

FAILURES IN MARKETING EDUCATION IN THE 1970'S: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE 1980'S

Ed L. Grubb, Portland State University

The 1970's were a period of growth in enrollment, increased research activity, rapid changes in the environment of marketing, and a period of continued refinement in programs developed after such reports as Gordon and Howell. It is wise and necessary to reflect upon the programs and results of the 1970's to determine what weaknesses and problems exist and what should be done to strengthen the marketing programs of the 1980's. The following are suggested as areas of concern:

1. In spite of a stated emphasis on the environment, academic marketing as a discipline still reacts, rather than leads. Concern over such things as inflation and productivity only surfaced after they were widely recognized in the mass media.
2. Marketing academicians, as they have sought legitimacy through science and research, have probably not given enough attention to major social, economic, technical, and political issues.
3. Too many graduating students of marketing programs are nearly illiterate in the tools and language of accounting, finance, and financial analysis.
4. The concepts of the discipline of marketing are too often absent at the top corporate level. Marketing educators have failed in gaining the necessary recognition and acceptance for the philosophy and use of modern marketing.
5. Too many marketing academicians treat transportation as a given and therefore, downplay its role in the marketing mix. De-regulation, high energy costs, and the high costs of capital investment will make this approach as obsolete as a black and white console TV.
6. Marketing academicians are slow in the adoption and use of modern technology, including microprocessing and videocommunications. Too many graduates are not prepared to use these technologies. Equally serious is the continued ignorance of technology as a means to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of our teaching. Productivity is a nation-wide problem, yet those in the teaching of marketing have done too little to improve it.
7. Marketers, particularly at the level of Ph.D. programs, went too far in their romance of the behavioral sciences. Too many issues and other approaches went unnoticed while scholars of marketing fine-tuned their behavioral models.

Other issues could be added, but this list should be enough to challenge curriculum developers, researchers, and the theoreticians of marketing. The following might be considered as general approaches for improvements.

1. Marketing educators must become less descriptive and more analytical in terms of the impact of the environment. Better means of predicting and therefore, means of leading change must be found.
2. Better forums for the discussion of issues is essential and the implications of these issues must be a more integral part of the educational process.
3. Marketing professors and their graduates must become stronger in the use of financial analysis.
4. Greater attention must be given to gaining the acceptance of marketing and what it has to offer by our fellow academicians and by corporate executives.
5. Programs of education must give more attention to transportation and physical distribution as a part of the marketing mix.
6. Marketing professors must make greater use of modern technology in our teaching, and the students must be better able to use it as they become productive managers.
7. Programs of marketing must become more balanced between behavioral, quantitative, managerial, and functional approaches. The end result must be concepts and students which can solve problems and lead to greater productivity, as well as improved customer satisfaction.