

**TWENTY YEARS OF ADVANCES IN MARKETING EDUCATION:
A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF PAPERS PUBLISHED
IN THE WMEA PROCEEDINGS**

Bruce L. Stern, Portland State University, School of Business Administration, Portland, OR 97207-0751; 503-725-3702; Craig A. Kelley California State University, Department of Management, Sacramento, CA 95819-6088; 916-278-7199; Niki Hawkins, Jennifer Sweeney, Annette Cragg, Nha Tran, Melanie Stratton, Portland State University, School of Business Administration, Portland, OR 97207-0751; 503-725-3702

ABSTRACT

All fields of inquiry need to do a self-assessment by periodically examining where they have been and where they are going. This study reports the results of a content analysis of 20 years of the Western Marketing Educators' Association's (WMEA) Proceedings from 1981 through 2000. The investigation examined contributions by individual authors and institutions. The analysis also examined how the topical coverage has changed over the years. Insights into the state-of-the-art in marketing education are offered.

INTRODUCTION

All fields of inquiry need to periodically take stock of where they have been and assess what research needs to be emphasized in the future. Since 1977 the WMEA has held an annual conference with the purpose of reporting and discussing current pedagogical research. Starting in 1981, the best papers submitted for competitive review have been published (either in their entirety or as an abstract), in a Proceedings. The membership of WMEA recently decided to change its name to the Marketing Educators' Association (MEA) and become national in scope. Therefore, it is time to determine what has been learned about the field of marketing education and where future studies should focus. The purpose of this study is to report the results of a content analysis of 20 years of WMEA Conference Proceedings from 1981 through 2000 with the intent to identify major contributors, contributing institutions and past topical coverage. Based on the results of the study, recommendations for future research in marketing education are offered.

LITERATURE REVIEW

There have been several studies published in a number of business disciplines that focus on the historical contributions contained in academic journals and proceedings in a particular discipline. In most cases, a content analysis was used to assess contributions categorized by author, institution, size of department, academic rank and/or topic. For example, Henry and Burch (1974) reported the

results of an analysis of general business and management research productivity. Dyl and Lilly (1985) profiled contributors to the accounting discipline. Heck and Cooley (1988) reported both author and institution contributions in 15 finance journals. Stead (1978) reported the results of a review of *The Journal of Business Communication* between 1963 and 1974. Reinsch and Lewis (1993) continued Stead's inquiry and completed a content analysis of the articles that appeared in *The Journal of Business Communication* from 1978 through 1992. Altman et al. (1997) reviewed 20 years of articles that appeared in the *Journal of Banking and Finance*.

In the advertising field, Yale and Gilly (1988) analyzed the advertising research published in six marketing-oriented journals between 1976 and 1985. Specifically, they classified articles by empirical and statistical methods used and by type of sample employed. Barry (1990) evaluated three major advertising journals from the dates of their inception through the end of 1989. His results included the contribution by journal and frequency of appearance by institution, author and authors' academic rank.

In marketing, Helgeson et al. (1984) classified the key variables in the consumer behavior literature published between 1950 and 1981 in ten selected journals. Clark (1985) content analyzed articles published in eight leading marketing journals between 1983 and 1984. He measured and ranked the productivity of institutional contributors and developed an active faculty index. Clark, Hancock and Kaminski (1987) evaluated the contributions of the *Journal of Marketing Research* from 1964 to 1985. They reported author and institutional productivity and whether a professor or a businessperson wrote an article. Randall, Miles and Randall (1999) reported the results of contributions to the *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*. Most recently, Bakir, Vitell and Rose (2000) reported the research productivity of marketing scholars and departments by analyzing six major marketing journals from 1991 to 1998.

Stern (1992) performed the study most relevant to this study by content analyzing the first 11 volumes of the WMEA Proceedings (1981-1991) and reporting the results according to contribution by author,

institution, subject matter, and article length. He also classified the articles as either conceptual or empirical. The current study seeks to extend Stern's study by conducting a content analysis of all 20 volumes of the WMEA Proceedings.

METHODOLOGY

All 20 issues of WMEA Proceedings from 1981 to 2000 were content analyzed by a group of trained, objective judges. Only the competitive papers in the Proceedings (633 total) were content analyzed. Two judges examined the competitive papers from each Proceeding and recorded data on author and institution identity, type (abstract or full paper, conceptual or empirical), and topic of article. Most of the judges' decisions were straightforward (e.g., author name, institution and type of article). The analysis also required the judges to evaluate the content of the article. In the event the two judges could not agree on any classification a third judge broke the tie. Interjudge reliability was 92.4%. The judges did not initially agree on the categorization of 48 articles--mostly for topical content.

