Flipped Classroom – My Experiences with Undergraduate Marketing Classes

Raghu Kurthakoti
Arcadia University
kurthakotir@arcadia.edu

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

In this study, I would like to discuss my experiences with flipping undergraduate marketing classroom at various levels (introductory Vs. advanced courses). I have been experimenting flipping a classroom since Fall 2014 and the approach has gone through a few revisions. The study is intended to summarize my findings and make an attempt to develop a set of best practices that tend to work with undergraduates.

The first part of the study will discuss the initial iterations of classroom flipping. The second part identifies some of the issues (as seen by the instructor) that were limiting the class from deriving full benefits of flipping. The third part discusses the list of changes that were made to the flip technique (partly influenced by the ABSEL Workshop in 2016). The final part discusses the student response to the flipping experience (segregated by course level – introductory versus advanced) and based on student feedback and instructor reflection attempts to identify some practices that might yield more positive experiences and outcomes.

Initial implementation of flip and problems associated with the flip.

1. *Lectures provided online (slides, audio) – very detailed (ranging from 30-45 minutes long per topic)*
2. *Class time split between three things*
   α. *Class activities (1 case, 1 game, 2 assignment discussions, 1 model development)*
   β. *Brief Lectures (only discussed key points related to each module of the course)*
   χ. *Student led current event discussion – Each student was responsible for a marketing topic and was expected to present a current event related to their topic to the class and lead the class in a 15-20 minute meaningful discussion.*

Problems identified from the above approach

1. *Students would depend on the brief lecture for getting course content. Very few read/listened to online lectures and/or text book*
2. *Much of class time (almost 60%) being spent as non-flip and in a more traditional mode.*

Changes made in delivery based on the insights from the ABSEL workshop to address the problems

1. *Lectures provided online (slides, audio) – very detailed (ranging from 30-45 minutes long per topic)*
2. *Class time was spent in the following*
   α. *Class was divided into teams and each teams was assigned a module in marketing to prepare and reinforce 2-3 key concepts the class in one session (graded based on level of class involvement, clarity of information provided and creativity used to reinforce)*
   β. *Student led current events discussion - Each team was responsible for a marketing topic and was expected to present 3-4 current event articles related to their topic with a common underlying theme to the class and lead the class in meaningful discussion for the entire meeting period (1 hour).*
   χ. *Class activities (1 case, 2 games, 3 assignment discussions, 1 model development)*
   δ. *Last 4 sessions of the semester were used by the instructor to do brief catch up sessions related to key topics where students expressed having less clarity, but was done after tests to ensure that they would not rely on these catch up sessions for content*

Reception

Preliminary mid-semester student feedback indicates a mixed response to the approach. The introductory class had a slightly more negative response compared to upper level classes. This indicates that the approach might be a better fit for advanced courses rather than introductory courses. Some genuine concerns were however expressed at both levels and are being addressed. Student feedback is still being collected and analyzed. Detailed findings will be presented at ABSEL meeting in March 2017.