and Development in Higher Education* (Vol. 29, pp. 146–51). Milperra: HERDSA.
- Herrington, J., Reeves, T.C. and Oliver, R. (2010). *A Guide to Authentic E-learning*. London: Routledge.
- HESA (2019/20). Where do HE students come from? Accessed 3 March 2021 at <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis/students/where-from>.
- Hill, M.E. and McGinnis, J. (2007). Curiosity in marketing thinking. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 29(1), 52–62.
- Hill, R.P. and Martin, K.D. (2014). Broadening the paradigm of marketing as exchange: A public policy and marketing perspective. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 33(1), 17–33.
- Hulbert, B. and Harrigan, P. (2011). How can marketing academics serve marketing practice? The new marketing DNA as a model for marketing education. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 33(3), 253–72.
- Hunt, S.D. (1976). The nature and scope of marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 40(3), 17–28.
- Hunt, S.D. (2011). On the intersection of marketing history and marketing theory. *Marketing Theory*, 11(4), 483–9.
- Hunt, S.D. and Morgan, R.M. (1996). The resource-advantage theory of competition: Dynamics, path dependencies, and evolutionary dimensions. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(3), 107–114.
- Keng, K.A. and Ehrenberg, A.S. (1984). Patterns of store choice. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 21(4), 399–409.
- Koch, A.J. (1997). Marketing curriculum: Designing its new logic and structure. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 19(3), 2–11.
- Koch, A.J. (2013). The future of marketing education: A practitioner's perspective. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 34(1), 54–67.
- Kotler, P. and Levy, S.J. (1969). Broadening the concept of marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 33(1), 10–15.

- Kotler, P. and Zaltman, G. (1971). Social marketing: An approach to planned social change. *Journal of Marketing*, 35(3), 3–12.
- Kozinets, R.V. (2002). The field behind the screen: Using netnography for marketing research in online communities. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39(1), 61–72.
- Kozinets, R.V. (2019). *Netnography: The Essential Guide to Qualitative Social Media Research* (3rd edn). London: SAGE Publications.
- Kuh, G.D. (2008). Why integration and engagement are essential to effective educational practice in the twenty-first century. *Peer Review*, 10(4), 27–8.
- Lavidge, R.J. and Steiner, G.A. (1961). A model for predictive measurements of advertising effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing*, 25(6), 59–62.
- Leonidou, L.C., Kaminarides, J.S. and Panayides, P. (2007). The international marketing environment: Textbook content vs educators' views. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 18(2/3), 101–131.
- Lincoln T.J. and Cassidy, R. (2018). Authentic assessment in business education: Its effects on student satisfaction and promoting behaviour. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(3), 401–415.
- Lombardi, M.M. (2007). Authentic learning for the 21st century: An overview (ELI Paper 1). Educause Learning Initiative.
- Malhotra, N.K., Wu, L. and Whitelock, J. (2013). An updated overview of research published in the *International Marketing Review*: 1983 to 2011. *International Marketing Review*, 31(1), 7–20.
- Maslow, A.H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–96.
- McGuire, W. (1974). Psychological motives and communication gratification. In J.F. Blumer and E. Katz (eds), *The Uses of Mass Communications: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research* (pp. 106–167). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Newmann, F.M., Marks, H.M. and Gamoran, A. (1996). Authentic pedagogy and student performance. *American Journal of Education*, 104(4), 280–312.
- Nicholson, C.Y. and DeMoss, M. (2009). Teaching ethics and social responsibility: An evaluation of undergraduate business education at the discipline level. *Journal of Education for Business*, 84(4), 213–18.
- Pharr, S. and Morris, L.J. (1997). The fourth-generation marketing curriculum: Meeting AACSB's guidelines. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 19(3), 31–43.
- Reynolds, S.J. and Dang, C.T. (2017). Are the “customers” of business ethics courses satisfied? An examination of one source of business ethics education legitimacy. *Business & Society*, 56(7), 947–74.
- Rundle-Thiele, S.R. and Wymer, W. (2010). Stand-alone ethics, social responsibility, and sustainability course requirements: A snapshot from Australia and New Zealand. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 32(1), 5–12.
- Schlegelmilch, B.B. (2020). Why business schools need radical innovations: Drivers and development trajectories. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 42(2), 93–107.
- Shaw, E.H. and Jones, D.G.B. (2005). A history of the schools of marketing thought. *Marketing Theory*, 5(3), 239–81.
- Shaw, E.H. and Lazer, W. (2007). Wroe Alderson: Father of modern marketing. *European Business Review*, 19(6), 440–51.
- Sheth, J.N., Gardner, D.M. and Garrett, D.E. (1988). *Marketing Theory: Evolution and Evaluation*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Smart, D.T., Kelley, C.A. and Conant, J. (1999). Marketing education in the year 2000: Changes observed and challenges anticipated. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 21(3), 206–216.

- Stanton, W.J. (1988). It's time to restructure marketing in academia. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 6(1), 2–9.
- Tadajewski, M. (2006). The ordering of marketing theory: The influence of McCarthyism and the Cold War, *Marketing Theory*, 6(2), 163–200.
- Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(January), 1–17.
- Villarroel, V., Bloxham, D.B., Bruna, C. and Herrera-Seda, C. (2018). Authentic assessment: creating a blueprint for course design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(5), 840–54.
- Vos, L. (2013). Improving international marketing programs to reflect global complexity and risk: Curriculum drivers and constraints. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 24(2), 81–106.
- Walle, A.H. (1991). Modern marketing: The shift from academic respectability to practitioner significance. *Management Decisions*, 29(4), 39–40.
- Wilkie, W.L. and Moore, E.S. (1999). Marketing's contribution to society. *Journal of Marketing*, 63 (Special millennium edn), 198–218.
- Wooliscroft, B. (2011). Marketing theory as history. *Marketing Theory*, 11(4), 499–501.