Two measures were computed when examining the frequency of appearance by author and institution. First, the raw appearances were recorded and reported. For example, if an article was co-authored by two persons from the same institution each author was listed with a frequency of one. Second, adjusted frequency scores were computed to provide additional insight. The adjusted frequency score was originally suggested by Lindsey (1980). If an author or institution was part of a co-authored article, each author (and institution) was given a 0.5 adjusted score. If there were three co-authors, each author and institution received a 0.33 adjusted score. The same adjustment formula was applied to articles co-authored by four or more authors.

RESULTS

Contributions by Author

A listing of authors with five or more appearances is shown in Table 1. Forty-three authors appeared five or more times in the twenty years that WMEA has published proceedings. Craig Kelley had the most appearances. Frequent authors in rank order were Fred Morgan (13), Stuart Van Auken (11), Bruce Stern (11), William Browne (10) and Helena Czepiec (10). The adjusted scores reflect the degree of co-authorship by each author. Here the research productivity by Kelley and Morgan are much closer, reflecting a greater number of sole-authored papers by Morgan. A somewhat different ranking would result based on the adjusted score for each author.

TABLE 1
Frequency Of Contributions By Author
(1981-2000)

Author	1981-2000	
	Number of Appearances	Adjusted Score*
Craig A. Kelley	17	10.05
Fred W. Morgan	13	9.50
Stuart Van Auken	11	7.99
Bruce L. Stern	11	5.99
William G. Browne	10	5.49
Helena Czepiec	10	4.14
Sharyne Merritt	9	8.50
Regina P. Schlee	9	7.16
Curt Dommeyer	9	6.83
Joseph L. Orsini	8	7.00
Gary L. Karns	8	5.66
Charles S. Sherwood	8	4.33
John Gottko	8	4.33
David E. McNabb	8	3.99
Dennis E. Clayson	7	6.00
William A. Cohen	7	6.00
Kyung-II Ghymn	7	5.50
Arthur Salzman	7	4.58
Leon Winer	6	6.00
Nancy T. Frontczak	6	5.00
Bruce J. Walker	6	4.83
Nina M. Ray	6	3.49
Robert J. Zimmer	6	3.00
Michael J. Swenson	6	2.24
Denney E. McCorkle	6	1.74
Joe F. Alexander	6	1.74
Juantia Roxas	6	1.59
Farrokh Safavi	5	5.00
Paul Hugstad	5	5.00
Karl A. Bodecker	5	3.50
Michael K. Mills	5	3.50
Boris W. Becker	5	3.00
Jay L. Laughlin	5	2.83
Dennis Guseman	5	2.73
Nabil Y. Razzouk	5	2.66
William R. Wynd	5	2.66
Linda R. Stanley	5	2.50
Robert A. Lupton	5	2.50
Beverly A. Browne	5	2.49
Richard D. Nordstrom	5	2.33
Gary McCain	5	2.16
Rajiv Vaidyanathan	5	2.08
Patricia Hopkins	5	1.31

* = Score of 1 for single authored article; .50 for a two-authored article.

From 1981 through 1990 there were 22 authors who appeared in the Proceedings at least 4 times. The number of authors contributing to the WMEA Proceedings from 1991 through 2000 was 371. They

wrote a combined total of 234 articles. Thirty-two authors appeared at least four times during this period. The top ranking authors made 171 appearances, while their aggregated adjusted score was 101.32. There was an increase in co-authorship over the 1981 to 1990 time period.

surprising given the fact that the WMEA conference has a strong education focus.

Contributions by Institution

The authors' institution affiliation is shown in Table 2. Contributing authors with 7 or more appearances represented 36 different schools. Five of the top 6 schools (all with 20 or more appearances) are part of the California State University system, which is by far the largest system in the Western region. The top contributing schools were California State University, Fullerton; Oregon State University; California State University, Sacramento; and California Polytechnic University, Pomona. The ranking of contributing institutions would be slightly different if the adjusted score was used.

Empirical vs. Conceptual

Greater insight into the types of articles included in the WMEA Proceedings was achieved by having the judges classify the articles as either empirical or conceptual. The analysis of the entire span of 20 years found that approximately 53% of the articles were empirical versus about 47% conceptual. These percentages contrast with what Stern (1992) reported for the first 11 years of the WMEA Proceedings (60% conceptual and 40% empirical). It is possible the shift away from conceptual articles may be due to a change in the subject matter studied or author - reviewer preferences.

