

A CONTRIBUTOR ANALYSIS OF EDUCATION RESEARCH IN MARKETING

Frank R. Urbancic, University of South Alabama, Mobile

ABSTRACT

This study provides a ranking of contributor sources for research published in the primary serial outlets for marketing education based on an analysis of individual author sources, institutional affiliations, and the geographic origins of research contributors. The analysis is based on 458 articles published in three marketing education journals, Journal for Advancement of Marketing Education, Journal of Marketing Education, and Marketing Education Review, for eight years 2001 to 2008. Results from the study indicate that marketing education provides a vehicle for scholarly dialogue across a broad segment of the marketing research community worldwide through contribution affiliations in 19 countries. The study identifies the top 50 most frequently contributing individuals and a ranking of the top 50 institutional sources for published research. Findings indicate that marketing education research continues its emergence as a respected avenue for intellectual pursuit.

INTRODUCTION

Quality teaching in higher education is an imperative for marketing academicians. Therefore, learning and pedagogical research that serves to advance teaching quality has significant value. However, previously published studies that rank the scholarly standing of marketing academicians and their institutional affiliations often minimize or in some cases completely ignore the value of contributor sources for research in marketing education, and thereby disregard an important aspect of academic mission. Hawes and Keillor (2002) and Polonsky, Mittelstaedt, and Moore (2008) contend that mission should be a primary consideration in evaluations of the research productivity for academic marketing programs.

The standards for accreditation by the AACSB (2008, p. 59) emphasize that "student learning is the central activity of higher education." The AACSB adds further importance to the learning mission by an explicit recognition of contributions to learning and pedagogical research as one of three major categories of intellectual contributions, along with contributions to practice (applied research) and discipline based scholarship (basic research). In accordance with accreditation standards of the AACSB (2008 p.24), intellectual contributions should meet two tests: exist in public written form, and have been subject to scrutiny by academic peers or practitioners prior to publication. Peer reviewed publications meet these criteria, and though other outlets for research in marketing education are acceptable, as a group the marketing education journals constitute the foremost outlet. Therefore, the contributors of the research that appears in marketing education journals merit further study and recognition.

The purpose of this paper is to provide an appraisal of contributor sources for research published in the primary serial outlets for marketing education based on an analysis of individual author sources, institutional affiliations, and

the geographic origins of research contributors. As will be discussed in the next section, a substantial number of studies assess research contributions as a metric for ranking individuals and/or institutions in marketing. However, such contributor studies generally devote attention to marketing journal outlets that primarily favor publication of basic and applied research contributions, such that very minimal or no consideration is accorded the published contributions to learning and pedagogical research. Given the latter shortcoming and in respect to the current importance of quality teaching in higher education, an aim of the present paper is to assign foremost recognition to the major research contributors in marketing education. For this purpose the study provides an account and comparison of the contributor sources for research in three journals: *Journal for Advancement of Marketing Education* (JAME), *Journal of Marketing Education* (JME), and *Marketing Education Review* (MER). The three journals chosen represent the primary journal outlets for research in marketing education according to Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Marketing (2009). Multidisciplinary business education journals (*Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, *Journal of Education for Business* and *Journal of Educators Online*) are excluded from the study.

The remaining paper is organized in four sections. First, the literature of journal-based contributor analysis is reviewed. The second section describes the data collection approach for the study. Results from the analysis are discussed in the third section of the paper. The final section offers concluding comments.

RELATED RESEARCH

Once an academic journal becomes firmly established, it is both customary and useful to undertake an analysis of its authorship and institutional contributors as a basis for

providing a beneficial retrospective appraisal of journal development and direction. Analyses of this type have provided useful information for numerous business journals including some of the most prestigious and elite journals in their respective disciplines: *Journal of Marketing* Marquardt and Murdock (1983); *Accounting Review* Heck and Bremser (1986), Williams (1985); *Journal of Accounting Research* Dyckman and Zeff (1984); *American Economic Review* Ashraf (1993), Heck (1993); *Journal of Finance* Heck et al. (1986); *Journal of Financial Economics* Schwert (1993); *Academy of Management Journal* Weaver (1975); and *Journal of International Business Studies* Inkpen and Beamish (1994). Such studies are referred to collectively as single-journal studies because of their exclusive assessment focused on only one journal. Within the discipline of marketing other previously published single-journal studies that incorporate an analysis of authorship and/or institutional contributors include: *International Marketing Review* Malhotra, Wu, and Whitelock (2005); *Health Marketing Quarterly* Honeycutt and Paul (2004); *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing* Sprott and Miyazaki (2002); and *Industrial Marketing Management* Ford, LaTour, and Henthorne (2001).

In addition to the aforementioned studies there are several single-journal studies in business education that also serve to identify individual and/or institutional contributors as a part of their assessments of journal development. One of the earliest education journal studies in business, Clark and Hanna (1986) assess the development of JME in terms of contributors to the journal from 1979 to 1985. Clark and Hanna (1986) provide data regarding authorship characteristics such as gender, academic rank and type of authorship, as well as an identification of the ten leading institutional affiliations for contributors to JME. In Clark (1995) the earlier study by Clark and Hanna (1986) is updated by an extension of the analysis for JME to include the years 1985 through 1993. Also, Clark (1995) adds identification of the most frequently contributing individual authors to the analysis of leading institutional affiliations of the contributors to JME. In the area of accounting, Urbancic (1995) maps the growth of *Accounting Educators' Journal* (AEJ) from 1988 to 1993, in terms of topics, methods, citations, and frequent contributors. In Urbancic (1995) unadjusted appearances are the basis for an identification of the most frequent contributing authors of AEJ articles, whereas adjusted appearances are used to determine the most frequent institutional affiliations of contributors to AEJ. *Financial Practice and Education* (FPE) is the focus of a retrospective evaluation by Carter and Simkins (2000), in which the success of FPE is measured in terms of journal mission, impact, subject coverage, authorship attributes, and contributors to the journal. Carter and Simkins (2000) report 21 most frequent individual authors of FPE articles and the 20 most frequent institutional affiliations of contributors to FPE

from 1991 to 1999. Another single-journal study, Wilson (2002) traces the progress of *Accounting Education* (AE) along several facets including most frequent contributing authors. Based on his analysis Wilson (2002) identifies 18 individuals with 3 or more authorship appearances in AE from 1992 to 2001. Urbancic (2003) examines the development of the *Journal of Teaching in International Business* from 1989 to 2001 and identifies 19 frequently contributing authors and 17 institutions.

