Key issues in marketing education: the marketing educators' view

Monica Gibson-Sweet
University of Glamorgan, Pontypridd, UK

Ross Brennan
Middlesex University, London, UK

Anne Foy
Academy of Marketing, Helensburgh, UK

Jacqueline Lynch
University of Westminster, London, UK, and

Peter Rudolph
University of Derby, Derby, UK

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to report the views of UK marketing educators about critical issues in teaching and learning of university-level marketing education, and to compare these views with the views of other stakeholder groups.

Design/methodology/approach – An online survey was administered to members of the UK Academy of Marketing; 51 completed, usable questionnaires were returned.

Findings – Respondents believe that teaching international students, plagiarism and providing feedback to students are the three top-priority issues in teaching and learning. Perhaps surprisingly, e-learning and the use of virtual learning environments are considered to be relatively low-priority issues.

Research limitations/implications – The low-response rate is a limitation of the study. The study detected some interesting similarities and differences of opinion between marketing academics and deans of business schools, between pre- and post-1992 universities, and between professors/readers and those in lecturing positions. Notably, the lack of agreement between marketing educators and deans over the importance of relating research to teaching (educators allocate this greater importance) and e-learning (deans allocate this greater importance) suggests areas for careful consideration in the development of teaching and learning policies.

Originality/value – The paper is unique in examining the views of university-level marketing educators about teaching and learning issues. University marketing educators are an important stakeholder in the marketing education process.

Keywords Marketing, Universities, United Kingdom, Curricula, E-learning, Academic staff

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

University marketing educators play an important role in the education of the next generation of marketing professionals. According to the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA, 2010), 23,190 students were studying marketing at UK universities in 2007/2008; each year, around 8,000 marketing students graduate from British universities, many of them destined for a marketing career. Marketing educators are in a position to

influence future generations of marketing practitioners. Consequently, their views on matters to do with teaching and learning are of importance to the profession.

Previous studies have provided a number of interesting insights into the views of marketing educators and their students about the marketing education process. These studies have examined such issues as the key activities undertaken by marketing academics and their views about the key issues in marketing education (Baker and Erdogan, 2000; Polonsky and Mankelow, 2000; Hetzel, 2000), the views of marketing educators about the balance between teaching marketing skills and teaching critical thinking skills (Ackerman *et al.*, 2003), and the views of marketing students about which teaching approaches are most effective in marketing education (Karns, 1993, 2005). Additionally, there is a tradition of reflective literature, written by very experienced marketing scholars, which provides profound insights into the marketing education process based on experience and philosophical or pedagogic literature (Chonko, 2004, 2007; Cunningham, 1995, 1999; Schibrowsky *et al.*, 2002). The majority of this literature originates from the USA. In addition, in a rapidly changing technological and educational environment, there is a risk that studies that are only a few years old may be seriously dated (Smart *et al.*, 2003).

In this paper, we report on an empirical study of UK marketing academics conducted in 2009, which was designed to measure attitudes towards 14 key issues in teaching and learning. The study employed a questionnaire that had previously been used in a study of UK business school deans and with school "key contacts" of the Business, Management, Accounting and Finance (BMAF) subject centre of the Higher Education Academy. This makes direct comparison with these groups possible. In addition, some comparisons are possible between this study and prior studies of marketing educator and marketing student views about the key issues in marketing education. Such comparisons are limited because different research instruments were used, but provide some interesting insights nevertheless.

The following section briefly reviews prior literature that has investigated marketing educator (and student) views about teaching and learning. Subsequently, the approach used to gather empirical data for this study is described. There follows a description of the results of the survey, and an analysis of the comparisons between these results and the results of prior studies. The concluding section considers the implications of the study for research and practice in the field of marketing education.

University-level marketing education: educator and student views

General discussions of what should be included in the university-level marketing curriculum have addressed the question of the appropriate fundamental approach to marketing education (Cunningham, 1995, 1999; Schibrowsky *et al.*, 2002). Schibrowsky *et al.* (2002) outlined three alternative philosophies for a marketing education: the liberal arts school, the professional school, and the vocational school. They were in agreement with Cunningham (1995, 1999) that it is the "professional school approach" to which marketing educators should aspire. While the goal of the liberal arts approach is to teach students about marketing, and the goal of the vocational approach is to teach students specific skills to make them ready for entry-level positions in marketing, the goal of the professional school approach is to prepare students for a career in marketing. Consequently, while the curriculum in a vocational school concentrates on how to complete specific marketing tasks, in a professional school the curriculum concentrates

on human skills, decision making, and synthesising and analysing information in order to deal with complex issues and make informed judgements (Schibrowsky *et al.*, 2002).

