

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235361183>

Faculty Perceptions of Marketing Journals

Article in *Journal of Marketing Education* · April 1997

DOI: 10.1177/027347539701900105

CITATIONS

296

READS

1,178

3 authors, including:



G. Tomas M. Hult

Michigan State University

291 PUBLICATIONS 80,104 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Faculty Perceptions of Marketing Journals

G. Tomas M. Hult, William T. Neese, and R. Edward Bashaw

The qualitative assessment of scholarly journals plays an important role in promotion and tenure decisions, recognition, scholarly dialogue, and the contribution to the knowledge base of marketing. To aid marketing faculty and administrators in this assessment, the latest perceptions among marketing faculty regarding the relative hierarchical positioning of scholarly marketing journals are reviewed. Besides the overall ranking, the study segments journals along two dimensions: AACSB-/non-AACSB-accredited institutions (American Assembly of College Schools of Business) and marketing doctorate-/non-doctorate-granting institutions. The results of this study can be used by various marketing faculty constituencies to aid in evaluating publication importance via their selected reference groups.

The importance of creating marketing knowledge by publishing in academic journals apparently has continued to increase over the last 25 years (Bertrand 1987; Glen 1987; Moxley 1992). Many studies suggest that research publications, almost exclusively, have led to tenure and promotion (Bohrer and Dolphin 1985; Browne and Becker 1985; Fry, Walters, and Scheuermann 1985; McCullough, Wooten, and Ryan 1981; Pierce and Garven 1995). The addition of many new marketing journals in recent years also suggests that the trend in publication importance is increasing.

The pressure for marketing and university faculty to publish research findings in scholarly journals resonates from two major sources: the tenure and promotion process, which offers job security and enhanced pro-

fessional status, and university administrators who seek recognition for their department, college, and university (Pierce and Garven 1995). While research standards for marketing faculty vary greatly among universities, publishing scholarly research appears to be necessary to obtain tenure and promotion in most universities. Similarly, a university's collective publication record is an important element in the process of obtaining or retaining AACSB accreditation. Because of the importance of published research in gaining individual and institutional achievements, colleagues and university administrators encourage and reward publication efforts. In fact, Davis (1980) noted that the faculty publication record is often viewed as the only real measure of performance.

Faculty research productivity and journal quality can be used as a surrogate indicator of quality for both scholars and their respective institutions (see, for example, Browne and Becker 1979; Henry and Burch 1974), as a measure of currentness of the faculty (Clark 1986), and as a measure of institutional prestige (Henry and Burch 1974; Moore and Taylor 1980). In addition, publications identify a discipline's opinion leaders and provide peer recognition to those scholars who have made significant contributions

G. Tomas M. Hult is Director of Multinational Business and Assistant Professor of Marketing and Multinational Business in the Department of Marketing of the College of Business at Florida State University in Tallahassee. William T. Neese is an Associate Professor and R. Edward Bashaw is an Assistant Professor of Marketing and Advertising in the Department of Marketing and Advertising of the College of Business Administration at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. The authors contributed equally to this article.

(Russell and Martin 1976). Such recognition can serve to motivate scholarly activity and increase future contributions (Bush and Grant 1991).

In evaluating both a marketing department's faculty and a particular faculty member, publication records are evaluated subjectively as to both quantity and quality. Though quantity is easily measured by the number of journal publications, the subjective measurement of quality is difficult (see, for example, Browne and Becker 1979). Many administrators and faculty members involved in tenure and promotion decisions prefer to have access to some perceived ranking of journal quality as guidance for decision making, although each institution separately determines the criteria for making these evaluations (see Davis 1980). The marketing faculty facing tenure and promotion decisions may also find such rankings useful in planning their individual research strategies.

Pierce and Garven (1985) state that the most significant determinant for authors when selecting a specific journal is the importance and prestige of the journal. In a study of academic writers, the American Council of Learned Societies found that "the reputation of the journal was considered most important by a wide margin" (National Enquiry... 1979, p. 49). Similarly, journal importance and prestige are often proposed as the two most important determinants of journal quality (see, for example, Browne and Becker 1979; Chandy and Williams 1994; Fry, Walters, and Scheuermann 1985; Luke and Doke 1987).

Since authors may submit manuscripts to only one publication at a time, a strategy for selection of that publication becomes important. Becker (1986) states that four intrinsic motivations exist for a research-oriented focus resulting in academic publishing. These motivations include enhancing reputation, attaining tenure and promotion, initiating a scholarly dialogue, and contributing to the knowledge base of social science. To develop a publication strategy and determine to which journals to submit manuscripts, authors should identify the combination of motivations that is driving their publication efforts.

The purpose of this article is to assess the perceptions of marketing faculty regarding the importance of marketing-related journals. Several attempts have been made at ranking marketing journals in the past (for example, Browne and Becker 1979, 1985, 1991; Luke and Doke 1987). With the recent addition of specialized marketing journals, the increased respect for other maturing marketing journals, and the potential reliability concerns of previous studies, however, earlier findings may have been rendered outdated, unreliable, or both.

The study discussed in this article offers both an overall ranking and sample segmentation to make comparisons between institutional groups: AACSB- versus non-AACSB-accredited institutions and marketing doctorate-granting versus non-doctorate-granting institutions. The various marketing faculty constituencies can use the results to aid in evaluating publication importance via their reference group. In addition, the rankings can help authors implement a chosen publication strategy in targeting specific journals.

STUDY SEGMENTATION VARIABLES

AACSB Accreditation

The educational standards of the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), a nonprofit corporation of nearly 900 colleges and universities and business and professional organizations, have become the recognized standard in postsecondary business education. AACSB-accreditation is helpful in developing and maintaining institutional prestige and recruiting new faculty members.

An important aspect of AACSB accreditation guidelines is the research publication record of current faculty members. Given that AACSB-accredited institutions place more emphasis on research than non-AACSB-accredited institutions, a difference may be found in the perceived marketing journal importance between the two groups. An author's publication strategy may differ depending on whether the

author is employed or seeking employment by an AACSB-accredited versus a non-AACSB-accredited university.

