

Worldwide Faculty Perceptions of Marketing Journals: Rankings, Trends, Comparisons, and Segmentations

G. Tomas M. Hult, Michigan State University
Martin Reimann, Stanford University
Oliver Schilke, Stanford University

Abstract: Scholarship in marketing journals serves a critically important role in developing the knowledge base of marketing. Knowledge contributions lead to advancements in the marketing field as well as to individual recognitions such as promotions, merit increases, and various accolades. In this study of 629 faculty members from a sampling frame of the worldwide marketing professorate, we develop a relative hierarchical positioning of marketing journals using the Popularity/Familiarity and Importance/Prestige Indices. Rankings are presented for the overall sample along with the results of ten segmented analyses involving faculty rank, geographic location of schools, and substantive subareas within marketing. To better understand the maturity and complexity of the field, a trend analysis using 1987, 1997, and 2007 data is also conducted, and comparisons to ranking studies using different methodologies are summarized. Broadly, the results indicate that *JM*, *JMR*, and *JCR* maintain their top three rankings from 1987 and 1997 also in 2007, and that the *Journal of Service Research* and *Quantitative Marketing and Economics* are strong new entries in the rankings. Overall, the paper significantly extends previous knowledge by providing an intertemporal analysis, conducting new segmentation analyses of the faculty perceptions, and triangulating the results with those of prior studies using alternative methods.

"Journals have become the primary medium to communicate scholarly knowledge in marketing, and the number of marketing-related journals has increased rapidly in recent years" (Baumgartner and Pieters 2003, p. 123).



The quotation from Baumgartner and Pieters' (2003) citation-based ranking study in the *Journal of Marketing* illustrates the importance of marketing journals as a scholarly vehicle in the marketing profession – both in terms of communicating marketing knowledge and in the proliferation of journal options. Innovative, cutting-edge ideas that provide significant and clear incremental contributions are often targeted to the field's top journals, as are studies that complement and build knowledge in particular research streams. Moderate extensions and replications of previous work are often positioned for lesser, typically niche-based marketing journals. Each journal fills a role in a marketplace where "publish or perish" in journals is increasingly becoming a norm, especially at the world's top business schools. The importance placed on various rankings (e.g., journals, individuals, institutions) is also increasing given the more frequent inclusion and discussion of such rankings in all of the marketing field's top journals (e.g., Bauerly and Johnson 2005; Baumgartner and Pieters 2003;

Bettencourt and Houston 2001a; Shugan 2003; Tellis, Chandy, and Ackerman 1999).

Baumgartner and Pieters' (2003, p. 123) recent citation-based study on "the structural influence of marketing journals" covering three time periods (1966-1967, 1981-1982, and 1996-1997) represents an important contribution to the marketing professorate's understanding of "the relative influence of marketing-related journals." At the same time, ranking journals via citation analysis has considerable limitations that can skew our understanding of the impact of a journal (MacRoberts and MacRoberts 1989). For example, perfunctory mentions account for 20 to 60 percent of the citations in marketing publications, rendering the usefulness of citation-based counts somewhat sketchy (Kotler 1972). In addition, authors often cite certain articles for strategic reasons, such as the expectance that those referenced may be reviewers of a manuscript or to appease a particular journal editor (e.g., Tellis, Chandy, and Ackerman 1999). As such, perceptual journal rankings are needed to overcome the shortcomings of objective rankings in that they have the advantage to "capture the multifaceted construct of the perceived status of journals" (Baumgartner and Pieters 2003, p. 125).

Previous use of citations (e.g., Baumgartner and Pieters 2003; Leong 1989; Pieters et al. 1999; Zinkhan, Roth, and Saxton 1992), library holdings (Polonsky, Jones, and Kearsley 1999), journals used in marketing doctoral programs (Bauerly and Johnson 2005), and perceptual survey-based studies (e.g., Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997; Luke and Doke 1987; Theoharakis and Hirst 2002) are useful methods to better understand the impact of journals in disseminating marketing knowledge. However, similar to Baumgartner and Pieter's (2003) citation-based study that covered 1966-1967, 1981-1982, and 1996-1997, trend analyses also need to be conducted using other ranking methods (i.e., perceptual survey studies, library holdings, and journals used in doctoral programs). In this vein, the objective of our research is to: (1) conduct a perceptual survey-based ranking study to alleviate limitations of studies using objective data; (2) provide a trend analysis across 1987, 1997, and 2007; (3) conduct comparisons with other rankings methodologies; and (4) conduct various segmentation analyses of the subareas of the marketing professorate.

Our research aim is to make several contributions to knowledge in the marketing literature. First, we conduct a large-scale study ranking marketing journals based on the perceptions of the marketing professorate at the world's top business schools. This involves using the largest sample of marketing academics to date ($n=629$) to conduct such a study. Second, we employ a robust methodology to calculate the ranking scores by focusing on both the Popularity/Familiarity Index (PFI) and the Importance/Prestige Index (IPI) that have been used in previous ranking studies in 1987 and 1997 (Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997; Luke and Doke 1987). Third, the use of this established PFI and IPI methodology allows for the analysis of how the field has developed over a 20-year period. Fourth, we provide comparisons to marketing journal rankings using other methodologies. Fifth, we conduct segmentation analyses for faculty ranks (assistants, associates, and full professors), geographic locations (U.S. versus international schools), and a faculty member's primary subarea of marketing (marketing management/ strategy, consumer behavior, international, channels/purchasing, and marketing research). Overall, our analyses provide a comprehensive picture of how marketing professors recognize their preferred scholarly publications outlets, which reflects academics' perception during promotional, positioning, and knowledge development judgments and decisions.

In the next section, a description of the marketing journal ranking study is discussed. Second, we present the overall results. Third, a trend comparison of the marketing rankings in 1987, 1997, and 2007 is presented. Fourth, comparisons of rankings using different methodologies are made (i.e., the Social Science Citation Index, Baumgartner and Pieters 2003 study, and Theoharakis and Hirst 2002 study). Fifth, several

segmentation analyses are discussed (based on faculty rank, geographic location of schools, and marketing subareas). Finally, we highlight noteworthy findings in the discussion section along with a tracing of the history of the top ten journals in 2007.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The ranking of journals has been an intriguing aspect of all scholarly business fields for decades. A broad search on journal rankings in business uncovered more than 180 studies since the late 1960s, with the vast majority of them being published since the beginning of the 1990s. The field of marketing has had its share of ranking studies, some with great impact on the marketing professorate and others targeting niche audiences with lesser overall impact (Hawes and Keillor 2002). For example, we uncovered 39 marketing ranking studies since 1980. A number of these studies are directly focused on ranking journals, and others rank various aspects of journals, scholars, and institutions.

Two of the more prominent journal ranking studies in marketing are the Baumgartner and Pieters (2003, p. 67) study on "the structural influence of marketing journals" and the Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997, p. 37) study on "faculty perceptions of marketing journals." Baumgartner and Pieters (2003) used citation counts in three time periods (1966-1967, 1981-1982, and 1996-1997) to rank marketing journals. Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997) conducted a survey of the marketing professorate to assess the importance of journals in disseminating marketing knowledge. The Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997) study was a direct follow-up to the Luke and Doke (1987) study employing the same methodology. The popularity of these two ranking studies, which use vastly different methodologies (i.e., citations versus perceptions), lies in their research rigor and longitudinal implications. At the same time, several marketing rankings have been produced since the early 1980s using a variety of approaches. These rankings complement each other and provide a better understanding of the field's journal hierarchies, the impact of various faculty members on marketing knowledge development, and the impact that different institutions have on the field.

Marketing Rankings in the 1980s

In the 1980s, Coe and Weinstock (1983, p. 37) updated their earlier study (Coe and Weinstock 1969) on "evaluating journal publications of marketing professors." They examined the role of publications in appointment/promotion decisions, the criteria used to evaluate journals, and the ratings of marketing journals. Clark (1985, p. 12), on the other hand, conducted one of the earliest studies focused on the "productivity ratings of institutions based on publication in eight marketing

journals.” His focus was on the productivity of 256 organizations (both businesses and universities) in publishing articles that advance the marketing field.

Also in 1985, Fry, Walters, and Scheuermann (1985) published a study of business faculty’s perception of journals across business fields. They developed a top 50 ranking of selected business journals. In that same year, Browne and Becker (1985) published a study on the perceptions of only marketing journals, where the focus was on the marketing professorate’s awareness and quality evaluations of the journals. Two years later, in 1987, Luke and Doke (1987) developed what has become a very popular methodology to rank journals when they introduced the Popularity/Familiarity Index and the Importance/Prestige Index. In their study, 108 faculty members were contacted via their respective deans and asked to rank their top 10 marketing journals from a list of 30 journals (respondents could also add write-in journals).

Two more studies added to the ranking literature in the 1980s and also introduced a different methodology for assessment – citations. Jobber and Simpson (1988) conducted a citation analysis of U.S. and European marketing journals. Eight of the top ten journals in the citation count were found to be American based. Jobber and Simpson (1988, p. 138) also found “that research published in marketing journals is having a beneficial impact on wider business issues, such as strategic management and international business...the analysis of citation patterns with base subjects, such as economics and psychology, revealed a heavy dependence upon them.” In the same year, Niemi (1988) examined the publication performance of marketing departments via raw page counts published in the four leading marketing journals at the time (*JM*, *JMR*, *JCR*, and *Journal of Retailing*). Pecotich, Everett, Jobber, and Simpson (1989, p. 199) built on the Jobber and Simpson (1988) study by “using loglinear and multidimensional scaling techniques to produce a map of the relative configuration of the journals and a measure of their importance.” Their 1989 findings largely reconfirmed the 1988 findings.

Marketing Rankings in the 1990s

The 1990s saw the explosion of several types of marketing rankings. A study by Ganesh, Chandy, and Henderson (1990, p. 93) examined the “awareness and evaluations of marketing journals outside the marketing discipline.” As anecdotal evidence suggests across many business fields, Ganesh, Chandy, and Henderson (1990) found that researchers outside the marketing field perceive marketing research to be of lesser quality than research in their own fields. The early 1990s also saw the return to studying marketing journals’ familiarity and quality (Browne and Becker 1991) as well as the introduction of a new focus on the impact of accreditation and publication history on the ratings of marketing journals (Heischmidt and Gordon 1993; cf. Gordon and

Heischmidt 1992). In the mid-1990s, Page and Mohr (1995, p. 417) conducted an analysis of “individual and institutional productivity in marketing” during 1989 to 1993.

After that, two years passed until the publication of Hult, Neese, and Bashaw’s (1997) study as a follow-up to the Luke and Doke (1987) study. In Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997), 309 faculty members ranked their top ten journals from an aided-recall list (but respondents could also add write-in journals). Out of this approach, the two indices of Popularity/Familiarity and Importance/Prestige were calculated, and comparisons were made to the Luke and Doke (1987) study. In that same year, Spake and Harmon (1997, p. 191) extended the Page and Mohr (1995) study by “assessing productivity based on publication in the top four marketing journals” during 1990 to 1996 (cf. Spake and Harmon 1998). A year later, Koojaroenprasit, Weinstein, Johnson, and Remington (1998) published a similar study to Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997) but used department chairs as their sampling frame instead of the stratified sampling frame of equal numbers of assistant, associate, and full professors as was the case in the Hult et al. study.

Also in 1998, Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998) examined the publication productivity of scholars in three leading advertising journals, putting a new emphasis on marketing rankings, i.e., those of faculty publishing in subareas in marketing. This “productivity” focus was also the key element in Spake and Harmon’s (1998) study on institutional and individual research productivity. In the year after, Zinkhan and Leigh (1999, p. 51) continued the “advertising trend” of Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998) by examining the “quality ranking of the *Journal of Advertising* in relation to 33 marketing, advertising, and business journals over the 1986-1997 time period.”

New twists on the research of journals were also implemented in two studies at the end of the 1990s. In a study by Tellis, Chandy, and Ackerman (1999, p. 120), the objective was to analyze the “4 major marketing journals on the basis of their diversity relative to each other, against their mission statements, and over time.” One of their critical findings was that each of the four journals had a distinct character that was not necessarily in line with its mission. In a study by Polonsky, Jones, and Kearsley (1999), ranking marketing journals took on yet another new form – the focus was on library holdings. The general premise was that a journal would be ranked high in the marketing journal hierarchy if it had prominent accessibility in a large number of libraries (they focused on libraries in Australia).

