

MARKETING FACULTY AWARENESS OF THE NEED TO PUBLISH OR PERISH

William G. Browne, Boris W. Becker, College of Business
Oregon State University, Bexell Hall 200
Corvallis, OR 97331-2603, (503) 737-3490

ABSTRACT

Three times during the past fifteen years, the authors have surveyed Marketing Departments of the AACSB accredited schools. The major results of the Browne and Becker surveys (1977, 1979, 1985, 1991, and 1991) have been published in various journals and proceedings. The intent of the studies have been to gain some insight into the perceived quality of journals publishing manuscripts written by marketing faculty residing in the AACSB accredited business schools. A copy of the most recent Browne and Becker (1991) findings are contained in Table 1 which compares both the journal familiarity (awareness) and journal ranking scores for the three years 1977, 1985 and 1991. While one section of the questionnaire addressed the awareness/familiarity and quality assessment questions another section of the questionnaire addressed the history, current policy, and recent publishing records of responding departments. This research note was prepared to report the changes that have taken place during the 1977-1991 period.

The authors observed, as a byproduct of other research, that there have been changes both in the output of the AACSB member schools and their policies regarding participation in scholarly activities. The data generated from the surveys shows that there has been a change in the appreciation of the need to participate in meaningful scholarly research and generation of scholarly work among the AACSB accredited schools. The impact of the continued reminder of the AACSB standards has had an effect on the intent and output of the member schools.

BACKGROUND

To qualify for initial AACSB accreditation and to be reaccredited, schools have had to demonstrate that their faculties are participating in the forefront of their respective fields. In marketing, this is usually demonstrated by showing that a majority of the faculty members participate in research

programs generating results that either introduce new and meaningful marketing concepts or provides for the education or dissemination of proven and meaningful marketing concepts. The major intent of this requirement is to insure that a majority of the faculty in the school being accredited or reaccredited are up-to-date in their area of teaching responsibility. The AACSB and the member schools have been very aware of both the evolutionary and abrupt changes taking place in the business environment and want to assure the public that the teaching performances reflect the most current ideas.

The above may not have always been the case. When the business school entity became a major participant in undergraduate education, there was added need to translate the materials from the basic academic disciplines for use in the expanded business curricula. To do this, most business units hired practitioners and/or individuals with backgrounds in the supporting areas outside of business. Most of the faculty candidates at that time did not have PhDs in business, since such programs were very rare, as formal graduate majors in higher education. In many universities, marketing courses were taught in psychology, agriculture, home economics, business education, economics and other related areas. Thus, the initial faculties in business did not have a business or, better yet, a marketing degree. Many of those without business degrees who had research programs did not have results published in academic business journals (few existed).

As business schools and business curricula grew and matured, schools added PhD or DBA programs in business and many of the newer faculty did obtain terminal degrees in business. Initially, many of the universities offering PhDs in business did not emphasize research but rather the translation and application of the materials borrowed from the social sciences and sciences. In fact, the use of the DBA title was used, in part, to reflect a lesser demand on the research requirement of the final graduate study.

