

ROLE OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL PROCEEDINGS IN THE FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESS

Kenneth E. Clow, Department of Management and Marketing, Pittsburg State University,
Pittsburg, Kansas 66762, (316) 235-4588

David L. Kurtz, College of Business Administration, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701

ABSTRACT

As the importance of publishing continues to increase, the role of national and regional proceedings in the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure will also receive additional attention. This research indicated the quality of national proceeding publications are equivalent to the second tier of marketing journals. National proceedings appear to be a viable representation of scholarly activity. However, regional proceedings were not considered as viable outlets of scholar activity in terms of promotion and tenure decisions.

INTRODUCTION

Promotion and tenure are topics of vital concern to every marketing professor. Lack of clear cut guidelines has lead most institutions to regard research as the primary dimension for the evaluation of marketing faculty (Lusch and Laczniaik 1976). This may be due, in part, to the fact that less than 50% of the marketing departments have actual written policies and guidelines concerning promotion and tenure (Beltramini, Schlacter, and Kelley 1985).

The 'publish or perish' pressure on marketing faculty appears to be increasing as more schools seek ACCSB accreditation and the schools which have accreditation strive to improve their standings among business schools. For many of these schools, only publications in the first or second tier of marketing journals are seen as being prestige enough for promotion and tenure (Beltramini, Schlacter, and Kelley 1985). Although discrepancies occur among which journals are second tier, first tier is almost always considered to be the Journal of Marketing, the Journal of Marketing Research, and the Journal of Consumer Research.

Ninety-two percent of the marketing chairs at ACCSB institutions reported that the importance of both quality and quantity of publications has increased over the last ten years and is expected to continue increasing in the future (Coe and Weinstock 1983). Because space is limited in the premiere journals, the competition among marketing scholars has increased reducing the accep-

tance rates. As marketing faculty face increasing pressure to publish and as acceptance rates of marketing journals continue to decline, increased pressure is and will be applied to marketing chairpersons, deans, and other individuals on promotion and tenure committees to consider proceeding publications in the evaluation of marketing faculty's scholar contribution. The addition of a number of marketing-related journals available for research publication has not decreased the pressure to utilize proceedings as part of the faculty evaluation processes (Jeon and Brazeal 1989).

The purpose of this research was to investigate the attitude of marketing faculty towards both national and regional marketing proceedings and their use in faculty evaluations for promotion and tenure decisions. If national and regional proceedings are to be used for faculty evaluation, how much should they count and how do they compare, in quality, to the marketing journals available for publication? Finally, what impact do marketing faculty have on their dean's evaluation of marketing proceedings and does the size of school impact the opinions of marketing faculty towards the use of proceedings in faculty evaluations?

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Attendance at national and regional conferences is motivated by at least four factors. First is the presentation of a paper. Second, conferences provide the opportunity to interact among colleagues. Third, conferences become a source of new ideas for future research or modification of current research. Fourth, for individuals working together on research who teach at different institutions, conferences often provide the opportunity to work out research agenda items that are difficult to do over the telephone.

Authorship in the top marketing journals appear to be dominated by a select list of schools (Mobley and Ibrahim 1989). For example, 60% of the articles in Journal of Marketing and 58% of the articles in Journal of Marketing Research were authored by professors from only 27 different schools. All are schools with prestige schools of business, large number of students, and relatively large business and marketing

faculty. However, schools vary in terms of importance of research, which journals are acceptable for evaluations, and the importance of quality versus quantity (Burnett, Amason, and Cunningham 1989). Because the number of articles accepted by first and second tier journals are limited and tend to be dominated by the larger schools, the attitude of faculty towards both national and regional proceedings should be effected by school and faculty size. The larger schools, if proceedings are allowed as acceptable outlets, will value national proceedings higher than regional proceedings. The reverse should be true for smaller schools.

If proceedings are viable outlets for marketing research, then the relative quality of these proceedings should be ascertained. Publication acceptance rates and studies conducted on the quality of the various marketing journals would indicate that national proceedings would probably not be on the same level as either the first or second tier marketing journals (Michman, Greco, and Hocking 1989; Browne and Becker 1992).

As the evaluation of national and regional proceedings by marketing faculty increases, the push to use these proceedings in promotion and tenure decisions should also increase. In addition, as the evaluation of national and regional proceedings by marketing faculty increases, it should impact the rating their deans have for the respective proceedings.