Marketing Rankings in the 2000s

The beginning of the 2000s saw the specialized ranking focus become even more apparent with a study by Hetzel (2000, p. 717) and his assessment of the “perceptions of French marketing academics...on where we are going” as a field. More broadly than Hetzel’s (2000) study, Bakir, Vitell, and Rose (2000) analyzed the publication patterns of scholars and marketing departments in major marketing journals. In a turn back to previous work, Bettencourt and Houston (2001a, p. 313) took another look at the work by Tellis, Chandy, and Ackerman (1999) and did “a reference analysis comparison of *JCR*, *JM*, and *JMR* from 1976 to 1995 using an expanded set of reference diversity indicators at the article level of analysis.” In the same year, Bettencourt and Houston (2001b, p. 327) published an article that tackled “the impact of article method type and subject area on article citations and reference diversity in *JM*, *JMR*, and *JCR*.”

Theoharakis and Hirst (2002, p. 389) broadened the sampling scope and indices used to rank marketing journals in their study on “perceptual differences of marketing journals” using a worldwide sample of 372 marketing academics. By 2002, the number of marketing journal rankings had become large enough in numbers for Hawes and Keillor (2002) to conduct an integrative analysis of previous journal rankings. Their findings supported the general nature of previous studies but also argued for a “mission-based approach” to publishing. Specifically, Hawes and Keillor (2002) suggested that schools should develop a set of target journals for their faculty based on both marketing journal rankings and the school’s mission and strategy.

The next year, in 2003, a plethora of ranking studies appeared in the literature. Helm, Hunt, and Houston (2003) took us back to the citation-based rankings and examined the impact of articles, scholars, and institutions based on publications in the top three journals of marketing. Shugan (2003), in an editorial, provided a recipe for building strong perceptions about marketing journals among important constituency groups. Easton and Easton (2003) offered a European focus and assessed frequency of submissions to a journal and overall journal quality. Cheng, Chan, and Chan (2003) narrowly analyzed the research productivity of Asia-Pacific universities in the major marketing journals. Lastly in 2003, as previously highlighted as an important contribution, Baumgartner and Pieters (2003) analyzed the structural influence of marketing journals via citation counts during three different time periods (1966-1967, 1981-1982, and 1996-1997).

Seven ranking studies were published in 2004 and 2005. Zinkhan (2004) addressed journal quality and knowledge use in an editorial. Uncles (2004) tackled the issue of how important journal rankings are for the marketing field. Polonsky (2004) continued the issue on the importance of rankings by arguing that “one-size does

not fit all” for the worldwide marketing professorate. Mort et al. (2004) addressed marketing journal rankings via the perceptions of senior academics in Australia and New Zealand. Then, 2005 ushered in Lehman’s (2005) discussion of the journal evolution and development of the marketing field, followed by Polonsky and Whitelaw (2005, p. 189) addressing the question about “what are we measuring when we evaluate journals?” Bauerly and Johnson (2005) rounded out the literature in 2005 by introducing yet another method for ranking marketing journals, namely evaluating journals that produce articles that are used in marketing doctoral programs.

Overall, a wealth of rankings have been produced in the literature – most notable the Baumgartner and Pieters (2003) longitudinal study using citations and the Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997) study using faculty perceptions. We complement the recent study by Baumgartner and Pieters (2003) by conducting a longitudinally-based faculty perception study to alleviate many of the concerns associated with citation-based ranking studies.

THE 2007 MARKETING JOURNAL RANKING

A Survey Based Ranking Study

The key characteristics of perceptual, survey-based ranking studies are (1) the use of key informants in assessing opinion surveys, (2) the ability to capture a multitude of “quality” aspects of a journal, and (3) the ability of respondents to project a journal’s impact in the field prior to being detected in objective ranking hierarchies (cf. Jones, Brinn, and Pendlebury 1996). These characteristics incorporate both positive and negative aspects of ranking journals that have been discussed extensively in the literature (e.g., Bauerly and Johnson 2005; Hawes and Keillor 2002; Baumgartner and Pieters 2003). Overall, however, strong support exists for perceptual ranking methodologies to complement and extend rankings using objective data (e.g., citations, library holdings, journal usage in doctoral programs). In many cases, perceptual rankings are preferred to objective rankings because they offer a comprehensive reflection of academics’ perception of journals (Baumgartner and Pieters 2003). More specifically, albeit important as pieces to the larger puzzle of ranking journals, objective rankings that use citations (e.g., Baumgartner and Pieters 2003; Leong 1989; Pieters et al. 1999; Zinkhan, Roth, and Saxton 1992), library holdings (e.g., Polonsky, Jones, and Kearsley 1999), and journals used in doctoral programs (e.g., Bauerly and Johnson 2005) typically assess only narrowly defined aspects of journals. Perceptual rankings alleviate such constricted scope by asking respondents to rank journals based on their perceptions of the most important marketing journals in disseminating marketing knowledge. Our survey-based research extends and

updates the popular study by Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997, p. 37) on “faculty perceptions of marketing journals.” As such, we balance the longitudinal citation-based study by Baumgartner and Pieters (2003) with a longitudinally focused perceptual study that examines trends across three time periods – 1987, 1997, and 2007 – via direct comparisons to the Luke and Doke (1987) and Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997) studies.

In addition, we designed the study to ease the primary concerns regarding key informant surveys of ranking journals that Baumgartner and Pieters (2003) outlined, i.e., quality of the sampling method, lack of familiarity with some journals, and overburdening of respondents by having them rate a large number of journals. Briefly, we used the *Financial Times* rankings of business schools to place boundaries on the faculty members who could be included in the study to lessen concerns regarding (1) whether the population of respondents was defined appropriately and (2) whether respondents were sampled correctly (Baumgartner and Pieters 2003). The data collection and sample are discussed in detail in the next section. Second, we used the same methodology as in Luke and Doke (1987) and Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997) to alleviate concerns about familiarity of a journal and overburdening the respondents. The respondents were asked to rank their top ten journals (from a list of 51 publications; write-in journals could be added). This ensured that the respondents were both familiar with the journals that made their top ten list and that they were not overburdened by having to rate a large number of journals. The rating procedures are discussed in more detail in the questionnaire and analysis sections.

Data Collection

To accomplish the goals of ranking marketing journals based on the perceptions of the worldwide marketing professorate, we used the *Financial Times 2007 Rankings* of the top 100 business schools worldwide as the primary basis for our sampling frame. The *FT Rankings* were also complemented with an additional 27 schools from the *Financial Times European Business School Ranking 2006* to ensure adequate global coverage. Moreover, the schools on the “*FT 100*” ranking were cross-checked with the *2007 US News Top 50 Ranking* of American business schools and the *2006 Business Week Ranking* of U.S. business schools; all of which were all included in the *Financial Times 2007 Rankings*. Based on Brown and Huefner (1994), faculty members at these leading schools tend to place great importance on research as a part of their scholarship. Thus, they should be in a good position to evaluate the importance of marketing journals on the importance of developing and disseminating marketing knowledge.

Using the sampling frame of 127 business schools worldwide, an e-mail database was developed that included all marketing faculty at these schools. The

schools’ websites were used to obtain the necessary contact information. Faculty members with positions/titles that indicated that they were not permanent members of the school were excluded. These criteria led to a sampling frame that consisted of 1,880 faculty members in marketing departments of the top business schools in the world. We used Dillman’s (2000) general guidelines for Internet surveys to obtain high-quality responses via an online survey. Each faculty received an invitation e-mail with a link to the survey. They were asked to complete the survey within a week. One follow-up e-mail with complete instructions was sent a week after the initial mailing.

A usable sample size of $n=629$ was obtained after duplicate records were omitted (i.e., faculty who filled out the survey more than once), after deletion of invalid records (e.g., faculty who filled out the survey but were not on the original e-mail list; records that were filled out incorrectly), and the removal of records with a large amount of missing data. One hundred and seven e-mails were not valid and did not reach the respondents (i.e., they “bounced”). Thus, the usable response rate was 35.5 percent [$629/(1880-107)$]. This sample is significantly larger than samples used in previous ranking studies (e.g., $n=309$ in Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997; $n=108$ in Luke and Doke 1987; $n=372$ in Theoharakis and Hirst 2002) but is similar to previous response rates (e.g., 30.9 percent in Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997; 30.4 percent in Luke and Doke 1987; 37.6 percent in Theoharakis and Hirst 2002). No significant differences were found between the two waves of respondents based on the first versus second e-mail requests, nor did we find any systematic differences between the first and last quartiles of the respondents (Armstrong and Overton 1977).

For example, the first-versus-last quartile analysis resulted in no differences being found based on the year the faculty received their highest degree (1992 in the first quartile vs. 1992 in the last quartile); faculty experience (14.8 vs. 15.8 years); allotment of time to teaching (31.9 vs. 32.8 percent), research (44.0 vs. 44.7 percent), service (19.5 vs. 18.8 percent), and consulting (13.5 vs. 14.9 percent); or publication in peer-reviewed journals (20.4 vs. 21.1 percent). However, differences were found in comparing business experience among faculty (4.5 vs. 3.6 years, $p<.05$) and non-peer reviewed journal publications (8.6 vs. 13.7 publications, $p<.05$). Overall, these differences do not constitute “systematic differences,” as described by Armstrong and Overton (1977) and, as such, non-response bias does not inhibit the data analyses.

Table 1 summarizes the demographics of the sample ($n=629$). Overall, the sample is a good representation of the marketing professorate (e.g., Hult and Hasselback 1998). For example, 24.9 percent females and 75.1 percent males make up the sample. These respondents hold the ranks of adjuncts/instructors (2.4 percent), assistant professors (29.4 percent), associate professors

(27.9 percent), and full professors (40.2 percent). Each faculty member, on average, has published 20.4 peer-reviewed and 9.8 non-peer reviewed publications, obtained their highest degree in 1992, has 4.3 years of business experience, and 15.0 years of faculty experience. 93.2 percent of the respondents have a doctorate degree. They spend 30.3 percent of their working time on teaching, 41.7 percent on research, 18.2 percent on service, and 9.8 percent on consulting. Consumer behavior is the area marked as the primary focus for 33.6 percent, followed by marketing strategy at 24.6 percent, and with each remaining area having fewer than 10 percent. 53.5 percent of the faculty members work at U.S. schools and the balance of the faculty members work at schools outside the U.S. These schools offer undergraduate degrees in marketing (60.1 percent), undergraduate degrees in business (72.0 percent), master degrees in business (94.1 percent), and doctorate degrees (87.3 percent).

Questionnaire

The survey listed 51 marketing-related publications, including 49 journals and two proceedings (*American Marketing Association Summer/Winter Conference* and *Advances in Consumer Research*) along with questions on demographics (a summary of the demographics is reported in Table 1). The 51 publications were selected based on journals included in previous ranking studies (e.g., Baumgartner and Pieters 2003; Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997; Theoharakis and Hirst 2002), marketing journals included in the Social Science Citation Index, studies on related topics (e.g., Bauerly and Johnson 2005), and an analysis of the 261 marketing-related journals listed in *Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Marketing 2007* (Cabell 2007).

Specifically, we included a journal on the aided-recall list in the online questionnaire based on the journals' inclusion in previous ranking hierarchies. Second, we added a select few journals to the list based on a method of cross-checking the age of other marketing journals and their ties to prominent academic association along with widespread readership and/or reference use. Third, we scanned *Cabell's Directory 2007* of 261 marketing journals to ensure adequate coverage of the field. Fourth, we consulted the 18 presidents/chairs of the academic special interest groups of the American Marketing Association (AMA) and asked them if our list of journals was exhaustive based on topics covered in their subareas of marketing. Ultimately, our goal was to produce an aided-recall list of journals that was both manageable for the respondents to sift through and inclusive of journals with potentially high impact in the field of marketing.

Analysis

The analyses consisted of calculating two indices – the Popularity/Familiarity Index (PFI) and the Importance/Prestige Index (IPI) – that have been used in previous studies on ranking marketing journals in 1987 (Luke and Doke 1987) and 1997 (Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997). While a variety of indices and methods can be used to rank journals, the use of the PFI and IPI allow for direct comparisons to the 1987 and 1997 studies by Luke and Doke (1987) and Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997). Additionally, taken together, these two indices provide a broad-based assessment of the journals' importance in the field of marketing in 2007.

