An Examination of the Globalisation of Authorship in Publishing in 20 Leading Marketing Journals

An Examination of the Globalisation of Authorship in Publishing in 20 Leading Marketing Journals

Professor Michael Jay Polonsky, Ph.D.
Melbourne Airport Chair in Marketing
School of Hospitality, Tourism and Marketing
Victoria University
PO Box 14428
Melbourne City MC 8001
AUSTRALIA
Phone: (61-3) 9919-4625
Fax: (61-3) 9919-4931
Email: Michael.Polonsky@vu.edu.au

Romana Garma
School of Hospitality, Tourism and Marketing
Victoria University
PO Box 14428
Melbourne City MC 8001
AUSTRALIA
Phone: (61-3) 9919-5270
Fax: (61-3) 9919-4931
Email: Romana.Garma@vu.edu.au

John D. Mittelstaedt, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Marketing
Department of Marketing
College of Business and Behavioral Science
253 Sirrine Hall
Clemson University
Clemson, SC 29634-1325
Phone: (864) 656 - 5293
Fax: (864) 656 - 0138
Email: jmittel@clemson.edu

Revised and Submitted to the
European Business Review
August 2006

An Examination of the Globalisation of Authorship in Publishing in 20 Leading Marketing Journals

WORD COUNT 8136

KEY WORDS Keywords: Publishing, Global, Knowledge Development, Research Performance

TYPE OF MANUSCRIPT: Research Paper

ABSTRACT

Purpose of this paper is to examine the global contribution of academics to marketing literature between 1999 and 2003, based on an examination of the location of academics institution of employment, as reported in published works. The data is used to evaluate the global dispersion of publishing.

Design/approach. The paper uses the method of content analysis where the authorship of all articles in 20 leading marketing journals between 1999 and 2003 is examined. An empirical examination of performance was undertaken across geographic regions. There was also an examination of whether the quality of journal affected regional performance.

Findings. The research found that there is a significant "bias" of authorship within the 20 journals examined, with the majority of works published by academics at institutions in North America. There is some variation in regional performance based on the type of journal examined.

Limitations. There was no attempt to empirically examine why differences might exist. The study only focused on a sample of 20 English language journals over 5 years. These journals have been included in studies that list the leading marketing journal for US and European academics.

Practical Implications. The research suggests that there may in fact be regional differences in publishing behaviour. It is unclear if these differences relate to variations in the "objectives" of institutions within each country or other factors, such as the North American publish-or-perish mentality. The research posits that a marketing knowledge may be unnecessarily restricted, if there is a bias against non-North American perspectives.

Originality. While there have been other works examining research performance of institutions, there has been limited examination in marketing on the nation in which authors work and none have used a broad cross-section of journals. This work takes a global "snapshot" of national research performance within marketing.

An Examination of the Globalisation of Authorship in Publishing in 20 Leading Marketing Journals

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to empirically examine the global dispersion of scholarly contributions to marketing thought within a set of 20 'leading' journals over five-years. Theory development in marketing, as in other disciplines, happens as boundaries expand, both intellectually and geographically. Marketing scholars have identified that there is a healthy cross fertilisation of thinking within the marketing discipline (Baumgartner and Pieters 2003, Bettencourt and Houston 2001, Guidry et al. 2004, Knight et al 2000). This is important, as it ensures that marketing incorporates ideas developed from other disciplines. One question that has not been extensively explored in marketing is whether ideas are being drawn from academics around the world (Svensson 2005, Stremersch and Verhoef 2005).

Research has examined the contribution of individual researchers and institutions (Bakir et al 2000, Cheng et al 2003, Easton and Easton 2003, Henthorne et al. 1998). Unfortunately, much of this research has sought to rank individuals or institutions (for example Bakir et al 2000), rather than focusing on how their contributions expand the development of marketing theory. It is often suggested that there is not extensive global dispersion of authors within marketing (Rosenstreich. and Wooliscroft 2005, Svensson 2005) and other business disciplines (Boyacigiller and Adler 1991, Doktor et al 1991, Thomas et al 1994). However other authors have suggested that within the 'top' journals there is an increasingly global representation of authors and thus no global bias exists (Wilkie and Moore 2003, Stremersch and Verhoef 2005). The purpose of this paper is to empirically examine the potential myth regarding the global dispersion of scholarly contributions to marketing thought within a cross-section of journals, where national affiliation of institutions is the unit of analysis.

IS THERE GLOBAL DIVERSITY OF SCHOLARSHIP?

Current research in marketing has discussed the degree to which scholarship is globally dispersed (Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft 2005, Svensson 2005, Stremersch and Verhoef 2005). It has been suggested that a lack of global inclusion, could possibly inhibit knowledge development, especially if this means certain types of research (i.e. different methodologies, geographical or cultural issues) are not included in US journals (Brinn et al. 2001, Homburg 2003, Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft 2005, Svensson 2005), although it has also been acknowledged that global issues may not necessarily be of equal interest to all audiences of journals (Stremersch and Verhoef 2005)

Is the lack of global dispersion of scholarly contributions a reality or a misperception? Svensson (2005) suggests that 95% of all articles in one unnamed leading marketing journal had at least one author located in the US. However, recent longitudinal research examining the five leading marketing journals suggest that global dispersion of authorship had increasing from 7.1% of authors outside the United States in 1964-1973 to 22.8% in 1999-2003 (Stremersch and Verhoef 2005). Wilkie and Moore (2003) also suggest that between 1986-87 and 2001-02 the international representation of authors (i.e. those based outside the United States) in leading journals has more than doubled, from 25% to 50%. These later works only explored what the researchers defined as the leading 5 journals.[1] However, it is unclear if the patterns of global dispersion they identified would occur over a cross-section of marketing journals. Literature suggests that even given these empirical results there is still a perception on the part of some academics that global dispersion does not exist and that there is a negative

[1] Stremersch and Verhoef (2005) - JM, JMR, JCR, MKS and IJRM; Wilkie and Moore (2003)- JM, JMR, JCR, MKS & JPPM.

bias against those from outside North America (Brinn et al. 2001, Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft 2005, Svensson 2005). Even Stremersch and Verhoef (2005 p593), who found there was extensive globalisation in authorship recognised that more could be done on the part of journals to ensure that the globalisation of contributions continues (i.e. global editors, global editorial review board members, etc.).

