



香港城市大學
City University of Hong Kong

專業 創新 胸懷全球
Professional · Creative
For The World

CityU Scholars

Marketing Professionals' Perceptions of Marketing Journals/Publications

Jiang, Ling(Alice); Yang, Zhilin; Carlson, David

Published in:

African Journal of Business Management

Published: 01/03/2012

Document Version:

Final Published version, also known as Publisher's PDF, Publisher's Final version or Version of Record

License:

CC BY

Publication record in CityU Scholars:

[Go to record](#)

Publication details:

Jiang, LA., Yang, Z., & Carlson, D. (2012). Marketing Professionals' Perceptions of Marketing Journals/Publications. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(11), 4317-4327. [F9B01C036021].

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on CityU Scholars is the Post-print version (also known as Accepted Author Manuscript, Peer-reviewed or Author Final version), it may differ from the Final Published version. When citing, ensure that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination and other details.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the CityU Scholars portal is retained by the author(s) and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights. Users may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.

Publisher permission

Permission for previously published items are in accordance with publisher's copyright policies sourced from the SHERPA RoMEO database. Links to full text versions (either Published or Post-print) are only available if corresponding publishers allow open access.

Take down policy

Contact lbscholars@cityu.edu.hk if you believe that this document breaches copyright and provide us with details. We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Full Length Research paper

Marketing professionals' perceptions of marketing journals/publications

Ling (Alice) Jiang¹, Zhilin Yang^{2*} and David Carlson³

¹Faculty of Management and Administration, Macau University of Science and Technology, Macau, P. R. China.

²Department of Marketing, City University of Hong Kong, Kowloon, Hong Kong, P. R. China.

³Department of Marketing, New Mexico State University, Mexico.

Accepted 9 January, 2012

This survey of marketing professionals' readership and ratings of marketing-related journals/publications was conducted to compare their reading behavior and opinions with those from past surveys of marketing academics. Although many professionals do read the academic journals and rate them much like academics, most professionals read more frequently and rate more highly marketing-related news publications than the journals academics tend to esteem. This information should be useful for business schools wishing to encourage marketing faculty to place more emphasis on applied research and is indispensable for journal editors who wish to disseminate knowledge effectively to practitioners.

Key word: Journal ranking, marketing publications, readership, marketing practitioner, marketing academics.

INTRODUCTION

Marketing educators have been surveyed about how they quality rate or prestige rank marketing journals/publications (Bauerly and Johnson, 2005; Hans and Pieters, 2003; Becker and Browne, 1979; Browne and Becker, 1991; Easton and Easton, 2003; Guidry et al., 2004; Hofacker et al., 2009; Hult et al., 2009; Hult et al., 1997; Luke and Doke, 1987; Mort, et al., 2004; Polonsky and Whitelaw, 2006; Steward and Lewis, 2010; Theoharakis and Hirst, 2002). These studies refer to the fact that marketing academics are judged for tenure and promotion, at least in some ways, based upon the quality or prestige of the journals in which they publish. Since academics do judge other academics, it is understandable that academics would be the subjects used in such studies.

Most of the highly rated marketing journals, such as *Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Marketing Research*, in the editorial mandates or directions for submission, indicate that information published should be of use to marketing practitioners. Since marketing research and

the published articles that emanate from it are intended to disseminate marketing knowledge and to further the practice of marketing, the point can be raised that readership and use of this information by marketing practitioners should be an additional input element when judging the quality or prestige of journals and for journal editors striving to increase readership among professionals.

The revised eligibility procedures and standards for business accreditation by AACSB (2011) appear to have opened the door for business schools to emphasize applied research as one of the three components of portfolio of the faculty contribution portfolio. As AACSB (2011; P. 21) puts it, "contributions to practice (often referred to as applied research) influence professional practice in the faculty member's field. Articles in practice-oriented journals, creation and delivery of executive education courses, development of discipline-based practice tools, and published reports on consulting all qualify as contributions to practice". For those business schools which have shifted some of the emphasis from "basic scholarship" to more applied research, it should be of value to obtain information about what professionals read and value.

Little research, however, has been conducted in

*Corresponding author. E-mail: mkzyang@cityu.edu.hk. Tel: (852) 3442-4644. Fax: (852) 3442-0346.

investigating professionals' perceptions of usefulness and value of marketing-related journals/publications. Ganesh et al. (1990) found that marketing academics have higher awareness and evaluation of the selected top eight marketing journals than those outside the marketing discipline. Both groups surveyed were in academia and did not include the marketing professionals who should be a large audience of these journals. Fry et al. (1985) did include 57 marketing and management practitioners in their sample, but did not ask any questions about readership or usefulness of the journals. They did include some readership information, but it was drawn only from the target audience descriptions included in Cabell's Directory (1981). Furthermore, Lundstrom and White (1997) surveyed marketing professionals and academics to determine any differences in perception of the importance of curriculum content and research, but they did not gather information about perceptions or importance of journals or other publications. Diaz III et al. (1996) surveyed both academics and professionals with regard to the importance of journals for promotion and tenure, as well as applicability to professional practice. However, they restricted their study to real estate journals.