The Popularity/Familiarity Index (PFI) is calculated as:

$$PFI_j = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{10} R_{ij}}{X} \quad (0 \leq PFI \leq 1.0)$$

where i is the journal number 1, 2, 3...n and R_{ij} is the number of times journal i was ranked j ($j = 1$ to 10). X represents the maximum number of times a journal was ranked in the top ten (in the overall ranking, the Journal of Marketing was ranked the most number of times at 543). Journals with a PFI $< .01$ were excluded from the overall rankings (but all journals that made the overall journal ranking were included in the segmented analyses). The only journal that made it as a write-in journal was Quantitative Marketing and Economics. As an example of the PFI calculation, QME's PFI score was based on dividing the number of times QME was ranked in the top ten (35 times) by the total number of times JM was ranked in the top ten (543 times), resulting in a PFI of .06.

The Importance/Prestige Index (IPI) is calculated as:

$$IPI_j = \frac{(\sum_{j=1}^{10} R_{ij} * j)}{\sum_{j=1}^{10} R_{ij}} \quad (1 \leq IPI \leq 10)$$

where i is the journal number (1 to n) and R_{ij} is the number of times journal i was ranked j ($j = 1$ to 10). It is important to note that the IPI is based on ranking (and indexing) data, not ratio data that can easily be compared. As such, the ordinal data used for the IPI means that while an IPI of 4.0 is better than an IPI of 8.0, the former score cannot be interpreted to be twice as good per se. Instead, the IPI provides the placement of the journal in the top ten. For example, QME received top ten votes from 35 respondents in the overall ranking, with the summated score of 145; thus, the IPI for QME is $145/35=4.14$ – meaning 4.14 is the average ranking placement that the 35 respondents attributed to QME.

Segmentation Variables

Previous journal ranking studies have used a variety of segmentation variables (e.g., accredited/not accredited and doctoral/non-doctoral granting schools – Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997; geographic location of school and primary subarea focus of faculty members – Theoharakis and Hirst 2002). In this study, we use three segmentation variables that are relevant for various reasons, including: faculty member rank (i.e., assistant, associate, and full professor), geographic location (i.e., U.S. versus international schools), and primary subarea of marketing faculty (i.e., marketing management/strategy, consumer behavior, international marketing, marketing channels/purchasing, and marketing research). In the case of the faculty's primary subarea of marketing, the questionnaire included options for marketing management, marketing strategy, promotion/sales, services marketing, consumer behavior, channels/retailing, purchasing, international, and marketing research that were adopted from the classification scheme and ordering used in the *Marketing Faculty Directory* (Hasselback 2005). Based on theoretically similar subareas, we combined marketing management and strategy on one hand and channels/retailing and purchasing on the other (segmentation analyses for promotion/sales and services marketing were not conducted due to small samples).

The latter two segmentation variables (geographic location of schools and primary subarea) have been shown to affect rankings previously (e.g., Baumgartner and Pieters 2003; Theoharakis and Hirst 2002) while the former ranking (faculty rank) is intuitively logical. For example, faculty members at the assistant professor rank often strive to do significant research to obtain promotions. Faculty at the associate rank either divert attention to teaching and service aspects of their job scope or continue their research programs to gain additional promotions and impact in the field. Faculty at the full professor rank often try to achieve impact by publishing fewer and more targeted articles, divert attention to service, or produce teaching excellence (e.g., in the classroom, via textbooks, or executive training). At the same time, a "one-size-fits-all" description cannot be attached to either of the rank levels but the differences that do exist for these levels warrant an inclusion as a segmentation variable for marketing journal rankings.

Overall Results of the 2007 Ranking Study

Table 2 provides a summary of the overall marketing journal ranking for 2007 (along with corresponding rankings in 1987 and 1997). Similar to the Luke and Doke (1987) and Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997) studies, we calculated both a "Popularity/Familiarity Index" and an "Importance/Prestige Index" for each journal. We follow previous practice and use the PFI to rank order the journals. The PFI is selected for rank ordering because it

offers a more solid picture of the marketing professorate's perception of a journal than the IPI, if only one index was chosen. While the IPI is important, a high IPI can be achieved by, for example, one person ranking a journal as #1 with no one else ranking the journal (this would result in an IPI=1.0). On the other hand, a high PFI can only be achieved by obtaining a top ten ranking from a large number of respondents. That said, the PFI and IPI should be used in tandem to develop a complete picture of a journal's influence in the field (cf. Theoharakis and Hirst 2002).

Ranking Using the Popularity/Familiarity Index

The ranking using the "Popularity/Familiarity Index" resulted in the *Journal of Marketing* (PFI=1.00), *Journal of Marketing Research* (PFI=.92), *Journal of Consumer Research* (PFI=.85), and *Marketing Science* (PFI=.73) being the top four journals. After those four journals, a drop in PFI scores is apparent – with the *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* (PFI=.50) being ranked #5 followed in small incremental PFI drops by *Harvard Business Review* (PFI=.48), *Journal of Retailing* (PFI=.48), *Management Science* (PFI=.47), *International Journal of Research in Marketing* (PFI=.44), *Journal of Consumer Psychology* (PFI=.39), and *Marketing Letters* (PFI=.38). After *Marketing Letters*, another drop takes place to *Advances in Consumer Research* (PFI=.24) at #12, followed by the series of 39 journals that complete the top 50 ranking. One journal made the ranking which was not included on the aided-recall list of journals listed in the online survey – *Quantitative Marketing and Economics*. *QME* started in 2003 and is already achieving some prominence in the literature (it was too new to be included in the aided-recall set).

Ranking Using the Importance/Prestige Index

The ranking using the "Importance/Prestige Index" resulted in a tie between the *Journal of Marketing* (IPI=2.78) and *Journal of Marketing Research* (IPI=2.78), both of which were elevated above the other journals in IPI scores. These two journals were followed by a set of three journals – *Journal of Consumer Research* (IPI=3.42), *Marketing Science* (IPI=3.95), and *Quantitative Marketing and Economics* (IPI=4.15). Each of the three journals except *QME* also have a very high PFI score. The remaining 45 journals on the IPI ranking follow in smaller incremental differences on the IPI score, starting with *Management Science* at 5.21 to the *AMA Summer/Winter Proceedings* at 8.47.

Cluster Analysis Using the PFI and IPI Scores

Three cluster analyses were conducted via the hierarchical clustering method. First, we analyzed the data using the PFI and IPI scores for the overall ranking. In this analysis, we found the *Journal of Marketing* and

Journal of Marketing Research clustering together in the top group, followed by a group that includes *Journal of Consumer Research*, *Marketing Science*, and *Quantitative Marketing and Economics*. Second, using the PFI and IPI scores for each of the assistant, associate, and full professors, the results indicate that *JM*, *JMR*, *JCR*, *Marketing Science*, and *QME* are grouped together. Third, we clustered the journals based on the PFI and IPI scores obtained in the samples for the U.S. faculty as well as faculty at international schools. In this analysis, we again found that *JM*, *JMR*, *JCR*, *Marketing Science*, and *QME* are grouped together in the top group.

A Comparison of the Rankings in 1987, 1997, and 2007

Table 2 provides a summary of the overall ranking for 2007 and the corresponding results for 1987 and 1997. The Luke and Doke (1987) and Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997) research along with the present study provide the means to conduct a direct comparison of marketing journal rankings across the last 20 years and three time frames (1987, 1997, and 2007). All three studies used the same theoretical indices (PFI and IPI) and performed the same calculations. However, the sampling frames and sample sizes differ to some degree, mainly in line with the “normal” evolution of data collection in the scholarly marketing field.

The Luke and Doke (1987) sample consisted of faculty at U.S. schools who were contacted by the research team via their respective deans. The contact information for deans appeared to have been more convenient to obtain for the 1987 study than individual faculty names and contact information. These deans were selected from the 1985-1986 AACSB Membership Directory (243 deans were contacted, 115 of those schools had a marketing department, and 108 faculty from these schools participated in the survey). The Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997) study used a sample consisting of faculty at U.S. schools that was stratified to be equal across assistant, associate, and full professors and including two-thirds AACSB accredited and one-third non-accredited schools. The sampling frame of 1,000 faculty came from Hasselback’s (1995) *Wiley Guide to Marketing Faculty* (309 faculty responded via mail). The present study used a sampling frame of 1,880 marketing faculty based on recent *Financial Times* rankings of top business schools (629 responded of the 1,773 who were reached via e-mail).

One of the trends that stands out when analyzing the data in Table 2 is that there has been an influx of marketing journals over the years. This was certainly the case between 1987 and 1997. The Luke and Doke (1987) study listed only 30 journals on the questionnaire while the Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997) study listed 63 journals. Respondents could add “write-in” journals in both cases (in each survey, 30 write-in journals were

added by the respondents). However, only one write-in journal made the ranking cut-off in the Luke and Doke (1987) study (i.e., *Marketing Science*) while only two write-in journals made the ranking in the Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997) study (i.e., *Journal of Consumer Psychology* and *Marketing Letters*). Both of these studies used a Popularity/Familiarity Index cut-off of .05 for inclusion in the rankings.

Given the breadth of marketing journals and the larger sample size obtained compared to previous studies, we use a Popularity/Familiarity Index cut-off of .01 for inclusion on the overall ranking. Fifty journals made the PFI \geq .01 cut-off for inclusion which included all but two (i.e., *Marketing Health Services* and *Marketing Education Review*) of the aided-recall set of 51 publications on the questionnaire and one write-in journal (i.e., *Quantitative Marketing and Economics*). However, had we used the PFI \geq .05 cut-off only 35 journals would have made it into the overall rankings. As such, an argument can be made that more scholarly publication outlets exist in marketing today than in 1987 and likely also compared with 1997, but there has not been an increase in marketing journals that achieve high Popularity/Familiarity and Importance/Prestige Indices that warrant attention as the field’s better journals.

Table 2 provides the PFI and IPI scores for 1987, 1997, and 2007. The broad trend implication is that a number of journals have held remarkably steady while others have moved up or down in a significant way. For example, the *Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Marketing Research*, and *Journal of Consumer Research* have maintained their #1, #2, and #3 rankings, respectively, in all three time periods. Three other journals have been mainstays in the top ten at slightly varied ranking spots (i.e., *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *Journal of Retailing*, and *Harvard Business Review*). *Management Science* (#13, #11, and #8 in 1987, 1997, and 2007, respectively) and *Journal of Business Research* (#9, #8, and #13 in 1987, 1997, and 2007, respectively) have also been hovering around the top ten in the three time periods.

Trends are clearly the most interesting element of being able to compare “apples-to-apples” aspects of any research over time. There are some positive trends and some negative ones. For example, the trend of *Marketing Science*, from its #22 position in 1987 (the journal started in 1982) via its #6 ranking in 1997 and to its #4 ranking in 2007, is one of the most significant upward movements of any journal over the three periods. On the other hand, the trend of the *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management* is more negative. *JPSSM* was not ranked in 1987 (started in 1980), was ranked #12 in 1997, and moved downward to #34 in 2007.

A parallel to the negative trend of *JPSSM* may be the lack of or very low rankings of “logistics” journals in the marketing journal rankings in 2007 compared with 1987. Both the *Logistics Transportation Journal* and the *Transportation Journal* made the rankings (at #23 and

#25, respectively) in 1987 but neither made it in 1997; only the *Journal of Business Logistics* (started in 1980) made the rankings in 1997 and 2007 but at rather low placements (#40 in 1997 and #47 in 2007). As a point of history, logistics used to be a field very entrenched in the marketing profession until the National Council of Physical Distribution Management (founded in 1963) positioned itself as the professional logistics organization when it became the Council of Logistics Management in 1985 (CLM changed names again in 2005 and became the Council of Supply Chain Management Professionals). Time will tell if personal selling and sales management ends up as a marketing spin-off, like logistics did a couple of decades ago, or if other dynamics led to the drop of *JPSSM*.

Another drop in the rankings is the AMA Winter/Summer Proceedings, from #10 in 1987 to #28 in 1997 and to #42 in 2007. Some would argue that proceedings should not be included in the “journal” ranking, so this drop may justify the sentiment of those individuals. Others would argue that journals, books, proceedings, and any publication outlet that has impact should be valued for its contributions. This may be a reason that another proceedings, *Advances in Consumer Research (ACR)*, is maintaining its position over the last decade (being #13 in 1997 and #12 in 2007). One element, of course, of *ACR*’s ranking consistency is that the marketing field includes a large subset of consumer behavior researchers (as is also reflected in the composition of the sample for this study). Thus, “CB-journals” are bound to rank higher on the Popularity/Familiarity Index than perhaps is warranted if a weighted approach was used. We opted to not include any form of weighting based on the demographics of the sampling frame or the sample obtained because we believe that the profession’s makeup should guide the rankings.

