

Early Collegiate Marketing Education in the U. S.

Edd Applegate

January 18, 2022

Abstract

This paper discusses the earliest collegiate academic programs that offered courses in marketing in the United States. These academic programs differed (1) in size based on the number of courses offered and (2) in name.

The paper also discusses the founding of the American Marketing Association.

Introduction

Private business schools, which offered courses in bookkeeping and eventually typing and shorthand, monopolized business education prior to 1890.¹ Although these schools served a basic purpose, the curriculum suffered because it focused on a few clerical skills, not business in general. Consequently, these schools failed to prepare individuals for positions of responsibility.²

According to Rakesh Khurana,

The first university business schools represented . . . an attempt to shift the traditional system of apprenticeship, with its interest in character formation as well as in the transmission of knowledge and skills, into an organizational context more amenable to the modern age.³

If students desired to learn more about business, private and state colleges and universities provided the solution. Indeed, courses in accounting, economics, and finance, among other subjects, were developed at a few colleges and universities before 1900.

In 1881, the Wharton School of Finance and Economy (later Wharton School of Finance and Commerce) was established at the University of Pennsylvania as a result of a financial gift of \$100,000 from Joseph Wharton, a successful manufacturer and merchant

in Philadelphia. In his proposal to the trustees, Wharton presented his educational philosophy and provided specifics for the school, including the curriculum and faculty positions needed.⁴ According to the proposal, the school would offer an undergraduate program that included accounting, commercial law, currency, finance, and taxation, among other subjects in business. In addition, students would be required to take liberal arts courses.⁵

The school struggled for two years primarily because the faculty had been educated in the liberal arts and did not necessarily believe that “practical” courses about commerce should be taught in a college or university.⁶ These faculty members were replaced with faculty members who understood the subjects they were assigned to teach.

Joseph Wharton promoted the school. Edmund James, a professor and later director of the school, promoted the school, too, and business education in general.⁷ Without question, their efforts influenced others, although those who worked in higher education were slow to respond. Many academicians believed that a university’s purpose was to educate young people in the arts and sciences, not prepare them for working in businesses.

Nonetheless, eventually other colleges and universities followed the University of Pennsylvania’s lead. In 1898, the University of Chicago established a College of Commerce and Politics. Dartmouth College established the Amos Tuck School of Administration and Finance, the first graduate school in commerce, in 1900. The same year New York University founded a School of Commerce, Accounts, and Finance.

In 1901, Ohio University established a School of Commerce in the Normal College. In 1903, James Milliken University (now Milliken University) established a School of Commerce and Finance.

In 1907, the University of Pittsburgh founded an Evening School of Economics, Accounts, and Finance. A year later Harvard University established a Graduate School of Business Administration, and the University of Denver established a School of Commerce, Accounts, and Finance.

Other colleges and universities developed courses in business or commerce and subsequently established departments, schools, or colleges of business or commerce.

Before the end of World War I, the typical school of commerce or business administration “was a school designed to equip its graduates with the tools of the trade necessary for immediate entrance on the job in the business world.”⁸ Some of these schools required few courses in liberal arts, the sciences, and mathematics, which caused faculty members in other academic disciplines to criticize the “practical” types of courses being offered.

In partial response, the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business (now the AACSB International—The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) was organized in 1916 to promote and improve business education in colleges and universities. The founding members included Columbia University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, New York University, Northwestern University, Ohio State University, Tulane University, University of California (Berkeley), University of Chicago, University of Illinois, University of Nebraska, University of Pennsylvania, University of Pittsburgh, University of Texas (Austin),

University of Wisconsin (Madison), and Yale University. Primarily because of World War I, the first formal meeting was not held until 1919.⁹

Establishment of business programs continued. By 1926, there were 89 institutions with departments, schools, or colleges of business or commerce.¹⁰ A few of these institutions were the smaller so-called liberal arts colleges. Many were the “land-grant” colleges and universities that had been founded as a result of the Morrill Act. Most of the programs belonging to the AACSB required students to take work in accounting, business law, finance, marketing, and statistics.¹¹

The Early Collegiate Courses in Marketing

Courses in marketing were not offered by any college or university until 1902-3. According to H. H. Maynard, the first course considered marketing was "The Distributive and Regulative Industries of the United States," which was taught by Edward D. Jones, a faculty member in the Department of Economics at the University of Michigan, in 1902-3. The description of the course appeared in the university's catalog:

