

Constructing Core-Course In-class Sessions From Students' Presubmitted Questions

Michael R. Hyman
New Mexico State University

Susan D. Steiner
The University of Tampa

Student interactivity and engagement are fundamental to creating effective student-centered learning. In core undergraduate business courses that introduce students to a business discipline, faculty typically determine the content and student engagement entails guided activities like case analyses, personality self-assessments, and role-playing. This meta-essay details a novel pedagogical approach in which instructors use students' graded, presubmitted questions to customize lectures and discussions, thereby enhancing student interest. This approach provides incentives missing from other question-centric in-class methods and eliminates discomfort among students apprehensive about asking spontaneous questions in an open forum. Moreover, it conforms to the increasingly popular flipped classroom and is suitable for many non-quantitative and non-skills-centric undergraduate courses.

Keywords: core undergraduate courses, student engagement, presubmitted questions, critical thinking

INTRODUCTION

The broad objective of a core undergraduate business (hereafter CUB) course is to introduce undergraduates to the conceptual and practical basics of a business discipline (e.g., marketing, management, finance, accounting). Completing a CUB course is an undergraduate degree requirement for all business majors and several non-business majors (e.g., journalism, hospitality, sports management). Ideally, CUB courses should satisfy these diverse students' dissimilar needs (Brewer, McGlone, McGlone, & Brewer, 2001; Smith, 2004).

Although each business school department can teach a CUB course tailored to non-majors, that approach tends to be resource-inefficient and deprives students of exposure to various personal and professional perspectives (McNeilly & Barr, 2001). Instead, CUB instructors often rely on a mix of non-experiential (e.g., delivering canned lectures, answering textbook-provided discussion questions, analyzing cases) and experiential (e.g., completing service learning exercises/projects, running simulations, playing one or more in-class games, writing a business plan) in-class activities to stimulate interest and understanding (e.g., Haytko, 2006; Vander Schee, 2011; Wooldridge, 2006). Is there an alternative non-experiential activity that can help achieve CUB learning objectives and more?

We posit that questions submitted online a day or two before the germane in-class session meets the posed challenge. This student-centered learning approach can satisfy two pedagogical goals. First, it can

deepen students' understanding of each concept in one business discipline and its relationships to concepts in other business disciplines. Second, it can encourage CUB instructors to embrace majors' and non-majors' diverse interests, thereby enhancing student engagement and learning.

CAN NON-EXPERIENTIAL IN-CLASS SESSIONS ENTHUSE AND EDUCATE ALL CUB STUDENTS?

CUB students—especially lesser-engaged non-majors—generally are reluctant to speak during class sessions. Many instructors rely on in-class exercises and games to overcome participation resistance that relates negatively to academic performance (Haytko, 2006; Vander Schee, 2011; Wooldridge, 2006, 2008). Another possibility is to construct in-class sessions from students' presubmitted questions, which should be effective regardless of the synchronous course delivery method (Francescucci & Rohani, 2019).

In *Teaching Nonmajors: Advice for Liberal Arts Professors*, P. Sven Arvidson wrote: As a substitute for the standard “Does anyone have any questions?” used by nearly all professors, the students can be instructed to write their own questions....After the several minutes it takes for the students to complete this assignment, the professor can poll some of the students and attempt to answer the questions or simply collect them to respond to later (p.22).

Arvidson (2008) suggests this interactive exercise to reduce classroom monotony and engage major and non-major students. Is there a more structured and comprehensive way to construct in-class sessions with thoughtful questions from CUB students?

Although more formalized than Arvidson's (2008) approach, Bierzychudek and Reiness (1992) implemented a primitive version of our proposed approach for the recitation sections of a biology course for non-majors. They required students to prepare a timely course-related question—based on course readings, news reports, or personal experience—for weekly class discussion sessions. Using these questions as the basis for in-class discussion allowed instructors to (1) monitor students' (mis)understanding of course materials and adjust in-class pace and content accordingly, and (2) enable students to learn more about personally exciting topics.

