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Abstract

Purpose – This research is based upon the assumption that the empirical research designs and the scientific identity of a journal are related. The objective is to review and evaluate the empirical research design of papers to determine the scientific identity of a selection of academic marketing journals.


Findings – The scientific identity of JM may be seen as built upon quantitative research designs and the North American paradigm of research values. The scientific identity of AMJ is based upon a mix of empirical research designs and the Australian paradigm of research values. The scientific identity of EJM is also based upon a mix of empirical research designs, but a multi-continental paradigm of research values.

Research limitations/implications – The leading continental journals in marketing maintain a scientific identity based upon the continental paradigm of research values. If it is driven to the extremes, a paradigmatic myopia and inertia of research designs may evolve that limit the scientific identity to be dogmatic and narrow-focused rather than variable and broad-focused.

Originality/value – A cross-continental review and evaluation of research designs and scientific identity of academic marketing journals is presented.

Introduction

The discussion of academic journal has been going on for more than three decades in economics (e.g. Hawkins et al., 1973; Danielsen and Delorme, 1976). In management, it has been a topic for at least decades (e.g. Stahl et al., 1988). The academic journals of marketing have been debated for about two decades (e.g. Jobber and Simpson, 1988; Luke and Doke, 1987; Fry et al., 1985). The academic journals are an interface between academics in and
between research disciplines and research communities. These journals are to a minor extent an interface for academics to reach practitioners (and vice versa).

In fact, journals of marketing have continuously increased during the last decades (Baumgartner and Pieters, 2003). Cabell (1997) has listed more than 550 journals of marketing. One reason for the increased number of marketing journals is that they position themselves into sub-disciplines or sub-areas (Baumgartner and Pieters, 2003; Malhotra, 1999). Another reason is that there is also a need among scholars to publish their research (e.g. Moxley, 1992). Publishing in peer-reviewed journals is a standard way through which academics communicate their research (Mort et al., 2004). Therefore, books have been published to facilitate and to provide guidelines to publishing in academic journals (e.g. Lester and Lester, 2005; Booth et al., 2003; Rozakis, 1999; Day, 1996).

Polonsky and Whitelaw (2005) raise the question of what is evaluated in the ranking of journals. Principally, two variables have been used to evaluate journals in academia (e.g. Mason et al., 1997; Kim, 1991). One is citation-based (e.g. Baumgartner and Pieters, 2003; Jobber and Simpson, 1988), while the other is perception-based (e.g. Browne and Becker, 1991; Luke and Doke, 1987). There are other less frequent variables used, such as the one of Polonsky et al. (1999) who discusses journals of marketing based upon accessibility. Czinkota (2000), Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft (2005) and Svensson (2005) study variables of ethnocentricity in reputable journals of marketing. Furthermore, Day and Peters (1994) present an extensive review from a variety of journals based upon quality variables in academic publishing. Svensson (2007) examines data collection variables of marketing journals. In addition, Emerald (Emerald Management Reviews, 2005) used differentiating variables to review and evaluate academic journals.

Accordingly, there is a range of variables addressed in literature in the discussion of marketing journals. Most of them provide ranking lists of marketing journals (e.g. Hawes and Keiller, 2002), however, the fundaments that underpin these lists are doubtful (Uncles, 2004; Polonsky, 2004). So far, these evaluations have rarely addressed variables presuming to be linked to the research designs of marketing journals (e.g. Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft, 2005; Svensson, 2006) and the scientific identity of these journals. The research designs applied in research papers of marketing journals may be traditional to certain world views not only to the discipline but to the “accepted bank” of knowledge within that discipline.

The impact of research designs may well be underestimated in the reviews and evaluations of marketing journals. We argue that it is an important approach that needs to be raised and discussed in literature, due to the paradigmatic influences that the research designs may have on the journal and its scientific identity and in extension, on the journal ranking and the journal quality.

Consequently, the outcome of reviews and evaluations of marketing journals varies due to the variables used. In this paper, light is shed on the aggregated research designs in academic marketing journals. We argue that the dominating research designs of research papers published in an academic journal indicate its scientific identity. In other words, the methodological paradigm according to the contributors – such as editors, editorial boards,
ad hoc reviewers and authors – is the basis upon which they may make judgments of its worth. Therefore, the research designs of papers may contribute to describe the scientific identity of academic marketing journals. Accordingly, this research is based upon the assumption that the empirical research designs and the scientific identity of a journal are related. The objective is to review and evaluate the empirical research design of papers to determine the scientific identity of a selection of academic marketing journals.