The primary intent of the single-journal studies in business education as identified in the preceding paragraph is to assess development and progress for a specific journal. By contrast, in recent years some multi-journal studies have undertaken the broader objective of ranking authors and institutions on the basis of combined contributions to research in education. These rankings are based on a set of two to three journals and include studies by Chan (2003), Chan and Thapa (2006), and McIntyre and Tanner (2004). Chan (2003) provides an account of the contributors to financial education research based on an analysis of FPE and *Journal of Financial Education* (JFE) for the years 1991 to 2002. From the analysis of 534 articles Chan (2003) finds contributions by 722 authors and 372 institutions and provides separate rankings for the top 20 authors and top 20 institutional contributors. A multi-journal study by Chan and Thapa (2006) extends the work of Chan (2003) to include three education journals in finance for the period 1991 to 2005, but the study excludes individual author contributors and focuses only on a contributor ranking for institutions. The institutional contributors for 700 articles appearing in FPE (renamed the *Journal of Applied Finance* in 2001), JFE, and *Advances in Financial Education* (AFE) represent a total of 446 institutions, from which Chan and Thapa (2006) identify and rank the top 28 institutions based on weighted number of articles. The study by McIntyre and Tanner (2004) examines marketing education contributions for two journals, JME and MER, between 1990 and 1999 for 437 articles. Similar to Chan (2003), the study by McIntyre and Tanner (2004) ranks both individual and institutional contributors. However, McIntyre and Tanner (2004) also provides insight to the geographic origins of marketing education contributions and observes that of the top eleven institutions publishing in marketing education journals, ten are located in the southern region of the United States.

Other studies in marketing also use a multi-journal approach to rank individual and/or institutional contributors based on publication counts, but do so with little or no consideration for education research. Table 1 presents a list of published multi-journal contributor studies in marketing, along with indication of whether a marketing education journal is a part of the study. A majority of the studies exclude the education journals from analysis. Furthermore, of the four studies listed in Table 1 that include education research, the only education journal

TABLE 1
MULTI-JOURNAL CONTRIBUTOR STUDIES IN MARKETING

Authors	Individuals Ranked	Institutions Ranked	Time Period	Number of Journals	Education Journals
Clark 1986	Yes	Yes	1983–1984	8	JME
Niemi 1988	No	Yes	1975–1985	4	None
Fields & Swayne 1988	No	Yes	1960–1986	4	None
Fields & Swayne 1991	Yes	Yes	1960–1986	3	None
Koojaroenprasit et al. 1997	No	Yes	1994	20	JME
Spake & Harmon 1998	Yes	Yes	1987–1996	4	None
Moncrief et al. 2000	No	Yes	1993–1997	16	None
Bakir et al. 2000	Yes	Yes	1991–1998	6	None
Cheng et al. 2003	Yes	Yes	1991–2000	20	JME
Polonsky et al. 2008	No	Yes	1999–2003	23	JME

represented for analysis is JME. Though articles published in JME are included in the analyses by Koojaroenprasit et al. (1997), Cheng et al. (2003) and Polonsky et al. (2008), the education articles account for a very minor proportion of the total articles from the 20 or more journals examined as a basis for the rankings by each of these studies.

Past studies that rank contributors based on published article counts do so as if all institutions have the same relative emphasis on basic, applied and education research. However, the mission linked standards for accreditation by the AACSB recognize that priorities may vary. For this reason, AACSB (2008, p.23) states that the mission of an institution determines the appropriate balance of activity among the three different types of intellectual contributions. Accordingly, more relevant information about the relative academic standing of participants in the marketing research process can be provided by a contributor analysis that recognizes separately the distinction for the three types of intellectual contributions. Therefore, the current study provides an appraisal focused on contributor sources for research published in the primary serial outlets for marketing education based on an analysis of individual author sources, institutional affiliations, and the geographic origins of research contributors. Also, compared with McIntyre and Tanner (2004), the present study adds JAME to the contributor analysis

for the years 2001 to 2008. The inaugural publication year for JAME, 2001, is not within the time frame (1990–1999) for the McIntyre and Tanner (2004) study and so the authors only examine JME and MER. By including JAME, a recognized and respected outlet for the publication of education research in marketing, the ranking result of the present study is a significant improvement on prior research.

DATA COLLECTION

The data for this study consist of authorship information for 458 marketing education articles published during the eight years 2001 to 2008. All articles published by JAME, JME, and MER are included except for editorials, comments and book reviews. The source journals for the articles with numbers of articles published are JAME (82), JME (185) and MER (191). Some of the difference in the quantity of scholarly output per journal is attributable to the frequency of publication. For example, both JME and MER are published more frequently (three times per year) than JAME. For further comparison, the average numbers of articles published *per issue* by each journal are: JAME (6.8), JME (7.7) and MER (7.9).

The analysis of authorship for the articles is organized in three sub-sections. The first sub-section presents an overview of scholarly production and trends in collab-

oration. The second sub-section provides information about individual authorship contributions and the most frequent contributors of marketing education articles. The final sub-section presents the results of an analysis of the institutional contributors of articles published in marketing education journals and also includes information concerning the geographic origins for the articles.

Scholarly Production and Collaboration

An overview of scholarly production by year and the number of authors with article attribution credit for three marketing education journals from 2001 to 2008 is presented in Table 2. According to the table a total of 953 authors contributed the 458 articles that were published by the marketing education journals during the past eight years. The highpoint in annual production, 71 in total, occurred in 2006 when MER published 34 articles. The total of 953 authorships per Table 2 includes repeat authors with multiple articles. The number of different individual authors that authored at least once in a marketing education journal for the period 2001 to 2008 is 690. Data on the average number of authors per article is also presented in Table 2 and shows that throughout the eight year period, the collaborative (co-authored) form of research serves as the basis for a majority of the articles published, as indicated by yearly averages approximating 2.0 authors per article, resulting in an overall average of 2.08 authors per article. The only sizable exception to this pattern is an average of 2.34 authors per article for the year 2003. The increase in average number of authors per article for that year is attributable to JME and MER. In 2003 JME published 23 articles with contribution credit to 56 authors (average 2.43), and MER published 20 articles with credit to 45 authors (average 2.25).