Recently, there has been much debate on the significant gap between academics and professionals when evaluating academic research and publications (e.g., Baldrige et al., 2004; Brennan, 2004; Hunt, 2002; November, 2004; Nyilasy and Reid, 2007; Skapinker, 2008, 2011; The Economist, 2007). The key criticism is centered on the realization that research from business schools has been focusing overwhelmingly on academic rigor; yet is largely irrelevant to business professionals. Baldrige et al. (2004) have pointed out that academics and managers share several commonalities in evaluating the academic quality and practical relevance of 120 management publications; nonetheless, significant differences exist between the two groups. In light of this discussion, we intend to explore the academicians-practitioner gap related to journal readability in the area of marketing.

This study surveyed marketing professionals only. Results from these professionals were then compared with those from prior studies of academics to determine how different their readership and opinions of marketing publications might be from those of marketing academics. Such information can help academics develop and maintain a more realistic assessment of which journals/publications professionals read and value. It also provides some information on targeting professionals when attempting to publish applied research results. For marketing departments that wish to reward applied research efforts, it gives information about judging the potential impact that such publications may have on marketing professionals. Finally, this type of survey information can be used by academic journal editors to develop strategies to attract more practitioner readers

through understanding the professionals' perceptions of their journals and knowing what these professionals desire

METHODOLOGY

The survey

Questionnaires were mailed to 1003 professional members of the American Marketing Association (AMA), using the alphabetical listing given in the International Members and Marketing Services Guide. One name was selected from each column on every page in the list (4 per page), with the following rules. The bottom name in each column was used if it appeared to be a professional member living in the U.S. If the bottom name was an academic member, or non-U.S. address, then the next name up from the bottom was chosen.

Of the 1003 questionnaires mailed, 34 (3.4%) were returned as undeliverable. One hundred and eleven (111) usable responses were received, for a response rate of 11.46%, somewhat higher than the 6.25% response rate reported by Lundstrom and White (1997) from the professionals in their survey.

The questionnaire

The selection of journals was based on recent studies related to marketing journal ranking (Bauerly and Johnson, 2005; Hans and Pieters, 2003; Easton and Easton, 2003; Guidry et al., 2004; Hofacker et al., 2009; Hult et al., 2009; Hult et al., 1997; Mort et al., 2004; Polonsky and Whitelaw, 2006; Steward and Lewis, 2010; Theoharakis and Hirst, 2002) with additions of five large circulation marketing publications - Advertising Age, Brand Week, Business Marketing, Business Week, and Marketing News, which marketing professionals might reasonably expect to see in the list. As a result, 70 marketing-related journals/publications were listed in the questionnaire and are shown in Table 1.

Respondents were asked to circle the names of all the publications from the provided list of 70 marketing/business publications from which they had read an article during the last two months. Lines were provided at the bottom of this list of publications for write-in names of any other marketing journals/publications that they had read during the last two months. Respondents were then asked to "rank the top 10 marketing publications based on how valuable the information contained in them has been to you". Demographic information, including current job title, industry, primary marketing interest area, years in a marketing position, education, gender, and approximate income (from this job position), was requested near the end of the survey form. Finally, space was provided for "any comments about marketing journals".

RESULTS

Profile of respondents

Table 2 presents the demographics of respondents. Half were marketing managers or directors. Although more than half of the respondents were male (56%), female professionals were well represented (44%). Professional respondents tended to be highly-educated, with 96% holding a bachelor or higher degree, and with over 9% having a doctorate. These respondents represent most

Table 1. Original list of marketing-related journals¹.