Doctoral Education

Another institutional segmentation variable is whether a school offers a doctoral degree in marketing (Ph.D. or D.B.A.). Faculty from doctorate-granting institutions may be perceived as opinion leaders because they are responsible for training and shaping new members of the scholarly marketing community (Russell and Martin 1976). Due to the different programmatic needs of doctorate-granting and non-doctorate-granting institutions, faculty at the former may have different perceptions regarding the quality of certain journals.

Knowledge of how faculty at doctorate-granting institutions perceive marketing journals can aid authors in developing a publication strategy. If the faculty involved in doctoral education are seen as opinion leaders (Russell and Martin 1976), authors whose primary motivation is enhanced reputation would be likely to send manuscripts to journals highly rated by this segment of the academic community.

METHODOLOGY

Sampling Frame

One thousand marketing faculty from a broad range of AACSB-accredited and non-AACSB-accredited schools were selected using Hasselback's (1995) *Wiley Guide to Marketing Faculty, 1995*. We used a stratified sampling approach to provide for a sample frame consisting of a proportionate representation of AACSB (sample size = 667) and non-AACSB (sample size = 333) marketing faculty members. These faculty members included department heads but excluded administrators at the school or college level; the sample consisted of professors, associate professors, and assistant professors. Questionnaires were received from 319 faculty members, of which 309 were deemed usable, for an overall usable

response rate of 30.9%. The response rate for AACSB faculty was 33.9%, while non-AACSB faculty had a 17.7% response rate. Twenty-four respondents did not note whether their school had AACSB accreditation. Table 1 profiles the respondents' school and faculty characteristics.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire listed 63 marketing-related journals. While not meant to be an all-inclusive list, we selected the journals based on the criteria set forth by Luke and Doke (1987), including that the journal should: (1) be frequently cited in the marketing literature, (2) have appeared in previous marketing journal hierarchies, and (3) have a widespread popularity and readership in the marketing profession. The original list of journals is presented in the Exhibit. Given the subjective nature of selecting journals to appear in the original list, we allowed respondents to "write in" journals not appearing on the list so they could be ranked by the respondents.

The faculty members were asked to list their top 10 journals in order of decreasing importance; ranking ranged from 1 = the most important for that respondent to 10 = the 10th most important. The instructions encouraged the faculty to add to the list any unlisted journals they considered to be among the top 10. Although 30 journals were added by respondents, only 2 of them were ranked in the top 10 enough times to be included in the analysis: the *Journal of Consumer Psychology* and *Marketing Letters*. All other write-in journals were ranked in the top 10 fewer than three times and all but four of these were ranked only once.

Analysis

Table 2 reports the overall journal rankings. Table 3 reports similar results for the AACSB and non-AACSB institutions. Table 4 reports the corresponding results for doctorate-granting and non-doctorate-granting institutions. To establish these rankings, two

TABLE 1
DEMOGRAPHICS

	Frequency	Percentage	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Marketing Faculty					
Professors	119	39.5%			
Associate Professors	87	28.9			
Assistant Professors	94	31.3			
Instructors/Others	1	0.3			
No Response	8	N/A			
Primary Research Interests					
Marketing Management	18	6.8%			
Marketing Strategy	33	12.5			
Promotion/Sales Management	41	15.6			
Services Marketing	14	5.3			
Consumer Behavior	48	18.3			
Channels/Retailing	24	9.1			
Purchasing	6	2.3			
International Marketing	29	11.0			
Marketing Research	20	7.6			
Other/Do Not Do Research	30	11.4			
No Response	46	N/A			
AACSB Accreditation					
AACSB Accredited	226	79.3%			
Not Accredited	59	20.7			
No Response	24	N/A			
Size of University					
Large	122	40.8%			
Medium	123	41.1			
Small	54	18.1			
No Response	10	N/A			

Continued...

characteristics of the journals were investigated: the popularity and familiarity of the journal and the perceived importance or prestige of the journal to marketing faculty (Luke and Doke 1987). Use of these indices in the analysis allowed direct comparisons with Luke and Doke's (1987) journal importance hierarchy. Taken with the number of times a journal is ranked by faculty members, these two indices are believed to provide a broad-based assessment of journal importance.

The popularity/familiarity index (PFI) is computed as

$$PFI_j = \sum_{i=1}^{10} R_{ij} / X \quad (0 \leq PFI \leq 1.0)$$

where i is the journal number 1, 2, 3, ..., n , and R_{ij} is the number of times journal i was ranked j ($j = 1$ to 10). X represents the maximum number of times a journal was ranked in the top 10, which, on the overall ranking, was 289 (*Journal of Marketing*). Journals with a PFI of .05 or lower (those ranked fewer than 13 times on the overall ranking) were excluded from the analysis. According to Luke and Doke (1987), a high PFI indicates high popularity/familiarity of the journal. As an example, the *Journal of Marketing Education* received 51 top-10 votes. The *Journal of Marketing* received the most top-10 votes, at 289, and serves as the baseline in determining the PFI

TABLE 1, Continued
DEMOGRAPHICS

	Frequency	Percentage	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Gender					
Males	251	83.9%			
Females	48	16.1%			
No Response	10	N/A			
Allotment of Work Time					
Teaching		47%	(s.d. = 19)		
Research		33%	(s.d. = 17)		
Service		21%	(s.d. = 16)		
Degrees Offered by School					
Undergraduate Marketing Major	250				
Undergraduate Business Degree	242				
M.B.A. or Masters in Business	273				
Doctorate	118				
Highest Academic Degree					
Ph.D.	260				
D.B.A.	36				
M.B.A.	4				
No Response	9				
Means					
Age, in Years				46.1	(s.d. = 9.4)
Number of Institutions Served as a Faculty Member				2.5	(s.d. = 1.5)
Number of Years as a Faculty Member				15.2	(s.d. = 9.6)
Number of Years Business Experience prior to Highest Degree				5.7	(s.d. = 6.2)
Number of Businesses Worked with during the Previous 24 Months				5.7	(s.d. = 8.8)

index value. The PFI index score for the *Journal of Marketing Education*, .18, was calculated by dividing 51 by 289.

