

# **International Marketing Journals: A Preliminary Regional and Institutional Examination of Research Productivity**

Allison C. Ringer and Michael Polonsky, Victoria University

## **Abstract**

Contributions to marketing knowledge are becoming more global (Stremersch and Verhoef, 2005). This paper explores the issue of regional contribution to the international marketing area, which could be expected to be more global than other areas. Publications within four leading international marketing journals were reviewed over a five-year period (1999-2003). Findings suggested that approximately 50 percent of the works were authored by academics outside North America.

## **Introduction**

A major function of academics and their institutions is to create and disseminate knowledge through teaching and publishing (Koojaroenprasit *et al.* 1998). This dispersion of ideas and knowledge development is encouraged by many leading journals (Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft, 2005). There is a suggestion that the contribution of international authors to the literature is generally increasing (Stremersch and Verhoef, 2005). It might be anticipated that global contributions within the international marketing area would be even higher, as a regionally diverse range of practices would need to be considered, if international marketing theory is to be truly global in nature. This research explores the global dispersion of authorship within the international marketing area.

There is growing interest in research productivity (Spake and Harmon, 1998). Not only are governmental bodies funding institutions based on research outcomes in some countries (Allen Consulting Group, 2005), but research evaluation creates ranking lists that are used to promote institutions to students and academics (Bakir, Vitell, and Rose, 2000; Helm, Hunt, and Houston, 2003). Research on academic publishing has explored individuals' performance (Helm, Hunt and Houston, 2003) and institutional performance (Kumar and Kundu, 2004). This has been examined in various marketing sub-disciplines (Polonsky and Mittelstaedt, 2006) and explored generally in terms of regional publishing performance (Svensson, 2005).

In terms of regional inclusion, there is a suggestion that authorship in journals is predominately from North American academics (Boyacigiller and Adler, 1991; Brinn, Jones, and Pendlebury, 2001), which may limit the breadth and generalisability of scholarly findings. Even in areas that might be expected to be more inclusive, such as international business, there appears to be a significant concentration of North American contribution (Kumar and Kundu, 2004; Thomas, Shenkar, and Clarke, 1994). Authors in the Asia-Pacific region have identified that while there are significant contributions from academics within the region, these outputs might be lower than might be anticipated for research focused institutions (Cheng, Chan, and Chan, 2003; Polonsky and Mittelstaedt, 2006).

The objective of this paper is to make interregional comparisons of publishing output within four leading international marketing journals. International marketing was selected, as publishing performance in this area has not been previously explored across journals and it would also be anticipated that the rate of international contributions might be higher than in other disciplines, given the focus is 'international' issues. The research also identifies the top publishing universities in these journals, both globally and within Australasia. To identify the journals to examine within this research, we identified the leading journals that focus on international or global marketing theory.

### **Are More North American Authors Published?**

Schlegelmilch (2003) analysed academic articles published in the *Journal of International Marketing (JIM)* over a 10 year period (1992-2002) and found that contributions came from 132 academic institutions in 23 different countries, representing five continents. In relation to regional dispersion of authors, the majority were from academic institutions located in the US (38.1%). Similar work by Malhotra, Wu and Whitelock (2005) examined contributions to the *International Marketing Review (IMR)*. It was found that US academics publish the majority of works, but a large number of non-US academics also made significant contributions.

Research in the international business area have found that while US academics dominate the literature, there is a significant proportion of non-US contributions with approximately 30 percent of works published by non-US academics (Kumar and Kundu, 2004; Thomas, Shenkar and Clarke, 1994). Other marketing-related work by Hyman and Yang (2001) found that non-US institutions produced 36.6 percent of the works published, thus further supporting the view that the most prolific institutions are disproportionately from the US. Although more recently, Stremersch and Verhoef (2005) have suggested that contributions by authors outside of the US are increasing.

### **Methodology**

The research involved two phases. Initially, we undertook a content analysis of the journal titles listed in *Cabell's Dictionary of Publishing Opportunities in Marketing, 2004 – 2005* to identify those that included the words marketing **and** global **or** international in the title. To ensure the focus of the journals were international issues, we then explored the mission statements (as reported in Cabell 2004) of these journals. Classifying manuscript topics (or journal domains) is difficult because these often focus on multiple, non-mutually exclusive topics (Hyman and Yang, 2001). Based on this review and the rankings of international business journals as reported by Dubois and Reeb (2000), four international marketing journals were identified for this study - *Advances in International Marketing (AIM)*, *Journal of International Marketing (JIM)*, *International Marketing Review (IMR)* and *Journal of Global Marketing (JGM)*.