1	Advertising Age	36	Journal of Euromarketing
2	Advances in Consumer Research	37	Journal of Global Marketing
3	AMA Educator's Conference Proceedings	38	Journal of Hospital Marketing
4	AMA Conference Proceedings	39	Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing
5	American Business Law Journal	40	Journal of International Business Studies
6	Brand Week	41	Journal of International Marketing
7	Business History	42	Journal of Marketing
8	Business History Review	43	Journal of Marketing Channels
9	Business Horizon	44	Journal of Marketing Education
10	Business Marketing	45	Journal of Marketing Management
11	Business Week	46	Journal of Marketing Research
12	California Management Review	47	Journal of Marketing Research Society
13	Case Research Journal	48	Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice
14	Decision Science	49	Journal of Nonprofit and Public Marketing
15	European Journal of Marketing	50	Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management
16	Harvard Business Review	51	Journal of Product Innovation Management
17	Health Marketing Quarterly	52	Journal of Professional Marketing
18	Industrial Marketing Management	53	Journal of Public Policy and Marketing
19	International Journal of Research in Marketing	54	Journal of Purchasing and Materials Management
20	Journal of Academic of Marketing Science	55	Journal of Retailing
21	Journal of Advertising	56	Journal of Services Marketing
22	Journal of Advertising Research	57	Journal of Travel Research
23	Journal of Business	58	Logistics Transportation Journal
24	Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing	59	Management Science
25	Journal of Business Ethics	60	Marketing Education Review
26	Journal of Business Logistics	61	Marketing Health Services
27	Journal of Business Research	62	Marketing Letter
28	Journal of Business to Business Marketing	63	Marketing News
29	Journal of Business Venturing	64	Marketing Management
30	Journal of Consumer Affairs	65	Marketing Science
31	Journal of Consumer Marketing	66	Marketing Science Institute Reports
32	Journal of Consumer Research	67	Psychology and Marketing
33	Journal of Consumer Psychology	68	Service Industries Journal
34	Journal of Direct Marketing	69	Sloan Management Review
35	Journal of Distribution Marketing	70	Transportation Journal

Table 2. Respondent profile.

Variable	Frequency (N=111 ¹)	Percentage ²
Current job title		
Market Manager/Director	55	50.9
Officer(Owner, President, Partner)	21	19.4
Marketing Researcher/Analyst	17	15.7
Customer Services/Satisfaction	5	4.6
Advertising	5	4.6
Sales/Consultant; etc	5	4.6
Total	108	
Industry		
Marketing Research/Consulting	22	21.2

Table 2. Contd.

Manufacturing(including software)	22	21.2
Product Distribution/Sales/Retail(including Direct Marketing)	17	16.3
Communication(including Advertising/Publishing/Telephone)	17	16.3
Government/Financial/Nonprofit	14	13.5
Healthcare	9	8.7
Misc. Services	<u>3</u>	2.9
Total	104	
Primary marketing interest area		
Research/Modeling	35	36.1
Marketing operations/Management	25	25.8
Promotion/Communication/Direction	23	23.7
Planning/Forecasting	7	7.2
Others	<u>7</u>	7.2
Total	97	
Years in marketing position		
1 - 5	22	20.6
6 - 10	30	28.0
11 - 15	22	20.6
16 - 20	19	17.7
21 - 25	8	7.5
26 – more	<u>6</u>	5.6
Total	107	
Gender		
Male	60	56.1
Female	<u>47</u>	43.9
Total	107	
Education levels		
Below Bachelor	4	3.7
Bachelor	42	39.6
Master	50	47.2
Ph. D	<u>10</u>	9.4
Total	106	
Reported income		
\$0-\$40,000	18	17.3
\$40,001-\$60,000	22	21.2
\$60,001-\$80,000	18	17.3
\$80,001-\$100,000	15	14.4
\$100,001 +	<u>31</u>	29.8
Total	104	

1. Total Numbers in each category may not be 111, as some items were not answered. 2. Missing data is not included in the percentage calculations.

areas in marketing, including marketing research/consulting (21.2%), manufacturing (21.2%), communication (16.3%), product distribution/sales (16.3%), and government/financial/nonprofit (13.5%).

Most of them have primary interests in the areas of market research, modeling, promotion, communication, and marketing operations. These professionals have been in their marketing positions an average of 12.5

years.

The most frequent income categories were between \$40,000-60,000 (22 or 21.2% of respondents) and more than \$100,000 (31 or 29.8% of respondents).

The respondents were encouraged to specify all marketing-related journals they had read that were not listed in the printed list. These professionals added 156 write-in responses, for a total of 82 additional marketing publications that they had read during the last two months (Table 3). Six of these 82 publications were mentioned more than five times.

This indicates the diversity of their professional reading. Two write-in publications, American Demographics and The Wall Street Journal, were among the top 14 most read publications. Furthermore, twenty-five of the additional publications were ranked as a "top 10 journal" by at least one respondent.

Overall marketing-related journal/publication rankings and readerships

To measure the rankings of all journals, two indexes were utilized: professional readership index (PRI) and professional value index (PVI).