TABLE 1

Rank	1989 Journal Rankings Journal Title	Weight			Rankings		
		1989 n = 154	1984 n = 119	1977 n = 151	1989 n = 154	1984 n = 119	1977 n = 151
1	Journal of Marketing Research	1.26	1.20	1.41	1	2	1
2	Journal of Marketing	1.29	1.17	1.52	2	1	2
3	Journal of Consumer Research	1.45	1.35	1.74	3	3	6
4	Management Science	1.49	1.53	1.61	4	4	3
5	Operations Research	1.68	1.63	1.71	5	6	4
6	Harvard Business Review	1.74	1.55	1.71	6	5	5
7	Marketing Science	1.82	*	*	7	*	*
8	Journal of Business	1.94	1.84	1.77	8	8	7
9	Decision Science	2.00	1.91	2.18	9	9	12
10	Journal of Advertising Research	2.01	1.96	1.94	10	11	9
11	Journal of Retailing	2.01	2.07	2.25	11	13	15
12	Public Opinion Quarterly	2.11	1.94	1.88	12	10	8
13	Journal of Advertising	2.17	2.28	*	13	17	*
14	Journal of Business Research	2.20	2.24	2.50	14	15	20
15	Sloan Management Review	2.24	2.04	*	15	12	*
16	California Management Review	2.29	2.17	1.97	16	14	10
17	Journal of Mkg. Research Soc.	2.33	2.25	2.18	17	16	12
18	Journal of Int'l Business Stud.	2.37	2.50	2.62	18	21	27
19	J. of the Academy of Mkg. Sci.	2.38	2.70	2.82	19	30	32
20	Journal of Public Policy & Mkg	2.43	*	*	20	*	*
21	Journal of Industrial Economics	2.50	2.40	2.55	21	18	23
22	European Journal of Marketing	2.53	2.56	2.52	22	24	21
23	Transportation Journal	2.56	2.50	2.46	23	21	18
24	Journal of Macro Marketing	2.57	2.51	*	24	24	*
25	Industrial Marketing Management	2.58	2.57	2.97	25	26	34
26	Journal of International Mkg.	2.60	2.73	2.72	26	33	30
27	Logistics & Transportation Review	2.61	2.50	2.55	27	21	24
28	J. of Personal Selling & Sales Mgt.	2.61	2.99	*	28	38	*
29	Journal of Health Care Marketing	2.62	2.85	*	29	35	*
30	Psychology and Marketing	2.62	*	*	30	*	*
31	Journal of Consumer Affairs	2.63	2.57	2.59	31	27	26
32	Business Horizons	2.64	2.42	2.29	32	20	17
33	Int'l J. of Physical & Materials Mgt.	2.66	2.72	2.58	33	32	25
34	Journal of Product Innovation & Mgt.	2.66	*	*	34	*	*
35	Journal of Marketing Education	2.78	2.95	*	35	36	*
36	Journal of Services Marketing	2.78	*	*	36	*	*
37	Omega-Int'l of Management Science	2.78	2.40	2.69	37	29	29
38	Industrial Marketing	2.79	2.57	2.97	38	26	34
39	AMA Conference Proceedings	2.83	2.63	2.21	39	28	14
40	Journal of Consumer Marketing	2.83	*	*	40	*	*
41	Quarterly Review of Marketing	2.91	2.79	*	41	34	*
42	Journal of Leisure Research	3.12	3.10	*	42	39	*
43	Business Management	3.15	3.13	2.90	43	40	33
44	Business Topics	3.16	2.97	2.53	44	37	22
45	Marketing in Europe	3.17	3.19	3.03	45	41	36
46	Sales & Marketing Management	3.27	3.34	3.02	46	42	34
47	Direct Marketing	3.38	3.66	3.56	47	50	52
48	Akron Business & Economic Review	3.39	3.36	3.17	48	43	48
49	Baylor Business Review	3.47	3.51	3.48	49	45	50
50	Advertising Age	3.49	3.36	3.41	50	43	41
51	NC Review of Business & Economics	3.49	3.66	3.37	51	50	47
52	Marketing News	3.68	3.55	3.47	52	43	41

* Journal not present in that year's survey

Now, with most of the faculty trained in business and added interest in assuring a modern curriculum, there is an increased emphasis on the output

of scholarly work. This message has taken some time to affect many of the faculty and business school administrators. In some cases it may have

reached the faculty but the resources were not available to retrain an individual to participate in more scholarly activities. The last generation of retirements included many faculty who were not interested in, committed to, or funded for the research activities associated with today's comprehensive university.

METHOD

The original questionnaire was designed to measure the awareness and evaluation of journals publishing articles written by marketing faculty of AACSB accredited schools. Fifty four journal titles were listed and recipients were asked to indicate possible awareness or non-awareness of each title. They also rated, on a scale of 1 to 4, the perceived quality of each journal. At the end of the questionnaire each respondent was asked to answer questions associated with their department's publishing traditions and current practices. The journal evaluation results for each of the years surveyed were used to develop a weighted index expressing the overall evaluation of each journal published earlier by Browne and Becker (1991). The second set of questionnaire material was used to develop Tables 2 and 3 reported for the first time in this manuscript.

The subjects for this research consisted of chairmen of departments in which Marketing is housed in institutions accredited by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). A questionnaire was sent, addressed to "Chair of the Marketing Department," to the 263 AACSB-accredited schools in late September 1989. A cover letter explained the purpose of the study and stressed anonymity of all responses. Respondents were given the option of identifying themselves, however, if they desired a summary of the findings; their identification was used for no other purpose.

RESULTS

Of the 263 questionnaires mailed out in 1989, a total of 154 completed and used in this analysis. The final response rate was 59%, comparable to the 64% and 53% reported by Browne and Becker in 1977 and 1984 (Table 2). This response rate is relatively high for mail surveys and indicates an ongoing interest in the topic of journal evaluations and publishing trends.

TABLE 2

Sample of Marketing Departments of
AACSB Accredited Business Schools

	1977	1985	1991
Member Schools - AACSB	513	628	663
Accredited Schools - AACSB	235	226	263
Responses from Accredited Schools	151	119	151
% Response	64%	53%	57%

The four questions that are of interest in this report are listed, along with results of the three years, in Table 3. The responses speak for themselves. There has been a major impact on the views and policies at the departmental level in regard to the publishing record and departmental policy.