Constructing in-class sessions from presubmitted questions can spur student engagement. Intrinsic motivations for completing a course correlate positively with student performance (Walker, Greene & Mansell, 2006). In-class sessions based entirely on questions relevant to them should increase the intrinsic motivations of majors and non-majors (Gnoth & Juric, 1996; Juric, Todd, & Henry, 1997; Petrović, et al., 2012). Moreover, the ability to ask the right questions is vital to making effective business decisions (Hagel, 2021; Hyman & Sierra, 2010), and it complements the typical objectives of a CUB course related to decision-making methods and tools. In addition to revealing important information, insights, and innovative ideas, good questions can promote trust and rapport within workgroups (Brooks & John, 2018). Recent *Job Outlook* surveys conducted by the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) indicate that critical decision-making/problem-solving and teamwork abilities are employers' two most-sought competencies for recent college graduate hires (NACE, 2019, 2020, 2021).

HOW IS THIS APPROACH IMPLEMENTED?

Each student submits one question online via email or a learning management platform for each question-based in-class session. To ensure adequate time for grading questions and creating an organized and online-posted compilation for students' reference during the in-class session, the submission deadline is 24 hours before the related class. Students are advised to ask a question that elaborates on, resolves ambiguities about, or rebuts a business practice. In addition, their question should be thoughtful, discussion-provoking, and personally relevant (e.g., related to their major, work experience, or experiences as

consumers). To ensure such questions, the syllabus includes small sets of good questions to emulate and poor questions to avoid (see Appendix 1 for a Principles of Marketing course).

Although the instructor speaks extensively during the in-class sessions, the class milieu is more like a seminar than a lecture (i.e., greatly enhanced student participation and engagement). The entire class session revolves around a question set posted online for student review several or more hours before class time. Hence, question sequencing is key to a coherent discussion that avoids disjointed coverage (i.e., progressing through each question set should be as seamless as possible).

For each relevant in-class session, this approach assumes assigned reading from a comprehensive CUB course textbook. To ensure full content coverage, instructors must require students to study and be tested extensively (with objective quizzes and essay exams). In a CUB course, this learning approach ensures student exposure to basic course concepts and vocabulary.

Organizing each in-class session around a single chapter is most straightforward. To facilitate the construction process and students' ability to follow in-class sessions, instructors should rely on the assigned textbook's within-chapter organization to sequence the questions. Each question set should indicate (1) initial instructor comments related to the course in general and that day's topic, (2) questions meant to stimulate in-class discussion, (3) questions meant for the instructor to answer, and (4) instructor answer prompts for each question.

To facilitate spontaneous adaptability based on students' interests and misconceptions, interaction quality (i.e., enthusiasm and thoughtfulness), likelihood of discussion redundancy, and need for essential content coverage, instructors can create question sets with more questions than they can pose during in-class sessions. Preparation time permitting, instructors can utilize in-class time more efficiently (i.e., reduce reading aloud and interpretation time) by editing presubmitted questions for clarity and brevity.

To encourage their thoughtfulness, the presubmitted questions should comprise 10% of the course grade. Although developed to classify questions posed in science courses (Marbach-Ad & Sokolove, 2000), the five-point grading scheme corresponds to these question types.

- 1-2 points: Illogical or uninterpretable
- 2-3 points: Definitional or factual (score depends on complexity)
- 3-4 points: Misconceptions (score depends on reasonableness)
- 3-5 points: Information not covered in the textbook (score depends on thoughtfulness)
- 4-5 points: Ethical, moral, philosophical, sociopolitical, functional or evolutionary explanation (often asks 'why'), synthetic, and empirically researchable (score depends on thoughtfulness)

This grading scheme encourages students to submit deeper wonderment questions (related to comprehension, prediction, anomaly detection, application, and planning) rather than shallower basic information questions (related to facts and procedures) (Chin & Brown, 2002). Although students are instructed to submit questions related to the relevant textbook chapter, questions often "spring from a deep interest...or arise from an effort to make sense of the world" (Chin & Brown, 2002, p.523).

To encourage rapport and engagement while discouraging student passivity, instructors should prioritize questions—initially and within each subtopic—for stimulating in-class discussion. (After sitting quietly for 15 or more minutes, students acclimate to being silent, hindering subsequent attempts to elicit their responses to the questions and other students' responses.) Following the discussion-inducing questions are those that broach concepts and practices the instructor wants to reinforce but are outside most students' exposure, experience, or initial interest (i.e., focused mini-lectures). Next, 'misconception' questions provide an opportunity to correct misunderstandings likely shared by multiple students. Although the instructor may occasionally acknowledge an especially insightful question's author, predominant anonymization encourages students to submit engaging questions based on their personal experiences and admit to confusion.