Literature on academic journals

Hawes and Keiller (2002) argue that higher status is usually attributed to journals that publish papers that are theoretical, scholar-oriented, highly quantitative or technical in nature, however, the exploration of journals is often based upon a single variable, such as perception (Luke and Doke, 1987) and citation (Jobber and Simpson, 1988). There is an ongoing review and evaluation of how marketing journals are perceived and how they have been ranked by different sources (e.g. Bakir et al., 2000; Clark, 1985; Fields and Swayne, 1991; Ganesh et al., 1990; Niemi, 1988; Petry and Settle, 1988; Pol, 1991; Spake and Harmon, 1998; and Trieschmann et al., 2000).

There is a focus on the perceived rank and quality of selected academics rather than the content and knowledge provided in published papers. Armstrong (2004) argues that the papers in marketing journals do not provide much useful knowledge. In addition, McKenzie et al. (2002) conclude that the readership of papers produced by marketing faculty do not gain the readership of practitioners. We do not believe that this is strange or odd, because the publication process of papers follows academic criteria as defined by the editorial of journals. November (2004) provides seven reasons why marketing practitioners should ignore academic research in marketing, namely: they are not the targeted customers; they tend to use their own personal practice as a frame of reference; they will not appreciate the dangers inherent in studying small parts of systems; they might be deluded into making conclusions that are poorly substantiated in reality; a few generalisations only corroborate what practitioners already know; research sometimes makes false or misleading statements about causality; and its truth-value is highly questionable. Furthermore, the outcome of research is affected by the non-response rate and the generalisability of the sample and the subsequent findings (Blair and Zinkhan, 2006).

There have been different characteristics considered in the examination and comparison of academic journals. One of them is the compilation of aggregated lists. For example, Harzing (2006) compiles journal quality lists that are updated periodically. The current list contains 16 different rankings of 861 journals. It is a collation of journal rankings from a variety of sources and they are reported separately. Consequently, the list is based upon a large number of cross-disciplinary journals, all of which also include marketing journals thus the list is derived from different sources and consists of different (various) ranking lists that are aggregated into one table. It applies a top-down approach, where an overall variable usually underpins the compilation of each journal-ranking list.

Contrary to Harzing (2006), Emerald (Emerald Management Reviews, 2005) applied a bottom-up approach, where several variables underpinned the compilation of four separate journal-ranking lists. These were cross-disciplinary journal rankings, including marketing
journals that were provided and continuously updated by Emerald. It also used a broader – as well as a profounder – approach to examine and compare journals across disciplines. It was based upon the foundation that each article published was independently reviewed based upon four variables, namely research implications, practice implications, originality and readability. Each article was assigned one, two or three asterisks across these criteria, all of which were used to calculate the annual average score on each variable for each journal. Annually, this database compiled a journal ranking of the top 400+ management journals in the world across different disciplines. Unfortunately, this unique approach in creating separate journal ranking lists was discontinued at the end of 2004.

The review and evaluation of journals may be based upon various variables (e.g. Beed and Beed, 1996; Hawes and Keiller, 2002; Jones et al., 1994; Parnell, 1997; Rice and Stankus, 1983; Zinkhan and Leigh, 1999). For example, Parnell (1997) provides taxonomy of journal quality variables based upon expert opinion surveys, citation counts, or a combination of both variables. Rice and Stankus (1983) provide variables of journals in such terms as: citation analysis of the journal (e.g. Social Sciences Citation Index), acceptance rate of the journal (e.g. Cabell's Directory), sponsorship of the journal (e.g. American Marketing Association), objective of the journal (e.g. methodological approaches and readership) and fundamentals of the journal (e.g. authors, editor, review board, and their affiliations). The last but one – i.e. the objective of the journal – is related to our research at hand.