Table 3 provides additional insight to the types of authorship collaboration underlying published articles in marketing education journals. Only 30.1 percent of all articles published are single-authored, whereas 38.7 percent are co-authored by two researchers and 25.3 percent are co-authored by three authors. Only 5.2 percent of all articles published result from the collaborative efforts of four or more authors. The overall rate of collaboration for the marketing education journals is 69.9 percent. By comparison a study by Brown, Chan, and Lai (2006) finds the rate of collaboration to be 75.8 percent for a group of 19 marketing journals. Among the three journals in Table 3 JAME has the greatest proportion (73.2%) of articles authored by collaboration. MER has a substantial rate of articles contributed by two authors (40.3%) and a comparatively low rate of articles by three authors (23.0%). The rise of collaboration in the production of published business research is not unique to the marketing education journals. Increasing rates of co-authorship have been observed throughout the disciplines of business as reported in prior research. These studies include marketing, Clark

(1995), Swan et al. (1991), accounting, Heck and Bremser (1986), Urbancic (1992); economics, Heck and Zaleski (1991); finance, Heck, Cooley, and Hubbard (1986); international, Inkpen and Beamish (1994); management, Acedo et al. (2006), Floyd et al. (1994); and real estate, Dombrow and Turnbull (2000), Sa-Aadu and Shilling (1988).

Collaboration has the capacity for enhancing the quality of published research, but there is also the potential for abuse with collaboration. For example, a study by Hamilton and Greco (1997) found that 45.7 percent of business faculty reported that adding non-contributing authors to papers was a common practice. Additionally, the extensive numbers of individuals listed as co-authors for non-business research articles led McDonald (1995) to question whether there can be too many co-authors, and should there be a limit? The aforementioned issue might not be a current problem for the marketing education journals. However, at some point in the future perhaps it may become necessary to evaluate the need for measures to assure the integrity of authorship credit. For example, as a means for discouraging unethical practices, Crain and Carruth (1992) suggest that journal editors could require lead authors to provide descriptions of the role and contribution for each co-author. An even more radical proposal, Endersby (1996) recommends that each author's responsibilities and percentage of credit for the research be provided in a footnote to published articles.

Another consideration relative to collaboration is attribution name ordering (alphabetical versus non-alphabetical) for co-authors. The editorial policies of most academic journals in business do not mandate any requirements with respect to name ordering for co-authored works. Given that decisions about name ordering are left to co-authors, studies have emerged to examine these decisions. Engers et al. (1999) develop a bargaining model as a theoretical explanation of why, on an aggregate basis, the use of alphabetical ordering of co-authors' names is optimal for economics scholars. And from this, Engers et al. (1999) speculate that if changes were made in journal editorial policies compelling co-authors to use name ordering based on contribution without regard for alphabetization, then the incentive to earn first-author rights would ultimately cause each co-author to put forth greater effort thereby collaboratively producing a higher quality paper. However, subsequent studies contradict the aforementioned position taken by Engers et al. (1999). A study by Joseph et al. (2005) relies on a stochastic model of two-author collaborations in economics to demonstrate a positive correlation between article quality and alphabetic name ordering. Empirical analyses of co-authorships in marketing journals by Brown, Chan, and Lai (2006) and in finance journals by Brown, Chan, and Chen (2004) also find that alphabetization is positively correlated with article quality in the case of two-author research. Interpretation of these findings asserts that publication of

TABLE 2 SCHOLARLY PRODUCTION BY YEAR					
Year	Avg. Number of Articles	Number of Authors	Number of Authors Per Article		
2001	52	101	1.94		
2002	53	112	2.11		
2003	50	117	2.34		
2004	56	119	2.13		
2005	57	120	2.11		
2006	71	139	1.96		
2007	68	139	2.04		
2008	51	106	2.08		
Total	458	953	2.08		

TABLE 3 TYPES OF AUTHORSHIP COLLABORATION					
Percent of Articles Authored By					
One Journal	Two Author	Three Authors	Four Authors	Five or More Authors	Authors
JAME	26.8	36.6	28.1	8.5	0.0
JME	29.7	37.9	26.4	5.4	0.6
MER	31.9	40.3	23.0	3.7	1.1
All	30.1	38.7	25.3	5.2	0.7

a high quality article in a reputable journal demands a greater effort and correspondingly requires each author to contribute more. Under these conditions alphabetic name ordering becomes more likely because of the difficulty in assessing the relative contribution of each author. A related study of co-authorship in management, Acedo et al. (2006) further supports the association of alphabetical name ordering with quality research based on a finding that the highest proportion of two-author publications in management journals are the results of collaborations by two prominent authors as opposed to collaborations by

scholars with different levels of prominence, and that articles co-authored by two prominent authors are positively correlated with alphabetization.

Table 4 provides an analysis of alphabetical name ordering for all co-authored articles appearing in the marketing education journals from 2001 to 2008. The number of co-authored articles (320) represents 69.9 percent of the 458 articles published during the period studied, and consists of 177 articles by two-authors, 116 by three-authors, and 27 articles authored by four or more authors. Table 4 finds that in 60.4 percent of the two-