Abstract vs. Full Paper

The articles were classified as abstracts (one page) or full paper (two or more pages). Only two page abstracts were published during the first two years of the Proceedings (44 total). Since 1983, authors had the choice of publishing the full article or an abstract of the article. Stern (1992) reported that between 1981 and 1991, 59.1% of the articles in the WMEA Proceedings were published as full papers. In the entire 20 year span of the Proceedings 60% of the articles were published as full papers.

Contribution by Subject Matter

The subject matter of the articles published in the WMEA Proceedings is reported in Table 3. Subjects of articles were analyzed into two periods. Teaching techniques was the number one topic covered by articles in both time periods. This finding is not

TABLE 2
Frequency Of Appearance By Institution
(1981-2000)

<u>Institution</u>	1981-2000	
	<u>Number of Appearances*</u>	<u>Adjusted Score**</u>
Cal St. Univ. Fullerton	26	21.33
Oregon St. Univ.	24	21.16
Cal St. Univ. Sacramento	24	19.80
Cal Poly Pomona	23	22.47
Cal St. Univ. San Bernardino	22	16.88
Cal St. Univ. Northridge	21	18.50
San Jose St. Univ.	18	17.50
Portland St. Univ.	18	16.85
Arizona St. Univ.	17	14.83
Cal St. Univ. Chico	15	13.25
Cal. St. Univ. Hayward	15	12.00
Cal St. Univ. Los Angeles	14	12.33
Seattle Pacific Univ.	14	11.50
Colorado St. Univ.	13	10.75
Metropolitan St. College	12	12.00
Boise St. Univ.	12	11.83
Cal St. Univ. Long Beach	12	11.00
Seattle Univ.	12	8.76
Cal St. Univ. Fresno	11	11.00
Univ. of Nevada - Reno	11	10.00
Wayne St. Univ.	11	10.00
Univ. of Nevada-Las Vegas	11	8.00
Brigham Young Univ.	11	7.83
New Mexico St. Univ.	10	9.66
San Diego St. Univ.	10	7.83
Univ. of Northern Iowa	9	8.50
Northern Arizona Univ.	9	7.33
San Francisco St. Univ.	9	7.00
Univ. of San Francisco	9	7.00
Eastern Washington Univ.	8	7.00
Pacific Luthern Univ.	8	6.33
Cal St. Univ. Bakersfield	7	7.00
Univ. of San Diego	7	6.50
Univ. of Northern Colorado	7	5.50

* = Number of times an article from a specific institution appeared.

** = If an article was authored by one or more authors, all from the same institution it would receive a score of 1; if an article was co-authored by two persons from different institutions then each institution would receive a score of .5, etc.

The subject matter of articles definitely shows an ebb and flow to the timely topics in marketing education. For example, many schools focused on the integration of international marketing into the marketing curriculum during the 1980s and early 1990s. Hence, there were a number of articles in the 1981 to 1990 time period that examined various aspects of international marketing. However, as programs assimilated international marketing into their curricula, fewer articles appeared on the subject in the 1991 to 2000 time period. The marketing of services, legal issues in marketing, advertising research, retailing, marketing theory, and pc's and

software are other examples of subjects that generated a great deal of interest in the 1980s but waned in the 1990s. Core concepts such as consumer behavior, advertising and marketing strategy also experienced a drop between the first and second halves of the Proceedings' life.

Subjects that gained in popularity in the 1990s were evaluation of students and marketing educators, modifying the marketing curriculum, challenges for marketing departments and career development for marketing students. The interest in these topics can be directly traced to the mission-driven standards adopted by AACSB in 1992, which required schools and faculty to demonstrate improvement. Hence, WMEA papers reflected the new emphasis as authors share their ideas and experiences in addressing the new standards. Other subjects that appeared in greater numbers in the 1990s were cross cultural/diversity issues, attitudes of students and distance learning.

Lastly, the Internet became a hot topic in the 1990s as the subject of technology shifted from how to use computer hardware and software to the use of the interactive Internet technology and e-commerce.