This course which alternates with Course 34, will include a description of the various ways of marketing goods, of the classification grades, brands, employed, and of the wholesale and retail trade. Attention will also be given to those private organizations, not connected with money and banking, which guide and control the industrial process, such as trade associations, boards of trade, and chambers of commerce.¹²

On the other hand, Simon Litman claimed the course, "The Technique of Trade and Commerce," which he taught in 1902-3 at the University of California (Berkeley), was one of the first courses in marketing. Litman also claimed that George M. Fisk taught a similar course at the University of Illinois the same academic year.¹³ In fact, the courses "Domestic Commerce and Commercial Policies," "Foreign Commerce and Commercial Policies," and "Domestic and Foreign Markets" were offered at the University of Illinois during the 1902-3 academic year.¹⁴ Litman wrote *Trade and Commerce*, which was published by La Salle Extension University in 1911. He wrote the *Essentials of International Trade*, which was published in 1923.

Litman was not the only faculty member who wrote textbooks, however. Indeed, as more courses in marketing were offered, there was a need for different textbooks about one or more aspects of the subject. Consequently, other faculty who taught one or more courses in marketing added to the literature.

Edward D. Jones taught the courses "Distribution of Agricultural Products" and "Wholesale and Retail Trade" at the University of Michigan the following academic year.¹⁵ Jones wrote *The Administration of Industrial Enterprises: with Special Reference to Factory Practice*, which included discussions about advertising and sales, among other topics. The book was published in 1916.

Unfortunately, the first professors who taught one or more courses in marketing had to develop such courses primarily because there were no textbooks and few journals. Certain faculty used reports produced by the federal government. Others employed textbooks that contained various business forms and consequently explained how these forms were used as part of their lectures.¹⁶

Table 1

Some Early Faculty Members Who Taught Marketing

Faculty Member*	Institution**
Ralph Starr Butler	University of Wisconsin
Paul T. Cherington	Harvard University
Fred E. Clark	University of Michigan
Paul D. Converse	University of Pittsburgh
Melvin T. Copeland	Harvard University
Carson S. Duncan	University of Chicago
George M. Fisk	University of Illinois
James E. Hagerty	The Ohio State University
Benjamin H. Hibbard	University of Wisconsin
Paul Ivey	University of Michigan
Edward D. Jones	University of Michigan
W. E. Kruesi	University of Pennsylvania
Simon Litman	University of California (Berkeley)
Theodore Macklin	Kansas State Col. of Agriculture & Applied Sci.
Paul Nystrom	University of Wisconsin
L. D. H. Weld	University of Minnesota

***Faculty members are listed in alphabetical order by the first letter of their last name. **Several faculty members listed taught at more than one university (see text for details).**

One of the first courses with "marketing" in its title was "The Marketing of Products," which was taught by W. E. Kruesi, a faculty member at the Wharton School of Commerce and Finance, in 1904-5. The following description appeared in the university's catalog:

The methods now practiced in the organization and conduct of the selling branch of industrial and mercantile business. The principal subjects in the field are publicity, agency, advertising, forms and correspondence, credit and collections, and terms of sale.¹⁷

The Ohio State University offered courses in marketing as early as 1904-5. For instance, James E. Hagerty taught "The Distribution of Products" that academic year. The course was expanded into the courses "The Distributive and Regulative Institutions" and "Commercial Credit" the following academic year. Students were required to enroll in the course mentioned first before enrolling in the second. In 1907-8, the university offered "Mercantile Institutions." The following description of the course appeared in the bulletin on Business Administration and Social Science:

This course considers mercantile organization from two points of view: (1) The evolution of mercantile organizations in the United States and their relation to each other; the origin and development of the various mercantile institutions with special reference to the economic conditions which brought them into existence and perpetuated them. The various methods of marketing goods, and the functions of the various distributors, manufacturers, manufacturers' agents, brokers, jobbers, traveling salesmen, etc. Advertising, its psychological laws, its economic importance and the changes it has introduced in selling goods. The work of stock and produce exchanges. (2) The internal or administrative organization of mercantile concerns. A study of the divisions and subdivisions of mercantile concerns and the relation of the various departments to each other and to the whole. The systems in use of recording and preserving data.¹⁸

Robert Bartels claimed the above description was for “The Distribution of Products,” not “Mercantile Institutions.”¹⁹ Bartels claimed “Mercantile Institutions” was a new name for the “Distributive and Regulative Institutions.” According to James E. Hagerty, “Mercantile Institutions” was renamed “Marketing” in 1916.²⁰

In 1909-10, Paul T. Cherington taught “Commercial Organization and Methods” in the Graduate School of Business Administration at Harvard University.²¹ Cherington wrote *Advertising as a Business Force* in 1913 and *The Elements of Marketing* in 1920.

