A Reply to the Commentaries on "Business-to-Business Marketing Textbooks: A Comparative Review"

Klaus Backhaus
Katrin Muehlfeld
Diana Okoye

ABSTRACT. In this commentary, the authors respond to the commentary by Professors Butaney, Hutt and Speh, Narus, and Plank on their commentary article "Business-to-Business Marketing Textbooks: A Comparative Review." The discussion involves responses to particular aspects of each commentary as well as some general thoughts on future developments of business-to-business marketing textbooks, particularly with respect to the influence of new information and communication media. In responding to the commentaries, the authors argue that while they are aware of a strong subjective element which still remains, their comparative examination of a selection of English-speaking textbooks on business marketing aims at providing theoretically-grounded insights that are helpful for both instructors and practitioners. They argue that the application of Bloom's taxonomy of

Klaus Backhaus is Professor of Marketing and Director of the Institute of Business-to-Business Marketing, Marketing Centre, University of Muenster, Germany (E-mail: backhaus@wiwi.uni-muenster.de).

Katrin Muehlfeld is a PhD Student in Marketing and Teaching Assistant, Institute of Business-to-Business Marketing, Marketing Centre, University of Muenster, Germany (E-mail: katrin.muehlfeld@uni-muenster.de).

Diana Okoye is a Graduate in Business Administration, University of Muenster, Germany (E-mail: dokoye@hotmail.com).

This English version was edited by Brian Bloch. The authors are grateful to Dr. Bloch for his comments and suggestions relating to the clarity and precision of the text.

Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing, Vol. 9(4) 2002
http://www.haworthpressinc.com/store/product.asp?sku=J033

educational objectives (1956) provides an appropriate framework for this objective and its operationalization, respectively. Although the comparison constitutes only a first step directed towards a thoroughly systematic analysis of textbooks on the subject, hopefully, it may nevertheless prove its fruitfulness in fostering the discussion on future developments of business marketing textbooks.

KEYWORDS. Taxonomy of educational objectives, comparison of business-to-business marketing textbooks, future developments of business marketing textbooks, new media

INTRODUCTION

In conducting our comparative analysis, our main objective was to gain insight into the strengths and weaknesses of various English-speaking textbooks on b2b marketing. While attempting to derive results as systematically as possible, we did not try to establish an objective "rating" of the selected books as their suitability hinges crucially on the underlying, context-specific teaching objectives. Despite this subjective element, we were nevertheless hoping to be able to share our results with other business marketing scholars and practitioners, for they, too, may have been confronted with the problem of textbook selection in the past and might find our analysis helpful in the future–either in terms of the results or the methodology. We are thus grateful for having the opportunity to do this in the Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing together with the thoughtful commentaries by Professors Butaney, Hutt and Speh, Narus, and Plank, to whom we are very thankful for their much appreciated efforts. They add important and interesting perspectives, some taking a broader, more visionary view, others discussing our analysis itself in greater detail.

REPLY TO PROFESSOR BUTANEY'S COMMENTS

Professor Butaney very constructively discusses our application of Bloom's taxonomy (1956) and the challenge of what topics should be included in a business marketing textbook in order to ensure an effective progression of students through that hierarchy. The latter issue concerns mainly aspects of conceptual complexity and student information overload, as well as suggestions for enhancing the procedures for comparing and evaluating textbooks. Firstly, with respect to the enhancement of the criteria, Professor Butaney convincingly argues in favor of broadening the knowledge criteria in order to additionally analyze conceptual complexity. The problem, though, in our view, lies with the measurement of the relevant, i.e., the perceived complexity. As he points out, the perceived conceptual complexity depends largely on the reader, on the level of knowledge and skills he/she has already acquired in the field. We strongly support that this is a factor of prime importance. However, we feel that a sound assessment in this regard could not be included in our analysis, but has to be undertaken by the teacher of a particular class, just as, for example, a qualitative evaluation of the importance of marketing situations presented in a book's case studies. Professor Butaney then expresses concerns that business marketing might be especially prone to excessive conceptual complexity in terms of the number of new concepts. He thus poses the question as to whether a reduction in complexity could be achieved by decreasing the attention devoted to traditional topics such as differences between consumer and business marketing. This is a difficult question to answer. Our position would probably be that traditional topics do not necessarily become less relevant to current b2b problems (e.g., auction theory and e-auctions), although they may need some complements. A textbook that provides students with fundamental, theoretically-grounded and flexible to use "equipment" demonstrates applications of these concepts in current business contexts, and thus allows students to tackle a large variety of problems that they will encounter in their later work experience, would be our preferred solution.