To encourage their attendance and textbook studying while maximizing discussion time, students could complete a textbook-centric online-administered quiz before or after the associated in-class session. Asynchronously administered and AI-proctored (e.g., via Lockdown Browser and Respondus Monitor) online quizzes drawn randomly from an objective test bank permit multiple completion attempts that can

enhance the quizzes' diagnostic value (i.e., students can learn from their mistakes) without compromising assessment integrity. Quiz results (i.e., the highest score on multiple attempts) that contribute sufficiently to final grade calculations should motivate students to think critically about the text and associated presubmitted questions. An alert about the instructor creating essay exams from presubmitted questions should motivate grade-conscious students to stay engaged in question-related discussions regardless of their current personal interests (e.g., attending to discussions related to other students' expertise, experiences, and interests).

IS THIS APPROACH BENEFICIAL?

Although education and science curricula often include courses that develop students' questioning skills (e.g., Aflalo, 2018; Chin & Brown, 2002; Harper, Etkina & Lin, 2003; Marbach-Ad & Sokolove, 2000; Shakurnia, Aslami & Bijanzadeh, 2018), most business curricula focus on teaching students to answer instructor-posed questions (Bain, 2004; Brown, Danvers & Doran, 2016). The proposed pedagogical approach differs from a Socratic approach, lectures organized around instructor-determined question sets, or in-class sessions for answering questions students post in a journal submitted weekly for grading (Crowley et al., 2008; Harper, Etkina, & Lin, 2003). It also differs from student-written multiple-choice exam questions submitted after each in-class session (e.g., Shakurnia, Aslami & Bijanzadeh, 2018; Snow et al., 2019; Yu & Liu, 2008). Unfortunately, students are apt to lose interest and not write reflective/relevant questions when they must wait 1-2 weeks for answers (Petrović et al., 2012).

The question-based in-class sessions can satisfy substantive and non-substantive course objectives. The satisfied substantive objectives are three-fold: (1) to show how the CUB course's and other business concepts interrelate and pertain to business practice; (2) to address seemingly contradictory concepts and perspectives, especially related to the ethicality and morality of business practice; and (3) to ensure key concepts are reinforced (i.e., clearly defined, illustrated, and nomologically grounded) and misconceptions about them are corrected. The satisfied non-substantive objectives are two-fold: (1) to enhance student engagement, especially among non-majors, via question-specific mini-lectures and discussions; and (2) to develop students' questioning skills. The latter non-substantive objective can help students develop critical thinking and communication skills (Aguirre, Hyman, & Jones, 2020; Dahl, Peltier, & Schibrowsky, 2018). "Question generation is an important metacognitive strategy that focuses the student's attention on the content and main ideas and helps develop critical thinking, self-criticism, and creativity" (Aflalo, 2018, p.64).

In addition to meeting the aforementioned substantive and non-substantive objectives, soliciting written questions in advance overcomes student reluctance to violate norms about speaking during in-class sessions. Orienting a CUB course around a frequently required comprehensive textbook incentivizes students to study it closely and gradually, thus mitigating the cramming-induced decay of course-related knowledge (McIntyre & Munson, 2008). Such in-class sessions also address the AACSB's (i.e., main business program accreditation entity) longstanding disapproval of a silo mentality toward business instruction (i.e., a non-integrative perspective on business practice) (Lorange, 2010). By revealing their course-related knowledge, misconceptions, and interests, students' questions can influence the structure of in-class sessions (Aflalo, 2018; Pedrosa de Jesus et al., 2006). The in-class sessions—especially the mini-lecture answers to select student questions—can entail all six of Bloom's learning objectives: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Finally, the in-class sessions can complement experiential exercises, such as a marketing or a management simulation.

IS THIS APPROACH'S SUPERIORITY PROVABLE?