TABLE 3
Subject Matter Of Articles

<u>Subject</u>	<u>1981-1990</u> <u>Appear-</u> <u>ances</u>	<u>1991-2000</u> <u>Appear-</u> <u>ances</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Appear-</u> <u>ances</u>
Teaching Techniques	46	38	84
Other Topics	28	36	64
International Marketing	29	23	52
Evaluation of Educators	14	22	36
Evaluation of Students	8	22	30
Career Development for Marketing Students	7	21	28
Curriculum Issues	10	18	28
Consumer Behavior	17	5	22
Pc's and Software	16	5	21
Legal Issues	15	4	19
Marketing of Services	13	6	19
Marketing Strategy	11	6	17
Social Issues	9	8	17
Attitudes of Students	4	12	16
Cultural/Diversity	3	13	16
Personal Selling/Sales Management	8	8	16
Challenges for Marketing Depts.	1	14	15
Advertising Research	12	2	14
Groups & Teams	2	12	14
Business Ethics	5	8	13
Research Techniques and Results	7	6	13
Teaching Market Research	5	7	12
Mktg. Theory & Practice	9	2	11
Retail Marketing	9	2	11
Using Case Studies	2	6	8
Internet Issues	0	7	7
Non-Profit Marketing	3	4	7
Decision-Making	5	1	6
Direct Marketing	4	2	6
Distance Learning	0	5	5
Marketing of Colleges	2	3	5
Distribution Channels	3	1	4

DISCUSSION

The WMEA Proceedings reflect where marketing education has been in the past and where it may lead in the future. The results of this study show that productivity by authors and institutions vary over time. This variance is most likely due to where authors are in their careers. It appears that earlier in one's career a greater number of articles are published in the WMEA Proceedings. Productivity by institutions appears to change depending on what may qualify as research at a particular institution over time. For example, in the first half of the WMEA Proceedings, the faculty at Arizona State University contributed frequently. However, the research emphasis at ASU shifted to top tiered journals in the late 1980s and there was a corresponding drop in published articles in the WMEA Proceedings.

The shift toward empirical articles is somewhat expected for a couple of reasons. First, recent authors early in their careers may have a greater familiarity and comfort with empirical studies. The reason may be that doctoral programs stress empirical aspects of research rather than the conceptual. Second, many of these same authors serve as reviewers of WMEA submissions and may have a bias toward defining research as empirical rather than conceptual.

THE FUTURE OF MARKETING EDUCATION

From a historical perspective, analyzing the past provides a window into where marketing education may be headed in the future. The real contribution of the present study is to suggest where marketing education may be headed and make recommendations for future research.

It is clear from these results that contributions of individual marketing educators and institutions change over time. Ten years from now the ranking of authors in Table 1 will be different as individual academic careers run through a life cycle. Furthermore, topics covered over the next ten years will focus on the issues occupying business at the time.

The "bias" toward empirical studies exemplified in the second half of the WMEA Proceedings is likely to continue as the need to provide empirical supporting evidence for ideas has gripped the academic profession.

It is unclear what impact the change of the name of WMEA to MEA will have in the future. Hopefully, the conference will broaden to include marketing educators from throughout the U.S. and the world. The broadening of the membership may lead to an expansion of the ideas that marketing educators might consider in their teaching and research efforts.

Future Research

Many areas of marketing education continue to be worthy of investigation by marketing educators. The following list is offered as a sample of the research topics that may be investigated in the next few years.

1. Integration of E-marketing. This evolving technology has attracted the research interest of many educators. A quick look at the papers presented at recent marketing conferences will tell you that the Internet is a timely topic. Specifically, research needs to be done on issues related to how to integrate E-commerce into the marketing curriculum. Should it be a separate class or incorporated into the existing courses in the marketing curriculum?

2. Role of marketing education. Periodically marketing scholars have asked the question, "What is the role of marketing education in a broad business education context?" Are the needs of graduates and business being served by today's curricula? What changes need to be made in the marketing curricula?

What are the barriers to change and how can they be overcome?

3. Role of marketing educators. The role of marketing educators has been, and will continue to be discussed at many conferences. What is the "proper" mix of scholarship and teaching? Have marketing educators had any impact on the way business is conducted? What changes must marketing educators make to increase their impact in the way business is conducted in the U.S. and in foreign countries?

4. Marketing curriculum. The WMEA proceedings indicate the marketing curriculum has undergone change over the past 20 years. International marketing, TQM, services marketing and E-commerce are all examples of topics that have had a profound influence on the marketing curriculum. Marketing educators need to be vigilant to insure currency of the marketing curriculum. What new developments in other fields might have impact on the marketing curriculum? What attempts to integrate traditional business disciplines (e.g., accounting, finance, operations) also have been incorporated into the marketing curriculum?