REPLY TO PROFESSORS HUTT AND SPEH'S COMMENTS

Professors Hutt and Speh focus on our proposition that in addition to the prevailing approaches in b2b marketing, a transaction (or business) types approach might offer an interesting extension to the conceptual spectrum of textbook-structuring. Although this idea was originally intended to figure only as a supplement, we nevertheless appreciate the interesting discussion by Professors Hutt and Speh and agree that the questions they pose, relate precisely to those aspects that contribute to the challenge of textbook writing. Our first remark, however, concerns their conclusion, that we had classified the books by Anderson and Narus and by Webster as undergraduate texts. While we are well aware of their classification as graduate texts by the Marketing Education Review website, we nonetheless chose to abstain from an a priori classification for the reasons explained.

Regarding the discussion on building a foundation for conveying business marketing knowledge, we very much support the view expressed by Professors Hutt and Speh, that a text (also one built around a business types perspective), would have to start with a general section, dealing with topics such as specific characteristics of business markets and organizational buying behavior. However, apart from this requirement, we do not think that breadth, coverage of current issues and depth of treatment would necessarily suffer from a structure centered around business types. For example, the discussion of the impacts a purchasing organization exerts by segmenting their purchases, addresses an important topic which has gained even more attention due to the increasing use of EDI-and Internet-based technologies in procurement during the last couple of years. Understanding customers' classification of purchased goods is surely an area of prime importance to seller companies. Yet, we maintain that this issue could well be addressed according to different (business) types (e.g., standardized versus customized products or products creating a customer lock-in versus no customer lock-in), because we would expect different classifications to be associated with these types.

The second area where Professors Hutt and Speh see hurdles for organizing a textbook around business types is the integrative development of a relationship marketing perspective, particularly with regard to such topics as electronic commerce and supply chain management. The reason why we do not share these doubts is that for each business type, we expect distinct features of the buyer-seller relationship to prevail, in general, but also with respect to the specific use of different modes of electronic commerce (information, communication, and transaction; private and public marketplaces; different models of auctions, etc.) and different forms of supply chain management. And while these issues present a variety of challenges to companies, we are not convinced that overcoming them will require a completely new set of theories. The emergence of e-auctions may serve as an example: undoubtedly, e-auctions are characterized by a couple of features setting them clearly apart from real-world auctions, due to reductions in information and transaction costs: asynchronous bidding, frequently a large number of geographically dispersed participants, fixed closing times for certain types of auctions (Lucking-Reiley 2000), and greater opportunity of acquiring additional information during the course of the auction. Consequently, through the mechanism of e-auctions, the auction model has been extended to a large variety of goods previously not auctioned due, for instance, to their low value. Nonetheless, the key elements of traditional auction theory still constitute a solid starting point, if not an appropriate framework for complete analysis of transaction processes via e-auctions (Lucking-Reiley 2000). Finally, Professors Hutt and Speh present some considerations on the need to of capture strategic marketing content. In this respect, we again agree on the importance of the topic, yet maintain that a business types approach, particularly from a dynamic perspective including strategically motivated changes between different business types (e.g., the development of Application Service Providing[1]), may address the issue quite adequately. So, while we are still convinced that a business types approach might represent a suitable framework for organizing a business marketing text, we see it as an additional perspective within a range of concepts (marketing management perspective, value approach, etc.), each of which has its legitimation regarding different purposes.