PRI and PVI are similar to IPI (importance/prestige index) and PFI (popularity/familiarity index) that were used by Luke and Doke (1987) and Hult et al. (1997). The formulas are as follows:

(1). **PRI:** The professional readership index is calculated as

$$PRI_i = R_i / X \quad (0 \leq PRI \leq 1.0)$$

Where: i -- the journal number 1, 2, 3, ..., n ;
 R_i -- the number of the times journal i was read; and X -- the maximum number of times a journal was read (which was 71 for Marketing News).

(2). **PVI:** The professional value index is computed as

$$PVI_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{10} (V_{ij} * j)}{\sum_{j=1}^{10} V_{ij}} \quad (1 \leq PVI \leq 10)$$

Where:
 i -- the journal number 1, 2, 3, ..., n ;
 j -- the rank of a journal, here j is from 1 to 10
 V_{ij} -- the number of the times journal i was ranked j .

A higher PRI indicates high readership of a journal while a lower PVI means high value of the journal.

Table 4 lists 28 journals which were ranked three or more times. Within the top 10 journals, five of them have strong news orientations, that is, Marketing News, Advertising Age, Business Week, Marketing Management, and Brand Week. It is interesting to note that Marketing News

has not been ranked very high by marketing academicians (Browne and Becker, 1985, 1991), yet professionals in this survey ranked Marketing News as the most valuable top 10 publication with PVI equaling 3.25 and the publication they most read ($N = 71$ or $PRI = 1.00$).

To ensure that PVI results are not skewed by one or two respondents, a minimum level of PRI is set at 0.15 (cf. Hult et al., 1997). With this cut-off, Marketing News (PVI = 3.25) was the highest-ranked publication, followed by the Marketing Health Services (PVI = 3.29), American Demographics (PVI = 3.33), Harvard Business Review (PVI = 3.45) and Advertising Age (PVI = 3.60). Journal of Marketing Research (PVI = 3.89) ranks eighth in this set of 11 publications' value ranking, with the Journal of Marketing (PVI = 4.88) in last place. Consistent with Hult et al.'s (1997) findings, PVI rankings do not correspond closely with PRI rankings.

Journal of Marketing was ranked as a top 10 publication by every professional who read it. Additionally, four respondents who had not read the Journal of Marketing recently did offer a top 10 ranking to it. Clearly professionals do recognize the Journal of Marketing as a valuable journal. What is surprising is the value ranking of Marketing News. Out of 71 professionals who read the Marketing News recently, 65 (91.5%) did rate it as a top publication for the value of its content.

Comparisons of rankings by academics and professionals

Table 5 compares professionals' perception from this study and academics' perceptions from the eight major previous studies. Harvard Business Review, Journal of Marketing, Journal of Marketing Research, and Journal of Advertising Research are the only four journals with readerships (PRI) ranked as top 10 by both academics and professionals. Among the top 25 publications ranked by professionals, only 11 were ranked by academics as top 50 at least in one study. And, though the Journal of Retailing, Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Marketing Science, and Journal of Business Research were ranked as top 10 by academics, they did not appear in the professionals' top 25. Furthermore, the three highest rated publications by professionals, Marketing News, Advertising Age, and Business Week, were not included in previous studies as they are not peer reviewed.

Journal readership differences by demographics

Differences in readerships of these publications across various demographics were generally not surprising. For example, respondents who indicated their area of interest as being marketing research/modeling tended to read Journal of Marketing Research ($\alpha = 0.001$, using t-test) and Journal of Advertising Research ($\alpha = 0.032$)

Table 3. Journals/publications added by the respondents.