The importance/prestige index (IPI), the weighted average rank, is computed as

$$PFI_j = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{10} R_{ij} * j \right) / \sum_{i=1}^{10} R_{ij} \quad (1 \leq IPI \leq 10)$$

where i is the journal number (1 to n) and R_{ij} is the number of times journal i was ranked j ($j = 1$ to 10). A low IPI indicates high importance/prestige of the journal. Readers should note that the analysis was intended to be based on ranking (and indexing) data, not ratio data. The IPI was computed using ordinal data, which means that while an IPI of 3.0 is better than an IPI of 6.0, it is not necessarily twice as good. The IPI gives information regarding where in the top 10 the

respondents placed a given journal. The *Journal of Marketing Education* (JME) received 51 top-10 votes. The sum resulting from the position in the top 10 that the 51 respondents gave the JME is 363. The IPI for the JME, 7.12, was calculated by dividing 363 by 51. This is the average ranking the 51 respondents gave the JME.

Follow-Up Surveys

In following the procedures outlined by Luke and Doke (1987), several potential problems surfaced. First, while respondents were asked to rank journals based on their perception of the importance of those journals, the definition of importance was not clearly addressed. Second, as in Luke and Doke

EXHIBIT
ORIGINAL LIST OF JOURNALS

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <i>Advances in Consumer Research</i> | 33) <i>Journal of Health Care Marketing</i> |
| 2) <i>AMA Educators' Conference Proceedings</i> | 34) <i>Journal of Hospital Marketing</i> |
| 3) <i>Other AMA Conference Proceedings</i> | 35) <i>Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing</i> |
| 4) <i>AMA Conference Proceedings</i> | 36) <i>Journal of International Business Studies</i> |
| 5) <i>American Business Law Journal</i> | 37) <i>Journal of Marketing International Marketing</i> |
| 6) <i>Business History</i> | 38) <i>Journal of Marketing</i> |
| 7) <i>Business History Review</i> | 39) <i>Journal of Marketing Channels</i> |
| 8) <i>Business Horizons</i> | 40) <i>Journal of Marketing Education</i> |
| 9) <i>California Management Review</i> | 41) <i>Journal of Marketing Management</i> |
| 10) <i>Case Research Journal (NACRA)</i> | 42) <i>Journal of Marketing Research</i> |
| 11) <i>Decision Sciences</i> | 43) <i>Journal of Marketing Research Society</i> |
| 12) <i>European Journal of Marketing</i> | 44) <i>Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice</i> |
| 13) <i>Harvard Business Review</i> | 45) <i>Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing</i> |
| 14) <i>Health Marketing Quarterly</i> | 46) <i>Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management</i> |
| 15) <i>Industrial Marketing Management</i> | 47) <i>Journal of Product Innovation Management</i> |
| 16) <i>International Journal of Research in Marketing</i> | 48) <i>Journal of Professional Services Marketing</i> |
| 17) <i>Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science</i> | 49) <i>Journal of Public Policy and Marketing</i> |
| 18) <i>Journal of Advertising</i> | 50) <i>Journal of Purchasing and Materials Management</i> |
| 19) <i>Journal of Advertising Research</i> | 51) <i>Journal of Retailing</i> |
| 20) <i>Journal of Business</i> | 52) <i>Journal of Services Marketing</i> |
| 21) <i>Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing</i> | 53) <i>Journal of Travel Research</i> |
| 22) <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i> | 54) <i>Logistics Transportation Journal</i> |
| 23) <i>Journal of Business Logistics</i> | 55) <i>Management Science</i> |
| 24) <i>Journal of Business Research</i> | 56) <i>Marketing Education Review</i> |
| 25) <i>Journal of Business to Business Marketing</i> | 57) <i>Marketing Management</i> |
| 26) <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i> | 58) <i>Marketing Science</i> |
| 27) <i>Journal of Consumer Affairs</i> | 59) <i>Marketing Science Institute Reports</i> |
| 28) <i>Journal of Consumer Marketing</i> | 60) <i>Psychology and Marketing</i> |
| 29) <i>Journal of Consumer Research</i> | 61) <i>Service Industries Journal</i> |
| 30) <i>Journal of Direct Marketing</i> | 62) <i>Sloan Management Review</i> |
| 31) <i>Journal of Euromarketing</i> | 63) <i>Transportation Journal</i> |
| 32) <i>Journal of Global Marketing</i> | 64) Other (Please Specify) |
-

(1987), the original list of journals was not exhaustive or comprehensive. This list, however, at least provides a starting point to update new journals that should appear on a ranking of marketing journals. While we included a place in the survey for respondents to write-in journals that were not listed but were in their top 10, the journals listed may have an advantage over those not appearing on the list (aided recall versus unaided recall).

Finally, a top-10 ranking format does not allow the 11th-rated journal (arguably an important journal) to be included in the respondents consideration set.

To address the above issues, two follow-up survey instruments were sent to a different sampling pool of marketing faculty to aid in overcoming potential reliability and validity concerns. Each survey instrument was mailed to 250 marketing faculty. Both offered