REPLY TO PROFESSOR NARUS' COMMENTS

After sharing his own experiences with textbook writing, Professor Narus provides a detailed discussion of a variety of aspects he regards as particularly critical to our comparison. His main concerns are the validity of our results, the methodology applied and the support for the conclusions. Having stimulated such a personal response and remarkably intensive analysis of our paper as the one provided by Professor Narus confirms our belief in the necessity of discussing the subject and our hopes of encouraging the debate on future developments of b2b textbooks. In terms of enabling us to follow his argument, the introductory description of his experiences with the process of textbook writing, the Anderson and Narus book on "Business Market Management" proves very helpful. Not all parts (e.g., the discussion on economic constraints, a phenomenon all those familiar with textbook publishing will already have encountered) being directly related to our core research question, they nonetheless supplement it very well for everyone interested in the background of textbook crafting.

For those confronted with the problem of choosing a textbook on business marketing suitable for their purposes, it is precisely the absence of formal standards for management textbooks, as Professor Narus notes, that makes the decision so difficult. Hence, the lack of standards is, in our opinion, rather than an obstacle to a reason for conducting a comparison of b2b marketing textbooks. Given a certain set of books available, we conducted the analysis from a teaching perspective, referring to one of the most established theories in the field of research on education and its assessment, Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives (1956). The neglect of economic constraints on the process of publishing textbooks from this perspective seems to us legitimate, if not necessary. Hinting explicitly at the students' perspective, is another great merit of Professor Narus' comment and in line with current psychological theories (e.g., Confrey 1990). Stating that "students would prefer reading a textbook that discusses fewer, critical topics in greater detail, to one that provides superficial treatment of a myriad of seemingly unrelated and unimportant topics," however, comes as no big surprise: who would not? The challenge in textbook writing precisely is to cover a certain amount of material in relating the individual topics to each other and to a broader context. Particularly regarding the latter aspect, it is not obvious per se that a managerial orientation ensures this better than a theoretical one–nor that they need necessarily be mutually exclusive.

Following his considerations on the process of textbook publishing, Professor Narus raises some reasonable doubts about the procedures and conclusions of our analysis. He poses important questions, which all academic research has to withstand: questions of validity, methodology and of legitimacy of inferences. When examining our research with respect to these issues, he expresses considerable unease. In this, we can only guess, but an important contributing factor might have been an unfortunate misunderstanding about the intentions of our research and its envisaged contribution to the field. With respect to an issue that has hardly gained any attention in the literature, we have tried to establish a first, maybe provisional basis for a systematic, theoretically-guided approach. This claim, however, does not imply ignoring the remaining subjective factor, nor were we intending to conduct empirical research in the sense of using formal statistical methods. Rather, due to the subjectivity in evaluation of criteria as "link between theory and practice," we decided a qualitatively-dominated approach with some quantitative elements (e.g., LIX) to be appropriate.

Looking in detail at some of Professor Narus' concerns, we will begin with his criticism of using Bloom's taxonomy (1956) as a theoretic basis for our comparison, because here obviously, some misunderstanding is present. By no means did we imply with our Table 4 that only Bloom's higher five educational objectives are concerned with the cognitive domain. What is implied by the first and second column, and might have caused the misunderstanding, is a link between the objectives of a textbook as stated by Berry (1993) or Lichtenthal and Butaney (1991), and the six elements of the taxonomy. The combination of three elements of the taxonomy (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) which he criticizes, is not unusual in the relevant literature (e.g., Dyrud & Worley 1998). They are referred to as "higher-order" thinking skills, because all three ask from the subjects extension of their minds beyond purely information-related processes. With respect to Professor Narus' claim that we applied the taxonomy out of its originally intended context, we surely must concede that this is the case. Our legitimation we see, though, in the close relatedness of the context and the lack of a specific framework for textbook comparison. Modifications, particularly concerning operationalization of and empirical support for our indicators, and, as suggested by Professor Narus, validity testing, are likely to be needed. We strongly hope that future research will address these issues.