Subsequently, Ackerman *et al.* (2003) addressed the contention that university marketing curricula are orientated too much towards the straightforward application of "tools", and fail to give students the critical thinking skills that employers want. In particular, the question they addressed was how to educate students so that they were ready to think critically about the future of the organisation, rather than simply to deploy a range of tools to analyse the past. The two key themes that emerged from their qualitative study with marketing educators were "student potential" and "curriculum issues". Within the theme of student potential, there were three major issues: whether students are capable of handling "real-world problems", whether it is possible to teach creativity, and whether it is possible to teach critical thinking skills. Within the curriculum, asking students to develop a marketing plan was regarded as a good method of developing the desired critical thinking abilities, but marketing educators were concerned about the time taken up by this approach to learning, and were unsure about how students would react – for example, might students respond negatively to learning methods that made greater intellectual demands? In the quantitative phase of this study, Ackerman *et al.* (2003) found that employers were more sceptical than students or marketing educators about the potential among students for creativity and critical thinking.

In an engaging polemic, Chonko (2004) wondered whether marketing educators were sometimes guilty of using quackery in their pedagogic practice. By analogy with the medical field, where quackery is defined as the use of medical techniques which have no scientific support and which patients are not qualified to evaluate, he defined quackery as educational methods that are not scientifically evaluated and about which students are unable to exercise reasoned judgement. The purpose of his work was to assess whether educational quackery might be one reason for the complaints that marketing graduates are poorly prepared for employment, and that because of grade inflation students obtain university qualifications without achieving the academic standards of previous generations. Chonko (2004, p. 6) expressed the implications for marketing educators bluntly:

> Faced with pressures for success and the prospects of hard work as a means toward a strong educational foundation, it seems that many students prefer to seek out any class that offers the hope of a passing grade for minimal effort. And they find them!

A particular concern raised by Chonko is that educators may engage students in active learning methods for invalid reasons – for example, because students find such methods more congenial and are therefore inclined to give more positive feedback about the educational experience regardless of how much has been learned.

A substantial amount is known about what students think about the educational techniques used by marketing educators. Notably, Karns (1993, 2005) has conducted two surveys, separated by roughly a decade, of marketing students in the USA, to discover their perceptions of different learning methods. Karns (2005) argued that understanding student perceptions of learning methods is both of interest and of practical value to marketing educators, since student perceptions will affect their responsiveness to the different approaches. He found that marketing students evaluate learning methods on the three dimensions "enjoyable", "challenging" and "real world". Karns's (2005) results for marketing student perceptions of learning activity effectiveness and preference are

shown in Table I. It is notable that while students perceive some active-learning methods such as internships and student-operated businesses as both effective and preferred, conventional passive-learning methods such as lectures and essay tests also score fairly highly for both effectiveness and preference. The e-learning techniques mentioned in the study (online discussion and course web site) did not score highly for effectiveness of preference.

Research method

The study sought to ascertain the perceptions of the most important learning and teaching issues facing marketing academics and the support available for learning and teaching provided within the business school or department. All UK Academy of Marketing (AM) members on the e-mail list in January 2009 were invited to take part in the survey using an online survey administration service. Members were encouraged to distribute the survey to marketing colleagues within their institution for completion whether or not they were members of AM. Two reminder e-mails were sent following initial distribution. The questionnaire largely replicated that used in a survey previously undertaken by BMAF (2007) Network within the Higher Education Academy, the results of which were published in Summer 2007. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of 14 teaching and learning issues on a five-point scale (not important at all[1], not very important[2], of some concern[3], quite important[4], very important[5]). A key difference between the BMAF (2007) and the present survey was that marketing

