Journal of Marketing Education

http://jmd.sagepub.com

Business Student Preferences: Exploring the Relative Importance of Web Management in Course Design

Steven A. Taylor, Michael Humphreys, Roger Singley and Gary L. Hunter

Journal of Marketing Education 2004; 26; 42
DOI: 10.1177/0273475303262352

The online version of this article can be found at:
http://jmd.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/26/1/42

Published by:
SAGE Publications
http://www.sagepublications.com

On behalf of:
Marketing Educators Association

Business Student Preferences: Exploring the Relative Importance of Web Management in Course Design

Steven A. Taylor, Michael Humphreys, Roger Singley, and Gary L. Hunter

The following study investigates the relative importance of Web management practices in business curricular pedagogy from an undergraduate student perspective. Using conjoint methodology, the results suggest that students early in their program of studies tend to most value (more) tests in terms of course attributes, while students later in their program of studies tend to value Web management practices. Taken together, these results suggest that undergraduate course design can be effectively implemented, consistent with the marketing concept, based on a sensitivity to diverse student learning styles and needs.

Keywords: *Web management; course design; course attributes: marketing pedagogy; course preferences*

In recent years, a number of issues have emerged as focal points for change in higher education. These issues are certainly now having an effect on marketing education, providing ample fuel for the continuing evolution of course design and teaching methods. Most significantly, marketing education is being (1) influenced by advances in technology and (2) held to standards of accountability and quality as never before.

Within business education, the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB International 2003) has adopted educational objectives that not only stress outcomes but are also mission oriented, process based, and student centered. Assessing whether these educational objectives are achieved must be based on the assessment of inputs (e.g., course design and pedagogy) in addition to outcomes. A student-centered focus suggests that student preferences, while certainly not the only factor, should be a consideration in course design (cf. Baker, Kleine, and Bennion 2003; Desai, Damewood, and Jones 2001; Houston and Bettencourt 1999). Thus, in recent years, there has been a dramatic increase in the need for research that examines the relationships between course design factors and student preferences for the course (for recent examples, see Deeter-Schmelz, Kennedy, and Ramsey 2002; Clarke, Flaherty, and Mottner 2001). Furthermore, students are dynamic, and their preferences change as they progress through their academic careers, so a need exists to examine student preferences at different stages of their academic careers.

The need for research on course design is further strengthened by the rapid evolution of information technologies and their application to learning environments. Academicians are recognizing the opportunity to use rapidly evolving information technology (e.g., computers and specialized course management software, intranets, the World Wide Web) to achieve a variety of educational goals, including making courses more current, self-paced, and experiential, as well as providing greater and more variety of access to various educational markets (Caverly and MacDonald 1999; Liaw and Huang 2000). The application of these technologies offers a myriad of new opportunities in terms of course designs that are more self-service and asynchronous, allowing students to access and learn information when and where they choose and at their own pace. We use the term *Web management* to describe the use of these technologies. Web management includes using some type of course-related Web page to report grades, to place lecture notes, to present homework exercises, or to generally communicate more effectively with students.

Clearly, higher education in general and marketing education in particular are embracing the challenge to continually improve the quality of the educational experience and meet standards of accountability in a highly dynamic educational environment. However, meeting this challenge requires new research to aid in course design decision-making processes.

Steven A. Taylor is a professor of marketing, Michael Humphreys and Roger Singley are associate professors of marketing, and Gary L. Hunter is an assistant professor of marketing at Illinois State University. Please note that the authors' names are randomly ordered to reflect equal contributions to the manuscript and research project.

Journal of Marketing Education, Vol. 26 No. 1, April 2004 42-49
DOI: 10.1177/0273475303262352

A well-conceived and creatively designed course that matches student preferences can greatly heighten the chances for successful outcomes (Desai, Damewood, and Jones 2001). So, one of the challenges facing marketing educators concerns identifying the specific attributes important in a well-designed course for today's pedagogical practice in light of rapid technological changes. The primary contribution of this study is to use a student perspective to evaluate course design; specifically, our study focuses on the relative importance of Web management and how student perceptions of that importance change during their academic careers.