There are ranking lists of journals that are based upon the variable of perceptions (e.g. Mylonopoulos and Theoharakis, 2001; Van Fleet et al., 2000; DuBois, 2000; Trieschmann et al., 2000; Nisonger, 1999; Hult et al., 1997; and Enomoto, 1993). Informal lists are also used in business schools (Brumbaugh, 2002). The access to formal ranking lists appears to be important when research is evaluated (e.g. Theorharakis and Hirst, 2002; Van Fleet et al., 2000; Hult et al., 1997) as academics in the UK and Australia are being driven to publish in higher quality journals.

In literature, there has been an ongoing interest and discussion of marketing journals (e.g. Mort et al., 2004; Theorharakis and Hirst, 2002; Hult et al., 1997). Historically, most research efforts to rank marketing journals have been based upon scholars in North America (e.g. Fry et al., 1985; Luke and Doke, 1987; Hult et al., 1997). Recently, a few other research efforts have been done in the Asia Pacific Region (e.g. Mort et al., 2004; Polonsky et al., 1999; Polonsky and Waller, 1993). Theorharakis and Hirst (2002) performed a worldwide survey. In addition, Easton and Easton (2003) have focused on the UK.

There have been numerous attempts at journal rankings or the evaluations/ratings of them (Hawes and Keiller, 2002). A few principal approaches of journal evaluations are used. One approach is based upon citation analyses (e.g. Baumgartner and Pieters, 2003; Jobber and Simpson, 1988). The citation index is often interpreted to be unbiased and a true reflection of the ranking of journals, however for various reasons, this approach may bias the evaluation of journals. For example, journals from some regions may be missing (e.g. Nobes, 1985). Day and Peters (1994) argue that the citation index is dangerously flawed in that it is heavily biased towards high circulation journals, suffers from a single-item syndrome and that there is no direct correlation with quality per se. There may also be delayed effects (e.g. Jobber and Simpson, 1988). In addition, databases tend be restricted to a selection of
journals (e.g. Neway and Lancaster, 1983), which may exclude a variety of other journals. For example, journals published in languages other than English tend to be excluded (e.g. French, German and Spanish journals or other languages). Uncles (2004) states that there are imperfections of journal rankings due to: the problem of journal selection, the problem of respondent familiarity, and the problem of respondent confusion. In addition, Polonsky (2004) raises the questions: why rank journals? How should journals be evaluated? To what extent are aspirations met?

Another approach is based upon perceptual review and evaluations to underpin journal rankings (e.g. Browne and Becker, 1991; Luke and Doke, 1987). The perceptually-based journal review and evaluations may vary and be biased for any number of reasons. They may be influenced by institutional and individual demographics (e.g. Hult et al., 1997). For example, research has often focused on leading institutions (e.g. Theorharakis and Hirst, 2002), or active researchers/deans/heads of schools (e.g. Mort et al., 2004; Browne and Becker, 1991). The objective or focus of the review and evaluation may have an impact too (e.g. Polonsky and Waller, 1993), as may regional variations (e.g. Danielsen and Delorme, 1976; Theorharakis and Hirst, 2002) and the journal's focus (e.g. Danielsen and Delorme, 1976; Hawkins et al., 1973). None of these studies have been based upon a journal's research designs and the link to the scientific identity.

**Methodology**

The sample that we have used is restricted to the review and evaluation of three academic journals in marketing during a six-year period. They have been selected to represent different research communities in marketing located in the continents of Australia, Europe and North America. The journal sample consists of the *Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)*, the *European Journal of Marketing (EJM)* and the *Journal of Marketing (JM)*. Our assumption is that the research designs and the link to scientific identity of the journals may vary between continents.

The editorial descriptions of the selected marketing journals were examined. The data was retrieved from the official homepage on the internet of each journal. An initial browsing of the sample was performed to get insights into each journal. Based upon the outcome of this procedure the time frame of review and evaluation of the variables was limited to the beginning of 2000 to the end of 2005.

