

IDENTIFYING THE IDEAL ATTRIBUTES OF A MARKETING EDUCATOR

Franck Vigneron, California State University, Northridge, Department of Marketing, College of Business and Economics, 18111 Nordhoff Street, Northridge, CA 91330-8377

ABSTRACT

Following administrative pressure, most universities and colleges have made a requirement to independently develop their own teaching evaluation process and a great amount of research has focused on how to better develop effective peer and student evaluations. Little is known about what are the important attributes for a practitioner when evaluating a teacher. Due to the new requirements coming from accreditation associations such as AACSB to increase the quotas of professionally qualified faculty in the curriculum, one would expect that the current perspectives on measuring teaching effectiveness be reevaluated. This research identifies the attributes of an ideal marketing educator according to students, academics and practitioners.

INTRODUCTION

Faculty and students may have different perceptions of what constitutes a good teacher. Previous research tells us that faculty members are questioning the use of students to measure teaching effectiveness, formally named student evaluations of teaching (SET). Most of the research to date has developed instruments to measure SET or to help the peer review process but little is known about the practitioner point of view. Other observers' perspectives may be anticipated when looking at the important teaching attributes from a practitioner's point of view. The objective of this consumer research is to identify the perceived characteristics of an ideal marketing educator according to the perspectives of students, academics and practitioners. Thus, what are the characteristics that students, instructors, and practitioners expect from a marketing instructor and how different or similar are these expectations among the respondents?

Thus, this research defines the eight attributes that make up the ideal marketing educator from the perspectives of students, academics, and practitioners. We reviewed the interactions between the attributes and for each viewpoint.

CONCLUSION

The contribution of this research is to revisit the attributes of an ideal marketing instructor and to bring up the perspectives of practitioners, as well as offer a combined model of the top eight attributes resulting

from a diverging viewpoint. The findings from this research are based upon the inputs from students, practitioners, and academics. Results from this study can benefit the academics in developing valid measures of teaching effectiveness but also when hiring new instructors. This ideal set of attributes may enhance the students' experience and move them in a more active learning role. Finally, practitioners and professionally qualified instructors could gain visibility with this new set of attributes.

REFERENCES

- Cashin, William E. 1999. Student ratings of teaching: uses and misuses. In *Changing practices in evaluating teaching*, ed. Peter Seldin. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Cooke, Lynne, and Susan Mings. 2005. Connecting usability education and research with industry needs and practices. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication* 48 (3): 296-304.
- DeZure, Deborah. 1999. Evaluating teaching through peer classroom observation. In *Changing practices in evaluating teaching*, ed. Peter Seldin, 70-96. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Feldman, K. A. 1989. The association between student ratings of specific instructional dimensions and student achievement: Refining and extending the synthesis of data from multisection validity studies. *Research in Higher Education* 30(6): 583-645.
- Frank, Gary B., and Steven A. Fisher 1989. Can you teach what you practice? *The Woman CPA* 51(1): 14-19.
- Greenwald, Anthony G. 1997. Validity concerns and usefulness of student ratings of instruction. *American Psychologist* 52(11): 1182-86.
- Smart, Denise T., Craig A. Kelley, and Jeffrey S. Conant. 2003. Mastering the art of teaching: Pursuing excellence in the new millennium. *Journal of Marketing Education* 25 (April): 71-78.