TABLE 4
AUTHORSHIP NAME ORDER FOR COLLABORATIONS

Number of Journal	Percentage of Co-Authored Articles	Alphabetical Two Authors	Name Three Authors	Ordering Four or More Authors	All
JAME	60	60.0	34.7	0.0	43.3
JME	130	70.0	26.5	27.2	50.0
MER	130	51.9	20.4	55.5	41.5
All	320	60.4	25.8	29.6	45.3

author articles the authorship name order is alphabetical, and separately the rates exceed 50 percent for each one of the three journals. This speaks well for the reputations of the marketing education journals in light of the previously discussed studies that identify the existence of a positive correlation between alphabetical name order and higher quality research. According to Joseph et al. (2005), editors of journals that have seen a decline in alphabetization of two-author articles may consider evaluating whether such a trend signals a decline in prestige. However, as opposed to Joseph et al. (2005) there might be other reasons for non-alphabetical name order. For example, some authorship teams with multiple articles may, as matter of practice, take turns in assigning first-author credit, or in some cases the author name-order decision may be linked to business school administrative preference or promotion and tenure policy rather than signaling quality. Nonetheless, based on the findings in their study, Joseph et al. (2005) claim that journal editors should be pleased to see increased rates of alphabetization for two-author articles over time. Also, the previously discussed name-order studies, Brown, Chan, and Lai (2006) and Brown, Chan, and Chen (2004), both observe a decrease in alphabetization with an increase in the number of authors, and per Table 4 this same relationship holds true overall for two-author articles (60.4 percent) compared with three-author articles (25.8 percent) appearing in marketing education journals. However, except for JAME, the relationship does not hold true for articles with four or more authors especially in the case of the high rate of 55.5 percent for alphabetical name ordering in instances of articles with four or more authors published by MER.

Contributing Authors

From 2001 to 2008 a total of 953 authors are credited as contributors of the articles published in marketing education journals. However, that number includes

authors that contributed more than one article. Accordingly, a total of 690 unique individuals have appeared as authors of the published articles, including only 163 (23.6 percent) individuals with multiple contributions. This is especially good news for newer faculty initially trying to publish their research. Publishing can seem like an insider activity wherein a journal is perceived as limiting its acceptances to a select group of faculty members. However, such selectivity does not typify the marketing education journals. Findings from this study show that the journals provide an outlet for many different voices. For this reason the learning and pedagogy journals may be a good way for faculty to break into scholarly publication and to demonstrate academic qualification under AACSB standards for accreditation.

Since repeat-authorship is less common for the marketing education journals, it is a significant accomplishment for an individual to be regarded as a frequent contributor to such a limited set of journals. Table 5 reports the most frequent contributing authors of articles appearing in the marketing education journals. The table is based on unadjusted number of appearances and lists all authors that have contributed 3 or more articles from 2001 to 2008. As a group, the 49 authors presented in Table 5 represent only 7.1 percent of the 690 contributors, but collectively the authors account for 20.7 percent (197 appearances) of the 953 authorship appearances. I. Clark III, J.W. Peltier, and M.J. Polonsky, each with 7 appearances, are the most prolific contributors of published marketing education research for the past eight years. The aforementioned individuals are next followed by three contributors with 6 or more appearances and these highly productive authors include B.T. Engelland, T.B. Flaherty, and M.R. Young.

As discussed in the preceding section of this study, nearly 70 percent of all articles published in marketing education journals are the product of collaborations by two or more authors. Therefore, another relevant basis for

identifying the most frequent contributors is in terms of their adjusted appearances. In determining adjusted appearances, the credit for a single-author article is 1.0, for two-authors the credit is .5, for three-authors it is .33, for four-authors it is .25, for five- authors the credit is .20, for six-authors it is .17 and for seven-authors the credit is .14 . The aforementioned adjustment, as a treatment for multiple authors, is a common technique in many of the studies cited previously.

Table 6 lists 50 authors that have more than 1.49 adjusted authorship appearances for articles contributed to the marketing education journals. As a group, the 50 authors presented by Table 6 represent only 7.3 percent of the 690 contributors, but collectively account for 113..03 (24.7 percent) of the 458 marketing education articles published from 2001 to 2008. L.B. Chonko with a total of 5.00 adjusted appearances (all single-authored) is the most prolific contributor of articles. The remaining top seven most prolific authors are M.R. Young (4.83), D.J. Lincoln (4.50), D.E. Clayson (4.00), B.T. Engelland (3.33),

I. Clark III (3.16), and M.J. Polonsky (2.99). Differences between contributions based on unadjusted and adjusted appearances become apparent when comparison is extended beyond the top seven most prolific authors. The major differences are in identification of an additional group of frequent contributing authors based on their adjusted appearances. These authors had not previously been listed as frequent contributors on the basis of unadjusted appearances as reported in Table 5. Foremost among these contributors are the single-authors of two articles each including S.B. Castelberry, S.B. Corbin, D.E. Hansen, M.B. Holbrook, G.L. Karns, D.T. McAlister, S.P. Ramocki, B.A. Vander Schee and B.R. Wooldridge.

Institutional Contributors and Geographic Origins

Authors of the 458 articles published in marketing education journals for the period 2001 to 2008 were affiliated with 309 different academic institutions (e.g., colleges and universities). This large number of

TABLE 5
MOST FREQUENT CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS OF ARTICLES IN MARKETING EDUCATION JOURNALS BASED ON UNADJUSTED NUMBER OF APPEARANCES

Unadjusted Appearances	Names	Rank	Unadjusted Appearances	Names	Rank
1	Clark III, I.	7	27	Reardon, J.	4
	Peltier, J.W.	7		Elam, E.L.R.	3
	Polonsky, M.J.	7		Granitz, N.	3
4	Engelland, B.T.	6		Aggarwal, P.	3
	Flaherty, T.B.	6		Haley, D.A.	3
	Young, M.R.	6		Hershey, L.	3
7	Ackerman, D.S.	5		Hite, R.E.	3
	Bacon, D.R.	5		Lilly, B.	3
	Chonko, L.B.	5		Lueg, J.E.	3
	Clayson, D.E.	5		Madhavaram, S.	3
	Gross, B.L.	5		Malhotra, N.K.	3
	Kelley, C.A.	5		Mankelow, G.	3
	Kurtz, D.L.	5		Marshall, G.W.	3
	Lincoln, D.J.	5		McClure, J.E.	3
	Schibrowsky, J.A.	5		Muncy, J.A.	3
16	Albers-Miller, N.D.	4		Paul, P.	3
	Borin, N.	4		Payan, J.M.	3
	Drago, W.	4		Pearson, M.M.	3
	Eastman, J.K.	4		Peterson, R.T.	3
	Ferrell, L.	4		Pettijohn, C.E.	3
	Haytko, D.L.	4		Smith, S.	3
	Iyer, R.	4		Straughan, R.D.	3
	Laverie, D.A.	4		Swift, C.O.	3
	McCorkle, D.E.	4		Tomkovick, C.	3
	McIntyre, F.S.	4			
Total		197			