Citations, perceptions, accessibility and other variables used in literature are variables that focus on an outside-in approach of the journal content. They represent mostly single and aggregated variables to be used for journal rankings purposes. We have chosen to focus on different variables constituting academic marketing journals that have not been used in most of the previous research efforts in literature (see Table I). These variables reflect an inside-out approach. Our review of papers in the selected academic marketing journals is limited to a selection of principal variables. A journal article represents a published paper that is classified into different categories and it is written by authors of different continental author affiliations. We contend that these variables may be important to review and evaluate the research designs of academic marketing journals and their scientific identity.
Each journal paper was examined and classified into different categories according to the variables in Table I. The data was quantified and the variables have been used in cross-tabulations to facilitate comparisons between journal characteristics and research designs. All papers published during the period January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2005 were examined. In total, the content analysis consisted of 811 papers in the selected sample of the three academic marketing journals.

The empirical evidence found on the journal characteristics, such as empirical research designs and continental author affiliations are used to underpin the issues raised regarding scientific identity. Tentatively, these empirical findings may be illustrative to other academic journals in the field of marketing. In fact, we contend that the selected journals should not be considered to be dramatically different in any particular sense in the area of academic marketing journals. On the contrary, together they may be quite representative of several others as well.

**A review and evaluation of academic marketing journals**

The review and evaluation of research designs of papers and the scientific identity of journals in this section is based upon the content analysis of 811 papers published between 2000-2005 in the three selected journals (i.e. *AMJ*, *EJM* and *JM*) according to the variables in Table I. It is also based upon the other data collected regarding the editorial descriptions and continental author affiliations. The findings are summarised in Tables II-X.

**Editorial descriptions of journal sample**

The selected academic journals (i.e. *AMJ*, *EJM* and *JM*) of marketing in Table II have a common denominator in that they all aspire to be the leading academic marketing journal of their continental belonging. In particular, this applies to *AMJ* and *EJM*. *JM* aspires to be the world-leading journal in marketing. Furthermore, *AMJ*, *EJM* and *JM* aim at a readership consisting of both scholars and practitioners. All of them also aspire to stimulate the discipline of marketing and the practice of marketing.

The editorial descriptions of the selected marketing journals indicate that they describe their published articles according to a few general criteria (see Table I). One of these criteria is that they aim at being broad-oriented. For example, a variety of marketing topics are relevant for inclusion. Another criterion is that each of them also indicates (or wish) that they belong to the leading group of journals in their part of the world. Interestingly – despite that they are primarily academic journals and apply peer review processes – the readership is often intended to be both academics and practitioners. We wonder how many practitioners there are that look forward to reading academic marketing journals? Furthermore, they strive to bridge the gap between theory and application. They also want to present new ideas and provide leading edge knowledge, which implicitly or explicitly is part of their editorial objectives.

**Number of papers per journal title**
During the period 2000-2005, 811 papers were published in AMJ, EJM and JM (see Table III). EJM published the amount of 453 papers. In this respect, it is by far the largest journal of the three selected ones of the current review across continents. JM published approximately half the amount of papers to EJM, namely 244. AMJ published 114 papers in the same period. The latter may be due to that it is a newly established journal. As a matter of fact, AMJ had volume 13 in 2005, while EJM and JM had volumes 39 and 69 respectively.

The rejection rate is high in both EJM and JM (please note that we have kept the statistics confidential!). Unfortunately, the editor of AMJ did not desire to reveal its statistics regarding submitted, accepted and rejected papers.

**Categories of papers**

There are different categories of papers published in AMJ, EJM and JM. Six aggregated categories of papers may be identified (see Table IV), such as the ones based upon quantitative, qualitative or triangular research designs (i.e. empirical research papers), reviews (i.e. includes general reviews, literature reviews, research agendas and conceptual papers), commentaries and book reviews. Papers based upon empirical research designs are to a large extent included in AMJ, EJM and JM. In fact, they represent almost two thirds (65.5 per cent). A total of 15 per cent are a compilation of general reviews, literature reviews, research agendas or conceptual papers. Approximately one tenth (9.1 per cent) is based upon commentaries and another tenth (10.4 per cent) is based upon book reviews.

Furthermore, approximately half of the papers contain quantitative research design.

There is significant association (Pearson Chi-Square: Sig: 0.00**; Value: 101.914; df: 10) between the categories of papers published and the journal titles – in AMJ, EJM and JM (see Table V). For example, there are more quantitative research designs and commentaries than expected in papers of JM, while the qualitative research designs and reviews are less than expected. The other categories of JM are as expected. There are less quantitative research designs, book reviews and commentaries than expected in papers of EJM, while there are more qualitative research designs and reviews. The other categories of EJM are as expected. There are less quantitative research designs and reviews in papers of AMJ than expected, while there are more qualitative research designs, book reviews and commentaries. The other categories of AMJ are as expected.