Professor Narus' criticism of one of our indicators, the LIX, we would like to consider in some detail. Comprehension, as developed by Bloom et al. (1956), refers to grasping a materials meaning, that is classifying, describing, discussing and summarizing. These activities in our opinion belong in the category of understanding a materials meaning. While, by itself, the term understanding is closer cognated to the construct of understandability which is commonly used in measuring the effectiveness of communication as distinct from readability (Patel & Day 1996)[2], we regret the confusion and admit that sticking to the original term might have prevented this. Why then did we choose to measure readability instead of understandability? The answer is that although understandability is admittedly the more extensive construct, readability as independent from the reading subjects themselves seemed more appropriate in our case, as we intended to evaluate the books as such, independent from particular (groups of) readers.

Concerning Professor Narus' doubts as to whether counting words and sentence length is a suitable indicator for readability, there is empirical support that these admittedly simple measures may actually represent fairly good indicators: A very thorough analysis of assessing readability was conducted by Klare as early as the 1970s (1974). He found that counting word length and sentence length (as e.g., in LIX; for application of this measure see, e.g., Anderson 1983), two rather simple measures of the formal structure of a text, allow for relatively good predictions of readability. Professor Narus' final point regarding validity is our specification of business marketing topics. We share his critical perspective on the subjectivity of selecting a number of topics in the field. Nonetheless, we still see no practicable alternative in attempting to conduct a systematic comparison of business marketing textbooks, than to rely on a range of more or less established topics. In the case of the cited market-sensing approach to market segmentation, for instance, future research, in our view, still has to relate this capabilities/resource-theory-based concept (Day 1994) more explicitly to "traditional," rather than market-based segmentation approaches. It is necessary to elaborate in detail how market-sensing processes that "are likely to be fragmented, obscured by the dispersal of critical activities throughout the organization, and woven into other processes" (Day 1994) may figure on their own as a market segmentation approach.

Of the many concerns voiced by Professor Narus regarding our methodology, we will focus on some prominent examples. He first expresses unease with respect to our method for grouping the textbooks and also to the sampling approach for the LIX. In first responding to the more fundamental issue, we would like to stress that we do not claim the use of any statistical tool for grouping like, for instance, any kind of formal cluster analysis (for detailed discussion of different methods see, e.g., Backhaus et al. 2000). As to our sampling approach for the LIX, we acknowledge that we should possibly have described it in detail.[3] However, due to the limited space, we still regard this omission as acceptable. The same argument applies essentially to Professor Narus' criticisms regarding the examination of coverage of business topics. For those interested in having a closer look at how we derived at our results, we provide detailed tables (http://www.wiwi.uni-muenster.de/ias). These results provide no support for Professor Narus' suggestion that we claimed the Anderson and Narus book ignored organizational buying behavior. The contrary is the case and we assume that the description of our findings unfortunately was not sufficiently clear: When comparing coverage of pricing and organizational buying behavior, we were intending to emphasize the common focus on value in both areas.

The value-based approach, in our view, represents a recent, yet highly interesting and important perspective on business marketing. Taking into consideration the variety of teaching objectives, learning purposes and types, we appreciate the existence of a variety of different approaches in the field. Transaction types approaches–as for example outlined in the concluding part of our paper–constitute another concept within this variety. While this kind of approach is quite common in for instance the German literature (e.g., Backhaus 1999; Plinke 1992 and 1997; Kaas 1995; Schade & Schott 1993; for an English-speaking review, see Kleinaltenkamp & Jacob 2001), it has not yet been treated extensively in the English-speaking literature on business marketing.[4] This may have been the reason why one of our anonymous reviewers requested a more detailed outline of the approach than presented in the first version of our paper. Consequently, we included a lengthier description, aimed at offering just one additional perspective. Unfortunately, this seems to have created the impression that in our analysis, we did not follow the previously presented methodology. We regret this, and would like to assure Professor Narus that the purposes of our analysis were just the ones stated in our paper.