Phase two of the research explored the regional research contribution of academics within the four leading international marketing journals as identified in phase one, based on the country where the scholars were employed. Regional authorship of five years of articles (1999-2003) was examined, by institution and within six global regions. We excluded editorials, book reviews, etc. from the analysis, as per other research (Stremersch and Verhoef, 2005). We assumed that all

authors on a paper made an equal contribution. If there were two authors from different institutions, each was allocated 0.50 of the article. If more than one author was affiliated with the same institution, this institution was credited multiple times. When an individual listed more than one affiliation, their “score” was split between institutions. Similar processes have been used in the literature (Heck and Cooley, 1988; Inkpen and Beamish, 1994; Malhotra, 1996; Morrison and Inkpen, 1991). We did not make any adjustments for the length of articles and we did not attribute industry or governmental authors to institutions or regions (Kumar and Kundu, 2004).

We then aggregated the data into six regional groupings (North America, South America, Europe, Middle East-Africa, Asia and Australia-New Zealand) based on the location of the institution where the academics were employed. It is recognised that individuals may have come from different countries (Sheldon, 1991), however, we assumed that academics would be guided by the expectations and standards set by their employer-institution (Wilkie and Moore, 2003) and thus location of the institution was seen as the salient grouping factor.

Given the exploratory nature of this research, the analysis is primarily descriptive. Regional publishing performances across the journal groupings are examined along with the individual journals. While the focus of the work was not designed to produce a ranking table of institutions, we have reported on the top 10 publishing institutions in the area of international marketing globally and within Australian and New Zealand in order to determine how they perform relative to the top 10 publishers globally.

## Results

Phase 1 identified that there were 212 marketing journals listed within Cabell’s directory. Ten of these were marketing focused *and* included the words global or international in the title. The mission/focus of these journals identified that the words international and global were used either to: 1) position the journal as relevant to scholars globally, or b) indicate that the core focus of was global/international issues. Of the 10 marketing journals with international or global in their title, only five focused on global and international-related content. Of these, the top four (based on Dubois and Reeb’s ranking of international business journals) were selected for exploration in phase 2. This included *International Marketing Review* (ranked four), *Journal of International Marketing* (ranked six), *Advances in International Marketing* (ranked eight), and *Journal of Global Marketing* (ranked 11). The *International Journal of Research in Marketing* was not included in the research despite being ranked 10<sup>th</sup> in Dubois and Reeb (2001), but its mission indicated that it was a generalist journal.

Phase 2 of the research focused on the substantive issue of publishing productivity within these four journals, over five years (1999-2003). Table 1 summarises the regional authorship by journal and across the set of journals. Table 1 indicates that almost half of the articles in total and across journals were authored by academics based in North America - total (49.39), IMR (47.27), JIM (52.01), AIM (52.94) and JGM (47.30). In regards to other regional contributions, these were more varied. In three cases, JIM, IMR and AIM (as well as the overall total), European-based authors were the second greatest contributors. In the case of JGM, Asia-based authors were second and the third largest group of contributors for JIM, IMR and JGM. Within AIM, Australia and New Zealand-based academics produced the third largest proportion of articles and the fourth

largest number of works in JIM and IMR. They tied with the Middle East-African academics for fourth position in JGM. Middle East-African and South American-based academics produced limited works in these four journals in general and only 13.35 articles in total across the four journals. The majority of these were in JGM.

It does need to be noted that we did not consider the size of academic markets or size of institutions in regards to publishing contribution. If there were more universities in North America (or academics within universities) then these institutions and regions might be expected to produce more research. For example, in Australia and New Zealand there are only 44 Universities, thus their performance may in fact be more substantial if adjusted for size. Additional research does need to explore the impact of size of the market and institution on performance. Other factors could also impact on performance such as research culture of the institutions and regions, resources for research, as well as individual and institutional demographic factors.

**Table 1: Authorship by Global Region**

<b>Journal</b>	<b>International Marketing Review (IMR)</b>	<b>Journal of International Marketing (JIM)</b>	<b>Advances in International Marketing (AIM)</b>	<b>Journal of Global Marketing (JGM)</b>	<b>All Four Total Journals</b>
Region	Number of Articles	Number of Articles	Number of Articles	Number of Articles	Number of Articles
North America	62.27	47.08	35.94	40.22	<b>185.51</b>
South America	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.63	<b>1.63</b>
Europe	43.78	22.31	27.71	13.03	<b>106.83</b>
Middle East-Africa	1.98	1.58	0.00	8.16	<b>11.72</b>
Asia	14.17	12.08	1.66	14.83	<b>42.74</b>
Australia-New Zealand	9.43	7.47	2.08	8.16	<b>27.14</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>132.13</b>	<b>90.52</b>	<b>67.89</b>	<b>85.03</b>	<b>375.57</b>

Further analysis was undertaken to identify the most prolific academic institutions globally and within the Australia-New Zealand region across the four international marketing journals. An examination of the disaggregated data identified that academics from 370 universities had authored works in the four international marketing journals. However, the number of institutions contributing to these four journals differed – AIM (87), JGM (107), JIM, (137), IMR (160). This difference might relate to how these journals are viewed by academics in the international/global marketing area. As was identified earlier, the ranking of these journals, within international business varied which might relate to the number of contributions received from regions.