A number of journals that are really not “marketing” journals in the truest sense have made the rankings in two or more years. Specifically, practitioner-focused publication outlets such as the *Harvard Business Review* (#6, #7, and #6 in 1987, 1997, and 2007), *Sloan Management Review* (#21, #17, and #14), and *California Management Review* (#17, #22, and #24) are staples in the marketing journal rankings. We already highlighted *Management Science*’s consistent inclusion as well (#13, #11, and #8). Additionally, the *Journal of International Business Studies* has been a part of the marketing ranking throughout the years, placing #20 in 1987, #19 in 1997, and #21 in 2007. Both *Management Science* and *JIBS* are typically viewed as the best in their fields and are having solid traction in the marketing field as well (both journals also feature associate editors dedicated to marketing topics).

Comparisons of Rankings Using Different Methodologies

Table 3 provides comparisons of recent marketing journal rankings using different methodologies. Making comparisons and drawing inferences across ranking methodologies is an important element in establishing robust rankings. In recent decades, ranking studies in the social sciences have proliferated. Marketing is no exception. What makes our study unique is that it is tracking scholarly marketing journals over time (1987, 1997, and 2007) and without some of the confounding effects inherent in other rankings. At the same time, the methodology we use is not without flaws. As such, we compare the results of the 2007 study with research by Baumgartner and Pieters (2003) and Theoharakis and Hirst (2002), both of which used Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997) as their basis for the journals included. In addition, we obtained permission from Thompson Scientific to include the average impact scores from the Social Science Citation Index (ISI Web of Science) for 2002-2006, the so-called *Journal Citation Reports* (see Table 3), and we begin the comparisons with those scores.

Comparisons with the Social Science Citation Index

The scores reported in the *Journal Citation Reports* of the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) involve the calculation of the citations received by articles in a journal during the previous two years to the number of articles published in the journal during those two years. For example, the *Journal of Marketing* is the top business journal in the overall ranking. *JM* has an SSCI score of 4.83 for 2006 (which was calculated by dividing the total number of cites *JM* received in 2006 by articles published in 2004-2005, 401, with the total number of articles published in *JM* in 2004-2005, 83). The SSCI has its critics as well as supporters. Critics typically argue that the SSCI focuses too much attention on recent time periods and does not account for citation variability (i.e., how many cites are used in a typical article across journals) to measure the true impact of journals. The SSCI score can also be affected by “gamesmanship” by individuals involved with a specific journal (i.e., the inclusion of an unusually large number of citations to articles published in the last two years in the journal in papers to be published in the following year in the same journal), thereby inflating the SSCI score of the journal (cf. Tellis, Chandy, and Ackerman 1999). On the other hand, supporters typically argue that the SSCI is objective and not open for skewed perceptual interpretation.

For the journals in our 2007 ranking that are also included in the *Journal Citation Reports*, the SSCI scores correspond in many areas with the 2007 ranking but also differ in some areas. Some of the more notable differences include the relatively high SSCI score of *Marketing Science* (3.00) compared with *Journal of Marketing Research* (2.24) and *Journal of Consumer Research* (2.31), in particular. The 3.00 score is inconsistent with our 2007 ranking and both of the other comparison studies (Baumgartner and Pieters 2003; Theoharakis and Hirst 2002). However, a deeper examination of the 3.00 score reveals that the journal increased its score remarkably in the years 2004-2006 compared with 2002-2003 (by about 1.5, which equals 1.5 more citations per article published in the journal).

Time-tested scores are also the focus of two new journals in the SSCI ranking: *Journal of Service Research* and *Journal of Interactive Marketing*. Both of these journals have only been ranked for one year (2006). Few journals start their rankings at such a high level, both in terms of the SSCI scores and in our perceptual 2007 study, and it will be interesting to plot trend data for these journals over time. Time has also affected two other publications in the SSCI list, one in a positive way and one in a negative way. On the positive side, the *Journal of International Business Studies* has moved up to an SSCI score of 1.53 (averaged for 2002-2006, with an all-time high score of 2.25 in 2006) and is maintaining its perceptual ranking in our study (*JIBS* is #21 in 2007 and was #20 in 1987 and #19 in 1997). On the negative side, *Advances in Consumer Research* has been removed from the *Journal Citation Reports* as of 2006. *ACR's* SSCI had been ranging between 0.03 and 0.10 for 2002-2005 but with a downward trend. This downward trend, however, has not affected perceptions of *ACR* (ranked #12 in 2007 and #13 in 1997).

Comparisons with Baumgartner and Pieters' (2003) Study

The Baumgartner and Pieters (2003) study used the journals included in at least one of the sub-rankings in the Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997) study (i.e., overall, doctoral, non-doctoral, AACSB accredited school, non-accredited school) plus they added the *Journal of Consumer Policy* based on a ranking by Zinkhan, Roth, and Saxton (1992). This resulted in a total of 49 journals being included for citation analyses in 1966-1967, 1981-1982, and 1996-1997 (11 journals existed in the early period, 25 existed in the middle period, and all 49 existed in the latter period). *Journal Citation Reports* and manual calculations were used to obtain the citation data.

The Baumgartner and Pieters (2003) study reinforces the ordering of the top three journals in our 2007 ranking, with the *Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Marketing Research*, and *Journal of Consumer Research* being #1, #2, and #3, respectively. Beyond the top three, however, the results are in many respects different from our 2007

ranking. The general grouping of many of the journals is about the same but the placement of several is also significantly different. One of the publication outlets discussed in the comparison between the 2007 ranking and the SSCI scores also shows up as an "outlier" in the Baumgartner and Pieters (2003) study, namely the *Advances in Consumer Research*. *ACR* has an "overall influence, share %" of 3.5 in the Baumgartner and Pieters (2003) study, placing it #6 among all marketing publications (but only #12 in our study). However, given the rather old time periods used for the citation data collection in Baumgartner and Pieters' (2003) study, one would presume that the influence of *ACR* has diminished over time and that the #12 ranking is more accurate in 2007.

Comparisons with Theoharakis and Hirst's (2002) Study

The Theoharakis and Hirst (2002, p. 391) study included an aided-recall set of 55 journals based on "the top journals found by Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997), personal communication with faculty from various universities, and survey pretesting." Theoharakis and Hirst's (2002) ranking was based on a combination of the ranking indices used in previous studies (Luke and Doke 1987; Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997) but with respondents being asked to rank their top 20 journals instead of their top 10 and with some other variations in methodology used. Their sample included 372 academics worldwide from a mix of top ranked global schools as well as select ranked regional schools.

Several notable differences can be found between our 2007 ranking and Theoharakis and Hirst's (2002) ranking. For example, the *Journal of Marketing Research* received the top spot based on the "index" in the Theoharakis and Hirst (2002) study while it was #2 in our 2007 study (at the same time *JMR* achieved a slightly higher popularity ranking in their study). The *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* was ranked #9 by Theoharakis and Hirst (2002), which mirrors the ranking it had in 1987 in the Luke and Doke (1987) study, but is lower than its #5 placement in our 2007 study (which it also held in 1997). Beyond the comparisons involving *JMR* and *JAMS*, Table 3 provides a number of similarities and differences across the two studies.

Comparisons of Segments of the Marketing Professorate

Corresponding to marketing journal rankings in the past (e.g., Baumgartner and Pieters 2003; Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997; Theoharakis and Hirst 2002), we conducted analyses of various segments of the marketing professorate. Three segmentation variables (faculty rank, geographic location of the school, and subareas of marketing) are used in this study to analyze 10 different segments. This multitude of analyses results in a better

understanding of the critical journals within the marketing field.

Ranking Perceptions of Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors

Table 4 reports the results for the segmented rankings for assistant, associate, and full professors. The top four journals (i.e., *Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Marketing Research*, *Journal of Consumer Research*, and *Marketing Science*) are consistent across the three faculty ranks. However, while *JM* leads in the Popularity/Familiarity Index for each of the ranks, *JMR* achieves a greater Importance/Prestige Index among assistant professors.

After the top four journals, shifting occurs. The #5 journal for assistant professors is *Management Science*, for associate professors it is *Harvard Business Review*, and for full professors it is *Journal of Retailing*.

Interestingly, this split among the three faculty ranks for the #5 spot results in the *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* being ranked #5 in the overall sample based on its strong performance across the three faculty ranks (tied for #6 among assistant professors, #6 among associate professors, and #6 among full professors).

Another unique finding involves the internationally oriented journals in the rankings. For example, *Journal of International Business Studies* is ranked #25 among assistant professors, tied for #22 among associate professors, and ranked as high as #15 among full professors. In parallel, the *Journal of International Marketing* achieves a significantly higher PFI score among associate and full professors (.14 and .11, respectively) than it does among assistant professors (.06), a finding that also carries for the *International Marketing Review* (with a .03 score among assistants, .11 among associates, and .08 among full professors). As such, the PFI scores for internationally oriented journals get higher as academics are promoted to associate/full professors and have been in the field for a longer period of time (cf. Vernon 1966).

The scores of four other journals are remarkable for their large differences in the Popularity/Familiarity Index across the faculty ranks: *Management Science*, *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *Journal of Business Research*, and *European Journal of Marketing*. First, *Management Science* achieves a much lower PFI score among associate professors (.37) than it does among assistants (.55) and full professors (.50). At the same time, although *Management Science* gets less “popular/familiar” among associate professors, those who rate the journal in their top ten do so at a higher “importance/prestige” level than the other ranks. Second, *Journal of Consumer Psychology* has better traction among assistants (.51) than it does among associates (.36) and full professors (.31). Both *Journal of Business Research* and *European Journal of Marketing* have better traction among associates (.29 and .33, respectively) than they do

among assistants (.18 and .18) and full professors (.22 and .15).

Ranking Perceptions of Scholars at U.S. versus International Schools

Table 5 provides segmented rankings for scholars at U.S. and international schools. We found a number of differences that are worth noting. Although the results are marginally different, it is important to note that the *Journal of Marketing Research* is #1 among faculty at U.S. schools, with the *Journal of Marketing* a very close #2. Among faculty at international schools, *JM* is the clear market leader. Ten other differences are unusually large in the Popularity/Familiarity Index. Six of these differences involve journals and PFI scores that are higher among faculty at U.S. schools and four of the differences involve journals and their PFI scores that are higher among faculty at international schools. Interestingly, the six journals that achieve higher PFI scores among U.S. faculty appear in the top 10 journals in the overall ranking (i.e., *Journal of Marketing Research*, *Journal of Consumer Research*, *Marketing Science*, *Journal of Retailing*, *Management Science*, and *Journal of Consumer Psychology*). The PFI scores across these six journals are, on average, .23 lower among faculty at international schools than they are among faculty at U.S. schools. On the flip side, the *Journal of Business Research*, *European Journal of Marketing*, *Industrial Marketing Management*, and *Journal of Marketing Management* achieve PFI scores that are, on average, .26 higher among faculty at international schools than they are among faculty at U.S. schools. Two of these latter publications are traditional European journals (i.e., *European Journal of Marketing* and *Journal of Marketing Management*) but the American-based *Industrial Marketing Management* has also received significant attention among international academics (such as those in the Industrial Marketing and Purchasing Group).

Ranking Perceptions of Marketing Scholars in Different Subareas

Table 6 reports the results of the analyses for the subareas of marketing management/ strategy, consumer behavior, international, channels/purchasing, and marketing research. As expected, variability exists across the segments, and these differences appear even at the top of the rankings. *Journal of Marketing* is the leader among faculty who indicate that their primary interest areas are marketing management/strategy, international, and channels/purchasing. *Journal of Consumer Research* is at the top among consumer behavior scholars and *Journal of Marketing Research* is the leader among marketing research scholars. However, the variability also carries deeper into the rankings.

For example, having the overall-ranked #21 journal (*Journal of International Business Studies*) and the #26 journal (*Journal of International Marketing*) being ranked #3 and #2, respectively among faculty with a primary interest in international marketing represents a large jump upwards in the rankings. Thus, the small portion of our sample (7.6 percent) that identify with international marketing have built a unique niche within the marketing field – where *JM* is the clear #1 and where *JIM*, *JIBS*, *HBR*, *JAMS*, and *IMR* are clustered together (all with PFI $\geq .59$) above the rest (all other journals have a PFI $\leq .46$).

In the consumer behavior area, five journals stand out. *Journal of Consumer Research* is the clear #1, followed closely by both *Journal of Marketing* and *Journal of Marketing Research*, with the *Journal of Consumer Psychology* solidly in #4 and *Marketing Science* in #5. These five journals have PFI scores $\geq .66$, with the remaining journals at PFI $\leq .51$.