TABLE 2
OVERALL JOURNAL RANKINGS

Rank	Journal Name	Frequency (N = 309)										Number of Times the Journal Was Ranked										Validity Analysis	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Rank	Mean
1	<i>Journal of Marketing</i>	289	1.00	2.18	141	58	45	21	11	7	0	1	3	2	1	9.02							
2	<i>Journal of Marketing Research</i>	266	0.92	2.55	69	121	37	11	6	4	3	3	6	6	2	8.32							
3	<i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>	235	0.81	3.34	38	38	83	32	16	7	6	8	3	4	3	7.88							
4	<i>Journal of Retailing</i>	172	0.60	6.44	1	3	8	21	24	32	28	22	21	12	5	7.16							
5	<i>Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science</i>	149	0.52	5.70	2	11	15	28	25	20	10	16	15	7	8	6.56							
6	<i>Marketing Science</i>	147	0.51	4.80	12	17	18	33	22	12	5	7	9	12	9	6.48							
7	<i>Harvard Business Review</i>	139	0.48	5.76	15	5	11	21	10	17	13	18	18	11	4	7.25							
8	<i>Journal of Business Research</i>	114	0.39	7.03	2	1	3	7	18	15	16	19	14	19	10	6.46							
9	<i>Journal of Advertising</i>	111	0.38	6.26	1	1	7	17	17	23	12	10	14	9	6	6.75							
10	<i>Journal of Advertising Research</i>	102	0.35	6.92	0	2	4	6	18	14	16	12	16	14	7	6.73							
11	<i>Management Science</i>	79	0.27	5.63	2	3	8	12	19	9	9	8	1	8	9	6.48							
12	<i>Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management</i>	67	0.23	6.52	0	3	7	6	7	12	5	7	12	8	16	6.02							
13	<i>Advances in Consumer Research</i>	64	0.22	7.20	1	1	2	2	8	6	15	9	9	11	13	6.31							
14	<i>Journal of Public Policy and Marketing</i>	57	0.20	6.37	0	2	3	7	5	14	9	6	8	3	17	6.00							
15	<i>Journal of Marketing Education</i>	51	0.18	7.12	0	3	3	3	4	3	5	13	11	6	23	5.57							
16	<i>Psychology and Marketing</i>	50	0.17	7.48	0	2	1	1	4	6	10	8	7	11	21	5.70							
17	<i>Sloan Management Review</i>	48	0.17	6.85	0	2	4	4	5	4	5	12	3	9	14	6.11							
18	<i>Journal of Business</i>	46	0.16	6.63	1	2	2	4	5	7	8	4	7	6	12	6.37							
19	<i>Journal of International Business Studies</i>	44	0.15	6.05	2	4	1	6	4	4	8	8	5	2	19	5.75							
20T	<i>Industrial Marketing Management</i>	41	0.14	6.20	1	4	3	4	2	6	7	6	3	5	22	5.65							
20T	<i>Journal of Consumer Marketing</i>	41	0.14	7.00	1	0	1	2	5	7	8	6	6	5	30	5.29							
22	<i>California Management Review</i>	37	0.13	6.86	1	0	2	5	4	3	5	5	6	6	25	5.50							
23T	<i>Business Horizons</i>	36	0.12	6.00	1	4	3	2	3	6	5	4	8	0	29	5.37							
23T	<i>Journal of International Marketing</i>	36	0.12	6.75	3	2	2	4	1	3	2	3	7	9	20	5.71							
25	<i>Journal of Services Marketing</i>	35	0.12	7.37	0	0	0	4	5	3	4	7	5	7	18	5.96							
26	<i>International Journal of Research in Marketing</i>	32	0.11	6.53	0	1	1	5	2	5	7	4	7	0	33	5.25							
27	<i>Journal of Consumer Psychology</i>	31	0.11	6.16	0	1	1	5	7	6	4	1	1	5	15	6.08							
28T	<i>Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice</i>	29	0.10	7.31	0	1	1	2	2	3	4	6	5	5	27	5.39							
28T	<i>AMA Educators' Conference Proceedings</i>	29	0.10	7.48	1	0	1	1	4	2	3	7	0	10	36	5.22							
30	<i>European Journal of Marketing</i>	28	0.10	6.75	0	3	3	2	1	2	3	5	2	7	28	5.38							

Continued...

TABLE 2, Continued
OVERALL JOURNAL RANKINGS

Rank	Journal Name	Frequency (N = 309)										IPI	PFI	Number of Times the Journal Was Ranked										Validity Analysis		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10			Rank	Mean											
31T	Journal of Marketing Management	0	0	3	3	4	3	5	1	3	4	6.50	0.09	26	0	0	3	3	4	3	5	1	3	4	31	5.28
31T	Journal of Health Care Marketing	1	2	0	2	2	4	2	3	5	5	6.92	0.09	26	1	2	0	2	2	4	2	3	5	5	37	5.21
33	Decision Sciences	0	0	2	2	2	2	8	4	3	2	6.84	0.09	25	0	0	2	2	2	2	8	4	3	2	34 (T)	5.24
34	Marketing Letters	1	2	0	2	5	2	1	4	3	2	6.18	0.08	22	1	2	0	2	5	2	1	4	3	2	38	5.09
35T	Journal of Product Innovation Management	0	1	1	0	2	6	4	2	4	1	6.71	0.07	21	0	1	1	0	2	6	4	2	4	1	24	5.51
35T	Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing	1	0	2	2	2	2	0	2	6	4	7.00	0.07	21	0	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	6	4	26	5.40
37	Journal of Global Marketing	0	0	0	2	1	1	3	2	3	5	7.82	0.06	17	0	0	0	2	1	1	3	2	3	5	34 (T)	5.24
38T	Marketing Management	1	0	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	6.69	0.06	16	1	0	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	39 (T)	4.78
38T	Journal of Business Ethics	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	3	1	2	6.88	0.06	16	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	3	1	2	39 (T)	4.78
40T	Journal of Business Logistics	1	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	4	3	7.31	0.05	13	1	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	4	3	32	5.26
40T	Marketing Education Review	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	1	5	8.31	0.05	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	1	5	41	4.51

a more structured and elaborate definition of the term *importance*. Respondents were asked to evaluate marketing journals based on their perception of the *journal's ability to develop and disseminate scholarly marketing knowledge* to the field.

In the first follow-up survey, we listed the top 41 journals from our original survey. The two write-in journals that were ranked based on the original survey (*Journal of Consumer Psychology* and *Marketing Letters*) were included in our aided-recall study. The ranking procedure was omitted, and respondents were asked, instead, to evaluate each of the 41 journals listed, using a scale of 1 to 10 (1 = least important; 10 = most important), based on their generation and dissemination of scholarly marketing knowledge to the field. In the second follow-up survey, respondents were asked to rank their top-10 marketing journals on the basis of the generation and dissemination of scholarly marketing knowledge to the field; the survey provided only 10 blank lines, thereby giving no guidance and exercising no influence on respondents' rankings.

The rank and means for each journal in the aided-recall survey are reported in Table 2. Given that it would be unlikely that each respondent would be familiar with all 41 journals, missing values were simply excluded from the mean calculation for the specific journal. The results of the follow-up survey generally support the validity and reliability of the original survey ranking. The response rate of the follow-up survey (26.7%, n = 69) is also similar to the response rate of the original study (30.9%, n = 309). In addition, out of the top-25-ranked journals based on PFI in the original survey, 23 are ranked in the top 25 in the follow-up survey. This indicates that respondents from the original study based their rankings on a definition of importance similar to that provided in the aided-recall survey. The second, unaided-recall follow-up survey suffered from a poor response rate and, therefore, was not reported in Table 2. Because of their similarity to the aided-recall survey results, the original results were used as the basis for analysis and discussion.