The research on the evaluation of publishing performance does seem to suggest that academics from the United States 'dominate' the leading journals. For example, within the International Business area, Kumar and Kundu (2004) found that only 28% of the "top 50" institutions publishing in international business were based outside the US. Thomas et al (1994) had similar results where institutions outside the United States contributed 30.1% of the published articles in the international business area between 1986-1993. For theory development this could be especially worrisome if it means that important perspectives on marketing issues relevant to non-US organisations are under-explored.

The lack of global inclusion within marketing has also been identified by some academics. As was mentioned previously Svensson (2005) found that 95% of all articles in one un-named leading marketing journal had at least one US author. Within specialised areas in marketing there also appears to be a concentration of authors from the United States. Within the industrial marketing area, Ford et al (2001) found that 72.3% of all authors were US-based. Moncrief et al (2000) identified that there was only one non-United States based university in the top-30 institutions publishing in the selling and sales area. Henthorne et al. (1998) found that there were no institutions outside the United States in the top 30 universities publishing within the advertising area. While Hanna and LaTour (2002) found that there were only three international institutions represented in the top 50 Universities publishing within the logistics

area.

If a regional bias in published does exist, this will limit the development of thinking, as there are theoretical perspectives and research approaches that may not be effectively considered (Boyacigiller and Adler 1991). The lack of inclusion of ideas from global regions could mean that theory develops in much slower and narrower ways than might otherwise be the case, especially if these under-utilised perspectives would have advanced marketing theory development (Thomas et al 1994). However, it should be noted that many leading journals, in marketing and other disciplines, include 'positioning statements' that encourage non-US authors to submit works and perspectives (Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft 2005). For example, Roland Rust (2005) the editor of the *Journal of Marketing* stated:

> *"… non-U.S. authors will have a fair opportunity to publish at* JM. *That is not to say that publication will be easy—recall that the journal's current acceptance rate is 11%--but I will guarantee that there will be no bias against non-U.S. authors or non-U.S. data. I have also increased non-U.S. participation on the Editorial Review Board."*

Any bias, intentional or not, against non-North American research perspectives can stifle new ideas and theory development. Getting innovative ideas published has been found to be generally harder (Armstrong 1995) and thus no new obstacles are needed for advancing knowledge. Given the general lack of research on the global dispersion of research in marketing this paper attempts to examine the degree to which authors from different regions participate in publishing in a cross-section of "leading" marketing journals.

WHY MIGHT DIFFERENCES EXIST?

There has been some research into perceived bias in academic publishing against non-US perspectives. Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft (2005) examined why Australasian academics were not successful in US-based marketing journals, and found that Australasian academics

felt that issues such as being linked into the right research networks and undertaking the right types of research limited their US publishing success. This perception can also be found by other non-US business academics. United Kingdom accounting academics also perceived that there was a preference by reviewers in the US for certain “theoretical or methodological” approaches, which might negatively bias against non-US research, especially works that seek to address research questions differently (Brinn et al. 2001). This might also explain why marketing academics in the UK seem not to target US journals with their work (Easton and Easton 2003).

There is some evidence that there are real, regional differences in the way academics evaluate knowledge, or at least journals. For example, Theoharakis and Hirst 2002 and Mort et al. 2004 found that academics in different regions appear to rank journals differently, which might relate to underlying differences in how they view research. Polonsky and Whitelaw (2005) found that there were regional differences in the perceived importance of a journal’s: prestige, contribution to theory, contribution to teaching, and contribution to practice. US academics placed more importance on prestige than contribution to knowledge, whereas European academics valued contribution to knowledge more than prestige.

Differences in organisational objectives of institutions should translate into differences in research foci of the individuals employed within these institutions (AACSB 2004, Hawes and Keillor 2002, Koojatoenprasit et al 1998, Polonsky 2004). As such, academics in different regions would possibly be expected to target different journals. This would suggest that there are potentially real differences in how publishing might be valued.

The publish-or-perish mentality traditionally adopted in many US institutions (Hawes and

Keillor 2002) might significantly contribute to the differences in academics' publishing philosophy. Within the marketing discipline in the US, institutions usually clearly define publishing expectations required for tenure. For example, the special interest group of the American Marketing Association dealing with doctoral student issues regularly publishes the mean tenure expectations of different types of universities (DocSig 2006, DocSig 2005, DocSig 2004).

As can be seen in Table 1, there are significant publishing expectations on academics at all US institutions, although the publishing expectations in terms of "A-journals" and other outlets appears to differ between institution types. The overall high expectations across institutions might result in US trained academics being more competitive than those outside the US, where expectations have, traditionally not been as explicit. It could be argued that this difference in research philosophy is partly reflected in non-US academics' views about perceived bias in publishing (Brinn et al. 2001, Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft 2005). Given the importance of education in shaping an academic's research orientation (Stremersch and Verhoef 2005, Wilkie and More 2003), one would anticipate that those trained in the US based system would adopt the US philosophical model of publishing (Schlegelmich 2004). As such the publish-or-perish mentality perpetuates itself and even affects those from outside the US who undertake their higher degrees in the US.

PLACE TABLE 1 HERE

The development of international rankings and national assessments of research performance might result in publishing approaches being identified more clearly. For example, Cheng et al (2003) suggested that marketing academics in Asia were publishing in leading journals,

however, they were not as productive as the leading US institutions. If these leading US institutions were viewed as their competitors, then the Asian institutions would need to establish performance targets similar to their US peers.