One last point should be made regarding Professor Narus' concerns as to whether our conclusions are supported by our study. While we feel that we have already addressed sufficiently his criticism of the presentation of a transaction types approach, the "case study" question remains open. In our study, we refer only to Professor Narus' category of "class discussion case studies," i.e., we did not include purely descriptive material that required no problem solving. Yet, we should probably have stated this more explicitly. Our position that such case studies are linked to the development of higher-order thinking skills, we still believe to be substantiated by the literature (e.g., Miller 1990).

In retrospect, we acknowledge that we should probably have outlined aspects of validity and methodology of our research more clearly and explicitly. Still, we maintain that the comparison could prove helpful for teachers and practitioners in their choice of a textbook and promote debate on the future of business marketing textbooks.

REPLY TO PROFESSOR PLANK'S COMMENTS

Professor Plank takes up our idea to stimulate debate on business marketing education. Drawing on continuous improvement process thinking and the theory of constraints, he provides a visionary discussion of education as a process, with standardization and synchronization as critical factors in improving this process. His argument is intriguing and may hold for a large number of educational processes, especially those involving undergraduates. Following his main idea and extending it to other types of learning situations, there may, however, be processes in education with opposite requirements: as an analogy, one may consider the process of designing and producing not a mass-market product like a car, but a highly customized product like a power station which is constructed for one specific customer, e.g., regarding climatic and geographic conditions. This kind of process might for instance be prominent when working with students who have learning difficulties or in highly specialized education such as with doctoral students. The importance of Professor Plank's emphasis on education as a process is reflected in growing concerns voiced in the literature, and also by public institutions like the European Commission, about aspects of "lifelong learning,"[5] calling for a more process-oriented perspective on education. Increasing numbers of adults returning to college (James & Sonner 2001) or entering (online) distance learning programs (Evans 2001) are just some indicators for this phenomenon. Taking up Professor Plank's idea, lifelong learning could be interpreted as a meta-process of education, composed of a number of sub-processes (ranging from elementary schooling to distance learning), each being characterized by distinct properties to be addressed by those involved in their design.

SOME THOUGHTS ON FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS OF B2B MARKETING TEXTBOOKS

With the advances in new information and communication media, we observe changing modes of acquisition of data, information, and finally knowledge and competence (for categorization see, e.g., Davenport & Prusak 1998). Education faces the challenge of keeping up. Imparting knowledge in this rapidly changing environment has to tackle a variety of problems. To name just a few, there is an increase in the total amount of data and information and in the amount available at a non-prohibitive cost (w.a. 2000; Tanner 1999). Thus, in the same time, ceteris paribus, a smaller proportion of a field's body of knowledge can be conveyed by a course, textbook or other means of education. This results in higher degrees of specialization and fragmentation. Hence, the proportion of basic, common sense knowledge to highly specialized knowledge decreases. With the discovery of new knowledge, we need to consider if the same amount of knowledge of the same complexity and the same relevance simultaneously becomes obsolete. Otherwise, shortage of (course) time and (textbook) space become relatively more prominent. And even if that condition was fulfilled, the increasing "turnover rate" of knowledge would cause problems. Thus, the question of what should be conveyed in the scarce time and space at hand, becomes harder to solve. A second issue, related to new information and communication media, are the changes in teaching techniques, that is the evolution from traditional teaching to technology-based education (Evans 2001): how can we best use the different teaching materials available in increasing quantities?

In our view, these phenomena hold not only for education in general, but are also relevant for education in business marketing (Vlosky & Wilson 1998). If one agrees with this, how then do they impact on the long-term future development of business marketing textbooks? In an attempt to answer this, we distinguish a textbook's functional features from its physical properties. We expect the physical properties of business marketing textbooks to stay in line with the developments of books in general. While traditional books still continue to dominate, media like electronic books or electronic paper can be expected to gain share once a convincing quality has been achieved at acceptable prices. Arguably, this could be even more pronounced for non-fictional reading: aspects associated with the sensory feeling of paper style books might be less important here, with purchase and consumption being motivated more rationally. Moreover, electronic media could offer additional advantages by facilitating updates and enhancing possibilities for modular design of textbooks.

