

JOURNAL RANKINGS, JOURNAL LISTS, CABELL'S AND THE P&T PROCESS

James Talaga, LaSalle University

Despite the fact that the literature on ranking marketing journals is fairly large, for many marketing academics and for many schools, the journal rankings that are published are of relatively little practical use. Journal rankings often reflect the publication practices and preferences of top-ranked business schools – often with doctoral programs. While we are willing to believe that all marketing academics strive to publish quality work, we also believe that the publication outlets that are highly ranked represent for many academics unrealistic and unobtainable targets for their research.

While beliefs are one thing, we need to find evidence that this is that case. To do so, we looked at a large number of marketing faculty (311) and examined where they actually published. Based on this data (over 5000 published articles) we found that there are number of possible segments of marketing academics based on their publications. This session has its focus on several of these segments: publications of faculty at doctoral granting schools vs. faculty at non-doctoral granting schools; publications by rank; and the utility of Cabell's as a measure of journal quality.

There are distinct differences among these groups. Faculty at doctoral granting schools publish in different journals than do faculty at non-doctoral schools. Published lists of journal quality skew toward faculty at doctoral schools. As a consequence, although faculty at non-doctoral schools may be good and productive scholars, the journals in which they often published are not highly (or even) ranked. This can make it difficult for department chairpersons at non-doctoral schools to make a case before promotion and tenure committees.

Faculty at different stages in their careers have fairly similar publication outlet patterns. That is, there seem to be no radical differences in where faculty publish based on rank. Full professors, associate professors and assistant professors seem to publish in the same types of journals.

Finally, one standard that is sometimes cited as a guide to journal quality – Cabell's – is examined in terms of publication frequency. We find Cabell's to be a less than adequate guide as to where faculty actually publish and thus ought not be used as a substitute for journal quality. Curiously, there are some journals in Cabell's in which no marketing scholar has published and there are some heavily published in journals that are not in Cabell's.

Finally, AACSB-accredited schools have to grapple with the need to develop standards for AQ status. Such standards sometimes start with classifying journals in to A, B, and C list journals. Given that we identified over 900 journals in which these 311 faculty published, perhaps an A, B, C approach may have some problems

Department chairpersons and academics who face the possibility of future promotion and tenure decisions, as well as those responsible for developing AQ/PQ standards ought to consider the actual publishing behavior of marketing scholars when making assessments. This session and related discussion may provide new, useful, insights in publication behavior.