TABLE 3
JOURNAL RANKINGS FOR AACSB-ACCREDITED INSTITUTIONS AND NON-AACSB-ACCREDITED INSTITUTIONS

Journal Name	AACSB Accredited Institutions				Non-AACSB Accredited Institutions			
	Frequency (N = 236)	Rank	PFI	IPI	Frequency (N = 59)	Rank	PFI	IPI
<i>Journal of Marketing</i>	226	1	1.00	2.25	51	1	1.00	1.90
<i>Journal of Marketing Research</i>	212	2	0.94	2.42	42	2	0.82	3.40
<i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>	186	3	0.82	3.16	37	3	0.73	4.16
<i>Journal of Retailing</i>	131	4	0.58	6.47	33	4	0.65	6.15
<i>Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science</i>	129	5	0.57	4.70	30	5	0.59	5.03
<i>Marketing Science</i>	110	6	0.49	5.73	11	15T	0.22	6.55
<i>Harvard Business Review</i>	102	7	0.45	6.09	32	6	0.63	4.50
<i>Journal of Business Research</i>	98	8	0.43	7.04	12	12T	0.24	7.17
<i>Journal of Advertising</i>	87	9	0.38	6.43	18	7	0.35	5.50
<i>Journal of Advertising Research</i>	78	10	0.35	7.17	16	8	0.31	5.94
<i>Management Science</i>	73	11	0.32	5.52	3	36T	0.06	7.67
<i>Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management</i>	55	12	0.24	6.38	18	18T	0.20	6.80
<i>Journal of Public Policy and Marketing</i>	50	13T	0.22	6.36	5	29T	0.10	6.40
<i>Advances in Consumer Research</i>	50	13T	0.22	7.32	11	15T	0.22	6.27
<i>Journal of Business</i>	41	15	0.18	6.80	3	36T	0.06	5.00
<i>Psychology and Marketing</i>	39	16	0.17	7.51	7	25	0.14	7.00
<i>Sloan Management Review</i>	38	17	0.17	7.08	10	18T	0.20	6.00
<i>Journal of Marketing Education</i>	36	18	0.16	7.17	15	9	0.29	7.00
<i>Journal of International Business Studies</i>	35	19	0.15	6.09	9	21T	0.18	5.89
<i>Industrial Marketing Management</i>	32	20	0.14	6.19	8	23T	0.16	5.88
<i>International Journal of Research in Marketing</i>	29	21	0.13	6.79	3	36T	0.06	4.00
<i>Journal of Consumer Psychology</i>	26	22T	0.12	6.08	Not ranked in the non-AACSB sample			
<i>Journal of International Marketing</i>	26	22T	0.12	6.73	9	21T	0.18	6.56
<i>Journal of Consumer Marketing</i>	26	22T	0.12	7.46	14	10T	0.27	6.14

Continued...

TABLE 3, Continued
 JOURNAL RANKINGS FOR AACSB-ACCREDITED INSTITUTIONS AND NON-AACSB-ACCREDITED INSTITUTIONS

Journal Name	AACSB Accredited Institutions				Non-AACSB Accredited Institutions			
	Frequency (N = 236)	Rank	PFI	IPI	Frequency (N = 59)	Rank	PFI	IPI
<i>European Journal of Marketing</i>	25	25	0.11	6.64	3	36T	0.06	7.67
<i>Decision Sciences</i>	24	26	0.11	7.00	Not ranked in the non-AACSB sample			
<i>California Management Review</i>	23	27	0.10	7.57	12	12T	0.24	5.50
<i>Business Horizons</i>	22	28T	0.10	6.82	14	10T	0.27	4.71
<i>Journal of Health Care Marketing</i>	22	28T	0.10	7.00	Not ranked in the non-AACSB sample			
<i>Journal of Services Marketing</i>	22	28T	0.10	7.59	12	12T	0.24	6.92
<i>AMA Educators' Conference Proceedings</i>	20	31	0.09	7.75	8	23T	0.16	6.50
<i>Marketing Letters</i>	19	32	0.08	6.11	Not ranked in the non-AACSB sample			
<i>Journal of Product Innovation Management</i>	18	33	0.08	6.44	Not ranked in the non-AACSB sample			
<i>Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice</i>	16	34	0.07	8.13	11	15T	0.22	5.91
<i>Journal of Marketing Management</i>	15	35T	0.07	6.67	10	18T	0.20	6.40
<i>Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing</i>	15	35T	0.07	6.67	6	26T	0.12	7.83
<i>Journal of Global Marketing</i>	12	37	0.05	8.00	5	29T	0.10	7.40
<i>Marketing Management</i>	11	38	0.05	6.73	4	34T	0.08	6.00
<i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>	Not ranked in the AACSB sample				6	26T	0.12	7.33
<i>Journal of Direct Marketing</i>	Not ranked in the AACSB sample				6	26T	0.12	8.17
<i>Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing</i>	Not ranked in the AACSB sample				5	29T	0.10	4.60
<i>Journal of Business to Business Marketing</i>	Not ranked in the AACSB sample				5	29T	0.10	7.20
<i>Marketing Education Review</i>	Not ranked in the AACSB sample				5	29T	0.10	8.60
<i>Journal of Consumer Affairs</i>	Not ranked in the AACSB sample				4	34T	0.08	7.00
<i>Journal of Marketing Research Society</i>	Not ranked in the AACSB sample				3	36T	0.06	5.67
<i>Case Research Journal (NACRA)</i>	Not ranked in the AACSB sample				3	36T	0.06	7.33
<i>Other AMA Conference Proceedings</i>	Not ranked in the AACSB sample				3	36T	0.06	7.33
<i>Journal of Business Logistics</i>	Not ranked in the AACSB sample				3	36T	0.06	8.33