Formal governmental research assessment exercises seek to objectively quantify the performance of institutions (Allen Consulting Group 2005) and may highlight 'gaps' in research performance. It has been suggested, based on evaluations in the UK Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), that institutions have determined that they need to improve publishing productivity to improve their RAE score (Bence and Oppenheim 2004, Easton and Easton 2003). National benchmarks, such as RAE exercises might result in the 'publish-or-perish' mentality spreading globally, simply because there is a desire to increase research standing, which is only achieved by publishing in higher quality journals. This does, however, ignore the fact that institutions may have different missions, and thus all academics might not necessarily be targeting the same set of journals. While understanding why differences exist in publishing performance is important, the current research does not examine this issue.

WHAT ARE THE LEADING MARKETING JOURNALS?

There is a growing literature in identifying the "leading" journals within disciplines. Works such as those by Starbuck (2005) suggest that generally works published in the 'most prestigious' journals contribute more to knowledge than works published in other 'leading' journals. There are of course exceptions; with some research suggesting some works in "leading" journals are rarely, if ever, cited (Sivadas and Johnson 2005).

Defining the leading journals in marketing is no easy task. While there are many studies on this topic (See AMA 2006 for a list of works looking at Journal Rankings) these tend to take

different approaches to ranking journals. The two main approaches used in the literature are based on academics' perceptions and citation rates (Sivadas and Johnson 2005). Polonsky and Whitelaw (2005) found that a statistically significant correlation exists across ranking studies, for the top ranked journals. However, they found that correlations diminished and became non-significant as one moved down the ranking lists. Thus, across the top ranked journals the method used may be of less importance.

Many of the journals' ranking systems are based on single items, i.e. individual's perceptions of the journals impact, importance or quality, or alternatively based on an evaluation of the number of citations of articles in these journals. One exception to this is Polonsky and Whitelaw's (2006) multi-dimensional perceptual ranking, where a cross section of US marketing academics evaluated journals they were familiar with on four dimensions (prestige, contribution to theory, contribution to practice and contribution to teaching), which were then weighted by respondents in terms of general importance when evaluating a journal. Polonsky and Whitelaw (2006) also undertook a cluster analysis on journals ranked by more than half of their respondents, using the respondents four evaluative criteria for each journal. This resulted in a three-cluster solution, which they defined as "A", "B" and "C" journals. According to Hawes and Keillor (2002) the use of A, B, C to classify journals is often used in universities (See Table 1 which refers to A publications), where publications in a class, rather than a particular journal, define research expectations.

Polonsky and Whitelaw (2006) found there were significant differences in the mean scores across the four criteria between three clusters other than for A and B journals' contribution to teaching and B and C journals' contribution to theory. That is A-journals were viewed to have the highest prestige, as well as contribution to theory and practice. Their contribution to

teaching was seen to be the same B-journals. B-journals where seen to perform below A-journals, but above C journals on prestige, as well as contribution to practice and teaching. It was perceived that B-journals and C-journals did not differ in terms of their contribution to theory. This suggested that A-journals are the emanate journals in marketing, B-journals are high quality marketing journals and C-marketing journals are acceptable quality marketing journals, although it should be noted that there are no universally accepted 'lists' of A, B and C journals.

Table 2 provides a sample of the top 20 journals from six marketing journal-ranking studies. In selecting rankings we sought to include a cross section of rankings using various approaches[2]. We included two citation based rankings (Baumgarter and Pieters 2003, Guidry et al 2004) as well as regionally based perceptual evaluations: US (Hult et al 1997, Polonsky and Whitelaw 2006), European (Theoharakis and Hirst 2002), and Australasian (Mort et al 2004). It does need to be acknowledged that we have only used rankings from English sources, and thus other studies may also exist.

Table 2 lists the "top 20" journals from each study. When the number is presented in brackets this represents how this top 20 journal was rated in the other studies. No ranking means it was not ranked within the other studies, which may relate to the journal not fitting within the focus of the study or that it was not evaluated with the set of journals evaluated. As can be seen in Table 2 there is extensive overlap in the journals included in the various ratings. Given that Polonsky and Whitelaw (2005) found there was high correlation across the leading journals,

[2] Polonsky and Whitelaw (2006) is a multi-dimensional perceptual ranking based on the views of a cross section of US academics. Theoharakis and Hirst (2002), is a single item perceptual ranking of leading European academics. Hult et al. (1997) is a single item perceptual ranking of a cross section of marketing academics. Mort et al. is a single item perceptual ranking based on Heads of Schools of Marketing Departments in Australia in New Zealand. Baumgarter and Pieters (2003) rankings are calculates as the overall influence of the citations in the journals identified. Guidry et al (2004) citation ranking is based on a review of citations in 6 leading journals over 5 years.

we believe that these would be representative of global views. Within this study as presented in this paper we have therefore included the 'leading 20' journals as identified by Polonsky and Whitelaw (2006). These also have the benefit that they fall into three pre-defined groups (A, B, C).

METHODOLOGY

Journals examined

The geographic authorship of five years of articles in 20 leading marketing journals was examined. The sample of journals examined were Polonsky and Whitelaw's (2006) top 20 journals (see Table 2). Table 2 also reports the location of the editor and publisher for the 20 journals examined in this study.

The Polonsky and Whitelaw (2006) rankings focused solely on marketing journals; multi-disciplinary journals were excluded. They developed their rankings based on the views of a cross section of US academics, rather than selecting highly research active respondents views. Their rankings used respondents' multidimensional perceptual evaluations of journals, whereas most other rankings are based on single items. Respondents were asked to evaluate journals that they were familiar with on four dimensions: prestige, contribution to knowledge, contribution to practice and contribution to teaching. Respondents were also asked to weight the general importance of these four dimensions when evaluating a journal using a 100 point summed scale. The general weights were used to calculate an overall weighted perceptual evaluation for each journal.

