A BACKWARD GLANCE OF WHO AND WHAT MARKETING SCHOLARS HAVE BEEN RESEARCHING, 1977-2002

Douglas West, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom
John B. Ford, Old Dominion University, United States
Vincent P. Magnini, Longwood University, United States
Michael S. LaTour, Nevada-Las Vegas, United States
Michael J. Polonsky, University of Victoria, Australia

ABSTRACT

This article provides a content analysis of the *Journal of Marketing*, the *Journal of Marketing Research*, the *Journal of Consumer Research* and the *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* over the period 1977-2002. 4,463 articles were surveyed. The analysis reveals the leading authors, institutions and topics.

INTRODUCTION

This paper provides longitudinal benchmarking of the 'inputs' (authors and institutions) and 'outputs' (articles) examining the marketing literature. Few will argue that these are key drivers of the tremendous energy, time, resources and talent focused on these endeavors.Yet, even beyond the face value of such analyses is the value of such results being reflecting points concerning the value of scholarship in the four major marketing journals: the *Journal of Marketing*, the *Journal of Marketing Research*, the *Journal of Consumer Research* and the *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* (hereafter *JM*, *JMR*, *JCR* and *JAMS* respectively). Commonly students, faculty and practitioners and other interested stakeholders periodically review the output of journals or search for specific topics on databases. Despite the diversity of all those involved within the Marketing discipline, all have a stake in maximizing the advancement of marketing knowledge. Without a specific analysis it is difficult to reflect on where a field has been or where it might be heading. The purpose of this paper is to examine who and what marketing scholars have been researching over the period 1977-2002 using content analysis. The following sections feature detailed rankings of authors and institutions as well as longitudinal topic analysis (broken down by journal) along with the overall citation impact of the four journals.

METHOD

Pasadeos et al (1998) suggested that the scholarly literature can be categorized along six dimensions. Comprehensive reviews aim to establish heuristics or paradigms on the conclusions reached in a large number of studies on a particular topic (e.g. Arndt 1986). Publishing productivity studies assess the contributions of particular authors and institutions (e.g. Barry 1990; Henthorne, LaTour and Loraas 1998; Ford, LaTour and Henthorne, 2001; West, 2007). Meta analyses are based on the findings from multiple studies to provide data-based conclusions (e.g. Crouch 1996). Methodological studies review the research methods used across studies within the same topic or same discipline (e.g. Pitt et al 2005; van der Merwe et al 2007). In-depth reviews of one or more publications are provided by specific journal investigations provide an (e.g. Leong 1989; Malhotra 1996) and finally, citation analyses are concerned by the references provided in articles (e.g. Baumgartner & Pieters 2003) and co-citation networks (Pasadeos et al 1998).This study offers a combination of publishing productivity, comprehensive reviews save citation analyses of specific journals (*JM*, *JMR*, *JCR* and *JAMS*).

A content analysis was seen as preferable to a survey of the Editorial Advisory Boards of each journal to provide an overview of marketing research trends. The main difficulty is that relatively few current board members would be well-placed to comment on the past 20+ years of marketing publishing. Furthermore, the prime alternative of a content analysis of publications provides an unobtrusive *ex post facto* evidence of the predilections of authors, reviewers and editors. As well many of the variables did not require judgmental coding, principally the number of authors, their names, their institutions and the citation impact. Given the potential multiplicity of categories, the grouping of topics was the most subjective aspect of the study. To address the problem it was decided to categorize each article by the major topic classifications. Eighteen topic classifications were identified and coded by a research assistant. These were (alphabetically): advertising, consumer behavior, industrial/channels, international marketing, internet marketing, legal issues, marketing education, marketing ethics, marketing research, marketing strategy, marketing theory, pricing, product/brand, relationship marketing, retailing, sales management, sales promotion and services marketing. After a full briefing the research assistant then coded a random sample of 20 papers that were checked by two of the authors. Several ambiguous codings were alerted by the research assistant and these were resolved by further careful reading by both the assistant and authors. Lastly all articles were independently

reviewed by two of the author for final classification. Topical analysis by journal was separated into five-year blocks. All commentary articles were removed from the analysis. Noted are trends over time as to managerial implications as well as a proportional breakdown of empirical vis-à-vis conceptual articles. Also included was a measure of academic impact by presenting the Social Science Citation Index "Impact Factor" scores for *JM*, *JMR*, *JCR* and *JAMS* for 1997-2002.