Table 2 identifies that only four of the top 10 publishing institutions are based in the US. Three are based in Europe and three in Asia, including the top two publishing institutions. While an aggregate examination would suggest that North American academics contribute the most to these journals, there is a wide dispersion in regards to the most prolific. Thus, it appears that Stremersch and Verhoef’s (2005) suggestion that global authorship is high, applies within the international marketing area as well.

Examining the contributions of the top 10 Australian-New Zealand institutions, we can see that

several of these are leaders in the international marketing field, with four institutions in the top 50 publishers and seven others within the top 100. This would further support the contention that Australian-New Zealand institutions contribute a relatively high number of works within the international marketing area, thus we are potentially performing relatively better than our size (i.e. 44 institutions) would possibly suggest.

**Table 2: Top Authorship Global and Australia-New Zealand**

Aus-NZ	Global	University	AIM	JGM	JIM	IMR	Total
	<b>1</b>	City University of Hong Kong	-	2.85	2.00	1.00	<b>5.85</b>
	<b>2</b>	Hong Kong Polytechnic University	-	0.45	2.50	2.49	<b>5.44</b>
	<b>3</b>	Florida State University, US	1.00	1.67	1.00	1.50	<b>5.17</b>
	<b>4</b>	Midwestern State University, US	2.50	-	2.41	-	<b>4.91</b>
	<b>5</b>	University of Texas at San Antonio, US	2.33	0.08	1.83	-	<b>4.24</b>
	<b>6</b>	Manchester Metropolitan University, UK	-	-	0.14	4.00	<b>4.14</b>
	<b>7</b>	Michigan State University, US	-	-	-	3.99	<b>3.99</b>
	<b>8</b>	University of Tromso, Norway	1.00	1.00	0.83	1.00	<b>3.83</b>
	<b>8</b>	University of Westminster, UK	-	2.83	1.00	-	<b>3.83</b>
	<b>10</b>	Nanyang Technological University, Sing.	0.66	-	0.50	2.60	<b>3.76</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>19</b>	Curtin University of Technology	-	1.34	1.00	0.60	<b>2.94</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>21*</b>	University of Western Australia	-	1.50	0.83	0.50	<b>2.83</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>35</b>	Monash University	0.33	-	-	1.98	<b>2.31</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>38*</b>	University of Melbourne	-	-	2.00	-	<b>2.00</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>58*</b>	Massey University	-	-	1.00	0.50	<b>1.50</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>58*</b>	University of Otago	-	-	0.50	1.00	<b>1.50</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>81</b>	Deakin University	-	0.33	-	0.99	<b>1.32</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>82*</b>	Griffith University	-	1.00	-	0.25	<b>1.25</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>94*</b>	University of Auckland	-	1.00	-	-	<b>1.00</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>94*</b>	University of the Sunshine Coast	-	-	1.00	-	<b>1.00</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>94*</b>	Manukau Institute of Technology	-	1.00	-	-	<b>1.00</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>162</b>	La Trobe University	0.50	-	0.14	0.20	<b>0.84</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>163*</b>	University of New South Wales	-	0.33	-	0.50	<b>0.83</b>

\* Denotes multiple institutions have the same ranking based on productivity

## Conclusions

The research suggests that North American authors publish a significant proportion of works within the four international marketing journals examined. However, non-US authors publish approximately half of the works in these journals. It is not clear if the publish-or-perish philosophy adopted in the US influences their performance, or if there is some positive discrimination favouring US focused work (Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft, 2005). Any bias against non-US research would limit the development of theory within the international marketing area. The globalisation of marketing practice might mean that models applicable in the US are not equally applicable in all regions of the world. Global research perspectives need to be explored if truly global theory and practice are to be developed.

Additional research can be undertaken to explore whether institutions specialising within the international area are also leading in other specialised marketing areas, or general theory development. The impact of international marketing theory could also be explored to identify how it will be valued in research assessment, as international research would potentially be more relevant to regional development. Lastly, the role of other factors such as the size of academic communities, within regions and institutions, as well as the demographic characteristics of individuals and institutions could be further explored.