Polonsky and Whitelaw (2006) then undertook a cluster analysis on 20 journals ranked by more than half of their respondents, using the respondents four evaluative criteria for each

journal. This resulted in a three-cluster solution, which they defined as “A”, “B” and “C” journals. As far as we are aware, this is the only research that defines groupings of journals within in a discipline, rather than simply focusing on rankings alone.

PLACE TABLE 2 HERE

Data

Data on authors’ institutional affiliation, was collected by reviewing all articles (i.e. excluding editorials, book reviews, etc) published in 20 leading journals, between 1999-2003 as identified by Polonsky and Whitelaw (2006). Thus, if there were four co-authors on one article each authors’ institution was allocated a “0.25”. If more than one author was affiliated with the same institution, this institution would have been credited multiple times and when an individual listed more than one affiliation their “score” was split between institutions. This approach has been used in other evaluations of publishing (for example, Zou 2005).

The data was then tabulated across institutions within countries for each of the 20 journals, as well as for the three groupings of journals (A, B and C). There were 314 articles over the five-years within the 20 journals. There were 870 authors associated with the works and these were based in 57 different countries. In addition, there were a number of industry-based authors, which were excluded from the analysis.

Analysis

Given the exploratory nature of this research, the data analysis is primarily descriptive, as we are seeking to examine the global dispersion of publishing across the three categories of journals. Rather than examine all 57 countries’ performance in detail, we focused on a

comparison of the 20 [3] most prolific countries in publishing. It is recognised that there are different numbers of academics and universities in various countries and we did not attempt to make any adjustments for size, which is a potential limitation, unfortunately no global database exists that lists the data on the number of academics in countries. Spearman correlations were undertaken to identify if there are relationships in the publishing within A, B and C journals across the 20 leading nations.

We then examined the publishing performance within individual journals. To make this task more manageable, we aggregated the countries into seven regions - North America, South America, European, Middle East, Africa, Asia, and Australasia.[4] Z-tests were conducted to examine whether there were differences in the publishing performance of academics in different regions across journal types (A, B, and C). This allowed us to ascertain whether academics from different regions contributed more any specific type (cluster) of journals.

Regional differences were then examined using ANOVA's and paired t-tests to determine whether there are differences in publishing performance across regions and whether this is based on the journal being US published and edited (see Table 2). Data on the publisher was identified from the Urlics Publication Guide (2005), while editorship was identified from the journals' web page.

RESULTS

The first step of the analysis was to examine the number of countries that were represented across the 20 journals. In regards to authors' institution there were 57 countries represented in the sample. On one level this might appear "high", suggesting there is a globally diverse set of

[3] "Ties" in performance means that more than 20 countries are included in some instances.
[4] There are different numbers of countries within each region, which were not adjusted for.

academic contributions to knowledge through publication. However, an examination of the performance suggests that there is high concentration by some countries, with academics in the top 11 countries authoring 80% of all articles published. The US contribution is highest across the total sample and within the three sub-groups (A, B and C). The second most contributing nation was the UK, followed by Australia, the Netherlands, Canada and Hong Kong (See Table 3). Stremersch and Verhoef (2005) found similar results, although the ordering of the top countries varied slightly. While country rankings varied across the three sub-categories, spearman correlations identified that there was a statistically significant correlation in publishing performance across the journal sub-groups: A-B = 0.687 ($p<.01$); A-C= 0.640 ($p<.01$); and B-C=.782 ($p<.01$).

PLACE TABLE 3 HERE

Table 4 examines the authorship performance by journal for each of the seven geographic regions. The first column reports on the non-academic authors for each journal (these were not tabulated by region). Within the A journals, non-academics wrote between 1.31% and 3.89% of all articles. In the B category of journals there was a wider variation in non-academic contributions ranging from 0.76% of articles to 23.43% of all articles. Within the C journal category the percentage of non-academic contributions varied between 1.83% and 11.46%. The *Journal of Advertising Research*, which self-identifies as a "trade" journal (Urlichs 2005) had 22.43% of non-academic authored works. The *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing* (16.91%) and *Journal of Consumer Marketing* (11.46%) were the only other journals to have more than 10% non-academic authors.

PLACE TABLE 4 HERE

In examining the regional performance it can be seen that North American academics (i.e. US, Canadian and Mexican) author the majority of works (67.56%) across all journals. This is lower than the 80% reported by Stremersch and Verhoef's (2005) for academics in the United States and Canadian from 1999-2002, within the six leading marketing journals. It is however higher than the 50% of United States academics reported by Wilkie and Moore (2003) in their review of five leading journals.

The other six regions represent 27.33% of the authors of the articles examined; European authors contributed 17.65%, Asian 3.68% and Australasia 5.13%. South America, Middle-Eastern and African academics did contribute to global knowledge, but at a much lower level. The low rates of representation of some regions might relate to the fact that English journals were examined.

Z-tests were undertaken to determine whether differences in the publishing performance across journal types existed. That is, was there some variation in performance based on whether A, B or C journals were considered. The results suggest that there is a variation between journal groupings for North Americans, as they contributed more to A-type journals than either B (Z=10.77) or C (Z=7.93) journals. While not statistically tested there also appears to be some variation within journal groupings as well. For example, North Americans contributed only 17% of all articles in the *European Journal of Marketing*, but contributed 93% of all articles in the *Journal of Marketing Education.*

We identified 28 European countries in the European regional grouping that contributed 17.65% of all journal articles in the leading 20 journals. One might have anticipated that they

would have contributed a greater proportion of articles, simply given the number of marketing academics and institutions across Europe. In terms of variations in performance between the three journal groupings European academics produced statistically more articles in B and C journals than they did in A-type journals (Z=-7.91 and Z=-5.89 respectively). Within categories there are also high variations in contributions. For example, within the B grouping European authors contributed more than half of the works in the *European Journal of Marketing*, as well as over 30% of the works in *Industrial Marketing Management* and the Int*ernational Journal of Research in Marketing*, but they produced less than 5% of the articles in the *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management* and *Journal of Marketing Education*. In the C category they contributed more than 20% of the articles to *Advances in Consumer Research* and the *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, but fewer than 10% of the articles in the *Journal of Consumer Marketing*.