The following discussion is presented in several sections. First, a review of recent research is presented that draws attention to the current status of knowledge in this area and underscores gaps in our current understanding. Second, an empirical investigation of student preferences for course design is presented and discussed based on the identified gaps in the existing research in this domain. Finally, we present the implications of our study for faculty colleagues to consider in terms of their own course development processes.

KEY RESEARCH ISSUES IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND MARKETING

Many business schools and marketing programs are applying quality management principles to the educational process. That is, goals and objectives are being developed that address student-centered learning and its enhancement based on principles of continual improvement (e.g., Adrian and Palmer 1999; Morris and Morris 1999). Within this paradigm, a key principle is that good course design reflects an understanding and appreciation for diverse student learning preferences. For example, the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business Task Force on Effective and Inclusive Learning Environments (1998) recognized the need to have course designs that matched learning style differences. Similarly, the principle that students and their learning experiences are the focus of academic endeavors is being emphasized. Indeed, the literature supports the affirmation that students be placed first and that instructors recognize the need to respect diverse learning styles (e.g., Davis, Misra, and Van Auken 2000).

Research suggests that when students are taught in a manner consistent with the way they learn, they not only have a favorable attitude toward the learning experience but they also perform better. For instance, some students prefer to learn alone, while others prefer learning in group or team settings. In an experimental study where teaching style was matched and mismatched with learning style, it was found that students (1) performed significantly better when the teaching style matched the learning style and (2) also had significantly more favorable attitudes in that condition (Dunn et al. 1990). A gap in our understanding concerns how important the inclusion of Web management in course design is to students, specifically students at different stages in their academic careers.

A number of studies have begun to explore student preferences for specific pedagogical approaches on which the current study builds. Typically, these studies have focused on the organization of a course and the specific types of learning activities used. For example, studies support that business students may prefer pedagogies that are more experiential and oriented toward the application of concepts. A study by Nulty and Barrett (1996) found that business students prefer pedagogies that are active and concrete. Karns (1993) examined learning activities in marketing courses and found a positive relationship between level of stimulation, level of effort, and concrete or real-world applications. Similarly, preferences held by students in different majors have been examined. In one such study, preferred pedagogies of marketing majors and nonmarketing major business students were examined (Stewart and Felicetti 1992). Support was found for marketing majors, relative to nonmarketing majors, preferring a learning style that was either methodological (e.g., the use of computer-aided instruction, direct application problems, hands-on opportunities, and programmed instruction) or holistic (e.g., short lectures with discussion, short assignments with reflection, group discussion, etc.). Also, Matthews (1994) found that business majors preferred conceptual and social/conceptual-based pedagogies and preferred learning with other students as opposed to learning alone.

Other studies have investigated a variety of often-used teaching methods, such as simulation (Wellington and Faria 1996) and the use of group projects (Batra, Walvoord, and Krishnan 1997). One notable aspect of this body of research is the emerging use of conjoint analysis for the empirical examination of student preferences and course design. The current study similarly uses conjoint analysis to answer the study's research question. Conjoint analysis can be very useful as a research methodology in this arena because it treats the course being analyzed holistically and recognizes that several course attributes typically work together interactively to determine student preferences. For example, Zufryden (1983) provided an early example of the application of conjoint analysis to explore potential course design issues in an MBA Sales Forecasting course. The study supported the value of making changes across several course attributes (course content, career orientation, class format, level of computer application, and level of mathematical sophistication) that would increase student preference and yield greater managerial relevance. More recently, similar studies have been conducted examining the course structure and content of MBA-level multivariate analysis classes (Dubas and Strong 1993) and undergraduate business information systems classes (Tarasewich and Nair 2000). The current study adds to this line of inquiry by using conjoint analysis to con-

sider five key course attributes, including Web management practices, across different levels of undergraduate business marketing courses.