What impact do marketing faculty have on the attitudes of deans toward national and regional proceedings? What effect will this impact have upon the dean's opinion towards the use of proceedings in the evaluation of marketing faculty up for promotion or tenure? Both questions are vital, especially since the majority of business deans do not have marketing backgrounds and may be unfamiliar with marketing journals and proceedings. If proceedings are to be used in faculty evaluations, what percentage should they count? Is this percentage effected by the attitude of the dean or marketing faculty towards the use of national proceedings for evaluations?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Two hundred and fifty questionnaires were mailed out to colleges and universities. A total of 115 useable responses were obtained resulting in a response rate of 46% percent. The data were analyzed using the econometric procedures of LISREL 7 as outlined by

Joreskog and Sorbom (1989). Although the data is not time series, the econometric procedure was deemed appropriate. First, the questionnaire design limited the development of latent constructs. Second, and more importantly, the relationships of individual test items were desired which is permissible only with the econometric procedures of LISREL. Third, the simultaneous equation procedures permit the analysis of very complex models with many inter-relationships among individual test items. (See TABLE 1 for identification of exogenous and endogenous variables). Fourth, the holistic theoretical foundation of the simultaneous equation procedures allows for the testing of theories and hypotheses with all factors considered. Often relationships can be found when variables are examined in isolation but when considered holistically, the relationship may be overpowered by other much stronger relationships or they may not exist at all.

TABLE 1
Exogenous and Endogenous Variables

Greek Identification	Description
ξ_1	Attendance at national conferences
ξ_2	Reading national proceedings
ξ_3	Number of students at university
ξ_4	Number of students in business school
ξ_5	Number of students in marketing
ξ_6	Number of faculty in business school
ξ_7	Number of faculty in marketing department
ξ_8	Attendance at regional conferences
ξ_9	Reading regional proceedings
η_1	Rating of national proceedings by faculty
η_2	Should national proceedings count in evaluations (marketing faculty)
η_3	Rating of national proceedings by dean
η_4	Should national proceedings count in evaluations (dean)
η_5	Percentage proceedings should count (faculty)
η_6	Percentage proceedings should count (dean)
η_7	Rating of regional proceedings by faculty
η_8	Should regional proceedings count in evaluations (marketing faculty)
η_9	Rating of regional proceedings by dean
η_{10}	Should regional proceedings count in evaluations (dean)
η_{11}	Rating of national proceedings to 1st tier journals
η_{12}	Rating of national proceedings to 2nd tier journals
η_{13}	Rating of national proceedings to 3rd tier journals

RESEARCH RESULTS

The Γ and β standardized coefficients from the

LISREL analysis are reported in TABLE 2. The goodness-of-fit index (GFI) of .819 and the adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI) of .776 would appear to be adequate for hypotheses testing in terms of significant paths. The Chi-Square value was 323.65 with 164 degrees of freedom.

TABLE 2

Lisrel Parameter	Standardized Solution	T-Value
Y ₁₁	0.018	0.194
Y ₁₂	0.213**	2.185
Y ₁₃	0.149	1.322
Y ₁₄	0.320**	2.287
Y ₁₅	0.089	0.581
Y ₁₆	-0.276	-2.291
Y ₁₇	-0.191	-1.235
Y ₇₃	0.008	0.065
Y ₇₄	-0.216	-1.477
Y ₇₆	0.264*	1.647
Y ₇₆	-0.049	-0.384
Y ₇₇	-0.102	-0.620
Y ₇₈	0.138	1.275
Y ₇₉	-0.171*	-1.735
B ₂₁	0.597***	7.620
B ₃₁	0.556***	6.857
B ₁₁₁	-0.110	-1.138
B ₁₂₁	0.229**	2.414
B ₁₃₁	0.015	0.156
B ₄₂	0.193**	2.059
B ₄₃	0.208**	2.217
B ₅₂	0.460***	5.615
B ₅₈	-0.287***	-3.506
B ₆₂	0.009	0.106
B ₆₄	0.264***	2.988
B ₆₈	0.315***	3.130
B ₆₁₀	-0.101	-1.005
B ₈₇	0.221**	2.321
B ₉₇	0.004	0.046
B ₁₀₈	0.471***	5.983
B ₁₀₈	-0.317***	-4.029

$\chi^2 = 323.65$ with 164 df * Significant at $p < .10$
 GFI = 0.819 ** Significant at $p < .05$
 AGFI = 0.776 *** Significant at $p < .01$

In terms of national proceedings, actual reading of the articles published in the proceedings had a positive impact on how national proceedings were rated in terms of quality. The more an individual read national proceedings, the higher they rated the quality of the articles.

With regional proceedings, an interesting phenomena occurred. The more the published regional proceedings were read, the lower the rating of quality. It would appear that the overall quality of material in the proceedings of regional conferences is considered to

be inferior to that found in national proceedings.

The number of students in business schools was positively related to the quality rating of the national proceedings. In addition, marketing faculty at schools with a large number of marketing majors evaluated regional proceedings higher than schools with less marketing majors. Thus, it would appear that ratings of both regional and national proceedings are effected by school size. A very interesting corollary to this was the relationship of the size of business faculty to quality ratings of national proceedings. As the number of faculty in the business school increased, the quality ratings of national proceedings decreased. The number of marketing faculty had no impact on either the national or regional proceeding quality rating.