5. Role of marketing departments. A major contributor to the success of the efforts of marketing educators is related to the leadership of marketing departments and business schools. Specific questions include, how have marketing departments and business schools adapted to changes in the way organizations conduct business? Do the leaders of marketing departments and business schools possess the skills necessary to manage in today's changing business environment? What should be the role of the marketing department in advancing the interest of a business school?

6. Ethical decision-making. Credibility is still the key to doing business. Much work remains to be done when it comes to student perceptions/ actions related to controversial ethical issues. Do the ends justify the means, especially with regard to enhancing earnings or product positioning?

7. Student assessment. AACSB standards require accredited business programs to assess what their students know. Already there is research on how to assess student outcomes (e.g., Ahmadi, Blake, Kelley and Takeuchi 1999). What is the relative effectiveness of different methods of assessment? When should assessment measures be taken? How should assessment results be incorporated into the marketing curriculum?

8. Employer perceptions of marketing graduates.

Employer assessments of student readiness for a business career have been the focus of many studies (e.g., Kelley and Gaedeke 1991). Have marketing educators made any progress in improving employer perceptions of student preparation for the business world? What remains to be done? How should new skills and knowledge requirements be integrated into the marketing curriculum?

REFERENCES

- Ahmadi, Hamid, Herbert Blake, Craig A. Kelley and Laurence Takuechi (1999), "Linking Mission and Goals with Learning Outcomes to Satisfy AACSB Standards," in *Western Marketing Educators' Conference Proceedings*, edited by Mary Curren and Katrin Harich, p. 116.
- Altman, Edward, Marshall Samat, Tony Saunders and Giorgio Sezego (1997), "Retrospective Evaluation (1976-1996) Journal of Banking and Finance," *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 21 (9), 1197-1208.
- Bakir, Aysen, Scott J. Vitell and Gregory M. Rose (2000), "Publications in Major Marketing Journals: An Analysis of Scholars and Marketing Departments," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 22 (August), 99-107.
- Barry, Thomas E. (1990), "Publication Productivity in the Three Leading U.S. Advertising Journals: Inaugural Issues Through 1988," *Journal of Advertising*, 19 (1), 52-60.
- Clark, Gary L. (1985), "Productivity Ratings of Institutions Based on Publication in Eight Marketing Journals: 1983-1984," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 7 (Fall), 12-23.
- Clark, Gary L., William Hancock, and Peter F. Kaminski (1987), "An Analysis of Leading Contributors to the *Journal of Marketing Research*: 1964-1985," in *AMA Educators' Proceedings*, Susan P. Douglas, et al, eds., Chicago: American Marketing Association (August), 250-253.
- Dyl, E. A. and M. S. Lilly (1985), "A Note on Institutional Contributions to the Accounting Literature," *Accounting Organizations and Society*, 10 (2), 171-175.
- Heck, J.L. and P.L. Cooley (1988), "Most Frequent Contributors to the Finance Literature," *Financial Management*, 17 (3), 100-108.
- Helgeson, James G., E. Alan Kluge, John Mager and Cheri Taylor (1984), "Trends in Consumer Behavior Literature: A Content Analysis," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10 (March), 449-454.
- Henry, W. R. and E. E. Burch (1974), "Institutional Contributions to Scholarly Journals and Business," *The Journal of Business*, 47 (January), 56-66.
- Kelley, Craig A., and Ralph M. Gaedeke (1990). "Student and Employer Evaluation of Hiring Criteria for Entry-level Marketing Positions," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 12 (Fall), pp. 64-71.
- Lindsey, Duncan (1980), "Production and Citation Measure in the Sociology of Science: The Problem of Multiple Authorship," *Social Studies of Science*, 10, 145-62.
- Randall, E. James, Morgan P. Miles and Cindy H. Randall (1999), "The Inception and Growth of the Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice," *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 7 (Fall), 1-15.
- Reinsch, Jr., N. L. and Phillip V. Lewis (1993), "Author and Citation Patterns for the Journal of Business Communication, 1978-1992," 30 (October), 435-462.
- Stead, Bette A. (1978), "A Content Analysis of the Journal of Business Communication: Toward a Body of Knowledge," *The Journal of Business Communication*, 15 (Winter), 45-52.
- Stern, Bruce L. (1992), "The WMEA Proceedings: An Eleven Year Retrospective," in *Proceedings of the Western Marketing Educators' Conference*, edited by Craig A. Kelley and Gary Karns, 92- 95.
- Yale, Laura and Mary C. Gilly (1988), "Trends in Advertising Research: A Look at the Content of Marketing-Oriented Journals from 1976-1983," *Journal of Advertising*, 17 (1), 12-22.