Thus, one of the contributions of the current research is the simultaneous consideration of Web management practices with other course design attributes across lower and higher level marketing courses. It is becoming common for educators to include course syllabi, exams, team projects, and other materials on their Web sites.

METHOD

In this section we will discuss the method employed in the current research. We will first explicate the basic research design, present the course design factors examined in the study, and then identify any potential threats to the reliability and validity of the study results.

Research Design

The basic pedagogical question we are addressing concerns identifying the relative importance of Web management in undergraduate marketing course offerings across lower and higher level courses. The corollary research question we will investigate involves the identification of the *important* attributes leading to student preference for course design. The identification of the important attributes should provide useful guidance for academic decision makers in terms of marketing strategies and tactics aimed at increasing the level of involvement of undergraduate students. We restrict our initial exploratory inquiry to students taking physical course offerings (i.e., synchronous learning) with regularly scheduled meeting times. However, we also capture self-service-style Web management practices in our study, which we suggest are fundamental to an eventual full understanding of synchronous versus asynchronous learning experiences. The thinking behind this restriction is to prevent confounding of results with extraneous synchronous versus asynchronous attribute interactions.

Course Design Factors

Based on the above review of recent research published in this and related publications, five course design factors are examined in this study. These factors are (1) the number of tests, (2) the number of in-class writing assignments, (3) the presence of a group project, (4) the number of guest speakers, and (5) the presence or absence of Web management. A recent issue of the *Journal of Marketing Education* includes articles regarding Web management (Granitz and Greene 2003), comparing different forms of tests (Bacon 2003) and the factors influencing student attitudes toward teamwork (Pfaff and Huddleston 2003). A quick browse of the indexes to the journal for the years 1999 to present suggests that articles that focus generally on Web management, tests, active learning, and teamwork are among those most frequently published in the journal. Karns (1993) reported that real-world applications in the marketing classroom are positively related to increased stimulation and effort by students. An article by Bridges (1999) offers evidence that students desire a connection to the real world through guest speakers. On the basis of her results, Bridges (1999) recommended using in-class activities and basing the course grade on exams and team projects among other methods. Also, some combination of the factors was being used in each of the classes participating in the survey. Given research supporting their use, their predominance in the *Journal of Marketing Education*, and their presence in the classes surveyed, these factors seemed to be best suited for the initial test.

The Sampling Frame

The next question we addressed concerned the source of the data for purposes of statistical analyses. We were fortunate in that three of the four investigators were currently teaching a large section Introduction to Marketing course ($N \geq 190$), and another was teaching two sections of an upper level marketing elective, Retail Management and Promotion. Both the upper and lower level classes were being taught at a midsize midwestern university. The lower level course includes both business and nonbusiness students, while the upper level course includes primarily marketing majors. Students were all afforded an opportunity to decline participation, in-class credit for study participation was offered, and the survey was administered at the beginning of the class session to ensure ample time for task completion. The study was administered during the first few weeks of the semester so that the effect of instructor differences could be minimized, and care was also taken to ensure consistency across the data collection exercises. A description of the respondents in the sample is provided in the Results section.

Sample Size

There are two forms of error we must consider when determining the appropriate sample size for our study. First, sampling error is a potential threat to the research, occurring when samples of respondents deviate from the underlying population. Second, measurement error must be considered, which involves deviations from the true value of a measured construct. Orme (1998) stated that although the minimum sample size for traditional conjoint analysis is one, the researcher should include enough questions to help control for measurement error. He states that sample sizes for conjoint measurement typically range from 150 to 1,200 respondents and argues that a researcher should ask enough questions to obtain three times the number of observations as parameters to be estimated, or $3(N - n + 1)$, where N = total number of levels and n = total number of attributes.