JM has more than two thirds of the papers based empirical research (70.5 per cent), while EJM has less than two thirds (64.9 per cent) and AMJ has a bit more than half of it papers based upon empirical research (57.1 per cent). When it comes to reviews, EJM has more than one fifth (21.4 per cent) of its papers in this category, while AMJ has only 7.9 per cent and JM has 6.5 per cent. On the contrary, AMJ has almost one fifth of the papers (18.4 per cent) dedicated to commentaries, where EJM has only 5.3 per cent. JM has 11.9 per cent (that includes a series of eight brief commentaries on another paper in 2004). AMJ includes a larger share of book reviews (16.7 per cent) in relation to JM (11.1 per cent) and EJM (8.4 per cent).

There is significant association (Pearson Chi-Square: Sig: 0.00**; Value: 43.883; df: 4) between the categories of empirical research papers published and journal titles AMJ, EJM
Nine out ten papers in *JM* have a quantitative research design (89.5 per cent), while *EJM* and *AMJ* have less than two-thirds (64.3 and 63.1 per cent respectively). Most of the triangular research designs have quantitative methodology involved in the research design. This means that almost 96.5 per cent of the empirical research papers in *JM* include quantitative methodology in the research design. *EJM* has almost 73.5 per cent and *AMJ* has nearly 72.3 per cent. Interestingly, *AMJ* and *EJM* are almost identical when it comes to the share of the different categories of empirical research papers.

**Continental author affiliation**

During the period 2000-2005 in the selected journals (see Table VII), 362 out of the 811 articles (i.e. 44.6 per cent) have at least one author with a European author affiliation, 327 articles (i.e. 40.3 per cent) have a North American author affiliation, and 185 articles (22.8 per cent) have an Australian author affiliation. 57 articles (i.e. 7.0 per cent) have an Asian author affiliation. Only five articles (i.e. 0.6 per cent) have an African author affiliation and one article (i.e. 0.1 per cent) has a South American author affiliation. Consequently, European and North American author affiliations dominate (i.e. 84.9 per cent), followed by Australian and Asian ones (i.e. 29.8 per cent). It is quite remarkable and worrying that very few articles have Asian author affiliations and there are almost no African and South American ones. In fact, it means that the worldwide research community is not represented satisfactorily.

**Continental author affiliation in *AMJ*, *EJM* and *JM***

During the period 2000-2005 (see Table VIII), the continental author affiliation varies to a large extent between the selected journals. For example, 225 articles out of 244 (92.2 per cent) in *JM* have at least one North American author affiliation. 36 (i.e. 14.8 per cent) have at least one European author affiliation. Only 8 (i.e. 3.3 per cent) and 4 (i.e. 1.6 per cent) articles have Asian and Australian authors. 309 articles out of 453 (68.2 per cent) in *EJM* have at least one European author affiliation. 92 articles (i.e. 20.3 per cent) and 88 articles (i.e. 19.4 per cent) have North American and Australian author affiliations. 42 articles (i.e. 9.3 per cent) have one Asian author affiliation. Only 4 (i.e. 0.9 per cent) and 1 (i.e. 0.2 per cent) articles have African and South American affiliations.