No.	Journal/publication	Freq. (N = 111)		No	Journal/Publication	Freq. (N = 111)	
		Read	Ranked			Read	Ranked
1	American Demographics	13	6	42	Medical Marketing & Media	1	1
2	Advertising Week	9	6	43	Meetings and Conventions	1	1
3	Wall Street Journal	9	6	44	Portland Business Journal	1	1
4	Marketing Research	8	6	45	PR News	1	1
5	Marketing Tools	8	4	46	PR Tips & Tactics	1	1
6	Sales Marketing Management	7	3	47	Product Management Today	1	1
7	Fortune	5	4	48	Promo	1	1
8	Direct	4	3	49	Public Opinion Quarterly	1	1
9	DM News	4	3	50	Public Relations Strategist	1	1
10	Quirks Marketing Research	4	3	51	Public Relations Tactics	1	1
11	Fast Company	3	2	52	Selling Power	1	1
12	Newsweek	3	2	53	Supermarket News	1	1
13	Automotive News	2	2	54	The Marketing Report	1	1
14	Bulldog	2	2	55	Tire Business	1	1
15	Potentials in Marketing	2	2	56	Traffic Week	1	1
16	Quirks Marketing Review	2	2	57	Webweek	1	1
17	Time	2	2	58	American Marketing news	1	0
18	Advertising Age International	2	1	59	An International Journal	1	0
19	Business Geographer	2	1	60	Card Marketing	1	0
20	Journal of Business Strategy	2	1	61	Catalog Age	1	0
21	Target Marketing	2	1	62	Corporate Communications	1	0
22	Across the Board	1	1	63	Dallas Business Journal	1	0
23	Austin Business Journal	1	1	64	Direct Marketing Pubs	1	0
24	Cable Avails	1	1	65	Financial Advertising Review	1	0
25	Competitive Utility	1	1	66	Forbes	1	0
26	Cowles Report on Database Marketing	1	1	67	Health Week	1	0
27	Energy Services Marketing Letter	1	1	68	Healthcare Marketing Report	1	0
28	Executive Female	1	1	69	Hospital News	1	0
29	Executive Strategies	1	1	70	Jone's Report	1	0
30	Healthcare Fortune Journal	1	1	71	Journal of Business and Economic Statistics	1	0
31	Inc.	1	1	72	Journal of Database Marketing	1	0
32	Information Week	1	1	73	Journal of Targeting	1	0
33	Inpractice Report	1	1	74	Los Angeles Business Journal	1	0
34	Interactive Week	1	1	75	Medical Healthcare	1	0
35	Internet Week	1	1	76	Oregon Business Magazine	1	0

Table 3. Contd.

36	J. D. Powers Reports	1	1	77	Red Herring	1	0
37	Jack O'dwyer's Newsletter	1	1	78	Stones Magazine	1	0
38	Journal of Applied Psychology	1	1	79	Strategy Business	1	0
39	Journal of Commerce	1	1	80	Success	1	0
40	Journal of Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior	1	1	81	The Economist	1	0
41	Kiphiger Washington Letter	1	1	82	Upside	1	0

Table 4. Overall marketing-related journal/publication rankings.

Rank	Journal name	Number of times the journal was ranked										Frequency (N = 111)			PRI ²	PVI ³
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Read	Ranked	Differences ¹		
1	Marketing News	20	11	13	3	6	3	5	2	1	1	71	65	6	1.00	3.25
2	Advertising Age	10	15	10	7	8	3	1	3	1	2	60	60	0	0.85	3.60
3	Business Week	2	13	5	4	8	2	2	2	1		44	39	5	0.62	3.85
4	Harvard Business Review	9	3	6	5	4	2	3	1			33	33	0	0.46	3.45
5	Journal of Marketing	1	4	5	3	3	3	1	4	1	1	22	26	-4	0.31	4.88
6	Marketing Management	3	3	5	2	1	1	2			2	22	19	3	0.31	4.05
7	Journal of Marketing Research	7	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	18	18	0	0.25	3.89
8	Brand Week	4	4	1	2	2	1	3	1	1		17	19	-2	0.24	4.05
9	Journal of Advertising Research	2		1	3	3	1	1	1			12	12	0	0.17	4.42
10	Marketing Health Services	2	2		1	1			1			11	7	4	0.15	3.29
11	American Demographics ⁴	1	1	1	2		1					11	6	5	0.15	3.33
12	Business Marketing			4	3		2	1	1			9	11	-2	0.13	4.64
13	Marketing Research	3	1		2							9	6	3	0.13	2.17
14	Wall Street Journal ⁴	2	1		1	1	1					9	6	3	0.13	3.17
15	Advertising Week	2	2		1	1						8	6	2	0.11	2.50
16	Sales Marketing Management ⁴		1		1		1					6	3	3	0.08	4.00
17	Marketing Letter		1		1	1	1		2			5	6	-1	0.07	5.50
18	Marketing Tools ⁴	2		1	1							5	4	1	0.07	2.25
19	Journal of Consumer Research		1	1	1	1				1		4	5	-1	0.06	4.60
20	Journal of Marketing Management			1	2		1	1				4	5	-1	0.06	4.80
21	Fortune ⁴	1	1	1						1		4	4	0	0.06	3.75
22	Quirks Marketing Research ⁴		1	1	1							4	3	1	0.06	3.00
23	Journal of Interactive Marketing			1	1		1					4	3	1	0.06	4.33
24	Journal of Advertising			1		1		1		3		3	6	-3	0.04	7.00
25	AMA Conference Proceedings					1	1	1			1	3	4	-1	0.04	7.00

Table 4. Contd.