Therefore, we require $3(10 - 5 + 1) = 18$ for the survey in the appendix. We received a total of 603 valid responses (see Table 1). Consequently, we obtained sufficient response to

TABLE 1
CONJOINT RESULTS—ALL REPORTED SCORES ARE IMPORTANCE SCORES

		Lower Level Courses		*Upper Level Courses*	
Factor	*Direction*	*Ranking*	*Importance*	*Ranking*	*Importance*
N			484		119
Number of Tests	5	2	26.45	4	5.14
In-Class Writing Assignments	Few	1	28.61	2	31.51
Course Web Management	Present	4	18.81	1	34.08
Group Projects	Absent	3	25.90	3	26.37
Guest Speakers	Many	5	0.23	5	2.89
Pearson's *R*[a]			.934		.948
Kendall's tau[a]			.857		.786
Kendall's tau for holdouts[a]			–1.00		–1.00

a. Statistically significant at $p < .05$ or less.

ensure appropriate interpretation of our results. The next section presents the results of our analyses.

RESULTS

Description of Respondents in the Sample

The sample consists of students from three sections of a lower level class ($n = 484$) and two sections of an upper level class ($n = 119$). Female students represent approximately 42% of both samples, and nonbusiness majors represent approximately 20% of the lower level class sample but were virtually nonexistent in the upper class sample (< 1%). The lower level class was composed primarily of juniors (74%), while the upper level classes were virtually all seniors.

The results reported represent importance scores derived using the conjoint module of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). These importance scores are computed by taking the utility range for a particular factor and dividing it by the sum of all the utility ranges (SPSS 1997). In addition, the Pearson *R* and Kendall's tau statistics are also reported, which serve as indications of how well the model fits the obtained data. The Kendall's tau represents a probability that the observed data are in the same order for the variables versus the probability that the observed data are in different order for the variables. Thus, these coefficients should be very high in valid analyses.

Finally, in each case, we held out two holdout profiles that are not used in the analyses to estimate part worths. Orme, Alpert, and Christensen (1997) suggested that another popular method for assessing conjoint validity involves assessing the correlation of rating-based holdouts. The thinking behind this practice is that full-profile holdouts best represent how objects are viewed and evaluated in the real world.

The results provide an interesting glimpse into the foundations of student preferences for course design. We begin by evaluating the preferences of the students in lower level marketing courses. These students are usually taking one of their first business courses as a major or one of their few nonmajor electives early in their program of studies. These students as a group prioritized the attributes they considered most important in the following order (from most important in terms of their preference to least important): (1) fewer in-class writing assignments (28.61), (2) more tests (26.45), (3) the absence of group projects (25.90), (4) the presence of Web management (18.81), and (5) many guest speakers (0.23). The consistency of these scores across demographic categories was notable. We interpret these results to suggest that students at this stage of their educational experience are by and large focusing on expecting/desiring tests as the primary form of pedagogical feedback. This expectation is likely grounded in their (often) largely test-based experience in high school, junior college, and university foundation courses.

We also evaluated the preferences of business marketing students taking upper level major-specific courses. These students tended to be much further along in their program of studies, with this group characterized as Senior-standing, marketing business majors, who had not transferred to the university from which this research derives within the last 12 months. These students as a group prioritized the attributes they considered most important in the following order (from most important in terms of their preference to least important): (1) the presence of Web management (34.08), (2) fewer in-class writing assignments (31.51), (3) more tests (26.45), (4) the absence of group projects (26.37), and (5) many guest speakers (2.89). These results suggest that students at this later stage of their educational experience are by and large shifting their focus away from testing as a primary feedback mechanism toward valuing Web management in support of pedagogical feedback. This finding suggests that more seasoned students may be beginning to value support for their own self-service-based information consumption practices.