**Category of papers and continental author affiliation**

During the period 2000-2005 (see Table IX), a cross-tabulation between the category of papers and the continental author affiliation in the selected journals show some essential differences. Overall, half of the continental author affiliations (i.e. 462 out of 937 or 49.3 per cent) are based upon a quantitative research designs. In particular, quantitative research designs are very common in papers with Asian (i.e. 44 out of 57 or 77.2 per cent) and North American (i.e. 193 out of 327 or 59.0 per cent) author affiliations. European and Australians
author affiliations use less quantitative research designs (i.e. 150 out of 362 or 41.4 per cent and 71 out of 185 or 38.4 per cent). Only 114 papers (i.e. 12.2 per cent) have used qualitative research designs. In fact, Asian and North Americans author affiliations do not almost use them at all (i.e. 11 out of 327 or 3.4 per cent and 6 out of 57 or 10.5 per cent). They are more common in Australian and European author affiliations (i.e. 33 out of 185 or 17.8 per cent and 64 out of 362 or 17.7 per cent). Triangular research designs have been used in 53 papers (i.e. 5.3 per cent). They are fairly equal across Asian, Australian, European and North American author affiliations. The distribution of commentaries and book reviews are based upon almost the Australian, European and North American author affiliations. Reviews are more common among European author affiliations (i.e. 19.3 per cent) than among Australian (i.e. 14.1 per cent), North American (i.e. 12.5 per cent) and Asian (i.e. 5.3 per cent). Note that the distribution of the different categories of papers is strikingly similar between Australian and European author affiliations.

**Empirical research design and continental author affiliation**

During the period 2000-2005 (see Table X), a cross-tabulation between the empirical research designs and the continental author affiliation in the selected journals indicate a few crucial differences and similarities. For example, 193 papers with North American author affiliations out of 220 (87.7 per cent) have used quantitative research designs and only 11 (i.e. 5.0 per cent) have used qualitative research designs. The rest of the papers with North American author affiliations (i.e. 16 or 7.3 per cent) have used triangular research designs. 71 papers with Australian author affiliations out of 117 (60.7 per cent) have used quantitative research designs and 33 (i.e. 28.2 per cent) have used qualitative research designs. The remaining papers with Australian author affiliations (i.e. 13 or 11.1 per cent) have used triangular research designs. A total of 150 papers with European author affiliations out of 236 (63.6 per cent) have used quantitative research designs and 64 (i.e. 27.1 per cent) have used qualitative research designs. The rest of the papers with European author affiliations (i.e. 22 or 9.3 per cent) have used triangular research designs. A total of 44 papers with Asian author affiliations out of 52 (84.6 per cent) have used quantitative research designs and 6 (i.e. 11.5 per cent) have used qualitative research designs. The remaining papers with Asian author affiliations (i.e. 2 or 3.6 per cent) have used triangular research designs. A total of 44 papers with Asian author affiliations out of 52 (84.6 per cent) have used quantitative research designs and 6 (i.e. 11.5 per cent) have used qualitative research designs. The remaining papers with Asian author affiliations (i.e. 2 or 3.6 per cent) have used triangular research designs. All the African and South American author affiliations (i.e. only 4 out of 627) have used quantitative research designs.

Interestingly, the empirical research designs of Australian and European author affiliations are very similar regarding the distribution of empirical research designs, while the Asian and North American ones resembles each other.

**Concluding thoughts and reflections**

In this final section, we present a number of concluding thoughts and reflections based upon the empirical findings shown in Tables II-X.
The selected journals of our review and evaluation are broadly oriented according to their editorial descriptions that have been available for us (see sample extracts in Table II). J*M has an explicit worldwide orientation, while AMJ and EJM have mainly orientations towards the Asia-Pacific region and Europe respectively. A common denominator is that the three journals aspire to provide practical implications. However, we believe that practitioners will find it hard to share these practical implications, because the primary readership of AMJ, EJM and J*M is the research community of the marketing discipline and its scholars. As such, the papers published have been authored and peer-reviewed to fit into the academic format of the journals, which restricts the readability and interest of a practitioner audience.

EJM is the largest – and AMJ is the smallest – journals of the three selected ones based upon the number of papers published (see Table III). EJM publishes an impressive amount annually. In fact, it publishes four times the amount in AMJ and twice the number of J*M. On an aggregated level, the dominating category of papers published in AMJ, EJM and J*M are the ones based upon quantitative research designs (see Table IV). The other papers vary between 5–15 per cent per category, such as: qualitative and triangular research designs, reviews, commentaries and book reviews. When the different categories are divided into journal titles a different distribution appears, namely that J*M stands out to be heavily focused on quantitative research designs (see Tables V and VI). EJM has a broad focus on both quantitative and qualitative ones, as well as reviews. AMJ has a focus on quantitative and qualitative research designs, as well as book reviews and commentaries.