TABLE 4
JOURNAL RANKINGS FOR DOCTORATE-GRANTING AND NON-DOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

Journal Name	Doctorate-Granting Institutions				Non-Doctorate-Granting Institutions			
	Frequency (N = 118)	Rank	PFI	IPI	Frequency (N = 183)	Rank	PFI	IPI
<i>Journal of Marketing</i>	112	1	1.00	2.59	170	1	1.00	1.91
<i>Journal of Marketing Research</i>	111	2	0.99	2.30	148	2	0.87	2.78
<i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>	104	3	0.93	3.31	124	3	0.73	3.34
<i>Marketing Science</i>	82	4	0.73	4.20	61	10	0.36	5.69
<i>Journal of Retailing</i>	63	5	0.56	6.71	104	4	0.61	6.25
<i>Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science</i>	55	6	0.49	5.73	89	5	0.52	5.49
<i>Harvard Business Review</i>	51	7	0.46	6.29	83	6	0.49	5.35
<i>Management Science</i>	50	8	0.45	4.96	27	19T	0.16	6.81
<i>Journal of Business Research</i>	45	9	0.40	7.56	67	8	0.39	6.73
<i>Journal of Advertising</i>	38	10	0.34	6.74	71	7	0.42	5.99
<i>Journal of Advertising Research</i>	35	11	0.31	7.86	63	9	0.37	6.44
<i>Journal of Public Policy and Marketing</i>	28	12	0.25	6.75	29	16T	0.17	6.00
<i>Sloan Management Review</i>	26	13	0.23	7.46	22	24T	0.13	6.14
<i>Journal of Business</i>	24	14	0.21	6.88	21	26T	0.12	6.24
<i>International Journal of Research in Marketing</i>	21	15T	0.19	6.81	11	36T	0.06	6.00
<i>Psychology and Marketing</i>	21	15T	0.19	7.29	27	19T	0.16	7.74
<i>Advances in Consumer Research</i>	20	17	0.18	6.85	42	13	0.25	7.26
<i>Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management</i>	19	18	0.17	7.05	46	11	0.27	6.20
<i>Industrial Marketing Management</i>	17	19	0.15	6.29	24	21T	0.14	6.08
<i>Decision Sciences</i>	16	20	0.14	6.63	9	42T	0.05	7.22
<i>Journal of Consumer Psychology</i>	15	21	0.13	5.33	12	34T	0.07	5.92
<i>Journal of International Business Studies</i>	15	22	0.13	6.27	29	16T	0.17	5.93
<i>Marketing Letters</i>	13	23T	0.12	6.54	9	42T	0.05	5.67

Continued...

TABLE 4, Continued
 JOURNAL RANKINGS FOR DOCTORATE-GRANTING AND NON-DOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

Journal Name	Doctorate-Granting Institutions				Non-Doctorate-Granting Institutions			
	Frequency (N = 118)	Rank	PFI	IPI	Frequency (N = 183)	Rank	PFI	IPI
<i>California Management Review</i>	13	23T	0.12	7.62	23	23	0.14	6.52
<i>Journal of Product Innovation Management</i>	12	25T	0.11	6.75	9	42T	0.05	6.67
<i>Journal of International Marketing</i>	12	25T	0.11	8.08	24	21T	0.14	6.08
<i>European Journal of Marketing</i>	11	27	0.10	7.18	17	29	0.10	6.47
<i>Journal of Health Care Marketing</i>	10	28	0.09	6.60	15	31	0.09	6.93
<i>Journal of Consumer Marketing</i>	8	29	0.07	7.50	33	14	0.19	6.88
<i>Journal of Business Logistics</i>	7	30T	0.06	6.14	Not ranked in the Non-Doctorate sample			
<i>AMA Educators' Conference Proceedings</i>	7	30T	0.06	7.57	21	26T	0.12	7.33
<i>Journal of Services Marketing</i>	7	30T	0.06	7.86	28	18	0.16	7.25
<i>Journal of Marketing Education</i>	7	30T	0.06	8.00	44	12	0.26	6.98
<i>Business Horizons</i>	6	34T	0.05	6.33	30	15	0.18	5.93
<i>Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice</i>	6	34T	0.05	9.17	22	24T	0.13	6.82
<i>Journal of Marketing Management</i>	Not ranked in the Doctorate sample				21	26T	0.12	6.57
<i>Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing</i>	Not ranked in the Doctorate sample				16	30	0.09	7.25
<i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>	Not ranked in the Doctorate sample				13	32T	0.08	6.92
<i>Journal of Global Marketing</i>	Not ranked in the Doctorate sample				13	32T	0.08	7.77
<i>Marketing Management</i>	Not ranked in the Doctorate sample				12	34T	0.07	6.67
<i>International Journal of Research in Marketing</i>	Not ranked in the Doctorate sample				11	36T	0.06	6.00
<i>Journal of Professional Services Marketing</i>	Not ranked in the Doctorate sample				11	36T	0.06	7.91
<i>Marketing Education Review</i>	Not ranked in the Doctorate sample				11	36T	0.06	8.18
<i>Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing</i>	Not ranked in the Doctorate sample				10	39T	0.06	5.90
<i>Journal of Business to Business Marketing</i>	Not ranked in the Doctorate sample				10	39T	0.06	6.50
<i>Journal of Direct Marketing</i>	Not ranked in the Doctorate sample				10	39T	0.06	7.20
<i>Journal of Consumer Affairs</i>	Not ranked in the Doctorate sample				9	42T	0.05	7.89

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The two indices used in this study, the popularity/familiarity index (PFI) and the importance/prestige index (IPI), provided a broad-based, ranked assessment of the importance of marketing journals. The indices, when combined, provide a stronger and more reliable indicator of overall journal importance than a single index. A minimum level of PFI is needed, however, to avoid overinterpreting the data. For example, one write-in journal had an IPI of 1.0 (which would have placed it first on the IPI) but was ranked only once (PFI = .003 on the overall ranking). Likewise, a high IPI may not necessarily correspond with a high overall ranking. For example, *Business Horizons* had an IPI of 6.00 on the overall list, ranking as number 7 on the IPI, but tied for number 23 on the PFI. The opposite is true for the *Journal of Retailing*, which had the fourth highest PFI on the overall list but was only ranked 14th on the IPI, with a modest 6.44 index. Therefore, the two indices should be used in combination to provide a more balanced journal ranking.

Journal Perception Changes

Based on the PFI index, the top four journals, the *Journal of Marketing* (again perceived as the premier journal in the marketing field), the *Journal of Marketing Research*, the *Journal of Consumer Research*, and the *Journal of Retailing*, are holding firm at the top, with results similar to the findings in Luke and Doke (1987). These results are not surprising, since these four journals are well established in the marketing discipline; the *Journal of Marketing* began publishing in 1936, the *Journal of Marketing Research* in 1964, the *Journal of Consumer Research* in 1974, and the *Journal of Retailing* in 1925. The *Journal of Retailing* is the oldest marketing-related journal, which may explain its high PFI relative to its IPI. A majority of scholars are familiar with the journal and regard it as a quality outlet in marketing, but they do not regard it as one of the most important or prestigious journals (a majority of the aca-

demicians who included the *Journal of Retailing* on their top-10 list ranked it between 6th and 10th).