The course “The Marketing of Products” was offered at the University of Pittsburgh during 1909-10.²²

Ralph Starr Butler went to the University of Wisconsin (Madison) in 1910. He developed correspondence courses for the University Extension Division and taught. One of the first courses he developed was “Sales, Purchase, and Shipping Methods,” a course in marketing, in 1910. Consisting of six pamphlets, Butler revised the material for the Alexander Hamilton Institute, which published a series of textbooks for students enrolled in its correspondence courses. The material appeared under the title “Selling and Buying,” which was a part of *Advertising, Selling, and Credits*, which was published in 1912. Butler used part of the material for the course “Marketing Methods,” which he began to teach in 1911-12. In 1914, Butler, Herbert F. De Bower, and John G. Jones published *Marketing Methods and Salesmanship*. Butler wrote another book for the Alexander Hamilton Institute’s series of textbooks. Titled *Marketing Methods*, it was published in 1917.²³

Melvin T. Copeland taught at New York University and at Harvard University. He developed the course “Commercial Organization” in 1912 for the Graduate School of Business Administration. He changed the name of the course to “Marketing” in 1914. Copeland conducted studies for the newly established Bureau of Business Research, too. He also wrote *Problems in Marketing*, which was published in 1920, and *Principles of Merchandising*, which was published in 1924.²⁴

Benjamin H. Hibbard had taught agricultural economics at Iowa State College of Agricultural and Mechanic Arts (now Iowa State University of Science and Technology) before he left in 1913 to teach at the University of Wisconsin (Madison), where he

developed a course in cooperative marketing of agricultural products. Hibbard wrote *Marketing Agricultural Products* in 1921.²⁵

L. D. H. Weld taught a course in agricultural marketing at the University of Minnesota in 1913. He wrote *Studies in the Marketing of Farm Products*, which was published in 1915, and *The Marketing of Farm Products*, which was published in 1916.²⁶

Theodore Macklin taught agricultural marketing at Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science (now Kansas State University). Then he taught at the University of Wisconsin (Madison), where he wrote *Efficient Marketing for Agriculture*, which was published in 1921.²⁷

Paul Nystrom helped advance marketing as a subject of economics at the University of Wisconsin (Madison). For instance, he taught a course about retail selling and store management in 1911-12. His textbook, *Retail Selling and Store Management*, was published in 1913. His *Economics of Retailing* was published in 1915. Nystrom taught for at least a year at the University of Minnesota and then left higher education to pursue other interests for several years. Eventually, he returned to teaching and writing. *The Economics of Fashion* was published in 1928 and the *Economic Principles of Consumption* was published in 1929.²⁸

Carson S. Duncan taught courses in marketing at the University of Chicago and wrote *Commercial Research*, which was published in 1919, and *Marketing: Its Problems and Methods*, which was published a year later.²⁹

Paul Ivey taught at the University of Michigan, the University of Iowa, the University of Nebraska, Northwestern University, and the University of Southern

California. He wrote *Principles of Marketing: A Textbook for Colleges and Schools of Business Administration*, which was published in 1921.³⁰

Paul D. Converse taught courses in marketing at the University of Pittsburgh and wrote *Marketing Methods and Policies*, which was published in 1921. He went to the University of Illinois in 1924.³¹

Fred E. Clark taught courses in marketing at the University of Michigan, the University of Minnesota, and Northwestern University. He wrote *Principles of Marketing*, which was published in 1922.³²

The individuals mentioned above were not the only people writing textbooks about marketing. Indeed, Arch W. Shaw wrote *Some Problems in Market Distribution*, which was published in 1915. Edmund Brown wrote *Marketing*, which was published in 1925. Ralph F. Breyer wrote *Commodity Marketing*, which was published in 1931, and *The Marketing Institution*, which was published in 1934. Of course, others wrote textbooks about the subject as well.