Activity	Effectiveness	Preference
Internship	6.78	7.44
Class discussion	6.73	7.27
Case analysis	4.55	6.58
Live-case project	5.43	6.58
Student-operated businesses	5.37	6.57
Lecture	5.43	6.28
Essay test	5.10	6.20
Field trip	6.88	6.20
Homework	4.57	6.10
Student presentations	4.43	6.05
Guest speaker	6.24	6.01
Case/business plan competitions	5.06	6.00
Simulation game	5.61	5.99
Multiple-choice test	7.04	5.99
Term paper	2.88	5.93
Film/video	6.10	5.73
Text/readings	3.29	5.64
Role playing	4.78	5.62
Course web site	5.18	4.99
Online discussion	4.47	4.39
Diary	4.18	4.35

Table I.
Marketing student perceptions of learning methods

Notes: Effectiveness and preference are mean scores for the student sample; scales were anchored by 1(not preferred, not effective) and 9 (preferred, effective)
Source: Based on Karns (2005, Table 4)

www.man

colleagues were invited to make additional qualitative comments to explain their rating of the relative importance of each aspect of learning and teaching.

Table II provides a summary of the respondents' characteristics. An effective sample of 51 was achieved. Given the disappointing overall sample size, both the post- and the pre-1992 universities were reasonably well represented (post-1992 universities included both polytechnics that were granted university status in 1992 and institutions that have achieved university status more recently). Similarly, although the overall sample size is small, the representation of different academic job roles is reasonably well balanced. The members of the "other" category for job role were largely marketing educators who had moved into administrative or managerial roles, with job titles such as "Director of Research", "Director of MBA Programmes", "Director of Programmes", and "Course Director".

Findings

Table III summarises the answers to the questions about 14 key teaching and learning issues, showing the percentage of respondents answering very or quite important, and

Type of HE institution	Number	%
Post-1992 university	29	57
Pre-1992 university	18	35
Other	4	8
Total	51	100
Job role of respondent		
Professor/reader	11	22
Lecturer/senior/principal	27	53
Other	13	25
Total	51	100

Table II.
Characteristics
of respondents

Issue	Very important	Quite important	Rating average
Teaching international students	32	15	4.53
Plagiarism	32	14	4.49
Providing timely and good quality feedback on assessment	32	12	4.49
Relating research to teaching	19	20	4.06
Designing creative assessment	21	15	4.04
Achieving active learning	20	16	4.04
Teaching large groups	19	16	3.92
Work based learning	13	20	3.75
Addressing issues of recruitment and retention	19	11	3.82
Using virtual learning environments	7	21	3.57
Using e-learning	10	17	3.61
Widening participation	12	12	3.57
Finding reliable evidence-based evaluation to measure the effectiveness of teaching and learning interventions	11	10	3.35
Introducing personal development planning	10	7	3.10

Table III.
Key learning and
teaching issues rated
by marketing
academics 2009

the mean score for each variable on the five-point scale (a higher score indicates greater importance).

Key learning and teaching issues
The key issues facing marketing academics are: teaching international students; plagiarism; providing timely and good quality feedback on assessment; relating research to teaching; designing creative assessment; achieving active learning; and teaching large groups. Given the rapid growth of international students who are studying marketing, particularly at postgraduate level (international students on marketing programmes rose from approximately 1,000 in 1996/1997 to just under 6,000 in 2006/2007 (HESA, 2010)) it is not surprising that teaching international students is the most highly rated factor (4.53). The teaching of large groups (3.92) reflects the "massification" of business related HE in general and the rise in marketing students particularly at undergraduate level (from 6,000 in 1996/1997 to just over 15,000 in 2007/2008 (HESA, 2010)) in particular.

Qualitative comments suggest that the key issues identified are largely inter-related. For example, some comments link achieving active learning (4.04) to the issue of teaching large groups which inhibits interactive learning. For example:

- [active learning is] difficult with large class sizes.
- We all teach big groups but how do you make them feel valued and ensure two-way communication beyond the simplistic?
- Student engagement is a big issue.
- Typical lecture size is 150 students and seminar groups are 20 [...] we are told this will rise to 30. This is madness and inhibits discussion.

The use of creative assessment (4.04) to encourage active learning is challenged both by large group sizes and the rising incidence of plagiarism (4.49). Plagiarism is in turn linked to both large group sizes and teaching international students. For example:

We have fallen into the habit of using a combination of written assignments/essay and group presentations (partly to cope with the numbers). Whilst not all modules have exams there's an increasing tendency to use in-class/online tests, partly to reduce marking but also to minimise opportunities for plagiarism.