We contend that it is a worry for the research community of the marketing discipline that J*M aspires – and often is perceived – to be the world leading marketing journal, but it only has a few papers based upon qualitative and triangular research designs. Therefore, we believe that there is a mismatch between the scientific identity and the editorial objectives of J*M. It strives to be broad-focused, but it is narrow-focused when it comes to the empirical research designs. There appears to be paradigmatic myopia and inertia to apply flexibility of research designs in J*M. In part, it may be explained by the constituting and underpinning editorships, editorial advisory board, ad hoc reviewers and the research values of the predominant continental author affiliations that succeed to survive the peer-review process and achieve publication in this journal. AMJ and EJM are less reputable than J*M in most journal rankings, but they are broad-focused when it comes to supporting the flexibility of empirical research designs.

Australian, European and North American author affiliations are present in most papers on an aggregated level in the reviewed journals (see Table VII). When the continental author affiliations are broken down into the three journal titles, then it reveals a dominating match between the continental belonging of the journal titles (i.e. the publishers’ continental home) and the continental author affiliations (see Table VIII). Almost all papers in J*M have North American author affiliations. AMJ and EJM also have a large amount of Australian and European author affiliations respectively, but it is less than in J*M. In that sense, the three journals have been seen as having a scientific identity derived from the home continent. However, the performed cross-tabulations between the category of papers/empirical research designs and the continental author affiliations reveal some distinguishing features. For example, the North American and Asian author affiliations apply mainly quantitative research designs, while the European and Australian ones apply both quantitative and
qualitative research designs. In other words, the predominance of quantitative research designs is less in the latter continental author affiliations. In extension, we argue that it influences the scientific identity of AMJ, EJM and JM.

We argue that the scientific identity of JM may be seen as built upon quantitative research designs and the North American paradigm of research values. AMJ is to a large extent based upon Australian author affiliations and their paradigm of research values. There is a mix of empirical research designs similar to those of EJM. The scientific identity of EJM is more multi-continental – and in a sense much more international – than JM and AMJ. EJM has a mix of cross-continental and multinational author affiliations, which is strengthened by the paradigmatic research values across the European continent that consists of numerous national and cultural territories. EJM is also based upon a mix of empirical research designs.

We contend that these leading continental journals such as the ones we have reviewed and evaluated in this paper maintain a scientific identity based upon the continental paradigm of their research values. If it is driven to the extremes, a paradigmatic myopia and inertia of research designs may evolve that limit the scientific identity to one that may be dogmatic and narrow-focused rather than variable and broad-focused. It should be kept in mind that the reviewed journals aspire to be broad-focused according to their editorial descriptions, but that JM in particular is – from a research design point of view – narrow-focused. There appears to be a dogmatic emphasis on quantitative research designs instead of variable ones. As stated earlier in this paper, Hawes and Keiller (2002) argue that higher status is usually attributed to journals that publish papers that are theoretical, scholar-oriented, highly quantitative or technical in nature. On this basis one can understand why JM is so revered around the world and is considered by many marketing academics to be the “holy grail” of academic marketing publication. JM is also to a large extent restricted to North American author affiliations. This combination of high status and the journal’s seeming reliance on the contributions of North American authors unfortunately may constitute “marketing article myopia”.

AMJ and EJM have a tendency to be dominated by quantitative research designs, but they have almost one third of their empirical research designs dedicated to qualitative ones. However, EJM has a broader representation of the continental and multi-national author affiliations than AMJ. Therefore, we argue that the scientific identity – i.e. the diversity of research designs and paradigmatic research values – of EJM is preferable for us as a research community, because marketing phenomena are multi-facetted, all of which require multiple research designs to be explored properly over time and across contexts.