INPUTS

Authors

Starting with the broad picture, there were 4,463 articles published in *JM*, *JMR*, *JCR* and *JAMS* over the period 1997-2002 involving 7,866 authors for an average of just under two people per article (1.76). 78 individuals appeared 10 or more times in all four journals with eleven people achieved a maximum of 14 appearances. Taking each journal in turn: 41 people appeared four times in *JM*; 104 had four plus in *JMR* with the maximum being 17 who had six appearances each; in *JCR* 85 had four plus with 13 achieving 6 appearances each; and finally, 36 people appeared four times in *JAMS*. Both *JMR* and *JCR* averaged slightly below two authors per article whereas *JM* was at 1.63 and *JAMS* the lowest at 1.51.

The top ten publishing authors, based on adjusted publications, for all four and each journal can be seen in Table 1. The first column shows the weighted average ranking, that is, taking into consideration number of coauthors involved, for example if an article has three authors—each is given one-third credit. Absolute ranking (based on total number of appearances) features in the second column. The most prolific author was Morris Holbrook with and adjusted ranking of just over 18 based upon 35 appearances in the top four journals which represents 1.4 articles per year average over 1997-2002. Holbrook is then followed in turn by Hirschman, Malhotra, Bagozzi, Hunt, Green, Lehmann, Bearden, Meyers-Levy and Day with an adjusted range of 18 to just over 10 based upon 20 to 15 publications respectively.

Institutions

In terms of institutional impact based on adjusted appearances, the top institution across all four is the University of Pennsylvania with a score of just under 104 based upon 216 publications. Pennsylvania is then followed by Wisconsin, Columbia, Northwestern, Texas at Austin, NYU, Indiana, Texas A&M, Illinois and the California – Los Angeles ranging from just an adjusted of over 95 to 60 based upon 185 to 104 publications respectively. The list changes when appearances are adjusted to reflect multiple authors (see Table 2).

OUPUTS

Topics

Empirical studies have noticeably increased as a proportion of the content of *JM* over the period from just over 50 per cent in the first benchmark period (1977-1981) to over 75 per cent of output in the last (1997-2002) representing an average of 63 per cent over 1977-2002. By contrast the other three have consistently featured empirical work, particularly *JMR* which started off at just under 90 per cent in benchmark one and had a period for an average of 92 per cent. Articles with managerial implications have increased noticeably over the benchmark periods. By nature *JM, JMR* and *JAMS* have the strongest managerial orientations and reflect the most dramatic shift in emphasis in this direction over the 26-year period for example with *JM* going from 40 to 82, *JMR* from 17 to 66 and *JAMS* from 30 to 53. However, *JCR* increased managerial-based output from only 14 per cent to 30 over the same period. Overall, this is broadly a positive trend as there is a need for bridge building between basic research and managerial thinking.

The plethora of research topics covered in these top journals reflects the diversity of the mosaic scholarship within the discipline. While *JMR* and *JCR* are more narrowly focused on particular subjects than *JM* or *JAMS*, it is interesting to see the broadening of topics that has been occurring for both of these journals since 1977. The topics were grouped in these tables in 5-year blocks, and it is interesting to note the changes over the 26 years. *JM* has maintained a fairly broad range of topics over the period with a focus upon marketing strategy (19 per cent over the entire period) and consumer behavior (12 per cent) and to a lesser extent marketing theory (9 per cent), advertising (8 per cent) and marketing research (7 per cent). However, there has been a lessening of focus on marketing theory, advertising, and to some extent marketing research with a significant fall in legal issues by the last benchmark period of 1997-2002. On the other hand *JM* gave increasing attention to services, product and brand, relationship marketing, and albeit small (given the lateness of arrival in the period under study) internet marketing. *JMR* has begun to focus more heavily on such topics as marketing strategy, consumer behavior and product/brand issues while *JCR* has branched out to include such topics as advertising, research methods and international marketing. *JAMS* has seen a switch in focus between consumer behavior (falling from 34 to 14 per cent of output) and marketing

strategy (rising from 10 to 23 per cent of output) with a large fall in the prominence of retailing (7 to 2 per cent) and a rapid rise of internet marketing (12 per cent of articles 1997-2002 from none).