A significant difference between Luke and Doke (1987) and the present study is the number of journals with PFIs equal to or greater than the .05 cutoff. The 1987 study had 25 publications above the .05 level; this study has 41 publications equal to or above the .05 level (see Browne and Becker 1991). This result is not surprising, however, given the large number of new journals and the increased respect for other, maturing marketing publications.

Segmentation Differences

Table 3 identifies the journal rankings of faculty members from AACSB-accredited and non-AACSB-accredited institutions. While the top five journals are the same for both groups, those rated relatively higher by the AACSB-accredited faculty members after the top five seem to have a more pronounced theory and research orientation. For example, *Marketing Science*, the *Journal of Business Research*, and the *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management* are rated 6th, 8th, and 12th, respectively, by the AACSB-accredited faculty. Conversely, the non-AACSB faculty members tended to rate journals that have an application orientation higher than their AACSB counterparts. For example, the *Journal of Marketing Education*, *Business Horizons*, the *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, and the *California Management Review* are rated 9th, 10th (tied), 10th (tied), and 12th (tied), respectively, on the non-AACSB list.

Table 4 identifies the journal rankings of doctorate-granting institutions (DGI) and non-doctorate-granting institutions (NDGI). The DGI faculty members show greater convergence of opinion concerning perceived journal quality than do NDGI faculty. The DGI faculty had 35 journals receiving a PFI of .05 or greater, versus 45 such journals for the NDGI faculty. In addition, *Marketing Science* and *Management Science*, two journals affiliated with competitively awarded research grants, are rated much higher by DGI respondents

than by NDGI respondents (4th versus 10th, and 8th versus 19th, respectively).

Publication Strategies

Given the consistently high PFI and IPI ratings of the *Journal of Marketing*, the *Journal of Marketing Research*, and the *Journal of Consumer Research*, publishing in these journals will enhance the author's reputation and professional status, whatever the motivation for publication (reputation, scholarly dialogue, tenure/promotion, or knowledge-base contribution). Authors are cautioned, however, against using a strategy of automatically sending all manuscripts to these journals. If the manuscript is rejected, sending the manuscript to other journals in order of decreasing prestige or popularity until the paper is accepted can be detrimental. For example, Mullins (1977) states that authors can lose their credibility with journal editors and reviewers; manuscripts can become dated during the overly long multiple journal review process; other researchers may publish similar studies; or authors may become disheartened by the increased number of journal rejections.

The results indicate that authors wanting to initiate a scholarly discussion in a widely recognized outlet should consider targeting the *Journal of Retailing*, due to its relatively high PFI of .60 among the overall sample. Authors wishing to enhance their reputations among AACSB-accredited and doctorate-granting institutions should consider targeting *Marketing Science*, given the high IPI score of 4.80 (fourth on the importance/prestige index for the overall sample). *Marketing Science* was also ranked much higher on both indices with the AACSB-accredited and doctorate-granting respondents. Thus, using a combination of the IPI and PFI indices can aid authors in developing and implementing publication strategies.

Relative to AACSB-accredited schools, authors would be advised to consider targeting manuscripts to the *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science (JAMS)*. This journal has increased in rank considerably since the last marketing journal perceptions study

(cf. Browne and Becker 1991). For example, considering both IPI and PFI indices, *JAMS* is rated fourth by faculty from AACSB-accredited schools. In addition, *Marketing Science*, the *Journal of Business Research*, and the *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management* are regarded more highly at AACSB schools than at non-AACSB schools.

Strategies for authors interested in the perceptions of doctorate-granting institutions should strongly consider targeting *Marketing Science*. This journal ranks fourth on both IPI and PFI indices. Authors should also note the relatively higher positioning of *Management Science*, the *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, the *Sloan Management Review*, and the *Journal of Business* in the minds of doctoral faculty. When their motivation is contributing to a scholarly dialogue in marketing, authors should consider adding these journals to their evoked set of potential publication outlets.

In the final analysis, publication strategies are personal decisions that may include more criteria than whether the journal is perceived as being important. For example, consider the author whose motive is the contribution of knowledge to a narrow, nonacademic audience. This individual would not find the information found in this article to be very useful. Regardless of our findings, this individual would continue to seek outlets that were read by the desired audience.

LIMITATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The findings and conclusions presented in this article are subject to several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the results. First, Tables 2, 3, and 4 list the ratings of some journals that are relevant to marketing scholars. These lists are presented with the caution that providing such rankings is debatable, given the breadth and complexity of the marketing field. In addition, although the sample was large and attempts were made to identify the most important publications, other researchers may have developed a different list.

Second, marketing scholarship is diverse in terms of subjects and philosophical approaches. Issues such as qualitative versus quantitative approaches and academic versus practical relevance affect the quality perceptions of some journals. Furthermore, faculty research interests may potentially affect the results found in our rankings. For example, consumer behavior was the largest identified primary research interest area among the respondents. Perhaps the relatively large proportion of respondents interested in consumer behavior influenced the high rankings of the *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, which did not appear on the original list. In addition, the strong cross-disciplinary dynamic of some marketing scholarship leads to a broader targeting of journals (such as the *Journal of Consumer Research*). Also, marketing scholars frequently target high-quality journals outside the marketing discipline, journals that do not rank above the .05 PFI level on overall journal rankings in marketing but are considered high-quality journals in their respective fields.

Third, although the analysis for non-response bias, performed by comparing early with late respondents on a select set of demographics, did not reveal any such problems, the potential for such bias needs to be recognized (Armstrong and Overton 1977). While the sample was stratified to include a broad number of faculty from a variety of schools, including professors, associate professors, and assistant professors, to prevent any sample representation bias, the sampling frame of a study like this is always subject to questions. For example, why did the respondents from schools offering doctoral programs have a proportionally higher response rate (118 of the 309, or 38%), compared with the total population of potential respondents from schools with doctoral programs (1,055 out of 3,871, or 27%)? (The total ratio of faculty representing doctorate-granting institutions was obtained from Hasselback's [1995] *Wiley Guide to Marketing Faculty*, 1995.)