26	Direct ⁴	1	1		1		3	3	0	0.04	3.00
27	DM News ⁴		2			1	3	3	0	0.04	4.00
28	Advances in Consumer Research	1		1		1	2	3	-1	0.03	5.00

1. Difference = Read N – Ranked N; 2. PVI - Professional Value Index; 3. PRI - Professional Readership Index; 4. Not listed in original list (Table 1).

Table 5. Comparisons of marketing-related journal rankings and readerships by academics and professionals.

Journal name	Professionals	Academics							
	Rank	HNB	TH	BP	G	M	BJ	PW	SL
Marketing News	1				21	65			
Advertising Age	2								
Business Week	3								
Harvard Business Review	4	7	4				10		7
Journal of Marketing	5	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	1
Marketing Management	6	38		28		45			
Journal of Marketing Research	7	2	1	2	1	3	3	2	2
Brand Week	8								
Journal of Advertising Research	9	10	15	15	12	9		8	8
Marketing Health Services	10	31		33		45			48
American Demographics	11								
Business Marketing	12								
Marketing Research	13					58			
Wall Street Journal	14								
Advertising Week	15								
Sales Marketing Management	16								
Marketing Letter	17	34	11	25	8	10	23	14	16
Marketing Tools	18								
Journal of Consumer Research	19	3	3	3	3	1	2	3	3
Journal of Marketing Management	20	20	29	34		16		46	34
Fortune	21								
Quirks Marketing Research	22								
Journal of Interactive Marketing	23					45		50	37
Journal of Advertising	24	9	15	15	12	9		8	10
AMA Conference Proceedings	25	28		27		21		59	42
Journal of Retailing	32	4	8	9	6	4	20	5	5
Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science	< 42	5	9	8	5	4	5	6	6

Table 5. Contd.

Marketing Science	< 42	6	5	5			6	4
Journal of Business Research	< 42	8	12	12	7	11	27	11

1. HNB refers to Hult, Neese and Bashaw (1997); 2. TH refers to Theoharakis and Hirst (2002); 3. BP refers to Baumgartner and Pieters (2003); 4. G refers to Guidry et al. (2004); 5. M refers to Mort et al. (2004); 6. BJ refers to Bauerly and Johnson (2005); 7. PW refers to Polonsky and Whitelaw (2006); and 8. SL refers to Steward and Lewis (2010).

significantly more than the other respondents. It was a bit surprising that this group also indicated more readership of Marketing News ($\alpha = 0.001$), while those whose interest area was promotions/communications tended to read Marketing News less than the others ($\alpha = 0.01$). These last respondents were less likely to read the Journal of Marketing, and those interested in planning/forecasting were more likely to read the Journal of Marketing ($\alpha = .01$). The planning/forecasting interest group was also more likely to read American Demographics ($\alpha = .025$). Respondents with higher income tended to read Business Week more than those with lower income ($\alpha = 0.01$, using t-test). Professionals who had higher degrees were more likely to read Journal of Marketing than those of relatively lower educational levels ($\alpha = 0.05$). Advertising Age had more readership among respondents with less education than those with higher degrees ($\alpha = 0.05$). Among this group of marketing professionals, males reported more readership of marketing publications than females ($\alpha = 0.05$).

Comments from respondents

Additional comments were voluntarily supplied by 39 respondents or 35.1% of all respondents. Their comments generally fell into the following four major categories:

1. Too academic, quantitative, and business

irrelevant: Thirteen professionals noted that most journals are for academia and irrelevant for business or for practitioners. Four of them complained of “too much academic mumbo-jumbo.” As one respondent put it: “They are so jargon-heavy and quantitative that they are useless to me. I see them as the private communication vehicle for professors who are trying to outdo one another and to continue to publish no matter how insignificant or meaningless the results”. Unfamiliarity with statistical methods was also reported as an obstacle for some practitioners when reading academic-oriented journals.

2. Time constraints: Nine respondents indicated that they lack time to read most marketing journals. The typical statement is “I wish I had the time to read more of them”. Five respondents said they want “concise content”.

3. Costs/Benefits: The expensive subscription fees and relatively old information contained in marketing journals were concerns which generated 5 comments. “More emphasis needs to be placed on the bottom line results, like ROI”. Providing more current, valuable marketing knowledge is essential for a journal to attract more practitioners.

4. Alternative outlets for marketing knowledge: Three respondents noted they preferred more efficient ways to get marketing information and knowledge, such as the Internet and newsletters. “Since it is easy to find topics and related information by browsing the Web, I am now getting most of my technical information over the

Internet, as opposed to subscription hard copy”. One respondent specifically emphasized the importance of “tech-enabled techniques-web, data base, video interaction, news groups, web-based affiliation groups, etc”. Harter and Park (1998) addressed some of the issues of rating Internet publications because they are playing an ever more critical role in disseminating marketing knowledge.