Typically, empirical support for this approach to non-experiential CUB in-class sessions would appear here. Indeed, empirical assessment could guide improvements. For example, pedagogy scholars could research the ideal percentage and placement of lecture-centric versus discussion-centric questions, tailoring

the approach to different course delivery modes, or the best learning module for developing CUB students' questioning skills.

Due to constraints imposed by the Covid-19 pandemic and institutional mandates (i.e., to minimize students' unease with shifting from in-person to synchronous online course delivery), we did not conduct a controlled study to determine the superiority of a priori customizable and spontaneously adaptable in-class sessions over non-experiential in-class sessions (e.g., canned lectures or textbook-provided discussion questions and mini-cases). Nevertheless, students' generally strong performance on three essay exams and three 750-word analyses of different discipline news events (e.g., Company X's introduction of a new product; Company Y's new promotional campaign) supports this pedagogical approach. Specifically, students in five teleconference-based Principles of Marketing sections taught from Fall 2020 through Fall 2021 provided exam answers and report analyses that generally reflected an excellent grasp of marketing and its interrelationship with other business and social science disciplines. Furthermore, students' formal (i.e., end-of-semester evaluations of teaching) and informal feedback about the course and the instructor was overwhelmingly favorable and highlighted the instructor's strong interest in and respect for students (see Appendix 2 for representative feedback).

WHAT CHALLENGES DOES THIS APPROACH POSE TO INSTRUCTORS AND STUDENTS?

The challenges to instructors attempting this pedagogical approach entail time commitment, general knowledge about business related fields, and pedagogical skills. For a typical CUB section, reading, grading, editing, organizing, and outlining answers to students' questions for each in-class session requires several hours. Because the deadline for question submission is roughly one day before the associated in-class session, instructors must reserve enough prep time on pre-class days regardless of other professional commitments. Relatively inexperienced instructors without a broad knowledge of their discipline and related disciplines may be unable to provide insightful and comprehensive answers that reflect a discipline-centric yet multidisciplinary perspective. Such instructors also may find the spontaneous nature of discussing and answering students' questions rather than delivering scripted lectures unnerving.

In contrast, the challenges to students entail grasping a multidisciplinary but discipline-centric approach, conceiving personally meaningful questions for each class session, and accepting frequent deadlines if 'working ahead' is problematic. Students unable or unwilling to master relevant content, especially if instructors construct their exams from the presubmitted questions, will underperform grade-wise. All students, especially non-majors, may be unable to write 'good questions' related to textbook chapters they believe are personally irrelevant. Students' work and school schedules may conflict. Instructors must weigh the costs and benefits to their students of dedicating one in-class session per chapter, as a comprehensive 20-chapter textbook creates 20 quiz and 20 question deadlines. With multiple discipline-related news event analyses, multiple course exams, and attending roughly 30 in-person classes, students may find such course-related scheduling demands taxing.

Alternatively, instructors of 30-in-class-session courses (e.g., meet twice weekly for 15-week) can dedicate one class session weekly to this non-experiential approach and the other session to experiential exercises (e.g., simulations, group projects, writing a business plan). In addition to reducing the number of assignment deadlines, the question submission deadline can be 48 hours before the in-class session, lessening the urgency of in-class-session creation.

IS THIS APPROACH ADAPTABLE TO OTHER COURSES?

Customizing courses based on presubmitted questions is well-suited for courses with a diverse roster of students (e.g., different majors, geographic locations, socio-economic backgrounds) who might otherwise miss CUB's applicability to their professional pursuits. Hence, many non-quantitative and non-skills-centric undergraduate courses are candidates for this pedagogical approach. Although the course titles may lack the phrase "introduction to", these courses survey the applicable domain (e.g., for management,

the typical one-semester undergraduate courses in international business, entrepreneurship, and non-profit management).

WHAT SHOULD FACULTY CONCLUDE?

Implicitly or explicitly, business departments use their CUB course to recruit and retain majors (Camey & Williams, 2004). However, many undergraduates' initial negative and mistaken beliefs about a business discipline tend to negate that effort (Ferrell & Gonzalez, 2004; Swanson, 2018). Students' assessments of a CUB course correlate positively with their beliefs about its informativeness/interestingness and the instructor's performance (Ferrell & Gonzales, 2004). A CUB course with high-engagement non-experiential in-class sessions should attract majors by fostering 'good course' beliefs concomitant with recognizing the discipline's potential value to businesses and society. Constructing in-class sessions from presubmitted questions should also help students develop their questioning skills.