TABLE 6
MOST FREQUENT CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS OF ARTICLES IN MARKETING EDUCATION
JOURNALS BASED ON ADJUSTED NUMBER OF APPEARANCES

Adjusted Rank	Names	Appearances	Adjusted Rank	Names	Appearances
1	Chonko, L.B.	5.00	26	Karns, G.L.	2.00
2	Young, M.R.	4.83	27	McAlister, D.T.	2.00
3	Lincoln, D.J.	4.50	28	McClure, J.E.	2.00
4	Clayson, D.E.	4.00	29	Peterson, R.T.	2.00
5	Engelland, B.T.	3.33	30	Ramocki, S.P.	2.00
6	Clarke III, I.	3.16	31	Vander Schee, B.A.	2.00
7	Polonsky, M.J.	2.99	32	Wooldridge, B.R.	2.00
8	Laverie, D.A.	2.83	33	Albers-Miller, N.D.	1.91
9	Bacon, D.R.	2.75	34	Borin, N.	1.91
10	Flaherty, T.B.	2.66	35	Eastman, J.K.	1.83
11	Haytko, D.L.	2.66	36	Schibrowsky, J.A.	1.82
12	Kelley, C.A.	2.66	37	Malhotra, N.K.	1.66
13	Haley, D.A.	2.50	38	Tomkovick, C.	1.66
14	Hershey, L.	2.50	39	Iyer, R.	1.58
15	Muncy, J.A.	2.50	40	Achenreiner, G.1.	50
16	Ackerman, D.S.	2.33	41	Duke, C.R.	1.50
17	Gross, B.L.	2.33	42	Hawes, J.M.	1.50
18	Kurtz, D.L.	2.32	43	Peterson, R.M.	1.50
19	Peltier, J.W.	2.31	44	Schlee, R.P.	1.50
20	Castelberry, S.B.	2.00	45	Singhapakdi, A.	1.50
21	Corbin, S.B.	2.00	46	Stern, B.L.	1.50
22	Ferrell, L.	2.00	47	Swift, C.O.	1.50
23	Granitz, N.	2.00	48	West, V.L.	1.50
24	Hansen, D.E.	2.00	49	Wilhelm, W.B.	1.50
25	Holbrook, M.B.	2.00	50	Wood, C.M.	1.50
Total		113.03			

institutional contributors in only eight years underscores the importance and remarkably widespread interest in marketing education research. Table 7 presents the top 50 most frequent institutional contributors of articles appearing in the marketing education journals. The Table includes institutions whose faculty members collectively had 2.20 or more adjusted appearances. The top 50 institutions listed in Table 7 represent only 16.2 percent of all the contributing academic institutions, but as a combined group these institutions and their faculty account for nearly half ($212.52/458 = 46.4$ percent) of all the articles published by the marketing education journals. Among the top contributors listed in Table 7 are 41 large publicly supported universities in the U.S., 6 U.S. private universities, and 3 non-U.S. academic institutions. The overall results for Table 7 indicate that faculty members affiliated with Mississippi State and James Madison are the leading contributors to the marketing education journals

with 8.99 and 8.96 adjusted appearances, respectively. Other contributing institutions with six or more adjusted appearances include Missouri State (7.06), Texas State at San Marcos (6.83), Northern Iowa (6.83), Texas Tech (6.66), Wisconsin at Whitewater (6.62), Baylor (6.14), and California State at Fullerton (6.00). The leading non-U.S. academic institutional contributors of education research articles in marketing journals include two Australian universities, Victoria (4.49) and Griffith (2.49), and a Canadian university Ryerson (2.25).

Table 8 lists additional information about each of the top 50 institutions based on data that is maintained by the AACSB. A substantial majority of the institutions have accreditation from AACSB, with 47 (94.0 percent) institutions accredited in business. Institutions such as these, including their faculty and students, typically represent high quality programs in business and so it is indicative of the reputation that marketing education

TABLE 7
TOP 50 MOST FREQUENT INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATIONS OF CONTRIBUTORS
TO MARKETING EDUCATION JOURNALS BASED ON ADJUSTED
NUMBER OF APPEARANCES

Adjusted Rank	Adjusted Institution	Appearances	Rank	Institution	Appearances
1	Mississippi State	8.99	26	Calif. Poly St. at SLO	3.98
2	James Madison	8.96	27	DePaul	3.98
3	Missouri State	7.06	28	Miami U.	3.66
4	Texas St. at San Marcos	6.83	29	Clemson	3.65
5	Northern Iowa	6.83	30	San Diego State	3.49
6	Texas Tech	6.66	31	Georgia Southern	3.16
7	Wisconsin at Whitewater	6.62	32	Central Michigan	3.08
8	Baylor	6.14	33	Portland State	3.00
9	Calif. State at Fullerton	6.00	34	Northern Illinois	2.99
10	Winona State	5.99	35	Wisconsin at Oshkosh	2.99
11	Calif. St. at Northridge	5.66	36	Wisconsin at Eau Claire	2.98
12	U. of Denver	5.50	37	Ohio U.	2.82
13	Valdosta State	5.41	38	Middle Tennessee St.	2.66
14	Boise State	5.00	39	Cleveland State	2.65
15	Arkansas	4.96	40	Nevada at Las Vegas	2.65
16	New Mexico State	4.83	41	Western New England	2.65
17	Bowling Green State	4.82	42	Colorado State	2.50
18	Victoria	4.49	43	Southeastern Okla. St.	2.50
19	Minnesota at Duluth	4.48	44	South Florida	2.50
20	Ball State	4.41	45	Southern Indiana	2.50
21	Northern Colorado	4.41	46	Texas at Arlington	2.50
22	Calif. St. at Sacramento	4.16	47	Griffith	2.49
23	Loyola College in Md.	4.00	48	West Georgia	2.48
24	Seattle Pacific	4.00	49	Ryerson	2.25
25	U. of Akron	4.00	50	Pace	2.20
Sub-Total		212.52			
259 Other Universities		241.00			
Non-Academic Contributors		4.48			
Total Number of Articles		458.00			

journals are achieving as prestigious and highly respected outlets for research.