Australasian academics (Australia, New Zealand and Fijian) contributed the third highest proportion of articles overall (5.l3%). Given the small size of this region, in population and number of universities, it would seem that authors in this region are relatively outperforming other regions. There is a statistically significant difference in performance across journal categories. Australasian academics produce more B journal articles than A journal articles (Z= -4.80) and more C journal articles than A journal articles (Z= -3.68). High variation exists within categories as well, for example Australasian authors contributed 14.83% of the articles in the *European Journal of Marketing* and 11.46% of the articles in the *Journal of Consumer Marketing.*

The fourth highest contributing group of authors is from Asia. There were nine countries

included in this group and they contributed 3.68% of all articles published in the leading 20 journals. It is surprising that this region's output is so small given the size of the population and the growing numbers of academics in the region. Cheng et al. (2003) identified that there were in fact some highly active institutions and individuals within the region and thus its' contribution may grow in the future. Stremersch and Verhoef (2005) identified that Hong Kong was growing and alone represented 2% of all works in the top five journals between 1999-2002. In terms of differences in performance between journal categories there was only one statistical difference between A and C journals (Z=2.09). Authors from this region contributed mostly to the *Journal of Consumer Marketing* (9.73%), *International Journal of Research In Marketing* (6.70%), *Journal of Advertising* (5.52%), and *Journal of Consumer Psychology* (5.18%).

In terms of the other three regions, relatively small numbers of articles were published in the 20 leading marketing journals and none of the regions contributed more than 1% of the articles in any journal group. Middle Eastern authors produced more than 1% of the articles in *Journal of Marketing Research*, *Journal of Retailing* and *Marketing Science*, *European Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Advertising*, *Journal of Consumer Psychology* and *Marketing Letters*. African authors contributed more than 1% of the articles in the *Academy of Marketing Science Review*. There were no statistical differences in publishing across the three journal groupings for authors in any region.

The next phase of the analysis used ANOVA to examine whether publishing performance varied based on the region being considered or whether the journal was published/edited in the US. The interaction between these effects was also examined. The ANOVA results suggest that the percentage of articles published does in fact vary based on the region being

considered (F= 157.11 p<.001). Given the results discussed previously this does not seem surprising. The ANOVA results also suggest that the region where the journal is edited/published does appear to influence publishing performance (F=.01 p>.10). There was also a statistically significant interaction between region and journal location (F=3.98 p<.001).

A country based analysis of the effect of publisher/editor locations found that location did impact on the publishing of academics in the following regions: North America (F=4.011 p=.061), Asia (F=9.313 p=.007) and Australasia (F=6.051 p=.024). In the case of North Americans and Asian academics they published more in journals that were published and edited in the United States. Australasian academics preferred journals that were not published or edited in the United States. This is important, as it suggests that people in these regions are more successful in terms of publishing based on where the journal is located. However, this does not necessarily mean that there is a bias in journals' publishing policy, rather it might also reflects a bias in terms of which journals people in different regions target.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the study suggest that there is global contribution to publishing, however it is still dominated by academics based in North America. It is unclear why the gap in performance across regions exists. One would hope that there is not a bias on the part of reviewers or editors against non-North American works. It may be that academics outside North America do not send articles to these journals (Easton and Easton 2003) and therefore there are fewer internationally authored articles for these journals to review.

The US publish-or-perish mentality might provide a competitive incentive to academics in

North America. The pressure to succeed might mean that they spend more time developing research programs that are 'publishable' within the leading marketing journals. This approach to research might even be inculcated in US PhD training (Stremersch and Verhoef 2005. Wilkie and Moore 2003) and therefore these academics have a different approach to research throughout their career. This might then explain why some UK and Australasian academics believe that North American journals want different types of research than is traditionally undertaken in these other regions (Brinn et al 2001, Svensson 2005, Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft 2005). This in no way suggests that if research is 'different', the research being undertaken in these other regions is not valuable, as all research is valuable if it can contribute to knowledge and theory building (Shugan 2003).

What are the implications if there is a pre-disposition to certain types of research within North American journals? On one level this would be fine, if these issues and approaches were targeted to their North American audience (i.e. a marketing perspective). At the same time this might suggest that new ideas are not being effectively aired in the literature. The implications of these new ideas for thinking would not be considered and the status quo would not be challenged. This latter perspective would result in works within these journals as possibly being insular and failing to innovate.

Other factors such as research assessment exercises (RAEs) might also impact on global inclusion in journals. If individuals, institutions or governments identify that publishing in the existing North America journals indicate quality, non-North Americans would need to develop research programs that 'fit' within these journals. There are some academics from outside the US who have been successful in publishing in leading North American Journals. The question might be asked whether this work is as innovative as other works published in

non-A journals? One Australasian academic who was awarded for his research contribution, commented that while he was proud of a recent "A-journal" publication, he felt that one of his other works in a less prestigious journals was in fact more important. RAEs would not be able to readily cater for differences in 'recognised' and lesser 'recognised' journals. Thus RAEs may impact on research behaviour (Bence and Oppenheim 2004, Easton and Easton 2003), but it is unclear how they really impact on knowledge development.

This paper suggests that globalisation of literature needs to be maintained and nurtured in a way that ensures global views are supported. The difficulty is, of course, that there is also a need to maintain academic quality and rigour, which then begs the question whose standards are applied to measure these? No one would suggest that works from global academics should be viewed differently; rather, there may need to be a broadening of how we view knowledge development generally. If there is some bias towards mathematical positivism in leading journals, it may not only seem to be "Pro-US", but may also mean that valuable knowledge developed using other approaches frequently used outside the US is not being disseminated and integrated into theory. In this latter case a lack of global contribution to journals would indeed limit the discipline and marketing knowledge development may be unintendedly stifled (Boyacigiller and Adlers 1991).