Regardless, some seasoned instructors blasé about delivering traditional lectures to yet another CUB section may embrace this pedagogical approach's challenges. The lead author can attest to adopting this perspective. Similarly, his students' feedback suggests this approach boosted their course engagement and interest in switching their major to marketing.

Finally, we advocate this a priori customizable and spontaneously adaptable approach to resist the demise of synchronously delivered (and especially lecture-centric) courses at non-elite (i.e., tuition-sensitive) universities (Rifkin, 2014). Supposedly meant to lower students' textbook costs, universities 'inclusive access' contracts with major textbook publishers can proliferate turnkey courses that lower-cost, non-terminally-qualified instructors can administer (McKenzie, 2017). Our pedagogical approach reinforces the non-substitutable value of seasoned, terminally qualified faculty, who can bring their years of accumulated knowledge to the explication of customized course content.

REFERENCES

- Aflalo, E. (2018). Students generating questions as a way of learning. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 22(1), 63–75.
- Aguirre, G.C., II, Hyman, M.R., & Jones, J.L. (2020). Dedicated marketing ethics course: Design and test. *Marketing Education Review*, 30(3), 177–194.
- Arvidson, S.P. (2008). *Teaching nonmajors: Advice for liberal arts professors*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bierzychudek, P., & Reiness, C.G. (1992). Helping nonmajors find out what's so interesting about biology. *Bioscience*, 42(2), 125–128.
- Brewer, P.D., McGlone, V.L., McGlone, T.A., & Brewer, V.L. (2001). The impact of non-business majors in a business core course. *Mid-American Journal of Business*, 16(1), 61–67.
- Brooks, A.W., & John, L.K. (2018). The surprising power of questions. *Harvard Business Review*, 96(3), 60–67.
- Brown, C.A., Danvers, K., & Doran, D.T. (2016). Student perceptions on using guided reading questions to motivate student reading in the flipped classroom. *Accounting Education*, 25(3), 256–271.
- Camey, J.P., & Williams, J.K. (2004). Selling principles: Influencing principles of marketing students' perceptions of and attitudes toward marketing as a discipline. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 26(2), 154–160.
- Chin, C., & Brown, D.E. (2002). Student-generated questions: A meaningful aspect of learning in science. *International Journal of Science Education*, 24(5), 521–549.
- Crawley, S.L., Curry, H., Dumois-Sands, J., Tanner, C., & Wyker, C. (2008). Full-contact pedagogy: Lecturing with questions and student-centered assignments as methods for inciting self-reflexivity for faculty and students. *Feminist Teacher*, 19(1), 13–30.