DISCUSSION

This paper has provided a comprehensive review the scholarly inputs and outputs in the *JM*, *JMR*, *JCR* and *JAMS*. Just under 4,500 articles were published by these four journals over 1977-2002 by an average of just over 1.75 authors each. The top author across all 4 was Morris Holbrook who was closely followed by Elizabeth Hirschman using an adjusted publication ranking. Other noteworthy individuals publishing across all four include Malhotra, Bagozzi, Hunt, Green, Lehmann, Bearden, Meyers-Levy and Day. The University of Pennsylvania proved to be the top publishing institution with an adjusted score of just under 104 which was mainly for work published in *JM* and *JMR*. Other institutions particularly worthy of note across all four journals are Wisconsin, Columbia, Northwestern, Texas at Austin, NYC, Indianna, Texas A&M, Illinois and the University of California at Los Angeles. Empirical articles as a share of output accounted for 70 to 94 per cent of all articles by 1997-2002 for all four journals after a considerable rise in the proportion taken by *JM* in the last two benchmark periods 1987-2002 from a low of 52 per cent over 1977-1981. Articles with managerial implications have taken an ever increasing share of the total over the period but considerable differences were found between *JCR* and the others. In terms of topics the period has considerable changes in the coverage of consumer behavior topics between the four with falls amongst *JM*, *JMR* and *JAMS* and a 'U' shape rise at *JCR* over the four benchmark periods where the topic accounted for 65, 60, 57 and 67 per cent of the total for a grand average of 61 per cent over the whole period 1977-2002. *JM* and *JMR* appear to be working towards a middle ground to some degree. The shift can be seen particular with *JMR* moving towards *JM* 'territory' with marketing strategy topics accounting for 28 per cent of *JMR's* total over 1997-2002 whereas marketing research fell to 24 per cent from a high of just under 90 for the first benchmark period (1977-1981). *JAMS* has most noticeably embraced internet marketing as a topic which accounted for 12 per cent of articles over 1997-2002.

REFERENCES

Baumgartner, H. & Pieters R. (2003) "The structural influence of marketing journals: a citation analysis of the discipline and its subareas over time." *Journal of Marketing* 67(2): 123-139.

Crouch, G.I. (1996) "Demand elasticities in international marketing: a meta-analytical application to tourism." *Journal of Business Research*, **36**(2): 117-136.

Ford, John B., Michael S. LaTour and Tony L. Henthorne. 2001. "Author and Institution Productivity in *Industrial Marketing Management* from 1971 to 1998." *Industrial Marketing Management* 30 (5): 441-452.

Henthorne, Tony L., Michael S. LaTour, and Tina Loraas. 1998. "Publication Productivity in the Three Leading U.S. Advertising Journals: 1989 Through 1996." *Journal of Advertising* 27 (2): 53-63.

Leong, S.M. (1989) "A citation analysis of the Journal of Consumer Research." *Journal of Consumer Research*, **15**(4): 492-497.

van der Merwe, R., Berthon, P., Pitt, L. & Barnes. B. (2007) "Analysing 'theory networks': identifying the pivotal theories in marketing and their characteristics." *Journal of Marketing Management* 23(3/4): 181-206,

Malhotra, N.K. (1996) "The impact of the Academy of Marketing Science on marketing scholarship: an analysis of the research published in *JAMS*." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 24 (4): 291-298.

Pasadeos, Y., Phelps, J. & Bong-Hyun, K. (1998) "Disciplinary impact of advertising scholars: temporal comparisons of influential authors, works and research networks." *Journal of Advertising* 27 (4): 53-70.

Pitt, L.F., Berthon, P., Caruana, A. & Berthon, J-P. (2005) "The state of theory in three premier advertising journals: a research note." *International Journal of Advertising* 24 (2): 241-249.

West, Douglas, (2007) "Directions in Marketing Communications Research: An Analysis of the IJA." *International Journal of Advertising* 26 (4): 543-554.