In the marketing research area, seven journals stand out, including *Journal of Marketing Research*, *Marketing Science*, *Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Consumer Research*, *Management Science*, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, and *Marketing Letters*. These seven journals have PFI scores $\geq .57$, with the remaining journals at PFI $\leq .41$.

The top journals in marketing management/strategy and marketing channels/purchasing are more narrowly defined. The fields differ, but contrary to the fields of international marketing, consumer behavior, and marketing research with 6, 5, and 7 journals in the top set, both the management/strategy and channels/purchasing fields center their research on a set of only four top journals. For the marketing management/strategy area, the four journals that stand above the rest are *JM*, *JMR*, *JCR*, and *Marketing Science* – all with PFI $\geq .76$ (with all other journals $\leq .63$). These results are interesting in that *JCR* is one of the journals in the top set for marketing management/strategy scholars even though it is typically not a journal targeted by such scholars. For the marketing channels/purchasing area, the four journals are *JM*, *JMR*, *Marketing Science*, and *Journal of Retailing* – all with PFI $\geq .71$ (with all other journals $\leq .61$).

DISCUSSION

Most studies are associated with limitations that constrain the interpretations of the data and the implications that can be drawn. This study is no exception. Three primary limitations should be taken into account in interpreting the findings. First, we used the Popularity/ Familiarity Index (PFI) and the Importance/Prestige Index (IPI) to rank marketing journals based on the perceptions of the worldwide marketing professorate. The PFI and IPI are broad-based, rank-order assessments of the importance of marketing journals in disseminating marketing knowledge

(Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997). Such rank-ordering is somewhat limiting in interpretation, but it did allow for direct comparisons with results in 1987 and 1997 (Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997; Luke and Doke 1987). Second, the subarea of consumer behavior represents 33.6 percent of the usable sample and is overrepresented if the objective is to incorporate equal treatment of all subareas of marketing. We opted to use the respondents' data without any weighting to allow for the skewness toward certain subareas that have particular strongholds in marketing. The representation of marketing faculty's primary interests in this study corresponds to that of the overall profession (e.g., Hult and Hasselback 1998).

The third general limitation we encountered was somewhat unusual and involved how individuals responded to the survey. Some individuals who were not on the mailing list filled out the survey and some who were on the original mailing list appear to have filled out the survey in a "strategic" way. In response, we first decided to remove cases that were not generated by individuals on the original mailing list. Second, we opted to leave the responses as they were entered by the strategically-responding individuals. More specifically, the issue we encountered was that a very select few editors and editorial board members ranked "their" journal unusually high relative to others in the sample. Despite these limitations, our ranking study provides a unique take on marketing journal hierarchies. In this discussion section we will highlight a couple of the more noteworthy findings as well as provide a brief tracing of the top 10 journals in the overall ranking in 2007.

Noteworthy Findings

Throughout the presentation of the results, we have incorporated interpretations and commentary to guide the reader on various insights that can be gleaned from the analyses. Some of these insights are particularly noteworthy, such as the upward and downward trends of some journals and the similarities and differences across various segments of the marketing professorate. Many of these unique results have been featured throughout the paper with the exception of two noteworthy findings. First, the inclusion of *Quantitative Marketing and Economics* in the rankings as a write-in journal and its clustering within the field's top journals is remarkable. Second, the strong first-time placement of the *Journal of Service Research*, a relatively new journal in the marketing field, is also extraordinary.

Quantitative Marketing and Economics. QME was the only publication that made the 2007 marketing journal ranking as a write-in journal, reaching the #30 position among the 50 journals ranked in the overall ranking (PFI=.06 and IPI=4.14). This is an encouraging step taken by a journal which was started as recently as 2003 toward achieving a prominent standing in the marketing field (the journal is co-edited by Rajiv Lal and Peter Rossi

and published by Springer). As a point of comparison, two write-in journals made the ranking in the 1997 study by Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997) – *Journal of Consumer Psychology* (#27 in 1997 and #10 in 2007) and *Marketing Letters* (#34 in 1997 and #11 in 2007). JCP started in 1992 and ML started in 1990 – 5 and 7 years, respectively prior to the Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997) study. Thus, one can potentially infer that QME is on the same trajectory given its write-in inclusion in the 2007 ranking. Such trajectory is also supported by QME's strong placement in the "marketing research" segment (already #11 on PFI), its strong overall IPI of 4.14, and its grouping with top journals in various segments in the cluster analyses. For example, QME is grouped in the second tier of the overall ranking with *Journal of Consumer Research* and *Marketing Science* (JM and JMR are in the top group) based on hierarchical cluster analysis. These results are supported when separate PFI and IPI scores are used for assistant, associate, and full professors to cluster journals as well as when U.S. and international schools' PFI and IPI scores are used for clustering purposes. QME gets grouped together with the four top marketing journals (i.e., JM, JMR, JCR, and *Marketing Science*) in both cases.

Journal of Service Research. JSR was the highest ranked new journal in the 2007 marketing journal ranking, reaching the #19 position among the 50 journals ranked in the overall ranking (PFI=.16 and IPI=6.79). The inclusion of JSR at such a high ranking placement is encouraging for a journal that was launched as recently as 1998 (the journal was started by Roland Rust and is now edited by A. Parasuraman and published by Sage). In many respects, JSR's inclusion in the rankings and how the journal is positioned mirrors that of the *International Journal of Research in Marketing*. After starting to be published in 1984, IJRM entered the overall 1997 ranking at #26 (after not being included in 1987) and moved up to #9 in 2007 (it has a 2002-2006 average Journal Citation Reports impact score of 1.07). Based on this trend, JSR's prospects are even greater, with an initial impact score in 2006 of 1.72 and a starting ranking in the 2007 study of #19. A significant upward trajectory is also likely given the high ranking, PFI, and IPI that JSR received among faculty with a primary interest in services, i.e., #3 ranking behind JM and JMR, PFI=.84, and IPI=5.35 (given the small sample size, n=27, for those with primary interests in services we opted not to include a separate ranking for this subarea of marketing). A scan of the SSCI, PFI, and IPI scores also indicate that JSR is approaching the highest level of impact in marketing scholarship. Top journals typically achieve SSCI scores ≥ 2.0 , PFI $\geq .50$, and IPI ≥ 5.0 – JSR is approaching scores in this range faster than any new marketing journal in recent history.

A Brief Tracing of the Top Ten Journals in 2007

The top journal in the 2007 ranking, *Journal of Marketing*, originated in name in 1936 and is the second oldest journal focused on marketing. *JM* has held the number one position in similar surveys in 1987 (Luke and Doke 1987) and 1997 (Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997). The *Journal of Retailing (JR)* is the oldest journal publishing marketing scholarship, with the first issue printed in 1925. The conceptualization of *JR* was aligned with the topic of "distribution," the early 1900s' precursor to the general field of marketing. In fact, distribution in ancient history can be seen as marketing exchange of yesteryear and marketing relationships of today (see Bartels 1988 for an eloquent discussion of marketing history).

JM's origins can be traced to 1934 when the American Marketing Society began publishing the *American Marketing Journal*, which subsequently became the *National Marketing Review* in 1935. This journal's name, in turn, was changed to *Journal of Marketing* in 1936. Roughly at the same time, in 1937, the American Marketing Association (AMA) was formed as a merger between the National Association of Marketing Teachers and the American Marketing Society, with the former being a "teacher" association (with roots as early as 1915) and the latter being a "practitioner" association (with its start in 1930). Today, AMA has a strong influence on the worldwide marketing profession with some 35,000 members (roughly 2,500 academics and the balance practitioners), the top two journals in the field (*JM* being #1 and *Journal of Marketing Research* at #2), and with complementary publications in solid positions in the ranking (*Journal of Public Policy and Marketing* #18, *Journal of International Marketing* #26, and *Marketing Management* #35). Until 1970, AMA was the sole influencing force in the marketing field as a community of marketing professionals, with *JM*, and also with the introduction of *JMR* in 1964.

Starting in the 1970s, "competition" infiltrated the marketing profession. Both the *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science (JAMS)*, which began in 1973) and *Journal of Consumer Research (JCR)*, which started in 1974) entered the arena as alternative outlets for premier marketing scholarship. *JAMS*, in particular, offered flexibility for the field with its ties to the Academy of Marketing Science (AMS) – representing both a new organization for marketing academics and a new journal (AMS also established an online journal titled *Academy of Marketing Science Review* in 1997 but it has yet to achieve prominence in the field). *JCR*, on the other hand, is not directly tied to an organization, although many would draw a friendly link to the Association for Consumer Research (ACR). *JCR*, which originated in 1974, is owned and published by the University of Chicago Press. It deals almost exclusively with consumer behavior topics, an important subfield of marketing, but

does so in a way that spans a number of social science fields beyond marketing. A relatively recent addition to the consumer behavior assortment which made the top ten in 2007 is the *Journal of Consumer Psychology* (a journal which started in 1992 and is the official journal of the Society for Consumer Psychology). Like *JCR*, *JCP* covers consumer-related topics and spans several social science fields.

In the 1980s, the marketing profession saw the introduction of several new journals. Two of them – *Marketing Science* (in 1982) and the *International Journal of Research in Marketing* (in 1984) – have become key publications in the field for a number of reasons.

Marketing Science is a product of INFORMS (The Institute for Operations Research and the Management Sciences). INFORMS has close scholarly ties to the operations research profession, having been formed in 1995 as a merger between the Operations Research Society of America (which started in 1952) and The Institute of Management Sciences (which began in 1953). As such, the marketing community, and especially those focused on operations research-related marketing topics, had another choice of premier journal and association. INFORMS has a complementary top-ten journal in *Management Science* (which started in 1955). *Management Science* covers the gamut of business fields, of which marketing has become an important contributor.

A central aspect of the 1980s was also the establishment of a prestigious marketing journal outside the U.S. The *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, with its ties to the European Marketing Academy (EMAC), became both a validation of the marketing profession worldwide (beyond influence from the U.S.) and a new competitor to the established associations and journals. Like the other associations, EMAC holds regular meetings (the first one was held in 1972) and has a vibrant membership. Officially, EMAC started in 1975. Of course, outside the top ten, the *European Journal of Marketing* can stake claims to being a non-American thought leader in the marketing field as well, but with lower popularity/familiarity than the *International Journal of Research in Marketing*.

The remaining journal in the top ten in 2007 maintains its position among marketing's elite from its positions in both 1987 and 1997, although it is not classified as a typical marketing journal – *Harvard Business Review*. *HBR* has the broadest subscription numbers in business (some 250,000 subscribers) and covers a wide range of managerially-oriented topics including marketing. In the first issue of *HBR* in 1922, then Harvard Business School Dean Wallace B. Donham

positioned *HBR*'s aim as “an essential groundwork for a broad executive theory.” The idea was that business executives should be able to learn from experiences of others – moving business towards a more refined and systematic practice.

CONCLUSION

The objective of this study was to provide a rigorous update and extension of previous perceptual marketing journal hierarchies and complement as well as alleviate limitations of recent objective ranking studies. A key focus was on trend analysis spanning 1987, 1997, and 2007 by using the same methodology as in Luke and Doke (1987) and Hult, Neese, and Bashaw (1997). Such trend comparisons are important for the marketing field in building knowledge about journals, much in the same way journals are used, over time, to build knowledge on certain topics. In fact, scholarship in marketing journals serves an important role in developing the knowledge base of marketing. Using a large database of responses from 629 marketing faculty from top business schools worldwide, we developed journal hierarchies for the overall sample and segments based on faculty rank, geographic location of the schools, and subareas of the marketing field. We also compared our ranking with those using various other methodologies. Overall, the 2007 marketing journal ranking gives the marketing professorate knowledge about marketing journal rankings that can be used for promotional, positioning, and knowledge development purposes. ♦ [gBR Article 03-03](#), Copyright © 2009.

About the Authors

G. Tomas M. Hult is Associate Dean for Global Initiatives, Director of the Center for International Business Education and Research (MSU-CIBER), and Professor of Marketing, International Business, and Strategic Management in the Eli Broad Graduate School of Management at Michigan State University. He is also Executive Director of the Academy of International Business. Dr. Hult can be reached at +1-517-353-4336 or hult@msu.edu.

Martin Reimann is a researcher in the Department of Psychology at Stanford University. Dr. Reimann can be reached at +1650-723-7431 or mreimann@stanford.edu.

Oliver Schilke is a researcher at the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences at Stanford University. Dr. Schilke can be reached at +1-650-736-1137 or Schilke@stanford.edu.