- Dahl, A.J., Peltier, J.W., & Schibrowsky, J.A. (2018). Critical thinking and reflective learning in the marketing education literature: A historical perspective and future research needs. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 40(2), 101–116.
- Ferrell, L., & Gonzalez, G. (2004). Beliefs and expectations of principles of marketing students. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 26(2), 116–122.
- Francescucci, A., & Rohani, L. (2019). Exclusively synchronous online (VIRI) learning: The impact on student performance and engagement outcomes. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 41(1), 60–69.
- Gnoth, J., & Juric, B. (1996). Students' motivation to study introductory marketing. *Educational Psychology*, 16(4), 389–405.
- Hagel III, J. (2021). Good leadership is about asking good questions. *Harvard Business Review Digital Articles*, 1-4.
- Harper, K.A., Etkina, E., & Lin, Y. (2003). Encouraging and analyzing student questions in a large physics course: Meaningful patterns for instructors. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 40(8), 776–791.
- Haytko, D.L. (2006). The price is right: An experiential pricing concepts game. *Marketing Education Review*, 16(2), 1–4.
- Hyman, M.R., & Sierra, J.J. (2010). *Marketing research kit for dummies*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Publishing, Inc.
- Juric, B., Todd, S., & Henry, J. (1997). From the student perspective: Why enroll in an introductory marketing course? *Journal of Marketing Education*, 19(1), 65–76.
- Lorange, P. (2010, January 1). A new model for management education. *BizEd*. Retrieved from <https://bized.aacsb.edu/articles/2010/01/a-new-model-for-management-education>
- Marbach-Ad, G., & Sokolove, P.G. (2000). Can undergraduate biology students learn to ask higher level questions? *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 37(8), 854–870.
- McIntyre, S.H., & Munson, J.M. (2008). Exploring cramming: Student behaviors, beliefs, and learning retention in the principles of marketing course. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 30(3), 226–243.
- McKenzie, L. (2017, November 7). 'Inclusive access' takes off. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/11/07/inclusive-access-takes-model-college-textbook-sales>
- McNeilly, K.M., & Barr, T.F. (2001). Tailoring a marketing course for a non-marketing audience: A professional services marketing course. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 23(2), 152–160.
- NACE. (2019). The four career competencies employers value most. Retrieved from <https://www.naceweb.org/career-readiness/competencies/the-four-career-competencies-employers-value-most/>
- NACE. (2020). *Key attributes employers want to see on students' resumes*. Retrieved from <https://www.naceweb.org/talent-acquisition/candidate-selection/key-attributes-employers-want-to-see-on-students-resumes/>
- NACE. (2021). *The attributes employers seek on students' resumes*. Retrieved from https://www.naceweb.org/talent-acquisition/candidate-selection/the-attributes-employers-seek-on-students-resumes/?utm_source=spotlight-college
- Pedrosa de Jesus, H.T., Albergaria Almeida, P., Joaquim Teixeira-Dias, J., & Watts, M. (2006). Students' questions: Building a bridge between Kolb's learning styles and approaches to learning. *Education + Training*, 48(2/3), 97–111.
- Petrović, J., Sović, A., Cvitanović, M., Pale, P., & Seršić, D. (2012). What do students think about during live lectures? What do students ask themselves during lectures? *IEEE 2012 15th International Conference on Interactive Collaborative Learning*, pp. 1–5.
- Rifkin, J. (2014). *The zero marginal cost society: The internet of things, the collaborative commons, and the eclipse of capitalism*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan Trade.
- Shakurnia, A., Aslami, M., & Bijanzadeh, M. (2018). The effect of question generation activity on students' learning and perception. *Journal of Advances in Medical Education & Professionalism*, 6(2), 70–77.

- Smith, K.H. (2004). Implementing the “marketing you” project in large sections of principles of marketing. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 26(2), 123–136.
- Snow, S., Wilde, A., Denny, P., & Schrafel, M.C. (2019). A discursive question: Supporting student-authored multiple choice questions through peer-learning software in non-STEMM disciplines. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(4), 1815–1830.
- Swanson, S.R. (2018). The defining dozen: Undergraduate students perceived views of marketing. *Marketing Education Review*, 29(1), 3–16.
- Vander Schee, B.A. (2011). Marketing feud: An active learning game of (mis)perception. *Marketing Education Review*, 21(1), 63–68.
- Walker, C.O., Greene, B.A., & Mansell, R.A. (2006). Identification with academics, intrinsic/extrinsic motivation, and self-efficacy as predictors of cognitive engagement. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 16(1), 1–12.
- Wooldridge, B.R. (2006). The power of perception an active/experiential learning exercise for principles of marketing. *Marketing Education Review*, 16(2), 5–7.
- Wooldridge, B.R. (2008). Golden duck awards: An interactive game to facilitate class participation. *Marketing Education Review*, 18(1), 15–17.
- Yu, F.Y., & Liu, Y.H. (2008). The comparative effects of student question-posing and question-answering strategies on promoting college students’ academic achievement, cognitive and metacognitive strategies use. *Journal of Education & Psychology*, 31(3), 25–52.

APPENDIX 1: SYLLABUS DESCRIPTION ABOUT DISCUSSION QUESTIONS FOR PRINCIPLES OF MARKETING COURSE

You are required to submit one graded discussion question related to the textbook chapter assigned for that day. Your grade for the question will depend on its thoughtfulness.