Providing timely and good quality feedback is an issue which could be driven by management policy in response to results from the UK's National Student Survey (a centrally administered questionnaire for final-year undergraduate students designed to measure their attitudes towards the education they have received). Qualitative comments suggest that the issue of feedback is also linked to large class sizes:

- We have a three week turnaround policy therefore there is the need to balance quality feedback v time.
- This goes along with large class sizes – we are trying to develop a standard pro-forma so that feedback can be given mainly by ticking boxes. It is impossible to turn around 300 + scripts in a reasonable time if you are trying to write detailed individual feedback.
- [feedback is] such an issue from the NSS – students I believe are less concerned if you are upfront about how long it will take [...]

Other learning and teaching issues
Qualitative comments suggest that marketing academics often interpret work-based learning as the development of "employability skills" in marketing typically through the use of placements, live projects, external clients and accreditation of part-time work experience. There is some development toward work-based learning in relation to employer-based learning:

- We have operated WBL [work based learning] for some years now as an integral part of our FD qualifications.
- Another centrally led initiative – the university has designed a framework for WBL that can help colleagues make the most of current regs on APL [accredited prior learning] and increase the uptake of WBL programme across the university.

Qualitative comments tended to suggest that recruitment was not considered important because it was not deemed to be an academic responsibility. Retention was cited variably as an issue but specifically mentioned in relation to first-year undergraduates. Similarly, qualitative comments suggested that introducing personal development planning was not an issue which was particularly "owned" by marketing academics. Comments relating to widening participation (3.57) also suggested that this was considered to be a non-academic issue. Only a quarter of the respondents directly associated widening participation with learning and teaching.

Comments relating to using virtual learning environments (3.57) varied from the positive, such as "a useful support to teaching", to negative, for example "their value not seen certainly for undergrads" and the exploration of less traditional VLEs such as "Second Life" was also mentioned. Comments relating to e-learning (3.61) did not necessarily draw a distinction between e-learning and using virtual learning environments and largely concerned its use as a blended learning tool.

Finding reliable evidence-based evaluation to measure the effectiveness of teaching and learning interventions did not appear to be well understood and, where it was understood, respondents' comments suggested that they did not know where to find evidence or how to evaluate its reliability.

Learning and teaching support
Respondents were asked to identify the different types of learning and teaching support provided to them by their business school and/or department. Responses are summarised in Table IV.

The presence of a teaching and learning committee received the highest response frequency (70.6 per cent) and it is interesting to note that over 60 per cent of respondents reported that formal learning and teaching strategies were in place along with a head/director of learning and teaching (62.7 per cent). The second highest response count is the encouragement to undertake learning and teaching development projects (68.6 per cent). However, only a quarter (25.5 per cent) of respondents indicated that remission from workload or funding was available to support such projects. The presence of regular workshops and seminars was reported by 62.7 per cent of respondents. Almost half (49 per cent) reported that learning and teaching is regularly reviewed as part of the annual individual performance review and over a third (39.2 per cent) reported that there is a career track for staff who specialise in learning and teaching matters. Other forms of support which were identified included Centres of Excellence in Teaching and Learning,

Support provided	Response (%)	Response count
Learning and teaching committee	70.6	36
Encouraged to undertake learning and teaching development projects	68.6	35
Head/director of learning and teaching	62.7	32
Learning and teaching strategy	62.7	32
Regular workshops and seminars on learning and teaching	62.7	32
Learning and teaching strategy that is regularly reviewed	58.8	30
Learning and teaching is regularly reviewed as part of annual individual performance review	49.0	25
Career track for staff who specialise in learning and teaching matters	39.2	20
Remission from workload and funding available to support teaching and learning project activity	25.5	13
Other	13.7	7
None	3.9	2

Table IV.
Support for learning and teaching currently provided by your business school/department

central specialist departments for education development and remission for specialist roles within the school.