Table 2

Early Published Titles Related to Marketing

Author	Title	Year
Paul T. Cherington	<i>Advertising as a Business Force</i>	1913
Ralph Starr Butler, et al.	<i>Marketing Methods and Salesmanship</i>	1914
Paul H. Nystrom	<i>The Economics of Retailing</i>	1915
Arch W. Shaw	<i>Some Problems in Market Distribution</i>	1915
Edward D. Jones	<i>The Administration of Industrial Enterprises:</i>	

	<i>with Special Reference to Factory Practice</i>	1916
L. D. H. Weld	<i>The Marketing of Farm Products</i>	1916
Ralph Starr Butler	<i>Marketing Methods</i>	1917
Paul T. Cherington	<i>The Elements of Marketing</i>	1920
Melvin T. Copeland	<i>Problems in Marketing</i>	1920
Carson S. Duncan	<i>Marketing: Its Problems and Methods</i>	1920
Paul W. Ivey	<i>Elements of Retail Salesmanship</i>	1920
Paul D. Converse	<i>Marketing Methods and Policies</i>	1921
Benjamin H. Hibbard	<i>Marketing Agricultural Products</i>	1921
Paul W. Ivey	<i>Principles of Marketing: A Textbook for Colleges and Schools of Business Administration</i>	1921
Theodore Macklin	<i>Efficient Marketing for Agriculture: Its Services, Methods, and Agencies</i>	1921
Fred E. Clark	<i>Principles of Marketing</i>	1922
N. H. Comish	<i>The Standard of Living: Elements of Consumption</i>	1923
Simon Litman	<i>Essentials of International Trade</i>	1923
Edmund Brown	<i>Marketing</i>	1925
Theodore N. Beckman	<i>Wholesaling</i>	1926
Harold H. Maynard, et al.	<i>Principles of Marketing</i>	1927
Roland S. Vaile	<i>Economics of Advertising</i>	1927
Walter C. Weidler, et al.	<i>Principles of Marketing</i>	1927
Floyd L. Vaughan	<i>Marketing and Advertising: An Economic Appraisal</i>	1928

N. H. Comish	<i>The Cooperative Marketing of Agricultural Products</i>	1929
Paul H. Nystrom	<i>The Economics of Consumption</i>	1929
Paul D. Converse	<i>Elements of Marketing</i>	1930
Harry R. Tosday	<i>Trends in the Manufacturer's Choice of Marketing Channels</i>	1930
Roland S. Vaile, et al.	<i>Market Organization: An Introductory Course</i>	1930
Ralph F. Breyer	<i>Commodity Marketing: the Marketing of a Number of Selected Non-Agricultural Products and Public Utility Services</i>	1931
Neil H. Borden	<i>Problems in Advertising</i>	1932
Ralph F. Breyer	<i>The Marketing Institution</i>	1934
N. H. Comish	<i>The Marketing of Manufactured Goods</i>	1935
Hugh E. Agnew, et al.	<i>Outlines of Marketing</i>	1936
Malcolm P. McNair, et al.	<i>Problems in Retailing</i>	1937
Hugh E. Agnew	<i>Outdoor Advertising</i>	1938
Hugh E. Agnew, et al.	<i>Advertising Media</i>	1938
Harold H. Maynard, et al.	<i>Retail Marketing and Merchandising</i>	1938
Clare W. Barker, et al.	<i>Modern Marketing</i>	1939
Hugh E. Agnew, et al.	<i>Advertising Principles</i>	1940
Ralph S. Alexander, et al.	<i>Marketing</i>	1940
Hugh E. Agnew, et al.	<i>Marketing Policies</i>	1941
Neil H. Borden	<i>The Economic Effects of Advertising</i>	1942

Malcolm P. McNair, et al.	<i>Problems in Merchandise Distribution</i>	1942
Malcolm P. McNair, et al.	<i>Problems in Marketing</i>	1949

As more schools of commerce or business administration opened, more courses in marketing were offered. These courses concerned the functional approach—that is, the activities of the marketing process (buying and selling, transporting and storing, standardizing and grading, and advertising, among others), the institutional approach—that is, the types of marketing institutions (wholesalers, agents, brokers, jobbers, and retailers, among others), and the commodity approach—that is, the products (farming, forestry, mining, and manufacturing, among others).³³

Based on their study, James H. S. Bossard and J. Frederic Dewhurst reported that all of the 42 member programs of the AACSB offered courses in distribution. “Marketing” was the most popular based on credit hours.³⁴

In 1930, out of 656 colleges and universities in the United States, 299 offered at least one course in marketing. In 1950, out of 917 colleges and universities in the United States, 688 offered at least one course in marketing.³⁵