Recognizing these shortcomings, we make no pretense that the rankings presented in this article are objective indicators of the

importance of any journal. No one should use the rankings in Tables 2, 3, and 4 as definitive statements. The authors, however, believe the results adequately depict marketing faculty perceptions of journal importance. The study is considered timely in that it provides a benchmark of the progress of new and maturing journals, which can be monitored and evaluated by similar studies in the future. In addition, these rankings can be used to place individual journals in a relative context with other marketing journals.

The results of this study, while not meant to be all-encompassing or to present the definitive study on marketing journal importance, should be useful for both administrators and individual faculty, due to the critical relationship of journal publications to the current academic reward system. The results of this study also can be used by researchers in developing a publishing strategy that is based on what they hope to accomplish (see Mullins 1977; Pierce and Garven 1995).

In addition, journal editors can use this study when positioning their journals in the marketplace. Many authors may not target certain journals because they perceive the journal as relatively unknown and not easily recognized by other faculty members. Accordingly, journal editors should perhaps consider participation in various promotional or academic activities, such as publication of "Best Papers" from conference proceedings, designed to raise the journal's profile in an effort to increase manuscript quality and number of submissions.

Future research in this area could consider a data collection schema that characterizes journals as being multidimensional, rather than using such unidimensional measurements as perceived journal importance. For example, the follow-up study described here defined importance as the journal's ability to generate and disseminate scholarly marketing knowledge to the field. If respondents were specifically asked to evaluate marketing journals on several dimensional criteria, the data obtained could be evaluated with more sophistication when analyzing faculty perceptions of these journals. Some

possible criteria for obtaining multidimensional results may include (1) usefulness of the journal for keeping up-to-date on current marketing practices, (2) its readership frequency, (3) the extent to which the journal is advancing marketing knowledge, (4) its usefulness in application, (5) its dissemination of theoretical knowledge, (6) its dissemination of empirical knowledge, (7) its dissemination of functional area information, (8) its dissemination of marketing research issues, and (9) the usefulness of publishing in the journal for obtaining tenure.

References

- Armstrong, J. Scott, and Terry S. Overton (1977). "Estimating Nonresponse Bias in Mail Surveys." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14 (August): 396–402.
- Becker, Howard (1986). *Writing for the Social Scientist: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book, or Article*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bertrand, Philip V. (1987). "Writing for Academic Publications." In *Publish or Perish*, edited by Philip Hills. Cambridge, MA: Peter Francis Publishers.
- Bohrer, Paul, and Robert Dolphin Jr. (1985). "Expectations and Support for Scholarly Activity in Schools of Business." *Journal of Education for Business*, 61 (December): 101–5.
- Browne, William G., and Boris W. Becker (1979). "Perceived Quality of Marketing Journals." *Journal of Marketing Education*, 1 (November): 6–15.
- (1985). "Perceptions of Marketing Journals: Awareness and Quality Evaluations." In *1985 AMA Educators' Proceedings*, edited by Robert F. Lusch. Chicago: American Marketing Association, pp. 149–54.
- (1991). "A Longitudinal Study of Marketing Journal Familiarity and Quality." In *1991 AMA Educators' Proceedings: Enhancing Knowledge Development in Marketing*, edited by Mary C. Gilly. Chicago: American Marketing Association, pp. 702–10.
- Bush, Alan J., and E. Stephen Grant (1991). "An Analysis of Leading Contributors to the Sales Force Research Literature, 1980–1990." *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 11 (3): 47–56.
- Chandy, P.R., and Thomas G.E. Williams (1994). "The Impact of Journals and Authors on International Business Research: A Citational Analysis of JIBS Articles." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25, (4): 715–28.
- Clark, Gary L. (1986). "Leading Marketing Departments in the United States: Who Is Publishing Where, and How Much Are They Publishing?" In *Proceedings of the AMA Summer Educators' Conference*, edited by Terence A. Shimp et al. Chicago: American Marketing Association, pp. 149–53.
- Davis, Gordon B. (1980). "A Systematic Evaluation of Publications for Promotion of MIS Academics." In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Information Systems*. n.p.: Society for Management Information Systems (in cooperation with the Association for Computing Machinery and the Institute of Management Sciences), pp. 206–16.
- Fry, Elaine Hobbs, C. Glenn Walters, and Lawrence E. Scheuermann (1985). "Perceived Quality of Fifty Selected Journals: Academicians and Practitioners." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 13 (Spring): 352–61.
- Glen, John (1987). "The Editor's Viewpoint." In *Publish or Perish*, edited by Philip Hills. Cambridge, MA: Peter Francis Publishers.
- Hasselback, James R. (1995). *Wiley Guide to Marketing Faculty, 1995*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Henry, W.R., and E.E. Burch (1974). "Institutional Contributions to Scholarly Journals and Business." *Journal of Business*, 47 (January): 56–66.
- Luke, Robert H., and E. Reed Doke (1987). "Marketing Journal Hierarchies: Faculty Perceptions, 1986–1987." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 15 (1): 74–8.
- McCullough, Charles D., Bob Wooten, and John Ryan (1981). "Research and Publication Programs in Collegiate Schools of Business: A Faculty Development Approach." *Journal of Business Education*, 57 (November): 46–9.
- Moore, L.J., and B.W. Taylor (1980). "A Study of Institutional Publications in Business-Related Academic Journals, 1972–1978." *Quarterly Review of Economics and Business*, 20 (Spring): 87–97.
- Moxley, Joseph M. (1992). *Publish, Don't Perish: The Scholar's Guide to Academic Writing and Publishing*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Mullins, Carolyn J. (1977). *A Guide to Writing and Publishing in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication. (1979). *Scholarly Communication*. A report on research conducted under the auspices of the American Council of Learned Societies. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Pierce, Barbara, and Garnet Garven (1995). "Publishing International Business Research: A Survey of Leading Journals." *Journal of International Business Research*, 26 (1): 69–89.
- Russell, J.T., and C.H. Martin (1976). "Sources of Scholarly Publications in Marketing, Advertising, and Public Relations." *Journal of Advertising*, 5 (Summer): 29–34.