Comparative analysis of respondent categories
The survey revealed few significant differences of opinion between respondents from different types of university, or between respondents with different job roles. For most issues, there was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of respondents from pre- and post-1992 universities, or between the mean scores for professors/readers and those in the lecturer/senior/principal grades. The few areas where interesting differences emerged are shown in Tables V and VI. The survey

Issue	Type of institution	Mean score
Plagiarism	Post-1992 universities	3.72
	Pre-1992 universities	4.28
Teaching large groups	Post-1992 universities	4.31
	Pre-1992 universities	4.72

Table V.
Differences between types of HE institution

Note: Differences between means significant at the 10 per cent level

Issue	Job role	Mean score
Teaching international students	Professor/reader	4.91
	Lecturer/senior/principal	4.48
Plagiarism	Professor/reader	4.18
	Lecturer/senior/principal	4.67
E-learning	Professor/reader	3.10
	Lecturer/senior/principal	3.59

Table VI.
Differences between job roles

Note: Differences between means for "plagiarism" significant at the 5 per cent level, for the other two variables at the 10 per cent level

provided some evidence (significant at only the 10 per cent level) that the issues of plagiarism and of teaching large groups are considered more important by respondents from pre-1992 universities than by those from the post-1992 sector. Compared to the lecturer/senior/principal grades, professors and readers considered teaching international students to be a more important issue, but considered plagiarism and e-learning to be less important issues.

Analysis and discussion
In this section, the focus is primarily on two types of comparison, first, comparison between the results of the study reported here and a prior study using the same research instrument with business school deans and BMAF key contacts, and, second, comparison with prior studies of the views of British, French and American marketing academics about key issues facing marketing academia. Before addressing these issues, it is interesting to reflect briefly on the comparison between Karns's (2005) findings about marketing student preferences for teaching methods, and the results of the present study of marketing educators' views.

In the present study, four issues were directly related to the practice of teaching: achieving active learning (ranked 6th out of 14 issues), work-based learning (8th), virtual learning environments (10th) and e-learning (11th). In comparison, Karns's (2005) survey of American marketing students showed that they believed that work-based learning and active learning methods were both effective and enjoyable, while course web sites and online learning methods were considered to be relatively less effective and less enjoyable (refer to Table I for details). For example, active-learning and work-based learning approaches such as "internship", "student-operated business", "live case project" and "field trip" were all rated highly by students in terms of effectiveness and preference, whereas "course web site" and "online discussion" were rated poorly by students. With some caveats – since the basis for comparison between these two studies is relatively weak – there is interesting indicative evidence of some congruence between the views of marketing students and educators, that active and work-based learning are higher priorities, while virtual learning environments and e-learning are lower priorities.

Comparison with views of deans and BMAF key contacts
In a study conducted in 2007, the BMAF subject group of the Higher Education Academy investigated the views of business school Deans and of BMAF key contacts in business schools about key teaching and learning issues. The BMAF key contact is a nominated individual in the business school who coordinates communication between the school and the subject centre. The same research instrument was used in that study and in the 2009 survey of UK marketing academics reported here; consequently, it is possible to make direct comparisons between the results. Table VII shows the ranking of the 14 issues by marketing academics, deans, and BMAF key contacts. The issues have been ranked in accordance with the percentage of respondents reporting that the issue is considered "very" or "quite" important.

The correlations between the rankings of marketing academics, Deans and key contacts are fairly high, indicating that there is, overall, a reasonable degree of agreement between all three groups on the ranking of key teaching and learning issues. The correlation between the views of deans and key contacts is the highest (0.78), between marketing academics and key contacts second highest (0.75), and between

Issues	Ranking by marketing academics	Ranking by business school deans	Ranking by business school key BMAF contacts
Teaching international students	1	2	2
Plagiarism	2	6	3
Providing timely and good quality feedback on assessment	3	1	1
Relating research to teaching	4	11	10
Designing creative assessment	5	4	4
Achieving active learning	6	3	5
Teaching large groups	7	9	8
Work-based learning	8	10	9
Addressing issues of recruitment and retention	9	5	14
Using virtual learning environments	10	7	7
Using e-learning	11	8	6
Widening participation	12	14	13
Finding reliable evidence-based evaluation to measure the effectiveness of teaching and learning interventions	13	13	11
Introducing personal development planning	14	12	12

Table VII.
Key teaching and learning issues, ranked by marketing academics, deans, and BMAF key contacts

marketing academics and deans the lowest (0.71). All three correlations indicate a considerable degree of agreement. However, inspection of Table VII quickly shows that despite this broad agreement, there is a considerable disagreement over specific teaching and learning issues. Issues of notably greater importance to marketing academics than to deans are "relating research to teaching" and "plagiarism". One issue is of notably less importance to marketing academics than to deans, namely "addressing issues of recruitment and retention", while the issues of "achieving active learning", "e-learning" and "using virtual learning environments" are considered somewhat less important by marketing academics than deans.