By contrast only 6 (12.0 percent) of the top 50 institutions offer PhD programs in marketing (Mississippi State, Texas Tech, Arkansas, New Mexico State, Cleveland State, and Texas at Arlington). PhD institutions are more likely to place more emphasis on faculty publishing discipline-based intellectual contributions as opposed to learning pedagogical research.

Table 8 also includes information from AACSB with respect to the teaching orientation and type of research emphasis declared by the top 50 institutions. The analysis

is particularly relevant within the context of mission linked standards for accreditation established by the AACSB which mandate that the mission of an institution should determine the appropriate balance of activity among the three types of intellectual contributions. According to data in Table 8 the emphasis on teaching relative to intellectual contributions and service is high for 27 (54%) universities and an equally high emphasis with intellectual contributions for 19 (38 percent), compared to medium for 2 universities, and not provided by AACSB for 2 universities. By contrast, the scholarly emphasis on learning and pedagogical research relative to discipline-

TABLE 8
AACSB INFORMATION FOR THE TOP 50 CONTRIBUTING INSTITUTIONS

AACSB Rank	PHD Institution	Emphasis per AACSB Accreditation	Program	Teaching	L/P Research
1	Mississippi State	Yes	Yes	1	Low
2	James Madison	Yes	No	High	5
3	Missouri State	Yes	No	High	Medium
4	Texas at San Marcos	Yes	No	1	Medium
5	Northern Iowa	Yes	No	1	Medium
6	Texas Tech	Yes	Yes	1	Low
7	Wisconsin at Whitewater	Yes	No	High	Medium
8	Baylor	Yes	No	High	Low
9	California St. at Fullerton	Yes	No	High	5
10	Winona State	M	No	High	Medium
11	California St. at Northridge	Yes	No	High	Low
12	U. of Denver	Yes	No	High	5
13	Valdosta State	Yes	No	High	Medium
14	Boise State	Yes	No	High	Medium
15	Arkansas	Yes	Yes	1	Low
16	New Mexico State	Yes	Yes	13	
17	Bowling Green State	Yes	No	High	Low
18	Victoria	No	No	—	—
19	Minnesota at Duluth	Yes	No	High	Medium
20	Ball State	Yes	No	High	Low
21	Northern Colorado	Yes	No	High	4
22	California St. at Sacramento	Yes	No	High	Medium
23	Loyola College in Md.	Yes	No	High	6
24	Seattle Pacific U.	Yes	No	High	2
25	U. of Akron	Yes	No	High	Low
26	California Poly St. at SLO	Yes	No	15	
27	DePaul	Yes	No	13	
28	Miami U.	Yes	No	1	Low
29	Clemson	Yes	No	Medium	Low
30	San Diego State	Yes	No	High	Low
31	Georgia Southern	Yes	No	High	Medium
32	Central Michigan	Yes	No	1	Medium
33	Portland State	Yes	No	1	Low
34	Northern Illinois	Yes	No	1	Low
35	Wisconsin at Oshkosh	Yes	No	15	
36	Wisconsin at Eau Claire	Yes	No	—	—
37	Ohio U.	Yes	No	High	Medium
38	Middle Tennessee St.	Yes	No	High	Low
39	Cleveland State	Yes	Yes	1	Low
40	Nevada at Las Vegas	Yes	No	High	Low
41	Western New England	Yes	No	High	Medium
42	Colorado State	Yes	No	1	Low
43	Southeastern Oklahoma St.	Yes	No	1	Low
44	South Florida	Yes	No	Medium	Low
45	Southern Indiana	Yes	No	High	Medium
46	Texas at Arlington	Yes	Yes	1	Low
47	Griffith	Yes	No	1	3

TABLE 8 (CONTINUED)
AACSB INFORMATION FOR THE TOP 50 CONTRIBUTING INSTITUTIONS

AACSB Rank	PHD Institution	Emphasis per AACSB Accreditation	Program	Teaching	L/P Research
48	West Georgia	Yes	No	High	Medium
49	Ryerson	M	No	High	High
50	Pace	Yes	No	1	Low
NOTES L/P Learning and pedagogical research. M AACSB member, but not accredited by AACSB. 1 General orientation is equally high emphasis for teaching and intellectual contributions. 2 Scholarly orientation is equal emphasis on contributions to practice and on learning and pedagogical research, with a low emphasis on discipline-based scholarship. 3 Scholarly orientation is high emphasis on discipline-based scholarship, with less but equal emphasis on contributions to practice and on learning and pedagogical research. 4 Scholarly orientation is high emphasis on contributions to practice, with less but equal emphasis on discipline-based scholarship and on learning and pedagogical research. 5 Scholarly orientation is equal emphasis on discipline-based scholarship, contributions to practice, and learning and pedagogical research. 6 Scholarly orientation is equal emphasis on discipline-based scholarship and on learning and pedagogical research, with a low emphasis on contributions to practice.					

based scholarship and contributions to practice is medium for 15 (30%) universities and low for 21 (42%) of the top 50 contributing universities. This disparity between the universities' declared medium to low scholarly emphasis on education research in comparison with the actual frequency of contributions to marketing education journals relates to the value problem as described in the beginning of this paper. That is to say, contrary to the widely held importance of teaching evident by the general orientation of universities (92% high emphasis); marketing education research is administratively devalued relative to basic and applied types of research. Nonetheless, current findings from this study with respect to the actual level of scholarly contributions and the institutional source contributors point toward a growing higher regard for learning and pedagogical research.

In terms of geographic origins, data presented as Table 9 indicates that authors affiliated with institutions located in a total of 19 different countries have contributed the articles published by the three marketing education journals for the years 2001 to 2008. The broad country mix of contributors to published marketing education is evidence of the virtually universal importance of teaching and learning. Not surprisingly, given that the three publications (JAME, JME, and MER) are U.S.-based journals, the U.S. is the leading contributor with 89.8 percent (411.16/458) of the adjusted appearances per Table 9. The United States as lead source for a majority of all articles in marketing education is not abnormally high when com-

pared with the rates of U.S. publications reported for studies of other journals. For example, based on an analysis of five major journals in marketing, Stremersch, and Verhoef (2005) find that 86 percent of published articles originate from institutions located in the U.S. Even for an area such as international business and education where one might reasonably expect to find a greater proportion of journal articles from non-U.S. sources, Chandy and Gopalakrishna (1994) identify the U.S. as origin for 75 percent and 87 percent of articles appearing in *Journal of International Business Studies* and *Journal of World Business* respectively, and based on a study of the *Journal of Teaching in International Business* Urbancic (2003) reports that 77 percent of articles published are from U.S. sources.