We should also mention, that discussions on global inclusion in the literature is almost non-existent. In this research we have examined whether authors from various regions (and countries) have contributed to the marketing literature. However, it should be noted that within countries there are many institutions and individuals. Thus while one person from Country X indicates Country X has contributed, it may be that the majority of individuals or institutions in Country X have not contributed. For example, in the US there are over 1600

degree granting institutions and the majority were not represented in the authorship within the top 20 journals. However within Australasia, there are less than 50 degree granting institutions, and more than half of these contributed to the authorships in the top 20 journals. As such, within Australasia there is in fact a greater inclusion in research than within the United States. This issue is one that needs further exploration.

FUTURE RESEARCH AND LIMITATIONS

There are several issues that might potentially limit these findings and may need to be explored in the future. The fact that the study presented in this paper focuses on English speaking journals is of course a possible limitation. There are possibly non-English journals that might be viewed as important. One could also examine how other variables such as impact factors (such as those produced by the social sciences citation index), determine which journals are targeted as these impact factors might focus on English language journals. It should be noted, however, that of the 122 current and discontinued marketing journals listed on a comprehensive Dutch website of marketing journals (pauldriessen.com 2006), only five were in languages other than English (*Journal of Korean Academy of Marketing Science, Zeitschrift fur Forschung und Praxis, Der Markt, Recherche et Application en Marketing, and Revue Française de Marketing)*. While each is a prestigious and important journal, collectively it is unclear if they would serve as a major alternative to English language journals.

The number of academics and academic institutions (i.e. size effects) may also need to be considered in future research. It would be expected that countries with more academics would be expected to publish more. Future research needs to look not only at the volume of research but the dispersion within countries and regions.

Future research could explore strategies aimed to broaden global inclusion in authorship. Some authors have suggested that having global editors and editorial boards might increase global inclusions (Svensson 2005, Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft 2005, Stremersch and Verhoef's 2005). There may be other initiatives at the national level to improve research performance and global dispersion. Existing research has not examined how proactive research development programs might impact on publishing success.

Table 1
Mean Tenure Requirements In Terms Of Publishing By Different Type Of Hiring Institution
(Data sourced from "Who When Where Survey" 2006, 2005, 2004)

	Research Private		Research Public		Balanced Private		Balanced Public	
Year	Number of A's	Total publications	Number of A's	Total publications	Number of A's	Total publications	Number of A's	Total publications
2006	2.79	4.85	1.76	4.4	2.31	4.67	0.78	5.7
2005	4.5	7	2.4	6.3	0.33	6.2	0.13	5.5
2004	3.64	3.17	2.76	6.71	0.40	6.00	0.75	6.77

TABLE 3
Country Ranking of Authorships

	Total Top 20 Authorship	A journal Authorship	B journal Authorship	C Journal Authorship
1	USA 64.4%	USA 79.6%	USA 59.0%%	USA 58.0%
2	United kingdom 6.9%	Netherlands 3.3%	United Kingdom 9.6%	United Kingdom 6.7%
3	Australia 3.8%	Canada 2.5%	Australia 4.6%	Canada 5.9%
4	Canada 3.2%	Australia 1.8%	Netherlands 2.9%	Australia 4.5%
5	Netherlands 2.7%	United kingdom 1.7%	Canada 2.6%	France 2.2%
6	HK 1.6%	HK 1.7%	New Zealand 1.8%	Spain 1.8%
7	France 1.5%	France 1.5%	HK 1.6%	Singapore 1.6%
8	New Zealand 1.3%	Germany 0.9%	France 1.3%	Netherlands 1.5%
9	Spain 1.0%	Israel 0.8%	Spain 1.2%	HK 1.3%
10	Singapore 0.9%	South Korea 0.6%	Sweden 0.9%	Turkey 1.3%
11	Germany 0.8%	Belgium 0.6%	Singapore 0.9%	Denmark 1.2%
12	Denmark 0.6%	Singapore 0.5%	Finland 0.7%	New Zealand 1.2%
13	South Korea 0.6%	New Zealand 0.4%	Germany 0.7%	South Korea 1.2%
14	Sweden 0.6%	Norway 0.4%	Norway 0.6%	Germany 0.8%
15	Norway 0.6%	Switzerland 0.2%	Denmark 0.6%	Ireland 0.7%
16	Belgium 0.5%	Turkey 0.2%	Ireland 0.6%	Belgium 0.6%
17	Ireland 0.5%	Denmark 0.1%	Greece 0.5%	Poland 0.6%
18	Israel 0.4%	Cyprus	South Korea 0.4%	Norway 0.6%
19	Turkey 0.4%	Spain	Belgium 4.0%	Twain 0.5%
20	Finland	Japan	Twain 0.3%	Sweden 0.4%
		China	Israel	Japan
		India	Switzerland	Israel
		Sweden		
		Brazil		
		Thailand		