Comparison with prior studies of marketing educators' views
Three studies undertaken in 1999 and reported in 2000 in the *Journal of Marketing Management* provide a limited basis for comparison with the study reported here, which was administered almost exactly ten years later. Those prior studies were based on surveys of marketing academics in the UK (Baker and Erdogan, 2000), the USA (Polonsky and Mankelow, 2000), and France (Hetzel, 2000). The three studies all used very much the same research approach and asked marketing academics for their views on the most pressing issues in marketing theory, in marketing practice, and in marketing academia. It is the latter, pressing issues in marketing academia, which are discussed here; the findings from the three studies reported in 2000 are summarised in Table VIII.

The results provide an interesting but limited basis of comparison with the survey reported here. The principal factor limiting the comparison between the present results and the earlier results is that the earlier studies used open questions to elicit marketing academics' views while the present study used a predefined list of issues previously used in a wider study of business academics' views. Consequently, the earlier studies report a wider range of issues affecting the working lives of marketing academics, rather than

Issues identified by UK academics (Baker and Erdogan, 2000)	Issues identified by US academic (Polonsky and Mankelow, 2000)	Issues identified by French academics (Hetzel, 2000)
1. Funding/administration (declining unit of resource)	1. Decline in standard of students	1. Performance of administrative staff
2. Personal development	2. Performance of administrative staff	2. More links to practice
3. Course content/development/ delivery	3. Flexible delivery	3. Better recognition of international careers by French institutions
4. Students (academic standard of)	4. Conflicting demands: teaching and research	4. Evaluation/accountability of academic staff
5. Research	5. Evaluation/accountability of academic staff	5. Better working conditions (insufficient libraries, etc.)
	6. Technology	6. Conflicting demands between teaching, administrative work and research
	7. More links to practice	

Table VIII.
Pressing issues
in marketing
academia (2000)

narrowly focusing on teaching and learning matters. Nevertheless, some interesting comparisons and contrasts emerge.

The issues that have been rated as most important in the 2009 survey of UK marketing academics reported here were generally not issues of concern to marketing academics in 1999-2000. Marketing academics in 1999-2000 were generally not concerned, for example, about teaching international students, plagiarism, and feedback to students – the top three issues in 2009. On the other hand, several of the issues that are regarded as lower priority in the 2009 survey of UK academics are very similar to the "pressing issues" identified by marketing academics a decade before. Notably, "technology" and "flexible delivery" were already concerns for US marketing academics in 1999-2000, and "evaluation/accountability of academic staff" was a concern to both US and French marketing academics; compare the finding that 21 per cent of UK marketing academics in 2009 considered it "very" or "quite" important to find reliable evidence to measure the effectiveness of teaching and learning interventions.

Conclusion, limitations and implications

UK marketing academics and business school deans agree that achieving active learning is a high priority. If the findings from Karns's (2005) study of American marketing students also apply to UK marketing students, then this suggests a high degree of congruence among three key stakeholder groups – marketing academics, deans and students – that marketing education should incorporate more active learning techniques. On the other hand, while both marketing academics and marketing students appear to be as yet unconvinced that e-learning methods are a high priority, business school deans consider them to be a higher priority. This suggests that deans may seek to increase the online and e-learning components of marketing (and other) programmes, but that both marketing students and marketing academics will need some persuasion if they are to put concentrated effort into further developing these learning approaches. Nevertheless, learning technology, although considered to be only a moderate priority by UK marketing academics in 2009, is a subject that has proved of enduring

interest, since it was already considered a priority by American marketing academics in 1999.

Another enduring issue for marketing academics is relating research to teaching. The relationship between teaching and research was clearly of interest to marketing academics in 1999, and remained so in 2009. However, while "relating research to teaching" was regarded as the 4th most important teaching and learning issue by marketing academics, in a prior study of deans of business schools it was only regarded as the 11th most important issue. This suggests that while marketing academics see it as important to use their research activities to enrich their teaching, their deans are less convinced that marketing teaching needs to be research led.