FINDINGS

There has been a noticeable increase of importance in publishing as a part of faculty evaluation (Table 3). This may be attributable in part to an increase in the number of chairs who have personally been involved in the research and publishing activity. It may also be a consequence of each school's interest in retaining AACSB accreditation. To increase the likelihood of individual performances in the research domain, the activity would have to be added to and emphasized as part of the faculty member's periodic evaluation. Thus, with the newer generation of experienced departmental leaders and the need to generate research results, participating in research programs becomes more universal.

The expanding number of publications should parallel changes in criteria discussed above. The number of publications, as reported by the chairs, has increased. Another factor causing this increase is the proliferation of journals printing academic articles in the marketing field. Many of these new journals have focused on specialized areas within marketing, while others have focused on new audiences. Of course some of the new audiences, and thus the journals, have been non-academic in nature.

The importance of publishing has not changed over the fourteen year span. Most marketing academics would agree that developing and disseminating new knowledge is both necessary and important. Many faculty and administration previously recognized the need but chose not to

TABLE 3

**Profile of Publishing Interests of Marketing Departments
From AACSB Accredited Schools**

A. Has publishing traditionally been important in faculty evaluation?

	1977 (n = 151)	1985 (n = 119)	1991 (n = 151)
Yes	59%	78%	89%
No	41%	22%	11%

B. Have a majority of your Marketing staff authored a journal article during the past year?

	1977 (n = 151)	1985 (n = 119)	1991 (n = 151)
Yes	58%	67%	83%
No	42%	33%	17%

C. Is publishing becoming more important?

	1977 (n = 151)	1985 (n = 119)	1991 (n = 151)
Yes	76%	89%	77%
No	24%	11%	27%

D. Does the formal reward structure at your school differentiate between "peer" publications and "practitioner" publications?

	1977 (n = 151)	1985 (n = 119)	1991 (n = 151)
Yes	60%	79%	96%
No	40%	21%	4%

participate in the development of the knowledge.

The response to the last question is interesting, in that administrators are not only observing and evaluating the number of publications published by faculty members, but they are looking at the content. Their evaluation includes, in part, the audience of a publication; peer and practitioner journals clearly are differentiated and almost certainly assigned different weights in the evaluation process.

CONCLUSIONS

There are an estimated 2400 full-time marketing faculty members in the 263 AACSB accredited business schools. In most accredited business schools the faculty member is required (for purposes of annual review and promotion/tenure decisions) to provide evidence of scholarly work. This evidence is most commonly demonstrated through the activity of publishing. Our research suggests that: 1) more marketing chairmen believe that research/publication is important in faculty evaluation; 2) More marketing faculty are engaged in research/publication; and 3) a greater distinction is being made between publication in peer and practitioner journals.

REFERENCES

- Browne, William G. and Boris W. Becker (1977), "Journal Awareness and Quality -- A Study of Academicians' View of Journals," 1977 American Marketing Association Educators' Conference Proceedings, 554.
- Browne, William G. and Boris W. Becker (1991), "Longitudinal Study of Marketing Journal Familiarity and Quality," 1991 American Marketing Association Educators' Conference Proceedings, 702-710.
- Browne, William G. and Boris W. Becker (1979), "Perceived quality of Marketing Journals," Journal of Marketing Education, 1 (November), 6-15.
- Browne, William G. and Boris W. Becker (1985), "Perception of Marketing Journals: Awareness and Quality Evaluations," 1985 American Marketing Association Educators' Conference Proceedings, Series No. 47, 149-154.
- Browne, William G. and Boris W. Becker (1991), "Quality Evaluations of Marketing Journals: Status and Trends," 1991 Western Marketing Educators' Conference Proceedings, 29-33.
- Dyckman, Thomas R. and Stephen A. Zeff (1984), "Two Decades of the Journal of Accounting Research," Journal of Accounting Research, 22 (Spring), 225-297.

Dymsze, William A. (1984), "Ten Years of JIBS at Rutgers Graduate School of Management," Journal of International Business Studies, 15 (Winter), 9-12.

Geistfeld, Loren V. and Rosemary Key (1986), "A Decade in Perspective 1975-1984: Focus and Trends in the Journal of Consumer Affairs," Journal of Consumer Affairs, 20 (Summer), 65-76.

Heck, Louis J., Cooley, Philip L., and Carl M. Hubbard (1986), "Contributing Authors and Institutions to the Journal of Finance: 1946-1985," The Journal of Finance, 41 (December), 1129-1140.

Hoverstad, Ronald, Ship, Shannon H., and Susan Higgins (1991), "Publishing in the Top Four Marketing Journals: 1980-89," Unpublished paper presented at the 1991 American Marketing Association Marketing Educators' Conference.

Leong, Siew Meng (1989), "A Citation Analysis of the Journal of Consumer Research," Journal of Consumer Research, 15 (March), 492-497.

Moore, James H. (1984), "Researching the Researchers: Who's Reading the Journal?" Journal of Advertising Research, 24 (June/July), 64-68.