The continued global expansion of accreditation efforts by the AACSB is a positive development likely to further the international recognition of education research in marketing and stimulate further contributions from an expanding number of geographic origins and a corresponding need for outlets in the future. Although the existing group of three journals provide an outlet internationally for marketing education research, perhaps the time is right for a new regional journal to be inaugurated. For example, a Pacific marketing education journal might prove to be a successful publication by primarily drawing its contributions from countries such as Australia, Hong Kong, India, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Singapore, Taiwan, or Thailand. Another possibility to consider

TABLE 9
GEOGRAPHIC ORIGINS OF CONTRIBUTORS TO MARKETING EDUCATION JOURNALS
BASED ON INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION

Country	Adjusted Appearances
United States	411.16
Australia	16.94
Canada	7.50
United Kingdom	6.31
New Zealand	2.57
Ireland	2.16
Austria	1.99
Spain	1.24
Finland	1.00
Italy	1.00
Sweden	1.00
Israel	0.99
Turkey	0.99
Hong Kong	0.66
Singapore	0.66
China	0.50
Denmark	0.50
Netherlands	0.50
Poland	0.33
Total Number of Articles	458.00

might be a marketing education journal targeted primarily for but not limited to Latin American countries, wherein the journal is published in both Spanish and English along the lines of *Contemporary Accounting Research* which is published in French and English.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Recognition for the relative academic standing of contributors to research in marketing education has been greatly understated or even absent in previously published ranking studies. The omissions correspond to long-held perceptions that marketing education research has a lesser status level in academic research. Improved comparative information about the relative academic standing of participants in the marketing research process can be provided by a contributor analysis that distinguishes based on the types of intellectual contributions. Accordingly, the current study gives separate recognition of the leading individual and institutional sources of marketing education learning and pedagogical research.

The study examines the contributing sources of 458 articles that were published in three marketing education

journals during the ten year period of 2001 to 2008. During the time period studied, the findings indicate that marketing education research continues its emergence as a respected avenue for intellectual pursuit as evidenced by the substantial number of frequently contributing authors affiliated with programs accredited in business by AACSB. Logically, if administrators for these types of institutions did not regard marketing education research as reputable, then the quantity of contributions originating from quality institutions would likely be only minimal at best.

The results of this study also indicate that marketing education research provides a vehicle for scholarly dialogue across a very broad segment of the academic marketing community worldwide, as there were 690 individuals affiliated with 309 different institutions located in 19 different countries represented as the contributing sources for the articles published during the period 2001 to 2008. While certain individuals and institutions are at the forefront in terms of the frequency of their contributions, it is the entirety of all contributions combined that have enabled the marketing education journals to become a valuable resource for learning and pedagogy in the worldwide marketing academy.

REFERENCES

- AACSB. (2008), *Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation* (January), Tampa, FL: AACSB International.
- Acedo, F., C. Barroso, C. Casanueva, and J. Galan (2006), "Co-Authorship in Management and Organizational Studies: An Empirical and Network Analysis," *Journal of Management Studies*, 43 (5), 957–83.
- Ashraf, J. (1993), "Institutional Affiliation of Contributors to the *American Economic Review*, 1981–1990," *American Economic Review*, 17 (1), 81–90.
- Bakir, A., S. Vitell, and G. Rose (2000), "Publications in Major Marketing Journals: An Analysis of Scholars and Marketing Departments," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 22 (2), 99–107.
- Brown, C., K. Chan, and C. Chen (2004), "First-Author Conditions: Evidence from Finance Journal Coauthorship," Paper Presentation, Financial Management Association Annual Meeting.
- _____, _____, and P. Lai (2006), "Marketing Journal Coauthorships: An Empirical Analysis of Coauthor Behavior," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 28 (1), 17–25.
- Cabell, D.E. (2009), "Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Marketing," Beaumont, TX: Cabell Publishing.
- Carter, D. and B. Simkins (2000), "A Retrospective Evaluation of *Financial Practice and Education* Over 1991–1999," *Financial Practice and Education*, 10 (1), 153–65.
- Chan, K. (2003), "The Institutional and Individual Contributors to Research in Financial Education: 1991–2002," Working Paper, Western Kentucky University.
- _____, and S. Thapa (2006), "A Ranking of Teaching Quality in Finance Departments Based on Contributions in Financial Education Literature," *Advances in Financial Education*, 4 (1), 89–96.
- Chandy, P. and P. Gopalakrishna (1994), "Scholarly Contributions to Two Major International Business Journals: A Comparison of *Journal of World Business* and *Journal of International Business Studies*," *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 6 (1), 31–51.
- Cheng, L., K. Chan, and R. Chan (2003), "Publications in Major Marketing Journals: An Analysis of Research Productivity of Asia-Pacific Universities," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 25 (2), 163–76.
- Clark, G. (1986), "Productivity Ratings of Institutions Based on Publication in Eight Marketing Journals: 1983–1984," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 7 (1), 12–23.
- _____, (1995), "An Analysis of the Sources of Articles in the *Journal of Marketing Education*: An Update," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 17 (1), 25–33.
- _____, and N. Hanna (1986), "An Analysis of the Sources of Articles in the *Journal of Marketing Education* Since its Founding in 1979," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 8 (2), 71–74.
- Crain, J. and P. Carruth (1992), "Academic Accounting Research: Opinions of Academicians on Recommendations for Improving Ethical Behavior," *Accounting Educators' Journal*, 4 (2), 27–46.
- Dombrow, J. and G. Turnbull (2000), "Individual and Institutional Contributors to the *Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*: 1988–1999," *Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*, 21 (2), 203–14.
- Dyckman, T. and S. Zeff (1984), "Two Decades of the *Journal of Accounting Research*," *Journal of Accounting Research*, 22 (1), 225–97.
- Endersby, J. (1996), "Collaborative Research in the Social Sciences: Multiple Authorship and Publication Credit," *Social Science Quarterly*, 77 (2), 375–92.
- Engers, M., J. Gans, S. Grant, and S. King (1999), "First-Author Conditions," *Journal of Political Economy*, 107 (4), 859–83.
- Fields, D. and L. Swayne (1988), "Publication in Major Marketing Journals: 1960–1986," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 10 (3), 36–48.
- Fields, D. and L. Swayne (1991), "Contribution of Southern Authors in Major Marketing Journals," *Journal of Business Research*, 22 (1), 33–45.
- Floyd, S., D. Schroeder, and D. Finn (1994), "Only if I'm First Author: Conflict over Credit in Management Scholarship," *Academy of Management Journal*, 37 (3), 734–47.
- Ford, J., M. LaTour, and T. Henthorne (2001), "Author and Institution Productivity in *Industrial Marketing Management* from 1971 to 1998," *Industrial Marketing Management*, 30 (5), 441–52.
- Hamilton, J. and A. Greco (1997), "Ethical Questions Regarding Joint Authorship: Business and Nonbusiness Faculty Perceptions on Noncontributing Authorship," *Journal of Education for Business*, 72 (6), 325–30.
- Hawes, J. and B. Keillor (2002), "Assessing Marketing Journals: A Mission-Based Approach," *Journal of the Academy of Business Education*, 3 (2), 70–86.
- Heck, J. and W. Bremser (1986), "Six Decades of the *Accounting Review*: A Summary of Authors and Institutional Contributors," *Accounting Review*, 61 (4), 735–44.
- _____, P. Cooley, and C. Hubbard (1986), "Contributing Authors and Institutions to the *Journal of Finance*: 1946–1985," *Journal of Finance*, 41 (5), 1129–40.
- _____, and P. Zaleski (1991), "Trends in Economic Literature: 1969–1989," *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 19 (4), 27–32.
- _____, (1993), "Eight Decades of Contributing