In short, marketing professionals call for concise, timely articles that are relevant to real business practice, presented in accessible media.

LIMITATIONS

The findings and conclusions presented here should be interpreted with a number of limitations in mind. Firstly, 111 respondents were not a very large sample. Given the diversity of areas of specialization in marketing, many marketing-related journals/publications were very lightly represented by respondents and some not represented at all. The result was that some well-respected journals, like Marketing Science, received no mention by the professionals as having been read or rated. In fact, only 11 journals received enough mentions to get any meaningful PVI scoring.

Secondly, no follow-up survey of non-respondents was conducted to compare them with this sample. It seems reasonable to expect that the respondent group might have had a more

favorable attitude toward academic research and academic publications than those who did not respond (Heberleig and Baumgartner, 1978).

Thirdly, the list of journals/publications was based primarily on the list used by previous studies surveying academia. With 82 other publications added by the respondents as write-in additions (unaided recall), it is quite obvious that there were not enough marketing-related publications initially listed to measure the full breadth of reading that marketing professionals actually do. Future studies of marketing professionals' reading should include a much broader range of publications, based on the list in Table 3.

Conclusions

This survey of marketing professionals shows that practitioners tend to value the kinds of information presented by news-type publications rather than the scholarly journal information marketing academics esteem. Three of the top five publications that professionals rated as the most valuable were non-refereed: Marketing News, American Demographics, and Advertising Age.

At least four recommendations can reasonably be drawn from these findings. (1) Even though it would be unwise to encourage faculty to publish original research results for the first time in highly ranked non-referred publications, research findings that have been accepted through peer review should be summarized and included in such non-refereed publications to give professionals maximum exposure to this information. Such summarizations are occasionally being published in Marketing News, and some type of rewards for both the original researcher and the abstractor (if different) would seem to be appropriate. (2) Academic journals might better serve professionals by distributing better summary information. For instance, Journal of International Marketing is providing one or two page summaries of each manuscript, and using highlights near the text body. This summary is normally written by the author(s) to help those readers who lack time or statistical backgrounds to get the essence of the whole paper. (3) Summaries of journal articles should be provided on practitioner friendly web sites. Such sites could be maintained and monitored by the original author. The address of these summaries could be included with the original journal article, with even shorter summaries in the news oriented professional publications. Professionals would then have the convenient access they value in a concise format, with reference information on how to find the complete article. (4) Marketing academic should expand their view of what might be considered marketing publications. These marketing professionals make it clear that they consider American Demographics and The Wall Street Journal to be good marketing publications. The ranking of

marketing-related journals/publications by professionals can also help marketing educators design their courses to convey more knowledge about real business world concerns. Students may be encouraged to read those publications most read by professionals, such as Marketing News, Advertising Age, Business Week, etc. Such readings should better prepare students for their future marketing careers.

For those business schools striving to encourage more applied research output, these findings indicate that increasing the benefits of publishing in such publications as Marketing News, Advertising Age, Business Week, Harvard Business Review, Brand Week and American Demographics might be appropriate. The value of articles published in these outlets should be adequately considered as they have exerted significant impact on practitioners.

Several approaches can be employed to translate academic works into layman's language. Researchers can write a story-like executive summary with detailed instructions for managerial implementation. Journal editors should encourage more problem driven-studies in addition to theory-driven research. Furthermore, it would be better for publishers to publish a periodic newsletter summarizing major research findings so as to optimize effective dissemination of knowledge.