TABLE 1
Demographics

Gender		Publications	
Male	75.1%	Peer Reviewed	20.4 (sd=27.3)
Female	24.9	Non-Peer Reviewed	9.8 (sd=21.0)
Experience		Primary Interest	
Year of Highest Degree	1992 (sd=11.3)	Marketing Management	8.6%
Business Experience	4.3 yrs (sd=4.9)	Marketing Strategy	24.6
Faculty Experience	15.0 yrs (sd=10.8)	Promotion/Sales	3.0
Highest Academic Degree		Services Marketing	4.3
Doctorate	93.2%	Consumer Behavior	33.6
Masters	4.4	Channels/Retailing	7.8
Undergraduate	0.5	Purchasing	1.0
Other	1.9	International	7.6
Rank		Marketing Research	9.5
Professors	40.2%	Geographic Location	
Associate Professors	27.9	U.S. School	53.5%
Assistant Professors	29.4	International School	46.5
Adjunct/Instructor	2.4	Degrees Offered	
Allotment of Work Time		Undergraduate Marketing	60.1%
Teaching	30.3% (sd=13.8)	Undergraduate Business	72.0
Research	41.7 (sd=18.9)	Masters in Business	94.1
Service	18.2 (sd=14.3)	Doctorate	87.3
Consulting	9.8 (sd=13.7)		

TABLE 2
Overall Marketing Journal Rankings 1987, 1997, and 2007:
Popularity/Familiarity Index (PFI) and Importance/Prestige Index (IPI)

Rank	Publication	Starting Year	Current Study 2007 (n=629)			Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997 (n=309)		Luke and Doke 1987 (n=108)	
			PFI 2007	IPI 2007	Frequency	PFI 1997	IPI 1997	PFI 1987	IPI 1987
1	Journal of Marketing	1936	1.00	2.78	543	1.00	2.18	1.00	1.70
2	Journal of Marketing Research	1964	0.92	2.78	499	0.92	2.55	0.98	2.18
3	Journal of Consumer Research	1974	0.85	3.42	463	0.81	3.34	0.87	4.43
4	Marketing Science	1982	0.73	3.95	395	0.51	4.80	0.14	4.43
5	Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science	1973	0.50	6.04	274	0.52	5.70	0.46	6.22
6	Harvard Business Review	1922	0.48	6.16	262	0.48	5.76	0.61	5.14
7	Journal of Retailing	1925	0.48	6.87	260	0.60	6.44	0.76	6.06
8	Management Science	1955	0.47	5.21	256	0.27	5.63	0.25	5.88
9	Intl Journal of Research in Marketing	1984	0.44	6.42	238	0.11	6.53	–	–
10	Journal of Consumer Psychology	1992	0.39	5.52	213	0.11	6.16	–	–
11	Marketing Letters	1990	0.38	7.45	205	0.08	6.18	–	–
12	Advances in Consumer Research	1970	0.24	7.00	132	0.22	7.20	–	–
13	Journal of Business Research	1973	0.23	7.16	123	0.39	7.03	0.43	6.70
14	Sloan Management Review	1959	0.22	7.02	117	0.17	6.85	0.14	5.00
15	Journal of Advertising	1972	0.21	7.11	114	0.38	6.26	0.56	6.59
16	European Journal of Marketing	1967	0.20	6.41	110	0.10	6.75	0.09	7.45
17	Psychology and Marketing	1984	0.20	7.72	107	0.17	7.48	–	–
18	Journal of Public Policy and Marketing	1982	0.17	6.86	94	0.20	6.37	–	–
19	Journal of Service Research	1998	0.16	6.79	85	–	–	–	–
20	Journal of Advertising Research	1961	0.15	7.01	83	0.35	6.92	0.64	6.43
21	Journal of International Business Studies	1970	0.15	5.88	82	0.15	6.05	0.17	5.83
22	Industrial Marketing Management	1971	0.15	5.79	80	0.14	6.20	0.27	7.89
23	Journal of Product Innovation Management	1984	0.15	6.29	79	0.07	6.71	–	–
24	California Management Review	1959	0.13	6.91	69	0.13	6.86	0.19	7.90
25	Journal of Marketing Management	1985	0.12	6.65	66	0.09	6.50	–	–
26	Journal of International Marketing	1993	0.10	5.35	57	0.12	6.75	–	–
27	Journal of Interactive Marketing	1987	0.10	7.37	52	–	–	–	–
28	International Marketing Review	1984	0.07	6.45	40	–	–	–	–
29	Journal of Business	1928	0.07	7.78	37	0.16	6.63	0.30	6.84
30	Quantitative Marketing and Economics	2003	0.06	4.14	35	–	–	–	–
31	International Journal of Market Research	1961	0.06	6.47	32	–	–	0.18	7.78
32	Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing	1993	0.05	7.03	29	–	–	–	–
33	Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing	1986	0.05	6.39	28	0.07	7.00	–	–
34	Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Mgmt	1980	0.05	6.46	28	0.23	6.52	–	–
35	Marketing Management	1992	0.05	7.07	27	0.06	6.69	–	–
36	Journal of Business Ethics	1982	0.04	6.83	23	0.06	6.88	–	–
37	Journal of Economic Psychology	1981	0.04	7.87	23	–	–	–	–
38	Journal of Services Marketing	1987	0.04	6.55	22	0.12	7.37	–	–
39	Decision Sciences	1970	0.03	7.89	19	0.09	6.84	0.24	7.05
40	Journal of Consumer Marketing	1984	0.03	6.78	18	0.14	7.00	–	–
41	Business Horizons	1958	0.03	7.18	17	0.12	6.00	0.24	7.05
42	AMA Summer/Winter Proceedings	1937	0.03	8.47	15	0.10	7.48	0.31	6.46
43	Journal of Marketing Education	1979	0.02	6.09	11	0.18	7.12	0.21	7.15
44	Journal of Global Marketing	1988	0.02	6.90	10	0.06	7.82	–	–
45	Journal of Consumer Policy	1977	0.02	6.89	9	–	–	–	–
46	Journal of Consumer Affairs	1967	0.02	7.22	9	–	–	0.19	7.32
47	Journal of Business Logistics	1980	0.01	8.14	7	0.05	7.31	–	–
48	Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice	1993	0.01	6.20	5	0.10	7.31	–	–
49	Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Mktg	1993	0.01	8.20	5	–	–	–	–
50	Services Marketing Quarterly	1979	0.01	5.25	4	–	–	–	–

TABLE 3
Comparisons of Select Marketing Journal Rankings

Rank	Publication	Current Study 2007 (n=629)		SSCI Impact Scores (Average 2002- 2006)**	Baumgartner and Pieters 2003 (Overall Influence, Share %)	Theoharakis and Hirst 2002 (n=372)	
		PFI 2007	IPI 2007			Index	% Top10
1	Journal of Marketing	1.00	2.78	3.39	19.1	82.6	92.9
2	Journal of Marketing Research	0.92	2.78	2.24	16.4	86.7	97.7
3	Journal of Consumer Research	0.85	3.42	2.31	13.7	75.9	96.3
4	Marketing Science	0.73	3.95	3.00	3.3	65.9	95.6
5	Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science	0.50	6.04	1.72	2.9	27.5	57.5
6	Harvard Business Review	0.48	6.16	1.49	6.9	33.5	55.9
7	Journal of Retailing	0.48	6.87	1.08	2.6	32.3	42.2
8	Management Science	0.47	5.21	1.62	3.6	42.6	91.3
9	International Journal of Research in Marketing	0.44	6.42	1.07	0.8	35.3	54.7
10	Journal of Consumer Psychology	0.39	5.52	0.92	0.2	26.6	44.7
11	Marketing Letters	0.38	7.45	0.53*	0.6	23.8	29.9
12	Advances in Consumer Research	0.24	7.00	0.06*	3.5	13.8	29.4
13	Journal of Business Research	0.23	7.16	0.60	2.2	23.3	41.5
14	Sloan Management Review	0.22	7.02	0.97	1.8	13.1	33.6
15	Journal of Advertising	0.21	7.11	0.64	1.5	17.9	27.0
16	European Journal of Marketing	0.20	6.41	–	1.5	18.4	35.1
17	Psychology and Marketing	0.20	7.72	0.69	0.4	9.1	23.2
18	Journal of Public Policy and Marketing	0.17	6.86	0.72	0.8	8.8	26.7
19	Journal of Service Research	0.16	6.79	1.72*	–	4.4	33.3
20	Journal of Advertising Research	0.15	7.01	0.68	2.5	19.4	30.8
21	Journal of International Business Studies	0.15	5.88	1.53	1.9	10.1	37.8
22	Industrial Marketing Management	0.15	5.79	0.74	2.6	10.7	22.3
23	Journal of Product Innovation Management	0.15	6.29	1.25	1.5	12.2	28.3
24	California Management Review	0.13	6.91	1.20	1.0	10.6	20.2
25	Journal of Marketing Management	0.12	6.65	–	0.3	7.4	30.2
26	Journal of International Marketing	0.10	5.35	0.60	0.2	6.1	28.6
27	Journal of Interactive Marketing	0.10	7.37	1.46*	0.3	–	–
28	International Marketing Review	0.07	6.45	–	–	2.6	30.4
29	Journal of Business	0.07	7.78	1.19	0.6	10.9	39.3
30	Quantitative Marketing and Economics	0.06	4.14	–	–	–	–
31	International Journal of Market Research	0.06	6.47	0.32	0.3	3.9	27.5
32	Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing	0.05	7.03	–	0.0	–	–
33	Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing	0.05	6.39	–	0.2	–	–
34	Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Mgmt	0.05	6.46	–	1.4	4.4	14.9
35	Marketing Management	0.05	7.07	–	0.4	–	–
36	Journal of Business Ethics	0.04	6.83	0.60	0.7	–	–
37	Journal of Economic Psychology	0.04	7.87	0.69	0.4	5.8	68.4
38	Journal of Services Marketing	0.04	6.55	–	0.4	3.8	8.5
39	Decision Sciences	0.03	7.89	0.98	0.3	8.9	38.0
40	Journal of Consumer Marketing	0.03	6.78	–	0.3	3.8	18.9
41	Business Horizons	0.03	7.18	–	0.8	4.4	17.4
42	AMA Summer/Winter Proceedings	0.03	8.47	–	0.5	–	–
43	Journal of Marketing Education	0.02	6.09	–	0.6	–	–
44	Journal of Global Marketing	0.02	6.90	–	0.1	–	–
45	Journal of Consumer Policy	0.02	6.89	–	0.1	–	–
46	Journal of Consumer Affairs	0.02	7.22	0.55	0.4	–	–
47	Journal of Business Logistics	0.01	8.14	–	0.1	–	–
48	Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice	0.01	6.20	–	0.0	–	–
49	Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing	0.01	8.20	–	0.0	–	–
50	Services Marketing Quarterly	0.01	5.25	–	0.2	–	–

* *Marketing Letter's* SSCI average is for the last 4 years. *Advances in Consumer Research's* average is for 2002-2005 (ACR was removed from the SSCI in 2006). *Journal of Service Research's* score is for 2006 only (JSR entered the SSCI in 2006). *Journal of Interactive Marketing's* SSCI is for 2006 only (JIM entered the SSCI in 2006).

** Permission was granted by Thompson Scientific to include the impact scores, the so-called called *Journal Citation Reports*, from the Social Science Citation Index (ISI Web of Science).