The results together clearly suggest that business student preferences for teaching methods can vary based on the stu-

dents' experience within their program of studies. Early in their program, students seem most comfortable with a focus on testing, whereas students later in their program of studies tend to be most comfortable with self-service-type Web management of courses. The next section presents a discussion of results.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MARKETING EDUCATORS

We can offer recommendations for marketing educators based on the results of this preliminary study. However, educators should use caution in implementing these recommendations because the results of this study are based on a few classes at a single institution. More research across different contexts is necessary to provide evidence of the validity of the results. For marketing educators designing their courses, we offer specific recommendations depending on whether their class occurs earlier or later in the students' educational program. Of the course design factors examined in this study, Web management is not very important to students at an early stage of their academic programs so educators could refrain from using it without adverse effects. One implication of this is that educators with little interest in technology could teach introductory classes with little or no detrimental impact on student perceptions of the course. Those educators teaching introductory courses but wishing to include Web management could do so but make it less salient relative to more important course design factors. For example, when discussing the syllabus, educators should focus on the numbers of tests offered and briefly mention that grades will be posted to a Web page. Educators teaching introductory courses (e.g., Marketing Principles) should use fewer in-class writing assignments and a greater number of tests as these have the greatest impact on students' perceptions of course design. However, if the educator feels that more writing assignments are necessary for pedagogical reasons, more emphasis could be placed on explaining to students why the assignments are valuable. Educators teaching introductory courses may choose to not incorporate group projects into the class because students perceive the absence of group projects as affecting their preference for a particular course design. Again, if group projects are important for pedagogical purposes, the educator is advised to either emphasize the importance of the project to students or to downplay the salience of the project.

Similar to Web management, the number of guest speakers does not have much of an impact on student preferences for course design. Educators should not focus a large amount of resources on recruiting guest speakers unless there are important pedagogical reasons for doing so. In such circumstances, strategies of emphasizing the connection between the speaker and gaining real-world knowledge should be used. Since students value real-world knowledge (Karns 1993), emphasizing the link between the speaker and the real world should increase student preferences for the course.

We recommend that educators designing a higher level marketing course focus more attention on other factors. For higher level courses, educators should include Web management and use fewer in-class writing assignments. Web management is the most important of the five course design factors examined in forming the perceptions of upper level students. For this reason, educators teaching upper level courses should make it salient that they are using Web management in the course design. This should have the effect of increasing student performance by matching their preferences with course design as well as increasing evaluations of the educator. Less important to upper class students are having a high number of tests, the absence of group projects, and having many guest speakers. Thus, educators have more leeway with upperclassmen in assigning group projects and determining the number of tests that a particular class will have. Similar to the lower class students, the number of guest speakers is not an important driver of student perceptions of course design. Therefore, an educator may be ineffectively using resources to bring in a large number of guest speakers. Perhaps combining Web management with guest speakers by having a Web conference during class time would be a more effective way of reaching students.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The data in this study were collected from four classes at a single university. Furthermore, the lower level classes were all large sections of a single course, Introduction to Marketing. Thus, generalizations to other samples and contexts should be made with caution. Future researchers are encouraged to investigate whether the findings are consistent across different types of marketing classes. Another limitation is the focus on only five factors of course design when a plethora of other course design factors exist (e.g., presence/absence of in-class experiential exercises, activity-based vs. text-based learning material, and whether the professor appears to like or dislike teaching). Future research should investigate these and/or other factors to determine if some other combination of factors may be more preferable to students. Exploratory research techniques could be used to identify factors that students may consider more important than those investigated. Future studies such as this would improve the generalizability of these preliminary results.

CONCLUSIONS

The results from this exploratory study provide further information on what sort of content and interaction students prefer from their courses. One could easily infer that the study indicates that students prefer working less to working more

based on the desire for fewer in-class writing assignments and the deletion of group projects. The cynic could even view the desire for a fairly large number of tests as being indicative of students' desire to avoid studying larger amounts of material that result from having a smaller number of exams. Concluding that many students prefer less work to more work would not be astounding to most educators. However, a more fair and balanced evaluation of the implications of this study would also involve consideration of the various demands on students' time resources and the ways in which they prefer to allocate these resources. For example, in an environment where most students are employed on a part-time or even near full-time basis and are taking multiple courses that involve group projects, it may prove difficult for students to meet numerous group obligations. In-class writing assignments may be viewed negatively due to "artificial" time constraints (the class time) being placed on written assignments. Or perhaps some students view these in-class assignments as evidence that professors are trying to avoid lecturing (or even being) in class.

