

Review of: "The Myth of the Liberal Arts vs. National Universities Divide: A Marketing Strategy"

Rand Irshaidat1

1 Independent researcher

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In my opinion, while this is a timely and interesting topic to explore, the piece does not satisfy basic academic rubrics. First and foremost, the entire article lacks in-text citations. There are numerous assertions in the article that read like opinions despite being stated as facts. These cannot be reliable in an academic context without actual citations. Secondly, even though the article mentions where the data was extracted from, it fails to clarify and justify significant methodical elements, including what the population of the study is, what the research approach is, the sample type, the sample size, and the data collection method, and link these to the main research objective. Another significant lack is the analysis approach. What is the mechanism or approach used to arrive at the main findings of liberal arts being disconnected from technical and professional fields? This conclusion reads as a predetermined supposition by the author and does not reflect sufficient validity on which more research can be built. More importantly, contrary to the headlines, I pinpointed zero marketing strategies. There are lots of marketing approaches that can be scrutinized in line with the research objective, but the author briefly mentioned a few marketing terms like promotion or branding without actual investigation into marketing tactics being adopted in universities for the liberal arts programs, and alternatively did not suggest a proper marketing scheme, despite numerous tactics in the marketing literature that could serve the research question. Therefore, the overall conclusion is that the paper presents an interesting inquiry, but it majorly lacks following a scientific approach in arriving at credible and reliable findings, and is in need of major revisions of the entire approach.

Qeios ID: XNEUJ9 · https://doi.org/10.32388/XNEUJ9