We expect the functional features or objectives of business marketing textbooks essentially, to last. What might change, however, is the focus: An increasing emphasis on imparting knowledge, i.e., on the lower levels of the taxonomy, with the higher-order thinking skills being supported by online-tutorials, computer simulations, Internet-based games, etc. (Rodriguez 1998; Strauss & Frost 1999; Vlosky & Wilson 1998), seems a viable option. Concerning content, that is the question of what topics should be included, we believe that, due to an increase in spectrum of contexts in which people will use books on b2b marketing, aspects of lifelong learning will open up space for even more variety of approaches. In any case, our expectation is that the question of identifying those parts of the body of knowledge that apply to a large variety of contexts (e.g., auction theory for real-world and e-auctions) becomes even more crucial.

Our view on the further developments may not be shared by everyone, and only future will tell. But in the meantime, we hope that our research, complemented thoughtfully by the commentaries of Professors Butaney, Hutt and Speh, Narus, and Plank, may contribute some interesting arguments to the debate on business marketing textbooks.

NOTES

1. Under the umbrella of "Application Service Providing" (ASP), a large variety of different contractual and product/service-related features is offered (e.g. http://www.allaboutasp.org, the ASP Industry Consortium website). ASP generally addresses issues of hiring software instead of buying it.

2. While readability relates only to the complexity of the content itself, understandability takes into account the capacity of readers to grasp the relevant message of a text (Patel & Day 1996).

3. In order to cover large parts of the textbooks in our analysis, we chose the following sampling approach: We started at page no. 10, conducting first a 100-word-analysis at the top of the page, followed by a sentence-analysis of the directly following 10 sentences. We continued with this procedure, choosing sections every 40 pages (starting from page no. 10). The size of the page gaps (40 pages) was due to considerations about the minimum length of a textbook (ca. 400 pages).

4. Distantly related classifications, though often not grounded in New Institutional Economics, can mainly be found in the literature on relationship marketing, e.g., Coviello, Brodie and Munro 1997.

5. On Nov. 21st, 2001, the European Commission adopted a "Communication on Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality." It defines lifelong learning as "all learning activity undertaken throughout life, with the aim of improving knowledge, skills and competence, within a personal, civic, social and/or employment-related perspective." (http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/life/; 01-10-2002)

REFERENCES

Anderson, James C./Narus, James A. (1999), Business Market Management: Understanding, Creating, and Delivering Value, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Anderson, Jonathan (1983), LIX and RIX: Variations on a little-known readability index, in: Journal of Reading, March 1983, 490-496.

Backhaus, Klaus (1999), Industriegütermarketing [Industrial Goods Marketing], 6th ed., München: Vahlen.

Backhaus, Klaus et al. (2000), Multivariate Analysemethoden: eine anwendungsorientierte Einführung [Multivariate Analysis: An Application-Oriented Introduction], 9th ed., Berlin et al.: Springer.

Berry, Leonard L. (1993), Our Roles as Educators: Present and Future, in: Journal of Marketing Education, Vol. 15, No. 3, 3-8.

Bloom, Benjamin S. et al. (1956), Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook 1: Cognitive Domain, New York: Longmans.

Confrey, Jere (1990), A review of the research on student conceptions in mathematics, science, and programming, in: Cazden, Courtney (Ed.), Review of Research in Education, American Educational Research Association, Vol. 16, 3-56.

Coviello, Nicole E./Brodie, Roderick J./Munro, Hugh, J. (1997), Understanding contemporary marketing: development of a classification scheme, in: Journal of Marketing Management, Vol. 13, No. 6, August, 501-522.