TABLE 4
Segmented Analyses for Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors:
Ordered as Ranked in the Overall Study Sample

Rank	Publication	Overall Sample (n=629)		Assistant Professors (n=182)		Associate Professors (n=173)		Full Professors (n=249)	
		PFI 2007	IPI 2007	PFI 2007	IPI 2007	PFI 2007	IPI 2007	PFI 2007	IPI 2007
1	Journal of Marketing	1.00	2.78	1.00	2.93	1.00	2.67	1.00	2.70
2	Journal of Marketing Research	0.92	2.78	0.96	2.58	0.91	3.01	0.91	2.75
3	Journal of Consumer Research	0.85	3.42	0.89	3.01	0.83	3.49	0.84	3.72
4	Marketing Science	0.73	3.95	0.79	4.10	0.69	3.98	0.72	3.73
5	Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science	0.50	6.04	0.51	6.58	0.51	5.63	0.51	5.90
6	Harvard Business Review	0.48	6.16	0.43	6.47	0.55	6.31	0.48	5.81
7	Journal of Retailing	0.48	6.87	0.48	7.12	0.41	6.71	0.54	6.81
8	Management Science	0.47	5.21	0.55	5.22	0.37	5.00	0.50	5.31
9	International Journal of Research in Marketing	0.44	6.42	0.44	6.79	0.39	6.37	0.48	6.20
10	Journal of Consumer Psychology	0.39	5.52	0.51	5.54	0.36	5.22	0.31	5.86
11	Marketing Letters	0.38	7.45	0.41	7.63	0.35	7.49	0.37	7.20
12	Advances in Consumer Research	0.24	7.00	0.27	7.02	0.23	6.91	0.21	7.09
13	Journal of Business Research	0.23	7.16	0.18	7.53	0.29	6.78	0.22	7.20
14	Sloan Management Review	0.22	7.02	0.17	7.00	0.22	6.55	0.24	7.52
15	Journal of Advertising	0.21	7.11	0.21	7.35	0.24	7.12	0.18	7.18
16	European Journal of Marketing	0.20	6.41	0.18	6.07	0.33	6.50	0.15	6.61
17	Psychology and Marketing	0.20	7.72	0.24	7.59	0.23	7.84	0.14	7.67
18	Journal of Public Policy and Marketing	0.17	6.86	0.18	7.00	0.17	6.63	0.17	6.92
19	Journal of Service Research	0.16	6.79	0.18	7.27	0.16	6.73	0.14	6.43
20	Journal of Advertising Research	0.15	7.01	0.12	7.00	0.13	7.39	0.18	7.13
21	Journal of International Business Studies	0.15	5.88	0.11	6.06	0.15	5.62	0.19	5.98
22	Industrial Marketing Management	0.15	5.79	0.13	5.73	0.13	5.22	0.17	6.18
23	Journal of Product Innovation Management	0.15	6.29	0.12	5.85	0.18	6.68	0.14	6.37
24	California Management Review	0.13	6.91	0.12	6.80	0.15	6.52	0.12	7.44
25	Journal of Marketing Management	0.12	6.65	0.12	6.89	0.16	5.91	0.10	7.62
26	Journal of International Marketing	0.10	5.35	0.06	6.60	0.14	5.00	0.11	4.92
27	Journal of Interactive Marketing	0.10	7.37	0.08	7.08	0.08	6.36	0.11	8.20
28	International Marketing Review	0.07	6.45	0.03	6.60	0.11	5.75	0.08	7.18
29	Journal of Business	0.07	7.78	0.06	7.30	0.07	7.80	0.07	8.25
30	Quantitative Marketing and Economics	0.06	4.14	0.08	3.69	0.06	4.00	0.06	4.69
31	International Journal of Market Research	0.06	6.47	0.05	6.50	0.02	6.00	0.09	6.63
32	Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing	0.05	7.03	0.03	7.00	0.09	6.92	0.05	7.40
33	Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing	0.05	6.39	0.05	7.00	0.06	5.22	0.04	7.33
34	Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Mgmt	0.05	6.46	0.05	7.00	0.02	6.33	0.07	6.53
35	Marketing Management	0.05	7.07	0.02	7.50	0.06	9.00	0.05	5.50
36	Journal of Business Ethics	0.04	6.83	0.04	6.00	0.05	7.14	0.04	7.22
37	Journal of Economic Psychology	0.04	7.87	0.02	7.25	0.06	8.44	0.04	7.89
38	Journal of Services Marketing	0.04	6.55	0.04	7.29	0.04	5.67	0.03	6.86
39	Decision Sciences	0.03	7.89	0.02	8.50	0.04	7.00	0.04	8.22
40	Journal of Consumer Marketing	0.03	6.78	0.05	7.63	0.03	5.25	0.02	6.00
41	Business Horizons	0.03	7.18	0.01	10.00	0.04	6.20	0.04	7.44
42	AMA Summer/Winter Proceedings	0.03	8.47	0.01	9.50	0.05	8.29	0.03	8.33
43	Journal of Marketing Education	0.02	6.09	0.02	6.67	0.02	6.00	0.01	5.33
44	Journal of Global Marketing	0.02	6.90	–	–	0.04	7.33	0.01	5.33
45	Journal of Consumer Policy	0.02	6.89	0.02	8.00	0.01	10.00	0.02	6.20
46	Journal of Consumer Affairs	0.02	7.22	0.02	7.67	0.02	7.33	0.01	5.67
47	Journal of Business Logistics	0.01	8.14	0.01	8.00	0.02	7.67	0.01	9.00
48	Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice	0.01	6.20	0.01	4.00	0.02	8.33	–	–
49	Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing	0.01	8.20	0.01	6.50	–	–	0.01	9.33
50	Services Marketing Quarterly	0.01	5.25	0.01	8.00	0.01	4.00	0.00	7.00

TABLE 5
Segmented Analyses for Scholars at U.S. and International Schools:
Ordered as Ranked in the Overall Study Sample

Rank	Publication	Overall Sample (n=629)		Faculty at U.S. Schools (n=336)		Faculty at Intl Schools (n=293)	
		PFI 2007	IPI 2007	PFI 2007	IPI 2007	PFI 2007	IPI 2007
1	Journal of Marketing	1.00	2.78	0.99	2.91	1.00	2.62
2	Journal of Marketing Research	0.92	2.78	1.00	2.58	0.81	3.09
3	Journal of Consumer Research	0.85	3.42	0.93	3.53	0.75	3.22
4	Marketing Science	0.73	3.95	0.86	3.85	0.56	4.14
5	Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science	0.50	6.04	0.49	6.34	0.52	5.67
6	Harvard Business Review	0.48	6.16	0.42	6.73	0.55	5.61
7	Journal of Retailing	0.48	6.87	0.55	7.02	0.38	6.60
8	Management Science	0.47	5.21	0.60	5.18	0.30	5.36
9	International Journal of Research in Marketing	0.44	6.42	0.41	6.70	0.47	6.14
10	Journal of Consumer Psychology	0.39	5.52	0.49	5.45	0.27	5.69
11	Marketing Letters	0.38	7.45	0.42	7.55	0.32	7.32
12	Advances in Consumer Research	0.24	7.00	0.20	7.58	0.30	6.53
13	Journal of Business Research	0.23	7.16	0.12	7.46	0.36	7.05
14	Sloan Management Review	0.22	7.02	0.20	7.03	0.23	6.98
15	Journal of Advertising	0.21	7.11	0.18	7.41	0.24	6.83
16	European Journal of Marketing	0.20	6.41	0.03	8.10	0.41	6.24
17	Psychology and Marketing	0.20	7.72	0.14	8.02	0.27	7.53
18	Journal of Public Policy and Marketing	0.17	6.86	0.23	7.01	0.10	6.48
19	Journal of Service Research	0.16	6.79	0.16	6.72	0.15	6.81
20	Journal of Advertising Research	0.15	7.01	0.16	7.28	0.15	6.67
21	Journal of International Business Studies	0.15	5.88	0.11	6.48	0.20	5.47
22	Industrial Marketing Management	0.15	5.79	0.06	6.41	0.26	5.62
23	Journal of Product Innovation Management	0.15	6.29	0.15	6.89	0.13	5.52
24	California Management Review	0.13	6.91	0.08	7.48	0.19	6.63
25	Journal of Marketing Management	0.12	6.65	0.03	5.44	0.23	6.84
26	Journal of International Marketing	0.10	5.35	0.07	6.36	0.14	4.62
27	Journal of Interactive Marketing	0.10	7.37	0.12	7.42	0.07	7.25
28	International Marketing Review	0.07	6.45	0.03	6.13	0.13	6.53
29	Journal of Business	0.07	7.78	0.08	7.64	0.04	8.18
30	Quantitative Marketing and Economics	0.06	4.14	0.09	4.19	0.03	4.00
31	International Journal of Market Research	0.06	6.47	0.05	6.88	0.07	6.06
32	Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing	0.05	7.03	0.02	8.00	0.10	6.83
33	Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing	0.05	6.39	0.03	7.00	0.08	6.15
34	Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Mgmt	0.05	6.46	0.04	6.38	0.06	6.43
35	Marketing Management	0.05	7.07	0.05	6.50	0.05	7.50
36	Journal of Business Ethics	0.04	6.83	0.01	5.33	0.08	7.05
37	Journal of Economic Psychology	0.04	7.87	0.03	8.11	0.06	7.71
38	Journal of Services Marketing	0.04	6.55	0.03	7.13	0.06	6.21
39	Decision Sciences	0.03	7.89	0.04	7.58	0.03	8.43
40	Journal of Consumer Marketing	0.03	6.78	0.02	5.40	0.05	7.31
41	Business Horizons	0.03	7.18	0.03	6.75	0.04	7.56
42	AMA Summer/Winter Proceedings	0.03	8.47	0.02	9.00	0.04	8.20
43	Journal of Marketing Education	0.02	6.09	0.02	7.50	0.02	4.40
44	Journal of Global Marketing	0.02	6.90	0.01	7.00	0.02	6.83
45	Journal of Consumer Policy	0.02	6.89	0.02	6.83	0.01	8.00
46	Journal of Consumer Affairs	0.02	7.22	0.02	6.80	0.02	7.00
47	Journal of Business Logistics	0.01	8.14	0.01	8.00	0.02	8.25
48	Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice	0.01	6.20	0.01	3.00	0.01	8.33
49	Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing	0.01	8.20	0.01	9.00	0.01	7.67
50	Services Marketing Quarterly	0.01	5.25	0.01	3.00	0.01	7.50

TABLE 6
Segmented Analyses for Scholars in Various Subareas of Marketing:
Ordered as Ranked in the Overall Study Sample

Rank	Publication	Management/ Strategy (n=205)		Consumer Behavior (n=208)		International Marketing (n=47)		Channels/ Purchasing (n=55)		Marketing Research (n=59)	
		PFI 2007	IPI 2007	PFI 2007	IPI 2007	PFI 2007	IPI 2007	PFI 2007	IPI 2007	PFI 2007	IPI 2007
1	Journal of Marketing	1.00	2.33	0.91	3.39	1.00	2.41	1.00	2.45	0.93	3.54
2	Journal of Marketing Research	0.88	2.68	0.90	2.97	0.67	3.50	0.90	2.75	1.00	2.04
3	Journal of Consumer Research	0.77	4.48	1.00	2.11	0.46	4.28	0.57	4.04	0.85	4.93
4	Marketing Science	0.76	3.58	0.66	4.78	0.31	3.75	0.76	3.57	0.94	2.63
5	Journal of the Academy of Mktg Science	0.58	5.78	0.37	6.65	0.62	6.00	0.45	5.32	0.35	7.16
6	Harvard Business Review	0.63	5.60	0.28	6.52	0.69	5.48	0.61	6.83	0.33	7.67
7	Journal of Retailing	0.42	7.62	0.45	6.89	0.21	7.75	0.71	5.20	0.41	7.27
8	Management Science	0.51	4.83	0.39	5.97	0.15	6.00	0.55	4.81	0.74	4.55
9	Intl Journal of Research in Marketing	0.46	6.33	0.34	6.93	0.46	6.00	0.47	6.74	0.63	5.68
10	Journal of Consumer Psychology	0.19	7.15	0.75	4.79	0.13	6.00	0.16	6.88	0.22	8.17
11	Marketing Letters	0.32	7.33	0.42	7.74	0.13	7.80	0.31	7.67	0.57	7.10
12	Advances in Consumer Research	0.08	7.21	0.51	6.89	0.10	6.75	0.10	7.00	0.09	8.40
13	Journal of Business Research	0.23	7.08	0.18	7.06	0.38	7.27	0.24	6.25	0.15	7.38
14	Sloan Management Review	0.31	6.93	0.08	7.06	0.26	7.20	0.45	7.32	0.17	8.00
15	Journal of Advertising	0.17	7.07	0.29	6.98	0.15	7.00	0.08	8.25	0.17	8.00
16	European Journal of Marketing	0.20	6.66	0.16	6.09	0.46	7.00	0.24	6.17	0.09	5.40
17	Psychology and Marketing	0.07	8.67	0.38	7.59	0.05	7.00	0.04	10.00	0.09	8.80
18	Journal of Public Policy and Marketing	0.07	7.62	0.30	6.59	0.10	6.75	0.18	7.44	0.06	8.00
19	Journal of Service Research	0.17	7.30	0.10	7.63	0.03	9.00	0.06	6.00	0.19	6.60
20	Journal of Advertising Research	0.12	7.33	0.18	7.31	0.18	5.43	0.02	8.00	0.17	6.89
21	Journal of International Business Studies	0.15	6.52	0.05	7.56	0.77	4.03	0.16	7.25	0.07	8.00
22	Industrial Marketing Management	0.23	5.71	0.04	6.29	0.36	5.57	0.18	4.44	0.04	9.00
23	Journal of Product Innovation Management	0.28	5.98	0.02	6.67	0.23	7.33	0.10	6.60	0.15	6.75
24	California Management Review	0.23	7.18	0.04	5.71	0.18	7.71	0.24	7.08	–	–
25	Journal of Marketing Management	0.13	6.64	0.10	6.21	0.21	7.63	0.12	7.83	0.06	5.00
26	Journal of International Marketing	0.07	6.85	0.03	6.33	0.79	3.97	0.06	7.33	0.02	5.00
27	Journal of Interactive Marketing	0.09	7.81	0.05	7.40	–	–	0.14	8.71	0.20	6.64
28	International Marketing Review	0.06	6.60	0.01	9.00	0.59	5.83	0.04	7.50	0.04	7.50
29	Journal of Business	0.07	7.54	0.03	7.60	0.10	8.25	0.10	7.60	0.13	8.14
30	Quantitative Marketing and Economics	0.07	4.50	0.02	4.33	–	–	0.08	4.00	0.28	3.87
31	International Journal of Market Research	0.05	5.11	0.05	7.00	0.05	6.00	0.10	7.20	0.02	8.00
32	Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing	0.06	7.00	–	–	0.13	5.40	0.14	6.71	0.06	10.00
33	Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing	0.08	7.00	0.01	8.00	0.13	4.20	0.14	6.71	–	–
34	Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Mgmt	0.07	7.69	–	–	0.05	6.50	0.06	5.33	–	–
35	Marketing Management	0.10	6.61	0.01	5.00	0.10	7.50	0.04	10.00	–	–
36	Journal of Business Ethics	0.02	5.75	0.07	6.92	0.08	6.67	0.04	7.50	–	–
37	Journal of Economic Psychology	0.01	7.00	0.07	7.43	–	–	–	–	0.06	9.67
38	Journal of Services Marketing	0.05	7.56	0.01	6.00	0.05	4.50	–	–	–	–
39	Decision Sciences	0.02	7.50	0.02	8.00	–	–	0.08	6.50	0.11	9.00
40	Journal of Consumer Marketing	0.03	5.00	0.05	8.22	–	–	0.04	7.00	0.02	4.00
41	Business Horizons	0.06	7.73	0.01	3.00	0.03	6.00	0.04	8.50	–	–
42	AMA Summer/Winter Proceedings	0.03	7.60	0.02	9.00	0.10	9.25	–	–	0.02	8.00
43	Journal of Marketing Education	0.03	5.60	0.01	9.00	–	–	0.02	10.00	0.04	3.00
44	Journal of Global Marketing	0.01	6.50	0.01	5.00	0.15	7.67	–	–	–	–
45	Journal of Consumer Policy	0.01	10.00	0.04	6.88	–	–	–	–	–	–
46	Journal of Consumer Affairs	0.01	9.00	0.04	6.29	–	–	–	–	0.02	9.00
47	Journal of Business Logistics	–	–	0.01	10.00	0.03	8.00	0.10	7.80	–	–
48	Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice	0.01	8.00	0.01	4.00	–	–	–	–	–	–
49	Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Mktg	0.02	8.00	–	–	0.03	7.00	0.02	10.00	–	–
50	Services Marketing Quarterly	0.01	4.50	–	–	–	–	0.02	8.00	–	–