In sum, we argue that the scientific identity of JM is built upon quantitative research designs and the North American paradigm of research values. The scientific identity of AMJ is based upon a mix of empirical research designs and the Australian paradigm of research values. The scientific identity of EJM is also based upon a mix of empirical research designs, but a multi-continental and multi-national paradigm of research values.
Table I: Constituting variables of review in journals of marketing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Journal title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Year of publication (i.e. volume)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Issue of publication (i.e. number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Editorial description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Category of journal paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Empirical research design of journal paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Continental author affiliation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II: Editorial descriptions of AMJ, EJM and JM – 2000-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editorial descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMJ is an academic journal written for both scholars and practitioners. The objective of the AMJ is to publish articles that enrich the practice of marketing while simultaneously contributing to the advancement of the discipline. Contributors are encouraged to focus on either conceptual or empirical work and to outline practical implications for marketing. Topics should always relate to some aspect of marketing. It is the intention to publish well-written, readable articles with broad appeal and of international relevance. AMJ is keen to publish more good papers which emanate from the Asia-Pacific region, or focus on the region in a global context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Marketing (EJM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJM provides a platform for contemporary ideas in marketing, the thinking, theory and practice. It aims to facilitate information among researchers on a worldwide basis and keep up to date with developments in European marketing and Europe in the global context. The journal contains leading edge marketing theory – supported by evidenced-based research, from the world’s leading marketing thinkers. EJM provides a platform for new ideas in marketing. EJM offers unparalleled insights on new research, current practice and future trends so that practitioners and academics can gain a useful overview of marketing activity and apply that knowledge to develop appropriate strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Marketing (JM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM’s primary objectives are (1) to lead in the development, dissemination, and implementation of marketing concepts, practice, and information and (2) to probe and promote the use of marketing concepts by businesses, not-for-profits, and other institutions for the betterment of society. JM is positioned as the premier, broad-based, scholarly journal of the marketing discipline that focuses on substantive issues in marketing and marketing management. The journal is designed to bridge the gap between theory and application. The journal is widely circulated with a diverse readership that includes both practitioners and academics. By design, JM publishes articles on a variety of topics contributing to the advancement of the science and/or practice of marketing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table III: Total number and number of papers per journal title – 2000-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Title</th>
<th>Number of papers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australasian Marketing Journal</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III: Total number and number of papers per journal title – 2000-2005
### Table IV: Total number of papers per category – 2000-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of paper</th>
<th>Number of papers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative research design</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative research design</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangular research design</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book review</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Total number of papers per category – 2000-2005

### Table V: Category of papers in AMJ, EJM and JM – 2000-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal title</th>
<th>Quantitative Expected count</th>
<th>Quantitative %</th>
<th>Qualitative Expected count</th>
<th>Qualitative %</th>
<th>Triangular Expected count</th>
<th>Triangular %</th>
<th>Category of paper</th>
<th>Review Expected count</th>
<th>Review %</th>
<th>Book review Expected count</th>
<th>Book review %</th>
<th>Commentary Expected count</th>
<th>Commentary %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Marketing Journal</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>214.5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** Category of papers in AMJ, EJM and JM – 2000-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal title</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Australian Marketing Journal</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>47.0</th>
<th>63.1</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>12.5</th>
<th>27.7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5.5</th>
<th>9.2</th>
<th>65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>212.6</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table VI:** Empirical research designs of papers in AMJ, EJM and JM – 2000-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author affiliation</th>
<th>Number of articles</th>
<th>Percentage of articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Percentage of 811 articles

### Table VII: Total continental author affiliation in AMJ, EJM and JM – 2000-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continent</th>
<th>Number of articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table VIII** Continental author affiliation in AMJ, EJM and JM – 2000-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal title</th>
<th>Africa n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Asia n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Australia n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Europe n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>North America n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>South America n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australasian Marketing Journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>937/811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table IX** Category of papers and continental author affiliation – 2000-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of papers</th>
<th>Africa n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Asia n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Australia n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Europe n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>North America n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>South America n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangular</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book review</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>937/100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table X** Empirical research design and continental author affiliation – 2000-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empirical research design</th>
<th>Africa n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Asia n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Australia n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Europe n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>North America n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>South America n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangular</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>937/100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References**


**Further Reading**


Helm, A., Hunt, D., Houston, M. (2003), "Citation frequency of research published in the top three marketing journals: ranking the impact of articles, scholars, and institutions", AMA Summer Educators' Conference Proceedings, pp.198-208.


Zinkhan, G.M., Saxton, M.J., Roth, M., Zaltman, J. (1990), "Citation analysis of the ACR proceedings a knowledge development and social exchange perspective", Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 17 No.1, pp.627-35.

Corresponding author

Greg Wood can be contacted at: gwood@deakin.edu.au