## References

- Allen Consulting Group. 2005. Measuring the Impact of Publicly Funded Research. Canberra: DEST Commonwealth of Australia.
- 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*, 22(2): 97-107.
- Boyacigiller, N. A., and Adler, N. J. 1991. The parochial dinosaur: Organizational science in a global context. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(2): 262-290.
- Brinn, T. M., Jones, M., and Pendlebury, M. 2001. Why do UK accounting and finance academics not publish in the top US journals? *British Accounting Review*, 33(2): 223-232.
- Cabell, D. W. E. 2005. *Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Marketing* (Ninth Edition: 2004-2005 ed.). Texas, US.: Cabell Publishing Inc.
- 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*, 25 (2): 163-176.
- DuBois, F. L., and Reeb, D. 2000. Ranking the international business journals. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 31 (4)(Fourth Quarter): 689-704.
- Heck, J. L., and Cooley, P. L. 1988. Most frequent contributors to the finance literature. *Financial Management*, 17: 100-108.
- Helm, A., Hunt, D., and Houston, M. 2003. Citation frequency of researched published in the top three marketing journals: Ranking the impact of articles, scholars, and institutions. Paper presented at the 2003 AMA Summer Educators' Conference Proceedings.
- Hyman, M. R., and Yang, Z. 2001. International marketing serials: a retrospective. *International Marketing Review*, 18 (6): 667-718.
- Inkpen, A. C., and Beamish, P. W. 1994. An analysis of 25 years of research in the *Journal of International Business Studies*. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25: 703-713.
- Koojaroenprasit, N., Weinstein, A., Johnson, W. C., and Remington, D. O. 1998. Marketing journal rankings revisited: Research findings and academic implications. *Marketing Education Review*, 8 (1): 95-102.
- Kumar, V., and Kundu, S. K. 2004. Ranking the international business schools: Faculty publication as the measure. *Management International Review*, 44 (2): 213-229.
- Malhotra, N. K. 1996. The impact of the Academy of Marketing Science on marketing scholarship: An analysis of the research published in JAMS. *Academy of Marketing Science*, 24 (4): 291-298.

Malhotra, N. K., Wu, L., and Whitelock, J. 2005. An overview of the first 21 years of research in the International Marketing Review, 1983-2003. *International Marketing Review*, 22(4)(391-398).

Morrison, A. J., and Inkpen, A. C. 1991. An analysis of significant contributions to the international business literature. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 22: 143-154.

Polonsky, M. J., and Mittelstaedt, J. 2006. Publishing in socially oriented journals - The state of play in Asia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics* (18 (1)): 61-71.

Rosenstreich, D., and Wooliscroft, B. 2005. What does it take to get published in a top marketing journal from Australasia? *The 30th Annual Macromarketing Conference*: 73-84.

Schlegelmich, B. B. 2003. The anatomy of an international marketing journal. *Journal of International Marketing*, 11 (01): 2-7.

Sheldon, P. 1991. An authorship analysis of tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18 (3): 474-484.

Spake, D. F., and Harmon, S. K. 1998. Institutional and individual research productivity: A comparison of alternative approaches. *Marketing Education Review*, 8 (3): 76-77.

Stremersch, S., and Verhoef, P. C. 2005. Globalization of authorship in the marketing discipline: Does it help or hinder the field? *Marketing Science*, 24 (4): pp. 585-594.

Svensson, G. 2005. Ethnocentricity in top marketing journals. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 23 (5): 422-434.

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*, (4): 675-686.

Wilkie W. L. and Moore E. S., 2003. "Scholarly research in marketing: Exploring the "4 Eras" of thought development". *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*. 22 (2), 116-146.

## Reviewer Report

Thankyou very much for your feedback and comments.

Reviewer's Comment(s)	Issues Addressed
<p><b>Purpose</b></p> <p>1. The purpose of the paper is clear but the rationale is not</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What is the reason for conducting the study?</li> <li>b. What did you hope to learn from it?</li> <li>c. How can the findings help the discipline?</li> <li>d. How can it help promote scholarship?</li> </ol>	<p>We have clarified the rationale for undertaking the research. Recent work by (Stremersch and Verhoef, 2005) identify that there is an increased rate of global contribution (i.e. authorship) to marketing theory. This research explores whether the global contribution is greater in the International marketing area.</p>
<p><b>Novelty value-originality, Uniqueness</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Greater focus required on the uniqueness of the study.</li> <li>2. Why was the focus on international marketing theory?</li> </ol>	<p>See comment above.</p>
<p><b>Conceptual Development</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reviewer's suggestions:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Number of faculty members in the geographic areas</li> <li>b. The academic qualifications and skills of the academics</li> <li>c. The available funding for research</li> <li>d. Difference in university missions</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Review of grammar and punctuation</li> <li>3. Revision of the 1998 reference relating to the growing interest in research productivity</li> <li>4. Justification for the choice of methodology in relation to research productivity i.e., publication in 4 journals</li> </ol>	<p>We have discussed the potential role of department size in affecting productivity. The issue of qualifications and research philosophy, such as the US publish-or-perish mentality is briefly mentioned.</p> <p>We have carefully reviewed the grammar and punctuation.</p> <p>We have clarified the issue regarding to interest in research productivity.</p> <p>We have explained the rationale for selecting the 4 journals of consideration in more detail within the methodology</p>