The indicated desire for few guest speakers is troubling in that students are either being exposed to a significant number of guest speakers who are not relevant to the course or they are failing to grasp the significance of the guest speakers' comments to the course. In either case, it is apparent that additional interaction by the faculty involved is needed both to ensure the selection of suitable guests and to integrate their insights into the overall course experience.

An interesting finding from this study is the difference between the lower level and upper level students with respect to their desire for Web management of the course. The upper level students were found to have a much stronger desire for this form of course management compared with the lower level students. This probably reflects a maturing acceptance of personal responsibility by the more senior students along with less need for the more personalized feedback provided directly by course instructors. This presents an interesting dilemma for institutions as typically the lower level classes are often larger in size where the efficiencies provided by Web-based course management are of even greater benefit to the institution.

Beyond (and more important than) the findings of what students prefer in terms of course makeup is the determination of what students should be acquiring from their overall course experience. It would be fairly easy to apply the marketing concept in this situation in which case courses would be structured with no group projects or guest speakers, few in-class writing assignments, and a fairly large number of quizzes covering a limited range of material. By using extensive course Web management where possible along with properly designed assignments, only minimal interaction outside of the classroom between educators and students would be needed. The result would likely be happy students coupled with excellent evaluations for the professor. However, a less desirable outcome of this scenario might be students with insufficient benefits from the course including lowered writing skills, a too narrow focus of the topic area, less exposure to group behavior and learning, and more of a tendency toward memorizing as opposed to understanding material. Such a narrowly defined student-centered approach would likely result in failure for the course to meet reasonable goals in terms of benefits to students and contributions to the overall major/course of study.

An opposite approach to the marketing concept would be to determine exactly what students should be doing from the point of view of the professor and structuring the course only from this viewpoint. This might result in a class heavily emphasizing group projects supplemented with numerous individual in-class writing assignments. Numerous guest speaker events with mandatory attendance both during and outside of normal class times would be a major course component. Course Web management might be structured with multiple required meetings between professor and students during the course of a semester. The course grade could be based largely on a single comprehensive exam occurring near the end of the course. From the viewpoint of the professor, this description might constitute the perfect course environment. But depending on the "real" environment of the institution, the actual results might include students avoiding that particular professor and/or course, students avoiding or changing away from this specific major, students accomplishing the absolute minimum to pass the course due to their dislike of the course, and highly negative/insufficient evaluations for the professor. Ultimately, this professor-centered method may also lead to failure of course goals being accomplished.

What is called for in this situation is a combination of clearly set and met course goals to meet course and student needs coupled with respect for student wants and preferences. A major pathway for success in this endeavor is proper and intelligent management of student/course expectations. This fits within the overall mission of socializing students for success both during and after their college experience. However, expectations management is not solely controlled within any one course environment. These expectations are formed along a macro/micro continuum with the broader expectations being set by the overall set of courses taken at the institution and the very micro level being set by the individual course professor. In the middle of this expectation-setting continuum lie the overall set of courses within both college and major. Thus, the management of expectations, which is very critical to the individual course environment, is actually part of a policy decision of the overall institution. This raises interesting institutional questions about relationships between courses and the need for policy creation at the macro level.

APPENDIX
The Survey Instrument

A class assignment: This survey involves how teaching style influences students' selection of class sections. The following set of questions describes 10 hypothetical combinations of course technology/projects combinations. After reading each of these scenarios, please indicate how desirable each combination is to you as a student. Please be honest. Our concern is whether course structure leads students toward or away from particular sections. Please refer to the following definitions we will use within the context of this study to help you rate your likely level of course selection based on the following 10 profiles:

