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ABSTRACT

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. The journal sample consists of the Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ), the European Journal of Marketing (EJM) and the Journal of Marketing (JM).

INTRODUCTION

The discussion of academic journal has been going on for more than three decades in economics (e.g. Hawkins, Ritter and Walter, 1973; Danielsen and Delorme, 1976). In management, it has been a topic for at least decades (e.g. Stahl, Leap and Wei, 1988). The academic journals of marketing have been debated for about two decades (e.g. Jobber and Simpson, 1988; Luke and Doke, 1987; Fry, Walters and Scheuermann, 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 (1997-98) 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, McColl-Kennedy, Kiel and Soutar, 2004). Therefore, books have been published to facilitate and to provide guidelines to publishing in academic journals (e.g. Lester and Lester, 2005; Booth, Colomb and Williams, 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, Steagall, and Fabritius, 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. Brown and Becker, 1991; Luke and Doke, 1987). There are other less frequent variables used, such as the one of Polonsky, Jones and Kearsley (1999) who discuss journals of marketing based upon accessibility. Czinkota (2000), Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft (2005) and Svensson (2005) study variables of ethniccentricity 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 (2007a) examines data collection variables of marketing journals. In addition, Emerald (Emerald Management Reviews, 2004) 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 Keillor, 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, 2000; Svensson, 2007b) 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.

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).

Each journal paper was examined and classified into different categories. 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 selected academic journals (i.e. AMJ, EJM and JM) of marketing 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.

During the period 2000-2005, 811 papers were published in AMJ, EJM and JM. 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.

There are different categories of papers published in AMJ, EJM and JM. Six aggregated categories of papers may be identified, 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%). 15% are a compilation of general reviews, literature reviews, research agendas or conceptual papers. Approximately one tenth (9.1%) is based upon commentaries and another tenth (10.4%) 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. 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%), while EJM has less than two thirds (64.9%) and AMJ has a bit more than half of it papers based upon empirical research (57.1%). When it comes to reviews, EJM has more than one fifth (21.4%) of its papers in this category, while AMJ has only 7.9% and JM has 6.5%. On the contrary, AMJ has almost one fifth of the papers (18.4%) dedicated to commentaries, where EJM has only 5.3%. JM has 11.9% (that includes a series of eight brief commentaries on another paper in 2004). AMJ includes a larger share of book reviews (16.7%) in relation to JM (11.1%) and EJM (8.4%).

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 and JM. For example, there are more quantitative and less qualitative research designs in JM than expected. AMJ and EJM have less quantitative and more qualitative research designs than expected. The triangular research designs are as expected in AMJ, EJM and JM.

9 out 10 papers in JM have a quantitative research design (89.5%), while EJM and AMJ have less than two thirds (64.3 and 63.1% respectively). Most of the triangular research designs have quantitative methodology involved in the research design. This means that almost 96.5% of the empirical research papers in JM include quantitative methodology in the research design. EJM has almost 73.5% and AMJ has nearly 72.3%. Interestingly, AMJ and EJM are almost identical when it comes to the share of the different categories of empirical research papers.

362 out of the 811 articles (i.e. 44.6%) have at least one author with a European author affiliation, 327 articles (i.e. 40.3%) have a North American author affiliation, and 185 articles (22.8%) have an Australian author affiliation. 57 articles (i.e. 7.0%) have an Asian author affiliation. Only five articles (i.e. 0.6%) have an African author affiliation and one article (i.e. 0.1%) has a South American author affiliation. Consequently, European and North American author affiliations dominate (i.e. 84.9%), followed by Australian and Asian ones (i.e. 29.8%). 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.

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

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%) 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%) and North American (i.e. 193 out of 327 or 59.0%) author affiliations. European and Australians author affiliations use less quantitative research designs (i.e. 150 out of 362 or 41.4% and 71 out of 185 or 38.4%). Only 114 papers (i.e. 12.2%) 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% and 6 out of 57 or 10.5%). They are more common in Australian and European author affiliations (i.e. 33 out of 185 or 17.8% and 64 out of 362 or 17.7%). Triangular research
designs have been used in 53 papers (i.e. 5.3%). 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%) than among Australian (i.e. 14.1%), North American (i.e. 12.5%) and Asian (i.e. 5.3%). Note that the distribution of the different categories of papers is strikingly similar between Australian and European author affiliations.

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%) have used quantitative research designs and only 11 (i.e. 5.0%) have used qualitative research designs. The rest of the papers with North American author affiliations (i.e. 16 or 7.3%) have used triangular research designs. 71 papers with Australian author affiliations out of 117 (60.7%) have used quantitative research designs and 33 (i.e. 28.2%) have used qualitative research designs. The remaining papers with Australian author affiliations (i.e. 13 or 11.1%) have used triangular research designs. 150 papers with European author affiliations out of 236 (63.6%) have used quantitative research designs and 64 (i.e. 27.1%) have used qualitative research designs. The rest of the papers with European author affiliations (i.e. 22 or 9.3%) have used triangular research designs. 44 papers with Asian author affiliations out of 52 (84.6%) have used quantitative research designs and 6 (i.e. 11.5%) have used qualitative research designs. The remaining papers with Asian author affiliations (i.e. 2 or 3.6%) 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.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

The selected journals of our review and evaluation are broadly oriented according to their editorial descriptions that have been available for us. JM 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 JM 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. EJM publishes an impressive amount annually. In fact, it publishes four times the amount in AMJ and twice the number of JM. On an aggregated level, the dominating category of papers published in AMJ, EJM and JM are the ones based upon quantitative research designs. The other papers vary between 5-15% 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 JM stands out to be heavily focused on quantitative research designs. 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 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.
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