The Founding of the American Marketing Association

During the annual convention of the Associated Advertising Clubs of the World in 1915, George Burton Hotchkiss, who taught courses in advertising at New York University, purportedly initiated a meeting that appealed to more than 20 faculty members who taught advertising, distribution, or marketing. These individuals discussed

several topics and decided to create a formal organization that represented their interests. The organization would have a board of directors and elected officers. The organization was named the National Association of Teachers of Advertising (NATA). The first president was Walter Dill Scott and the first secretary was George Burton Hotchkiss. However, few faculty members joined the organization during the first few years the organization met. Consequently, attendance to the first few annual meetings was low. Indeed, only three members attended the meeting in St. Louis in 1917, for instance, primarily because of the impact World War I had on the United States.³⁶

At the American Economics Association meeting in 1918, L. D. H. Weld and Fred E. Clark met with other faculty who taught courses in distribution or marketing. At the American Economics Association meeting a year later, the faculty decided to meet annually. In the early 1920s, N. W. Barnes, the secretary of the NATA, asked this informal group of faculty to join the NATA. Since the informal group of faculty taught courses in which advertising was discussed, the group agreed. The following year the membership of the National Association of Teachers of Advertising grew to at least 70. These members represented about 50 institutions of higher education.³⁷

The organization's name was changed to the National Association of Teachers of Advertising and Marketing (NATAM) in 1926. The name was changed to the National Association of Marketing Teachers (NAMT) in 1933. The association's house organ, *Natma-Graphs*, which appeared a few times a year, was renamed the *National Marketing Review* in 1935.³⁸

In 1930, N. W. Barnes, a prominent member of the association, introduced a proposal for a new organization to the officers and other members. After much

discussion, the idea was accepted, and the new organization was named the American Marketing Society, which grew slowly primarily because of the Great Depression. The organization established the *American Marketing Journal* in 1934. Unfortunately, this publication was very similar to the *National Marketing Review*. In July, 1936, the two publications merged and became *The Journal of Marketing*.³⁹

The National Association of Marketing Teachers and the American Marketing Society also united, forming the American Marketing Association in 1937.⁴⁰

The Impact of Major Studies on Marketing

According to Joseph Johnston, Jr. and colleagues, “By the late 1950s and the early 1960s, undergraduate business study felt the sting of criticism from business and higher education leaders because of its overspecialization and vocationalism.”⁴¹

In 1959, *The Education of American Businessmen: A Study of University-College Programs in Business Administration*, which was written by Frank C. Pierson and others and was supported by the Carnegie Corporation, was published. Pierson and others’ study examined the various disciplines, including marketing, offered by schools of business. The authors presented a suggested curriculum for undergraduates interested in studying business. Only one course was listed for marketing and it was “Marketing Management.”⁴²

The same year Robert Gordon and James Howell published *Higher Education for Business*, which was supported by the Ford Foundation. The authors presented a “core” of courses for undergraduate business students. The authors believed students should not

be allowed to enroll in more than one or two electives in business after the “core.” The authors listed one course in marketing.⁴³

Although several schools or colleges of business administration had changed their curricula before these studies were published, action regarding curricula was taken by the AACSB and subsequently by other schools or colleges of business administration after these studies had been read by academicians. For instance, by 1963 several schools or colleges of business administration had discontinued programs in so-called “practical” areas. This included advertising, which generally was found in the marketing area or department.

Notes

1. Benjamin R. Haynes and Harry P. Jackson, *A History of Business Education in the United States* (Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Co., 1935), 14.
2. Haynes and Jackson, *A History of Business Education in the United States*, 25.
3. Rakesh Khurana, *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands: The Social Transformation of American Business Schools and the Unfulfilled Promises of Management as a Profession* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 2007), 105.
4. Quentin J. Schultze, *Advertising, Science, and Professionalism 1885-1917*, PhD dissertation (Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, 1978), 144.
5. De Forest O'Dell, *The History of Journalism Education in the United States* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935), 1.
6. Frances Ruml, “The Formative Period of Higher Commercial Education in American Universities,” *The Collegiate School of Business: Its Status at the Close of the*

First Quarter of the Twentieth Century, ed. L. C. Marshall (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928), 55.

7. Edmund J. James, *Education of Business Men: An Address before the Convention of the American Bankers' Association*, Vols. I and II (New York: American Bankers' Association, 1892).