Table 2 Rankings of Journals Based on Past studies

		Perceptual Based Rankings of Journals				Citation Based Rankings of Journals	
	Editor/ Publisher	Polonsky & Whitelaw US (2006)	Theoharakis & Hirst Europe (2002)	Hult et al. US 1997	Mort et al 2004	Guidry et al (2004)	Baumgartner & Pieters Overall (2003)
Academy of Marketing Science Review	US/US	20					
Advances in Consumer Research	US/US	18	15	13			6
Business Horizons			(30)	(23)			20
California Management Review			(21)	(22)			19
European Journal of Marketing	UK/UK	16	10	(30)	11	18	17
Harvard Business Review			6	7			4
Industrial Marketing Management	US/US	13	14	20	16	17	10
International Journal of Research in Marketing	France/UK	12	4	(26)	8	9	(22)
Journal of Advertising	US/US	8	13	9	9	12	15
Journal of Advertising Research	US/US	10	12	10	13	10	11
Journal of Business			(25)	18			(26)
Journal of Business Research			9	8	11	7	12
Journal of Consumer Marketing	UK/UK	19	(31)	20	(38)	(25)	(35)
Journal of Consumer Psychology	HK/US	9	(23)	(22)	(21)	13	(40)
Journal of Consumer Research	US/US	3	3	3	1	3	3
Journal of International Business Studies			20	19	7		13
Journal of Macromarketing		(22)			19		
Journal of Marketing	US/US	1	1	1	2	2	1
Journal of Marketing Education	US/US	17		15	(28)		(24)
Journal of Marketing Management		(35)	18	(31)	16		(34)
Journal of Marketing Research	US/US	2	2	2	3	1	2
Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management	US/US	11	(36)	12	(28)	15	18
Journal of Product Innovation Management			(22)	(35)		11	16
Journal of Public Policy and Marketing	US/US	7	(37)	14	13	16	(21)
Journal of Retailing	US/UK	5	8	4	4	6	9
Journal of Services Research		(34)	(39)		13		
Journal of Strategic Marketing		(51)	(34)		19		
Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science	US/US	6	7	5	4	5	8
Management Science			11	11			5
Marketing Letters	Canada/US	14	16	(34)	10	8	(25)
Marketing Science	US/US	4	5	6	4	4	7
Psychology and Marketing	US/US	15	(24)	16	16	14	(29)
Sloan Management Review			19	17			14
Strategic Management Journal			17				
Advertising Age						19	
Journal off consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction ad Complaining Behavior						20	

Table 4
Authorship of Articles within Journals Across Regions (Percentages)

Journals	Non Academic Authors	Total Academic Articles Authored	North America Articles Authored	South America Articles Authored	European Articles Authored	Middle East Articles Authored	Africa Articles Authored	Asia Articles Authored	Australasia Articles Authored
Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science	3.15	96.85	85.19		6.08	.66		1.60	3.32
Journal of Market Research	3.89	96.11	76.46		14.20	1.06		3.24	1.14
Journal of Consumer Research	1.31	98.69	88.14		3.21	.08		4.98	2.28
Journal of Marketing	1.77	98.23	82.13		13.42	.64		0.97	1.07
Journal of Retailing	3.17	96.83	77.35		9.76	1.40	0.22	3.54	4.57
Marketing Science	3.22	96.78	81.44	0.40	8.17	1.66		3.52	1.60
A's	**2.69**	**97.30**	**82.06**	**0.05**	**9.08**	**0.84**	**0.03**	**3.04**	**2.20**
European Journal of Marketing	3.43	96.57	17.05	0.31	58.23	1.05	0.74	4.38	14.83
Industrial Marketing Management	5.05	94.95	56.64		31.33		0.37	2.03	4.60
International Journal of Research in Marketing	1.84	98.16	51.98	0.39	31.80	.32	0.46	6.70	6.48
Journal of Advertising	3.71	96.29	79.36	0.27	6.50	1.06		5.52	3.58
Journal of Advertising Research	23.43	76.57	58.72		8.78		0.31	3.78	5.05
Journal of Consumer Psychology	0.76	99.24	88.90		2.62	1.90		5.18	0.63
Journal of Marketing Education	1.77	98.23	90.75		2.94			1.14	3.40
Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management	3.68	96.32	88.23		4.74				3.35
Marketing letters	7.26	92.74	68.28		13.66	1.66		4.28	5.24
Psychology and Marketing	2.00	98.00	69.97		14.45	. 23		4.39	8.96
Journal of Public Policy and Marketing	16.91	83.09	79.68		1.31			0.92	1.18
B's	**6.49**	**93.54**	**61.59**	**0.09**	**21.27**	**0.51**	**0.23**	**3.50**	**6.35**
Advances in Consumer Research	1.83	98.17	66.40	0.23	23.22		0.35	3.89	4.05
Journal of Consumer Marketing	11.46	88.54	57.06	0.13	9.30	0.86		9.73	11.46
Academy of Marketing Science Review	9.31	90.69	62.01		20.13		1.62	0.97	3.18
C's	**4.62**	**95.45**	**63.90**	**0.19**	**19.62**	**0.40**	**0.32**	**5.18**	**5.84**
Top 20	5.12	94.89	67.56	0.10	17.65	0.58	0.19	3.68	5.13

REFERENCES

AACSB (2004), "Eligibility procedures and accreditation standards for business accreditation", AACSB International. http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/business/standards01-01-04.pdf accessed June 2004

Allen Consulting Group (2005), "Measuring the impact of publicly funded research", DEST Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra: Australia.

AMA (2006) "Journal rankings", American Marketing Association Web Page http://www.marketingpower.com/content16939.php accessed May 2006.

Armstrong, S. (1996), "Publication of research on controversial topics: The early acceptance procedure", *International Journal of Forecasting*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 299-302.

Bakir, A., Vitell, S.J. and Rose, G.M. (2000), "Publications in major marketing journals: An analysis of scholars and marketing departments", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 99-107.

Baumgartner, H. and Pieters, R. (2003), "The structural influence of marketing journals: A citation analysis of the discipline and it subareas over time", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 67, No. 1, pp. 123-139.

Bence, V. and Oppenheim, C. (2004), "A comparison of journal submissions to the UK's research assessment exercises 1996 and 2001 for UoA 43 (Business and Management Studies)", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 402-417.

Bettencourt, L.A. and Houston, M.B. (2001), "Reference diversity in JCR, JM, and JMR: A reexamination and extension of Tellis, Chandy, and Ackerman (1999)", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 313-323.

Boyacigiller, N.A., and Adler, N.J. (1991), "The parochial dinosaur: Organizational science in a global context", *Academy of Mangement Review*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 262-290.

Brinn, T., Jones, M. and Pendlebury, M. (2001), "Why do UK accounting and finance academics not publish in the top US journals?", B*ritish Accounting Review*, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 223-232.