Table 1: Top Publishing Authors 1977-2002

Top Ten		Adjusted+ Publications	Total Publications
All 4	Holbrook, Morris	18.07	35
	Hirschman, Elizabeth	18.00	20
	Malhotra, Naresh	15.23	21
	Bagozzi, Richard	14.16	22
	Hunt, Shelby	13.97	25
	Green, Paul	13.97	31
	Lehmann, Donald	13.28	29
	Bearden, William	11.04	28
	Meyers-Levy, Joan	10.50	17
	Day, George	10.33	15
JM	Hunt Shelby	7.16	12
	Day, George	6.83	11
	Dickson, Peter	6.16	9
	Frazier, Gary	5.99	12
	Varadarajan, P. Rajan	5.81	11
	Cohen, Dorothy	5.00	5
	Morgan, Fred	4.99	7
	Deshpande', Rohit	4.83	6
	Heide, Jan	4.66	9
	Singh, Jagdip	4.66	6
JMR	Dillon, William	8.06	18
	Green, Paul	7.06	15
	Malhotra, Naresh	6.91	9
	Srinivasan, V.	6.74	15
	Churchill, Gilbert Jr.	5.91	12
	Kamakura, Wagner	5.58	11
	Bagozzi, Richard	5.5	8
	Fornell, Claes	5.5	10
	Lehmann, Donald	5.38	13
	Holbrook, Morris	5.33	8
JCR	Holbrook, Morris	10.74	23
	Hirschman, Elizabeth	10.00	11
	Belk, Russell	9.15	15
	Meyers-Levy, Joan	8.00	12
	Janiszewski, Chris	6.50	9
	Bearden, William	6.14	15
	Lynch, John, Jr.	6.03	13
	Mick, David Glen	6.00	9
	Richins, Marsha	6.00	7
	John, Deborah Roedder	5.66	10
JAMS (11)	Malhotra, Naresh	5.49	8
	Lamb, Charles	4.91	11
	Teas, R. Kenneth	4.50	6
	Varadarajan, P. Rajan	4.41	8
	Ferrell, O.C.	4.32	10
	Hunt, Shelby	4.15	8
	Sirgy, M. Joseph	3.87	6
	Lumpkin, James	3.66	7
	Lusch, Robert	3.66	7
	Akaah, Ishmael	3.50	
	Futrell, Charles	3.50	

+Note: Adjusted = (1/# authors) per author.

Table 2: Top Publishing Institutions 1977-2002

Top Ten		Adjusted+ Publications	Total Publications
All 4	U. of Pennsylvania	103.64	218
	U. of Wisconsin	95.22	185
	Columbia University	92.74	179
	Northwestern University	76.58	142
	U. of Texas - Austin	73.34	152
	New York University	69.12	126
	Indiana University	68.64	141
	Texas A&M University	67.3	137
	U. of Illinois	61.29	110
	U. of California – Los Angeles	60.07	104
JM	U. of Pennsylvania	22.81	48
	Texas A&M University	19.93	49
	U. of Texas - Austin	19.71	42
	Indiana University	18.61	38
	Harvard University	18.46	33
	U. of Wisconsin	17.49	33
	U. of Southern California	16.63	26
	Texas Tech University	15.91	32
	New York University	15.65	30
	Columbia University	15.13	28
JMR	U. of Pennsylvania	43.49	97
	U. of Wisconsin	36.61	71
	Northwestern University	33.04	63
	Columbia University	32.47	64
	U. of Texas - Austin	29.62	58
	U. of California - Los Angeles	26.69	52
	Stanford University	25.91	52
	New York University	24.04	45
	Indiana University	21.33	46
	U. of Michigan	20.67	48
JCR	Columbia University	43.14	84
	U. of Florida	34.83	66
	U. of Wisconsin	33.33	66
	U. of Pennsylvania	28.53	58
	U. of Illinois	26.64	46
	Northwestern University	25.89	47
	U. of California - Los Angeles	25.38	41
	New York University	24.93	45
	U. of Michigan	21.98	38
	Duke University	20.91	46
JAMS	Texas A&M University	32.3	58
	Arizona State University	17.13	36
	Virginia Tech	16.33	36
	U. of Miami	15.39	34
	U. of Alabama	11.73	26
	Georgia State University	11.47	21
	U. of Kentucky	11.22	15
	Texas Tech University	10.54	25
	Bowling Green State University	10.33	18
	Kent State University	10.33	16

+Note: Adjusted = (1/# institution) per institution.