Factor	*Definition Used in This Study*
Number of Tests	We offer two levels for this factor. The first level is only two tests (a midterm and a final) that are each heavily weighted. The second level is five tests, each less heavily weighted.
In-Class Writing Assignments	Here we are referring to in-class exercises for credit. There are two levels for this attribute. The first level is relatively few exercises (1-3), while the second level is many (8-10 exercises) per semester.
Web Management of Courses	Here we are referring to course-related Web pages to report grades, to place lecture notes, to present homework exercises or to otherwise generally communicate more effectively with students. We propose two levels, either the presence or absence of Web management of courses.
Group Projects	Many courses, particularly at the Junior and Senior levels include large group projects. We are offering two levels, either the presence or absence of a major group project associated with a class.
Guest Speakers	Many classes have guest speakers. Our concern is whether a lot of them during the course of a semester is better or worse. We offer two levels: few (1-2) guest speakers or many (5-6) guest speakers during the course of the semester.

Each of the rows in the table that follows represents a course profile that we would like you to rate in terms of desirability. If a particular profile would likely lead to a very high level of desirability for such a section, please check the box on the far right. If a profile would likely engender absolutely no chance that you would desire such course attributes, please check the box on the far left. Please use boxes in between to reflect less extreme positions. Please remember to refer to the definitions on the previous page as you consider the following profiles. *In addition*, in the column titled "Rank," please rank order from 1 to 10 your most preferred profile for course offerings. A 1 would reflect your most preferred profile, with a 10 reflecting your least preferred profile. Please answer the following questions before beginning the survey that follows:

If the course involved five tests during the course of the semester, how desirable would the course be if it also involved . . .	*Rank Order*	*Not at All Desirable*							*Extremely Desirable*
2. Few in-class writing assignments, absence of Web course management, no group projects, and many guest speakers.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
3. Many in-class writing assignments, presence of Web course management, no group project, and few guest speakers.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
4. Many in-class writing assignments, no Web course management, a group project, and many guest speakers.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
7. Few in-class writing assignments, presence of Web course management, a group project, and few guest speakers.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	

If the course involved only two tests during the course of the semester, how desirable would the course be if it also involved . . .	*Rank Order*	*Not at All Desirable*							*Extremely Desirable*
1. Many in-class writing assignments, no Web course management, a group project, and few guest speakers.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
5. Few in-class writing assignments, presence of Web course management, a group project, and many guest speakers.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
6. Few in-class writing assignments, absence of Web course management, no group project, and few guest speakers.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
8. Many in-class writing assignments, presence of Web course management, no group project, and many guest speakers.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
9. Many in-class writing assignments, presence of Web course management, a group project, and few guest speakers.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
10. Few in-class writing assignments, absence of Web course management, a group project, and few guest speakers.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	

Please remember that you have two tasks. First, rate each profile in terms of desirability. Second, rank order from 1 to 10 your most preferred profile for course offerings. A 1 would reflect your most preferred profile, with a 10 reflecting your least preferred profile. Thank you for your assistance!

REFERENCES

Adrian, C. Mitchell, and G. Dean Palmer. 1999. Toward a model for understanding and improving educational quality in the Principles of Marketing course. *Journal of Marketing Education* 21 (1): 25-33.

American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) Task Force on Effective and Inclusive Learning Environments. 1998. *Effective and inclusive learning environments*. St. Louis, MO: AACSB International.

Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business International. 2003. *Eligibility procedures and standards for business accreditation*. Retrieved August 25, 2003, from http://www.aacsb.edu/accredidation/brc/standards-4-25.pdf.

Bacon, Donald R. 2003. Assessing learning outcomes: A comparison of multiple-choice and short answer questions in a marketing context. *Journal of Marketing Education* 25 (1): 31-36.

Baker, Stacey M., Susan S. Kleine, and Mark Bennion. 2003. What do they know? Integrating the core concept of customer value into the undergraduate marketing curriculum and its assessment. *Journal of Marketing Education* 25 (1): 79-89.

Batra, Madan M., Barbara E. Walvoord, and Krish S. Krishnan. 1997. Effective pedagogy for student-team projects. *Journal of Marketing Education* 19 (2): 26-42.

Bridges, Eileen. 1999. Experiential learning and customer needs in the undergraduate marketing research course. *Journal of Marketing Education* 21 (1): 51-59.