8. Charles J. Kiernan, "The Rise of the Collegiate School of Business," *Thought Patterns: Toward a Philosophy of Business Education*, ed. Blaise J. Opulente (Jamaica, N. Y.: St. John's University Press, 1960), 8:4.

9. Frank C. Pierson and colleagues, *The Education of American Businessmen: A Study of University-College Programs in Business Administration* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), 51; also Khurana, *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands: The Social Transformation of American Business Schools and the Unfulfilled Promises of Management as a Profession*, 144-146.

10. James H. S. Bossard and J. Frederic Dewhurst, *University Education for Business: A Study of Existing Needs and Practices* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931), 254.

11. Frank C. Pierson and colleagues, *The Education of American Businessmen: A Study of University-College Programs in Business Administration*, 47.

12. H. H. Maynard, "Marketing Courses Prior to 1910," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (April 1941), 383.

13. Simon Litman, "The Beginnings of Teaching Marketing in American Universities," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (October 1950), 220.

14. J. E. Hagerty, "Experiences of an Early Marketing Teacher," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (July 1936), 21.
15. H. H. Maynard, "Marketing Courses Prior to 1910," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (April 1941), 383.
16. Litman, "The Beginnings of Teaching Marketing in American Universities," 222.
17. Maynard, "Marketing Courses Prior to 1910," 383.
18. Hagerty, "Experiences of an Early Marketing Teacher," 21.
19. Robert Bartels, *The History of Marketing Thought*, 2nd ed. (Columbus, Ohio: Grid, 1976), 22-23.
20. Hagerty, "Experiences of an Early Marketing Teacher," 21.
21. Hagerty, "Experiences of an Early Marketing Teacher," 22.
22. Hagerty, "Experiences of an Early Marketing Teacher," 22.
23. Robert Bartels, "Influences on the Development of Marketing Thought, 1900-1923," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (July 1951), 7; also H. H. Maynard, "Early Teachers of Marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (October 1942), 158; also James Playsted Wood, "A Pioneer in Marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (April 1961), 69-71.
24. Bartels, "Influences on the Development of Marketing Thought, 1900-1923," 9-10.
25. Bartels, "Influences on the Development of Marketing Thought, 1900-1923," 6.

26. L. D. H. Weld, "Early Experiences in Teaching Courses in Marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (April 1941), 381; also Bartels, "Influences on the Development of Marketing Thought, 1900-1923," 12.
27. Bartels, "Influences on the Development of Marketing Thought, 1900-1923," 6.
28. Bartels, "Influences on the Development of Marketing Thought, 1900-1923," 6-7.
29. Bartels, "Influences on the Development of Marketing Thought, 1900-1923," 14.
30. Bartels, "Influences on the Development of Marketing Thought, 1900-1923," 13.
31. Bartels, "Influences on the Development of Marketing Thought, 1900-1923," 13-14.
32. Bartels, "Influences on the Development of Marketing Thought, 1900-1923," 13.
33. Robert Bartels, *The Development of Marketing Thought* (Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1962), 159-164.
34. Bossard and Dewhurst, *University Education for Business: A Study of Existing Needs and Practices* (New York: Arno Press, 1973; originally, 1931), 412.
35. Harold E. Hardy, "Collegiate Marketing Education Since 1930," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 19 (April 1955), 327.

36. Hugh E. Agnew, "N.A.M.T.—A Survey," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 1, No. 4 (April 1937), 305-309; also Hugh E. Agnew, "The History of the American Marketing Association," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (April 1, 1941), 374-375.
37. Agnew, "The History of the American Marketing Association," 375.
38. Agnew, "The History of the American Marketing Association," 377-378; also Thomas E. Caruso, "50 Years of AMA Historical Highlights and Sidelights," *Marketing News*, Vol. 20, No. 26 (Dec. 19, 1986), 12.
39. Thomas E. Caruso, "50 Years of AMA Historical Highlights and Sidelights," 12; also Agnew, "The History of the American Marketing Association," 377-378.
40. Agnew, "The History of the American Marketing Association," 378; also Paul D. Converse, "Notes on Origin of the American Marketing Association," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (July 1, 1952), 66.
41. Joseph S. Johnston, Jr. and colleagues, eds., *Educating Managers: Executive Effectiveness Through Liberal Learning* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987), 127.
42. Pierson and colleagues, *The Education of American Businessmen: A Study of University-College Programs in Business Administration*, 1959.
43. Robert Gordon and James Howell, *Higher Education for Business* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959).