Examples of good questions:

- Direct and digital marketing is about engaging with carefully targeted individual consumers. How do companies decide which persons they will target to build a brand community?
- With sales and marketing moving online, how do companies adjust to having so many brick-and-mortar locations?
- The textbook advocates for relationship marketing. Do you want a relationship with all of your goods/services providers? What about the problems associated with the need to share personal information to maintain a relationship?
- The textbook states the purpose of marketing is ‘to generate customer value profitably’. That sounds good at first blush. What about Ford’s decision about the design of its Pinto?
- Are consumers shifting toward thriftiness and voluntary simplicity? If so, why are consumer debt and self-storage facilities proliferating?
- What are the ethics of collecting, analyzing, and reselling customer data? Is competitive marketing intelligence ethical? What about observing consumers without their consent?
- Do consumers primarily make their buying decisions consciously or unconsciously? If the latter, do marketers take advantage of consumers being unaware of why they buy goods, services, and ideas?
- Marketers tend to study individual consumers rather than family decision-making. Does this practice distort their thinking about goods and services?

Examples of poor questions:

- Which is the most important or most frequently used: Marketing Tactic A, Tactic B, or Tactic C? (In introductory courses, all concepts are essential and used frequently.)
- Between direct and digital marketing and digital and social media marketing, which of the two is more impactful?
- What are some more examples of Marketing Tactic A? (not thoughtful)

- How does Covid-19 affect international business? (too broad)
- What is the best approach to fixing the economy post-pandemic? (too broad)
- Are companies that are competitor-centered, customer-centered, or market-centered more successful in the long run? (not thoughtful)
- Market leaders usually get displaced when another company comes up with a new product. Is that usually the case? (not thoughtful)

To ensure a sufficient number of discussion questions, the question submission deadline is noon the day before each related class session. Although you may submit questions well before that deadline (i.e., you may ‘work ahead’), late submissions are unacceptable because the instructor could not use them to construct the related session.

APPENDIX 2: END-OF-SEMESTER COURSE ASSESSMENT: REPRESENTATIVE VERBATIM COMMENTS RELATED TO STUDENTS’ BELIEFS ABOUT ENGAGEMENT, RAPPORT, CARING, RAPPORT, AND LEARNING

Student Engagement – Having Class Periods or Other Activities That Are Engaging

- I did.
- Great.
- There was so much student engagement.
- Students were encouraged to engage in everyday class.
- All the time.
- The zoom meetings would often have the professor asking us questions to get us to engage in the class.
- The class way highly focused on engagement.
- Yes.
- Each class session was meant to be engaging.
- It was okay
- Despite being online, the questions sent in about the chapter that were discussed for open discussion was interesting.
- We had plenty of discussions that were engaging.
- Zoom meetings had student engagement.
- For an online class, his student engagement was pretty good. It can be difficult to get students to speak; however, his discussion questions usually garnered a decent response at the beginning of the class.

Rapport – Having a Positive and Respected Relationship With the Instructor

- We all did.
- Good.
- I had no problems with this professor. I thought he was respectful.
- Yes.
- Great relationship, very interactive with students.
- The instructor was always respectful to students’ questions.
- Pleased.
- My professor always showed a positive and respectful relationship.
- The instructor communicated with students well.
- I believe the instructor made an effort to respect all of his students.
- Overall positive.
- The interactions I had were always positive and respectful.
- Had a positive attitude.
- Really cool with lots of entertaining and informative stories.

- I did have a good relationship with the instructor and the instructor with us. He was always very nice to us.
- I didn't have much of a relationship with the instructor but it was alright.
- Professor xxxxxx was enjoyable to engage with.

Instructor Support – Receiving Useful and Timely Assistance From the Instructor

- I did.
- Great.
- Good.
- The instructor made sure we knew we could ask questions anytime we needed to.
- Yes.
- The instructor gave assistance if students had questions on zoom meetings or through email.
- Reported back immediately.
- Instructor provided assistance when asked.
- Professor always answered and was there for us.
- He was great as the part of supporting the students so they could get engaged with the class and succeed.
- He was very helpful with any questions or concerns we had.
- Timely assistance was present.
- Professor xxxxxx was helpful when asked.