The issues that UK marketing academics considered the highest priorities in 2009 – teaching international students, plagiarism, and providing feedback to students – were not considered to be important issues by marketing academics in 1999. This is perhaps not surprising, and reflects the extent to which the higher education environment changed during that decade. UK universities have come to rely increasingly on the fees from international students, and have, accordingly, become adept and successful exporters of higher education qualifications. The issue of student feedback has risen to prominence since the inception of the UK's National Student Survey. Meanwhile, the issue of plagiarism is certainly related to the issue of new technology, which facilitates plagiarism, and perhaps related to the issue of international students, since students from cultural backgrounds outside the UK may initially not understand the meaning of plagiarism.

Although plagiarism is clearly considered an important issue by all of the constituencies reported in this paper, nevertheless there are important differences of opinion. Marketing academics allocate greater importance to plagiarism than do deans of business schools, those in professorial/reader positions consider plagiarism relatively less important than do those in lecturing positions, and respondents from post-1992 universities consider plagiarism less important than do respondents from pre-1992 universities.

The principal limitations of this study are the low number of respondents (51), and the use of a pre-specified set of 14 teaching and learning issues in the questionnaire. The former limitation indicates that the results from this study should be considered tentative rather than conclusive. The latter limitation was, of course, designed into the study, in order to achieve direct comparability with the prior study of deans and BMAF key contacts. However, if open-ended questions about teaching and learning priorities had been used instead then it is possible that a slightly different set of priority issues would have been identified.

This study suggests that extending the use of active learning methods on marketing programmes is likely to be fairly easy to achieve, since educators, students and deans all consider this a high priority. However, extending the use of online and e-learning methods may be more difficult, since educators and students regard these as a relatively lower priority.

There are a number of areas for further research which emerge from this study. First, it would be desirable to conduct a study of UK marketing student attitudes towards teaching and learning issues, to measure the congruence of attitudes between marketing academics and marketing students. Such a study might, conveniently, replicate Karns's (2005) study of American students. Second, a replication of the study reported here among academics from other departments in the business school would answer some

important questions. For example, where the views of marketing academics and deans diverge is this because of the difference in their hierarchical position within the organisation, or is it a subject-related phenomenon? Equally, is the relatively low priority attached to online and e-learning simply a phenomenon of marketing education, or is it a wider phenomenon in the business school? Finally, this study, despite its limitations, has shown that the concerns of marketing academics about teaching and learning issues are far from static and, indeed, have changed substantially over the last decade. The replication of this study periodically, perhaps every two or three years, would provide information of use to designers of marketing curricula, to marketing educators and to those who manage them.

References

Ackerman, D.S., Gross, B.L. and Perner, L. (2003), "Instructor, student, and employer perceptions on preparing marketing students for changing business", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 46-56.

Baker, M. and Erdogan, Z. (2000), "Who we are and what we do – 2000", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 16, pp. 679-96.

BMAF (2007), *BMAF Survey of Key Teaching and Learning Issues in UK Business Schools*, available at: www.heacademy.ac.uk/business/publications/reports (22 March 2010).

Chonko, L.B. (2004), "If it walks like a duck. . .: concerns about quackery in marketing education", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 4-16.

Chonko, L.B. (2007), "A philosophy of teaching . . . and more", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 111-21.

Cunningham, A.C. (1995), "Developing marketing professionals: what can business schools learn?", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 3-9.

Cunningham, A.C. (1999), "Confessions of a reflective practitioner: meeting the challenges of marketing's destruction", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 33 Nos 7/8, pp. 685-97.

HESA (2010), *Students and Qualifiers Data Tables*, Higher Education Statistics Agency, Cheltenham, available at: www.hesa.ac.uk (accessed 22 March).

Hetzel, P. (2000), "Where are we going? Perceptions of French marketing academics", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 16, pp. 697-716.

Karns, G.L. (1993), "Marketing student perceptions of learning activities: structure, preferences, and effectiveness", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 3-10.

Karns, G.L. (2005), "An update of marketing student perceptions of learning activities: structure, preferences, and effectiveness", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 163-71.

Polonsky, M.J. and Mankelow, G. (2000), "Where are we going? Perceptions of US marketing academics", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 16, pp. 717-43.

Schibrowsky, J.A., Peltier, J.W. and Boyt, T.E. (2002), "A professional school approach to marketing education", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 43-55.

Smart, D.T., Kelley, C.J. and Conant, J.S. (2003), "Mastering the art of teaching: pursuing excellence in a new millennium", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 71-8.

Corresponding author
Ross Brennan can be contacted at: r.brennan@mdx.ac.uk