The quality of national proceedings was not seen as approximately equivalent to the third tier marketing journals. Surprisingly, national proceedings were ranked with the second tier journals such as Journal of Retailing, Journal of Academy of Marketing Science, and Journal of Public Policy and Marketing. In terms of faculty promotions and tenure decisions, this finding may be very significant in evaluating the quality and quantity of scholar research. It certainly adds credibility to using national proceedings in faculty evaluations.

As the marketing faculty ratings of both national and regional proceedings increased, the opinion that the respective proceedings should be used in the faculty evaluation process also increased. In looking at what impact marketing faculty had upon their dean's opinion of proceedings, mixed results were obtained. For national proceedings, the dean's rating of quality was positively impacted by the rating of the marketing faculty but for regional proceedings there was no impact. For both national and regional proceedings, the stronger the marketing faculty felt towards use of these proceedings in the faculty evaluation process, the more inclined the dean was to agree.

The last part of the study examined the percentage proceedings should count. For the marketing faculty the mean was 27.99. For the deans, it was 23.60. But in looking at how this percentage was arrived at sheds some light into what may be occurring in institutions concerning the use of proceedings for promotion and tenure decisions. For marketing faculty, the percentage proceedings should count was positively effected by how strongly they felt about national proceedings being used in evaluations but inversely effected by how strong they felt about

regional proceedings being used in evaluations. Marketing faculty who placed a high emphasis on national meetings in comparison to regional meetings believed the percentage proceedings should count was higher than faculty who placed more emphasis on regional proceedings. This would appear to be consistent with other results obtained in this research.

In looking at the percentage indicated by deans, even more interesting results were obtained. First, the percentage indicated by the deans was positively affected by the strength of their own opinion in the use of national proceedings for faculty evaluations but was not impacted by their attitude towards using regional proceedings in the evaluation process. The stronger the dean felt about using national proceedings for promotion and tenure decisions, the higher the percentage he or she indicated they should count.

In looking at the impact of the marketing faculty upon the dean's percentage amount, the marketing faculty had no impact in terms of national proceedings but a positive impact in terms of regional proceedings. The stronger the marketing faculty felt towards using regional proceedings in the evaluation process, the more deans were willing to count proceedings for promotion and tenure decisions but it appears the proceedings being considered by deans are not the regional, but the national. It may be that as they face intensified pressure to consider regional proceedings in the faculty evaluation process, they counter with greater use of national proceedings in promotion and tenure decisions.

DISCUSSION

As pressure to publish continues to increase, pressure to accept both national and regional proceedings as part of the faculty evaluation process will continue to increase. This research substantiates the premise that proceedings should be considered in promotion and tenure decisions. Both marketing faculty and deans of business schools indicate the percentage these proceedings should count is somewhere between 23 and 28 percent.

This research indicated that national marketing proceedings are evaluated, in terms of quality, on the same level as the second tier marketing journals. This makes national proceedings a viable outlet for scholar research activity and valid criteria in faculty evaluations for promotion and tenure.

Getting deans of business schools to agree with the use of proceedings as part of the faculty evaluation process is not always an easy task. This research indicated that marketing faculty who put pressure on deans to use regional proceedings in their promotion and tenure decisions may not be successful in terms of gaining acceptance of regional proceedings but may be successful in greater acceptance of national proceedings. It would appear the best strategy for marketing faculty is to stress with the deans the high quality of national marketing proceedings in comparison to the marketing journals.

REFERENCES

- Beltramini, R.F., J.L. Schlacter, & C. Kelley (1985). Marketing Faculty Promotion & Tenure Policies & Practices. Journal of Marketing Education, 74-80.
- Browne, W.G. & B.W. Becker (1991). A Longitudinal Study of Marketing Journal Familiarity & Quality. American Marketing Association Educators Proceedings, 702-710.
- Burnett, J.J., R.D. Amason, & P. Cunningham (1989). What Makes Marketing Academicians Successful? An Assessment of Teaching, Publishing, & Service. Journal of Marketing Education, 7-11.
- Coe, R.K. & I. Weinstock (1983). Evaluating Journal Publications of Marketing Professors: A Second Look. Journal of Marketing Education, 37-42.
- Jeon, J. & D.V. Brazeal (1989). Perceived Quality of Marketing Related Journals. Marketing: Positioning for the 1990's, R.L. King, ed., Charleston, SC: The Citadel & Southern Marketing Association, 252-256.
- Joreskog, K.G. & D. Sorbom (1989). Lisrel 7: A Guide to the Program & Applications. Chicago: SPSS, Inc.
- Michman, R.D., A.J. Greco, & R.T. Hocking (1989). Evaluating Marketing Periodicals: Another Dimension. Marketing: Positioning for the 1990's. R.L. King, ed., Charleston, SC: The Citadel & Southern Marketing Association, 257-261.
- Mobley, M.F. & N.A. Ibrahim (1989). Analysis of Authorship of Major Marketing Journals. Marketing: Positioning for the 1990's. R.L. King, ed., Charleston, SC: The Citadel & Southern Marketing Association, 262-264.