Davenport, Thomas H./Prusak, Laurence (1998), Working Knowledge: How Organizations Manage What They Know, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Dyrud, Marilyn A./Worley, Rebecca B. (1998), Critical Thinking, in: Business Communication Quarterly, Vol. 61, No. 3, September, 62-78.

Evans, Joel R. (2001), The Emerging Role of the Internet in Marketing Education: From Traditional Teaching To Technology-Based Education, in: Marketing Education Review, Vol. 11, Fall, http://cbpa.louisville.edu/mer/elecarticles.htm (12.01. 2002).

James, William L./Sonner, Brenda S. (2001), Just Say No to Traditional Student Samples, in: Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 41, No. 5, 63-71.

Kaas, Klaus Peter (1995), Marketing zwischen Markt und Hierarchie [Marketing between Markets and Hierarchies], in: Kontrakte, Geschäftsbeziehungen, Netzwerke: Marketing und neue Institutionenökonomie [Contracts, Business Relationships, Networks: Marketing and New Institutional Economics], Kaas, Klaus Peter (Ed.), Zfbf Special Edition 35, 19-42.

Klare, George R. (1974), Assessing readability, in: Reading Research Quarterly, Vol. 10, No. 1, 255-264.

Kleinaltenkamp, Michael/Jacob, Frank (2002), German approaches to business-to-business marketing theory. Origins and structure, in: Journal of Business Research, Vol. 55, 149-155.

Lichtenthal, J. David/Butaney, Gul (1991), Undergraduate Industrial Marketing: Content and Methods, in: Industrial Marketing Management, Vol. 20, 231-239.

Lucking-Reiley, David (2000), Auctions on the Internet: What's Being Auctioned, and How? in: The Journal of Industrial Economics, Vol. 48, No. 3, September, 227-252.

Miller, Charles (1990), Higher-Order Thinking–An Integrated Approach for Your Classroom, in: Vocational Education Journal, Vol. 65, No. 6, October, 26-27, 69.

Patel, Chris/Day, Ron (1996), The Influence of Cognitive Style on the Understandability of a Professional Accounting Pronouncement by Accounting Students, in: British Accounting Review, Vol. 28, No. 2, 139-154.

Plinke, Wulf (1992), Ausprägungen der Marktorientierung im Investitionsgütermarketing [Different Forms of Market-Orientation in Industrial Goods Marketing], in: Schmalenbachs Zeitschrift für betriebswirtschaftliche Forschung, Vol. 44, No. 9, 830-846.

Plinke, Wulf (1997), Grundlagen des Geschäftsbeziehungsmanagements [Principles of Business Relationship Management], in: Plinke, Wulf/Kleinaltenkamp, Michael (Eds.), Geschäftsbeziehungsmanagement [Business Relationship Management], Berlin 1997, 113-159.

Rodriguez, Carlos M. (1998), Commentary on: "Technology in the Classroom: Teaching Business Marketing in the 21st Century," by Richard P. Vlosky and David T. Wilson, in: Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing, Vol. 5, No. 1/2, 157-160.

Schade, Christian/Schott, E. (1993), Instrumente des Kontraktgütermarketing [Design of Marketing-Instruments Depending on Different Contraction Modes], in: DBW, Vol. 53, No. 4, 491-511.

Strauss, Judy/Frost, Raymond D. (1999), Selecting Instructional Technology Media for the Marketing Classroom, in: Marketing Education Review, Vol. 9, No. 1, http://cbpa.ouisville.edu/mer/abst1999.htm (12.01.2002)

Tanner, Jeff (1999), Key Issues in Marketing Education, in: Marketing Education Review, Vol. 9, No. 1, http://cbpa.ouisville.edu/mer/abst1999.htm (12.01.2002)

Vlosky, Richard P./Wilson, David T. (1998), Essay: Technology in the Classroom: Teaching Business Marketing in the 21st Century, in: Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing, Vol. 5, No. 1/2, 145-156.

w.a. (2000a), Survey: The New Economy (Untangling e-conomics, and: Elementary, my dear Watson), in: The Economist, Sept. 23rd, 5-11.