- Authors and Institutions to the *American Economic Review: A Historical Summary*,” *Journal of Economic Education*, 24 (2), 163–70.
- Honeycutt, E. and K. Paul (2004), “An Analysis of *Health Marketing Quarterly* 1991–2002,” *Health Marketing Quarterly*, 21 (4), 77–87.
- Inkpen, A. and P. Beamish (1994), “An Analysis of Twenty-Five Years of Research in the *Journal of International Business Studies*,” *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25 (4), 703–11.
- Joseph, K., D. Laband, and V. Patil (2005), “Author Order and Research Quality,” *Southern Economic Journal*, 71 (3), 545–55.
- Koojaroenprasit, N., A. Weinstein, W. Johnson, and D. Remington (1997), “Analyzing the Reputation of Marketing Departments,” *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 3 (1), 185–98.
- Malhotra, N., L. Wu, and J. Whitelock (2005), “An Overview of the First 21 Years of Research in the *International Marketing Review*, 1983–2003,” *International Marketing Review*, 22 (4), 391–98.
- Marquardt, R. and G. Murdock (1983), “Analysis of Authorship in the *Journal of Marketing* 1960–1981,” *Journal of Marketing Education*, 5 (3), 53–57.
- McDonald, K. (1995), “Too Many Co-Authors?” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, (April 28), 35–36.
- McIntyre, F. and J. Tanner (2004), “The Scholarship of Teaching: A Study of Marketing Education Journal Publications,” *Marketing Education Review*, 14 (1), 33–44.
- Moncrief, W., G. Marshall, and C. Watkins (2000), “Tracking Academic Research in Selling and Sales Management: Authors, Authorships, Academic Institutions, and Journals,” *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 20 (2), 99–108.
- Niemi, A. (1988), “Publication Performance of Marketing Departments: 1975–1985,” *Journal of Marketing Education*, 10 (2), 8–12.
- Polonsky, M., J. Mittelstaedt, and J. Moore (2008), “Benchmarking Publishing Activity of U.S. Colleges and Universities across the Leading Journals: A Grouped Evaluation,” *Journal of Advancement for Marketing Education*, 12 (1), 19–31.
- Sa-Aadu, J. and J. Shilling (1988), “Rankings of Contributing Authors to the *AREUEA Journal* by Doctoral Origin and Employer: 1973–1987,” *AREUEA Journal*, 16 (3), 257–70.
- Schwert, G. (1993), “The *Journal of Financial Economics*: A Retrospective Evaluation 1974–91,” *Journal of Financial Economics*, 33 (2), 369–424.
- Spake, D. and S. Harmon (1998), “Institutional and Individual Research Productivity: A Comparison of Alternative Approaches,” *Marketing Education Review*, 8 (3), 67–77.
- Sprott, D. and A. Miyazaki (2002), “Two Decades of Contributions to Marketing and Public Policy: An Analysis of Research Published in *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*,” *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 21 (1), 105–25.
- Stremersch, S. and P.C. Verhoef (2005), “Globalization of Authorship in the Marketing Discipline: Does It Help or Hinder the Field?” *Marketing Science*, 24 (4), 585–94.
- Swan, J., T. Powers, and P. Sobczak (1991), “Utilization of Sales Management Knowledge and Identification of Contributors: An Analysis of *JPSSM* 1980–1990,” *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 11 (1), 5–13.
- Urbancic, F. (1992), “The Extent of Collaboration in the Production of Accounting Research,” *Accounting Educators’ Journal*, 4 (2), 47–61.
- _____ (1995), “A Content and Citation Analysis of the *Accounting Educators’ Journal*,” *Accounting Educators’ Journal*, 7 (2), 32–46.
- _____ (2003), “An Analysis of Individual and Institutional Contributors to the *Journal of Teaching in International Business*,” *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 14 (4), 5–20.
- Weaver, C. (1975), “Institutional Affiliation of Contributors to the *Academy of Management Journal*,” *Academy of Management Journal*, 18 (2), 411–16.
- Williams, P. (1985), “A Descriptive Analysis of Authorship in the *Accounting Review*,” *Accounting Review*, 60 (2), 300–13.
- Wilson, R. (2002), “*Accounting Education Research: A Retrospective Over Ten Years with Some Pointers to the Future*,” *Accounting Education*, 11 (4), 295–310.