Caverly, David C., and Lucy MacDonald. 1999. Techtalk: Asynchronous distance developmental education. *Journal of Developmental Education* 23 (2): 36-37.

Clarke, Irvine, III, Theresa B. Flaherty, and Sandra Mottner. 2001. Student perceptions of educational technology tools. *Journal of Marketing Education* 23 (3): 169-77.

Davis, Richard, Shekhar Misra, and Stuart Van Auken. 2000. Relating pedagogical preference of marketing seniors and alumni to attitude toward the major. *Journal of Marketing Education* 22 (2): 147-54.

Deeter-Schmelz, Dawn R., Karen Norman Kennedy, and Rosemary P. Ramsey. 2002. Enriching our understanding of student team effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Education* 24 (2): 114-24.

Desai, Suzanne, Earl Damewood, and Richard Jones. 2001. Be a good teacher and be seen as a good teacher. *Journal of Marketing Education* 23 (2): 136-44.

Dubas, Khalid M., and James T. Strong. 1993. Course design using conjoint analysis. *Journal of Marketing Education* 15 (1): 31-36.

Dunn, Rita, Mary C. Giannitti, John B. Murray, Ino Rossi, Gene Geisert, and Peter Quinn. 1990. Grouping students for instruction: Effects of learning style on achievement and attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology* 130 (4): 485-94.

Granitz, Neil, and C. Scott Greene. 2003. Applying e-marketing strategies to online distance learning. *Journal of Marketing Education* 25 (1): 16-30.

Houston, Mark B., and Lance A. Bettencourt. 1999. But that's not fair! An exploratory study of student perceptions of instructor fairness. *Journal of Marketing Education* 21 (2): 84-96.

Karns, Gary L. 1993. Marketing student perceptions of learning activities: Structure, preferences, and effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Education* 15 (1): 3-10.

Liaw, Shu-sheng, and Hsiu-mei Huang. 2000. Enhancing interactivity in Web-based instruction: A review of the literature. *Educational Technology* 40 (3): 41-45.

Matthews, Doris B. 1994. An investigation of students' learning styles in various disciplines in colleges and universities. *Journal of Humanistic Education and Development* 33 (2): 65-74.

Morris, Linda J., and John S. Morris. 1999. Introducing quality function deployment in the marketing classroom. *Journal of Marketing Education* 21 (2): 131-137.

Nulty, Duncan D., and Mary A. Barrett. 1996. Transitions in students' learning styles. *Studies in Higher Education* 21 (3): 333-45.

Orme, Bryan. 1998. Sample size issues for conjoint analysis studies. *Sawtooth Software Research Paper Series*. Retrieved August 15, 2002, from http://www.sawtoothsoftware.com.

Orme, Bryan, Mark I. Alpert, and Ethan Christensen. (1997). Assessing the validity of conjoint analysis—Continued. *Sawtooth Software Research Paper Series*. Retrieved August 15, 2002, from http://www.sawtoothsoftware.com.

Pfaff, Elizabeth, and Patricia Huddleston. 2003. Does it matter if I hate teamwork? What impacts student attitudes toward teamwork? *Journal of Marketing Education* 25 (1): 37-45.

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). 1997. *SPSS conjoint 8.0*. Chicago: SPSS, Inc.

Stewart, Karen L., and Linda A. Felicetti. 1992. Learning styles of marketing majors. *Educational Research Quarterly* 15 (2): 15-23.

Tarasewich, Peter, and Suresh K. Nair. 2000. Course design using instructor and student preferences. *Journal of Business and Economic Studies* 6 (2): 40-54.

Wellington, William J., and A. J. Faria. 1996. The use of simulation games in marketing classes: Is simulation performance due to luck or skill? *Journal of Marketing Education* 18 (2): 50-61.

Zufryden, Fred S. 1983. Course evaluation and design optimization: A conjoint analysis-based application. *Interfaces* 13 (2): 87-94.