REFERENCES

- AACSB (2011). Eligibility procedures and accreditation standards for business accreditation. The Association of Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, Tampa, FL. source: www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/standards-2011-revisions-jan2011.pdf [Accessed 30 November, 2011].
- Baldrige DC, Floyd SW, Markoczy L. (2004) Are managers from Mars and academicians from Venus? Toward an understanding of the relationship between academic quality and practical relevance. *Strateg. Manage. J.*, 25 (November): 1063–1074.
- Bauerly RJ, Johnson DT (2005). An evaluation of journals used in doctoral marketing programs. *J. Acad. Mark Sci.*, 33(3):313-329.
- Becker BW, Browne WG (1979). Perceived quality of marketing journals. *J. Mark. Educ.*, 1(Nov.):6-15.
- Brennan R (2004). Should we worry about an 'academic-practitioner divide' in marketing? *Mark. Intell. Plan.*, 22(5):492-500.
- Browne WG, Becker BW (1985). Perceived of marketing journals: awareness and quality Evaluations. *AMA Educators' Conf. Proc.*, 47:149-154.
- Browne WG, Becker BW (1991). A longitudinal study of marketing journal familiarity and quality. *AMA Educators' Conference Proceedings: Enhancing knowledge development in marketing*, edited by Mary C. Gilly. Chicago, pp. 702-710.
- Cabell's Directory (1981). Directory of publishing opportunities in business administration and economics. Beaumont: Cabell Publishing Company. Third Edition.
- Cabell's Directory (1997). Directory of publishing opportunities in management and Marketing. Beaumont: Cabell Publishing Company. Seventeenth Edition.
- Diaz III, Julian RTB, Rabianski J (1996). A note on ranking real estate research journals. *Real Estate Econ.*, 24(4):551-583.
- Easton G, Easton DM (2003). Marketing journals and the research assessment exercise. *J. Mark. Manag.*, 19(1/2):5-24.
- Economist T (2007). Practically irrelevant? <http://www.economist.com/node/9707498>. [Accessed 28 August, 2007].

- Fry EH, Walters CG, Scheuermann LE (1985). Perceived quality of fifty selected journals: academicians and practitioners. *J. Acad. Mark Sci.*, 13 (Spring):352-361.
- Ganesh GK, Chandy PR, Henderson GV (1990). Awareness and evaluation of selected marketing journals inside and outside the discipline: an empirical study. *Akron Bus. Econ. Rev.*, 21(4): 93-107.
- Guidry JA, Hollier BNG, Johnson L, Tanner JR, Veltos C (2004). Surveying the cites: a ranking of marketing journals using citation analysis. *Mark. Educ. Rev.* 14 (Spring): 45-59.
- Hans B, Pieters R (2003). The structural influence of marketing journals: a citation analysis of the discipline and its subareas over time. *J. Mark.*, 67(2):123-139.
- Harter SP, Park TK (1998). Effects of electronic (pre-) publication on scholarly journal publishing: emerging manuscript consideration policies. *J. Am. Soc. Inform. Sci.*, 35: 438-444.
- Herberlin TA, Baumgarner RA (1978). Factor affecting response rate to mailed questionnaires: a quantitative analysis of the published literature. *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, 43 (August): 447-462.
- Hofacker CF, Gleim MR, Lawson SJ (2009). Revealed reader preference for marketing Journals. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.*, 37(Summer): 238-247.
- Hult GTM, Neese WT, Bashaw RE (1997). Faculty perceptions of marketing journals. *J. Mark. Educ.*, 19 (Spring): 37-52.
- Hult GTM, Reimann M, Schilke O (2009). Worldwide faculty perceptions of marketing journals: rankings, trends, comparisons, and segmentation. *Global Edge Bus. Rev.*, 3(3): 1-23.
- Hunt SD (2002). Marketing as a profession: on closing stakeholder gaps. *Eur. J. Mark.*, 36 (March): 305-312.
- Luke RH, Doke ER (1987). Marketing journal hierarchies: faculty perceptions, 1986-1987. *J. Acad. Mark Sci.*, 15(1):74-78.
- Lundstrom, White (1997). A gap analysis of professional and academic perceptions of the importance of international marketing curriculum content and research areas. *J. Mark Educ.*, 19(Summer): 16-25.
- Mort GS, McColl-Kennedy JR, Kiel G, Soutar GN (2004). Perceptions of marketing journals by senior academics in Australia and New Zealand. *Aust. Mark J.*, 12(2): 51-61.
- November P (2004). Seven reasons why marketing practitioners should ignore marketing academic research. *Aust. Mark J.*, 12(2): 39-50.
- Nyilasy G, Reid LN (2007). The academician-practitioner gap in advertising. *Int. J. Advert.*, 26(4): 425-445.
- Polonsky MJ, Whitelaw P (2006). A multi-dimensional examination of marketing journal rankings by North American Academics. *Mark Educ. Rev.*, 16(3): 59-72.
- Skapinker M (2008). Why business ignores the business schools. *Financial Times*. <http://search.ft.com/>. [Accessed 7 January, 2008].
- Skapinker M (2011). Why business still ignores the business schools. *Financial Times*. <http://search.ft.com/>. [Accessed 24 January, 2011].
- Steward MD, Lewis BR (2010). A comprehensive analysis of marketing journal rankings. *J. Mark Educ.*, 32(1): 75-92.
- Theoharakis V, Hirst A (2002). Perceptual differences of marketing journals: a worldwide perspective. *Mark. Lett.*, 13(4): 389-402.