Cheng, L.T.W., Chan, K.C. and Chan, R.Y.K. (2003), "Publications in major marketing journals: An analysis of research productivity of Asia-Pacific universities", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 163-176.

DocSig (2006), "Who went where survey results", *Marketing Doctoral Students SIG*, http://docsig.eci.gsu.edu/wwwsurvey/www2006.pdf Accessed May 2006

DocSig (2005), "Who went where survey results", *Marketing Doctoral Students SIG*, http://docsig.eci.gsu.edu/wwwsurvey/www2005.pdf Accessed May 2006

DocSig (2004), "Who went where survey results", *Marketing Doctoral Students SIG*,

http://docsig.eci.gsu.edu/wwwsurvey/www2004.pdf Accessed May 2006

Dokor, R., Tung, R.L. and Von Gilnow, M.A. (1991), "Incorporating international dimensions into management theory building", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 259-261.

Easton, G. and Easton, D.M. (2003), "Marketing journals and the research assessment exercise", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 19, No. 1-2, pp. 5-24.

Ford, J.B., LaTour, M.S. and Henthorne, T.L. (2001), "Author and institution productivity in industrial marketing management 1971 to 1998," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 30, No. 5, pp. 441-452.

Guidry, J.A., Guidry, B.N., Hollier, L., Johnson, L., Tanner, J.R. and Veltsos, C. (2004), "Surveying the cites: A ranking of marketing journals using citation analysis", *Marketing Education Review*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 45-59.

Hanna, J.B. and LaTour, M.S. (2002), "Building bridges through logistics publication: Author and institution productivity in businesses' most applied science", *American Business Review*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 43-49.

Henthorne, T.L., LaTour, M.S. and Loraas, T. (1998), "Publication productivity in three leading U.S. advertising journals: 1989 through 1996", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 53-63.

Homburg, C. (2003), "Publishing processes in academic marketing discipline in the United States: A German perspective", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 438-350.

Hult, G.T.M., Neese, W.T. and Bashaw, R.E. (1997), "Faculty perceptions of marketing journals", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 37-52.

Koojaroenprasit, N., Weinstein, A., Johnson, W.J. and Remington, D.O. (1998), "Marketing journal rankings revisited: Research findings and academic implications," *Marketing Education Review*, Vol. 8, Bo. 1, pp. 95-102.

Knight, G.A., Hult, G.T. and Brashaw, R.E. (2000), "Research productivity in the *Journal of Business Research*: 1985-1999", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 49 No. 3, pp. 303-314.

Kumar, V. and Kundu, S.K. (2004), "Ranking the international business schools: Faculty publication as the measure", *Management International Review*, Vol. 44, No. 2, pp. 213-229.

Linton, J.D. (2004), "Perspective: Ranking business schools on the management of technology", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 416-430.

Moncrief, W.C., Marshall G.W. and Watkins, C. (2000), "Tracking academic research in selling and sales management: Authors, authorships, academic institutions and journals", *The Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 99-108.

Mort, G.S., McColl-Kennedy, J.R., Kiel, G. and Soutar, G.N. (2004), "Australian and New Zealand senior academics' perceptions of marketing journals", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 51-61.

pauldriessen.com (2006), "Academic Marketing Journals," http://oase.uci.kun.nl/`driessen/journal.html. Accessed August 2006

Polonsky, M.J. and Whitelaw, P. (2006), "A multi-dimensional examination of marketing journal rankings by North American academics", *Marketing Education Review*, Vol. 16, No. 3, Forthcoming.

Polonsky, M.J. and Whitelaw, P. (2005), "What are we measuring when we evaluate journals?", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 189-201.

Rosenstreich, D. and Wooliscroft, B. (2005), "What does it take to get published in a top marketing journal from Australasia?", in Mittlestadt, J. (ed) The 30th Annual Macromarketing Conference, pp. 73-84.

Rust, R.T. (2005), "From The Editor," Elmar June 23, 2005 http://www.marketingpower.com/content.php?Item_ID=26019 Accesses September 2005.

Schlegelmich, B.B. (2000), "Editorial: Is the grass really greener on the other side?" *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 16, No. 7, pp. 675-678.

Serenko, A. and Bontis, N. (2004), "Meta-review of knowledge management and intellectual capital literature: Citation impact and research productivity rankings", *Knowledge and Process Management*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 185-198.

Shugan, S.M. (2003), "Journal rankings: Save the outlets for your research", *Marketing Science*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 437-441.

Sinkovics, R.R and Schlegelmilch, B.B. (2000), "Marketing academics in Austria, Germany and Switzerland: Hulbolt's ideas give way to performance pressure", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 16, No. 7, pp. 745-760.

Sivadas, E. and Johnson, M.S. (2005), "Knowledge flows in marketing: An analysis of journal article references and citations", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 339-361.

Starbuck, W.H. (2005), "How much better are the most prestigious journals? The statistics of American publication", *Organisational Science*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 180-200.

Stremersch, S. and Verhoef, P.C. (2005), "Globalization of authorship in the marketing discipline: Does it help or hinder the field?" *Marketing Science*, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 585-594.

Svensson, G. (2005), "Ethnocentricity in top marketing journals", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 23, No. 5, pp. 244-234.

Theoharakis, V. and Hirst, A. (2002), "Perceptual differences of marketing journals: A worldwide perspective", *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 398-402.

Thomas, A. S., Shenkar, O. and Clarke, L. (1994), "The globalization of our mental maps: Evaluating the geographic scope of JIBS coverage", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 25 No. (4), pp. 675-686.

Ulrich Publication Guide (2005), *Ulrich Publication Guide*, R.R. Bowker LLC: USA. http://www.ulrichsweb.com/ulrichsweb/ (Accessed May 2005).

Wilkie, W.L and Moore, E.S. (2003), "Scholarly research in marketing: Exploring "4 Eras" of thought development", *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing* Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 116-146.

Zou, S. (2005), "Contributions to international advertising", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 99-110.