Challenge – Learning a Lot and Being Challenged in the Course

- I learned a lot. It was just great.
- Very.
- Good.
- Yes.
- Definitely challenging.
- This course had a lot of challenging material and concepts throughout the whole book.
- Sure.
- Course challenged me to think outside the box sometimes.
- I felt challenged only because of the immensely fast paced course.
- Learned a lot.
- It was challenging remembering all the material during the quizzes.
- The course had some challenges.
- The professor made it easy and fun to understand.
- The material was a bit challenging to learn quickly on a weekly basis.
- This class pushed me to work with my group online and be more interactive.
- I was challenged a lot in this class because of all the new information every week.
- The course did contain a lot of information.

Grading – grading of assignments, exams, and projects

- Was fair.
- Awesome.
- Good.
- Agree with.
- Great and fair.
- The grading was clear for the assignments and projects.
- Yes.
- Very fair.
- Quick and fair.
- Grading was good for the most part.

- Grading is very fair in this class.
- The way he graded the assignments, exams and projects was fair and honest, as well as the feedback.
- He was a generous grader.
- The grading is understandable.
- Grading was always swift and stuck to the rubric. I do feel it fell on the lenient side.

Briefly Identify Your Three Biggest Takeaways From This Course.

- I learned how to comprehend better some of the marketing concepts there are, how to be more well organized and how to take my time make better my work.
- Marketing makes a lot of sense.
- Good for marketing majors.
- 1. Basics of marketing 2. How they are applied in real life 3. How to identify these things and analyze them.
- Ask questions, participate, and stay on top of your work.
- The teacher is great at communicating the topics at hand for the class. I enjoy how helpful the teacher is when students have questions. He's very nice as well.
- My three biggest takeaways from this course are how big and important marketing is in our lives, the complexity of marketing decisions, and all of the different roles that marketers do for companies.
- Marketing is not only about ads.
- The complexity to marketing, How I can use marketing in my future.
- Doing marketing research is very important.
- Marketing involves ethics, marketing is complex, marketing is everywhere.
- I learned a lot about marketing strategies, how to implement strategies in today's world and how marketing can be used not only in the economy.
- Marketing concepts. Marketing research. Importance of the marketing in the real world.
- Marketing strategies, consumer markets, and the process of developing products.
- 1. Who and how to target audience, 2. Types of advertising 3. How to engage a audience.
- New information, better understanding, and new knowledge.
- Marketing encompasses far more than making commercials. Businesses must focus on creating customer value, both immediate and long-term. Businesses have increasingly had to build relationships with their customers, not just offer a good or service.

Briefly Described the Greatest Strengths of the Course.

- This teacher was really supportive with all of us, when I had a question about how to apply for a job he helped me and guide me through all the process.
- He did a really good job in teaching.
- I really liked his grading, very fair.
- Student engagement.
- Very cool and kind. I enjoyed the class a lot!
- The greatest strengths that were beneficial to my learning were instructions and challenge.
- The class was very challenging so I had to thoroughly read through the chapters a few times before I wrote my class questions or took my quizzes. The exams were also very challenging because they covered a lot of material, but I learned a lot.
- Response times, Organization, Student feedback.
- Instructor support - it was helpful when he clarified concepts.
- Student engagement kept me engaged and entertained.
- interactions with the teacher.
- Grading, rapport.
- Instructions were beneficial to my learning because I had an understanding of what I needed to do.

- It was nice that the professor was there for us and took the time to answer our questions. Each class he would ask us if we had any questions and if we didn't he gave more detail about the assignments.
- The tests were great because we could show what we learned from the chapters but it wasn't right or wrong, we could actually show what we knew.
- Support.
- He's a really cool professor and doesn't make things complicated. He's experienced in marketing and he knows what he's talking about. He is good at teaching and knows how to connect with students. A professor I would not mind having again.
- Instructor Support and Organization. The way he would be interested on helping the students with the class and help them succeed with a good schedule of the work and assignments during the semester.
- Although the material was very informative and important, the quizzes were definitely a challenge to get perfect scores and to retain as much of the chapters on a weekly basis. Everything we did was to reinforce the material learned.
- He was always in class and gave great feedback on our class questions.
- Organization of the course was good; not too many crazy things to do every week.
- Professor xxxxxxx was passionate about what he was teaching, which made a sometimes dry topic enjoyable. I appreciated getting my grades back so quickly. Having him ready to answer any questions was also very reassuring.