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, J. Scott and Terry S. Overton (1977), "Estimating Nonresponse Bias in Mail Surveys," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14 (August), 396-402.
- Bakir, Aysen, Scott J Vitell, and Gregory M. Rose (2000), "Publications in Major Marketing Journals: An Analysis of Scholars and Marketing Departments," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 22 (2), 99-107.
- Bartels, Robert (1988), *The History of Marketing Thought*, 3rd edition, Columbus, OH: Publishing Horizons, Inc.
- Bauerly, Ronald J. and Don T. Johnson (2005), "An Evaluation of Journals Use in Doctoral Marketing Programs," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 33 (3), 313-329.
- Baumgartner, Hans and Rik Pieters (2003), "The Structural Influence of Marketing Journals: A Citation Analysis of the Discipline and Its Subareas Over Time," *Journal of Marketing*, 67 (April), 123-139.
- Bettencourt, Lance A. and Mark B. Houston (2001a), "Reference Diversity in *JCR*, *JM*, and *JMR*: A Reexamination and Extension of Tellis, Chandy, and Ackerman (1999)," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (2), 313-323.
- Bettencourt, Lance A. and Mark B. Houston (2001b), "The Impact of Article Method Type and Subject Area on Article Citations and Reference Diversity in *JM*, *JMR*, and *JCR*," *Marketing Letters*, 12 (4), 327-341.
- Browne, William G. and Boris W. Becker (1985), "Perceptions of Marketing Journals: Awareness and Quality Evaluations," In *AMA Summer Educators' Proceedings*, Robert F. Lusch et al., Eds., Chicago, American Marketing Association, pp. 149-154.
- Browne, William G. and Boris W. Becker (1991), "A Longitudinal Study of Marketing Journal Familiarity and Quality," In *Enhancing Knowledge Development in Marketing*, Mary C. Gilly et al., Eds., pp. 702-710.
- Brown, Lawrence D. and Ronald J. Huefner (1994), "The Familiarity with the Perceived Quality of Accounting Journals: Views of Senior Accounting Faculty in Leading U.S. MBA Programs," *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 11 (1), 223-250.
- Cabell, David W. E. (2007), *Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Marketing*, Beaumont, TX: Cabell Publishing Company.
- Cheng, Louis T.W., Kam C. Chan, and Ricky Y. K. Chan (2003), "Publications in Major Marketing Journals: An Analysis of Research Productivity of Asia-Pacific Universities," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 25 (2), 163-176.
- Clark, Gary L. (1985), "Productivity Ratings of Institutions Based on Publication in Eight Marketing Journals: 1983-1984," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 7 (3), 12-23.
- Coe, Robert K. and Irwin Weinstock (1969), "Evaluating Journal Publication: Perceptions versus Reality," *AACSB Bulletin*, 6 (October), 1-3.
- Coe, Robert K. and Irwin Weinstock (1983), "Evaluating Journal Publications of Marketing Professors: A Second Look," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 5 (1), 37-42.
- Dillman, Don A. (2000), *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method* (2nd edition), New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Easton, G., and D. M. Easton (2003), "Marketing Journals and the Research Assessment Exercise," *Journal of Marketing Management*, 19 (1/2), 5-24.
- Fry, Elaine Hobbs, C. Glenn Walters, and Lawrence E. Scheuermann (1985), "Perceived Quality of Fifty Selected Journals: Academicians and Practitioners," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 13 (Spring), 352-361.
- Ganesh, G. K., P.R. Chandy, and G.V. Henderson (1990), "Awareness and Evaluation of Selected Marketing Journals Inside and Outside the Discipline: An Empirical Study," *Akron Business and Economic Review*, 21 (4), 93-102.
- Gordon Peter J. and Kenneth A. Heischmidt (1992), "Evaluation of Marketing Publications: Some New Findings," In *Enhancing Knowledge Development in Marketing*, Volume 3, Robert P. Leone and V. Kumar, Eds., Chicago: American Marketing Association, pp. 318-319.
- Hasselback, James R. (1995), *Wiley Guide to Marketing Faculty*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hasselback, James R. (2005), *Marketing Faculty Directory 2004-2005*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Hawes, Jon M. and Bruce D. Keillor (2002), "Assessing Marketing Journals: A Mission-Based Approach," *Journal of the Academy of Business Education*, 3 (Fall), 70-86.
- Heischmidt, Kenneth A. and Peter Gordon (1993), "Rating Marketing Publications: Impact of Accreditation and Publication History," *Journal of Education for Business*, 68 (3), 152-158.
- Helm, Amanda E., David Hunt, and Mark B. Houston (2003), "Citation Frequency of Research Published in the Top Three Marketing Journals: Ranking the Impact of Articles, Scholars, and Institutions," *AMA Summer Educators' Conference Proceedings*, pp. 198-208.
- Henthorne, Tony L., Michael S. LaTour, and Tina Loraas (1998), "Publication Productivity in Three Leading U.S. Advertising Journals: 1989 through 1996," *Journal of Advertising*, 27 (2), 53-63.
- Hetzel, Patrick (2000), "Where Are We Going? Perceptions of French Marketing Academics," *Journal of Marketing Management*, 16 (7), 717-44.
- Hult, G. Tomas M. and James R. Hasselback (1998), "A Report of Gender and Professional Age of the Marketing Professorate," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 20 (1), 35-40.
- Hult, G. Tomas M., William T. Neese, and R. Edward Bashaw (1997), "Faculty Perceptions of Marketing Journals," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 19 (1), 37-52.
- Jobber, David and Paul Simpson (1988), "A Citation Analysis of Selected Marketing Journals," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 5 (2), 137-142.
- Jones, M.J., T. Brinn, and M. Pendlebury (1996), "Journal Evaluation Methodologies: A Balanced Response," *Omega, International Journal of Management Science*, 24 (5), 607-612.
- Koojaroenprasit, Narong, Art Weinstein, William C. Johnson, and David O. Remington (1998), "Marketing Journal Rankings Revisited: Research Findings and Academic Implications," *Marketing Education Review*, 8 (1), 95-102.
- Kotler, Philip (1972), "A Generic Concept of Marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, 36 (April), 46-54.
- Lehman, Donald R. (2005), "Journal Evolution and the Development of Marketing," *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 24 (1), 137-139.
- Leong, Siew Meng (1989), "A Citation Analysis of the *Journal of Consumer Research*," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15 (March), 492-497.
- Luke, Robert H. and E. Reed Doke (1987), "Marketing Journal Hierarchies: Faculty Perceptions, 1986-1987," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 15 (1), 74-78.
- MacRoberts, Michael H. and Barbara R. MacRoberts (1989), "Problems of citation analysis: A critical review," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 40 (September), 342-349.
- Mort, Gillian Sullivan, Janet R. McColl-Kennedy, Geoffrey Kiel, and Geoffrey N. Soutar (2004), "Australian and New Zealand Senior Academics' Perceptions of Marketing Journals," *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 12 (2), 51-61.
- Niemi, Albert W., Jr. (1988), "Publication Performance of Marketing Departments,, 1975-1985," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 10 (2), 8-12.
- Page, Christine and Jakki J. Mohr (1995), "Individual and Institutional Productivity in Marketing: Publishing in the Top Three Marketing Journals, 1989-1993," In *Marketing Theory and Applications*, David W. Stewart and Naufel J. Vilcassim, Eds., Chicago: American Marketing Association, pp. 417-424.
- Pecotich, Anthony, James E. Everett, David Jobber, and Paul Simpson (1989), "An Extension of the Citation Analysis of Selected Marketing Journals," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 6 (3), 199-205.
- Pieters, Rik, Hans Baumgartner, Jeroen Vermunt, and Tammo Bijmolt (1999), "Importance and Similarity in the Evolving Citation Network of the *International Journal of Research in Marketing*," *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 16 (June), 113-1127.
- Polonsky, Michael J. (2004), "Journal Rankings: Does One Size Fit All?" *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 12 (2), 64-70.
- Polonsky, Michael Jay, Gary Jones, and Megan J. Kearsley (1999), "Accessibility: An Alternative Method of Ranking Marketing Journals," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 21 (3), 181-193.
- Polonsky, Michael J. and Paul Whitelaw (2005), "What Are We Measuring When We Evaluate Journals?" *Journal of Marketing Education*, 27 (2), 189-201.

Shugan, Steven M. (2003), "Editorial: Journal Rankings: Save the Outlets for Your Research," *Marketing Science*, 22 (4), 437-441.

Spake, Deborah F. and Susan K. Harmon (1997), "Assessing Productivity Based on Publication in the Top Four Marketing Journals, 1990-1996: A Multiple Method Approach," In *Enhancing Knowledge Development in Marketing*, William M. Pride and G. Tomas M. Hult, Eds., Chicago: American Marketing Association, pp. 191-198.

Spake, Deborah F. and Susan K. Harmon (1998), "Institutional and Individual Research Productivity: A Comparison of Alternative Approaches," *Marketing Education Review*, 8 (Fall), 67-77.

Tellis, Gerard J., Rajesh K. Chandy, and David S. Ackerman (1999), "In Search of Diversity: The Record of Major Marketing Journals," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36 (February), 120-131.

Theoharakis, Vasilis and Andrew Hirst (2002), "Perceptual Differences of Marketing Journals: A Worldwide Perspective," *Marketing Letters*, 13 (4), 389-402.

Uncles, Mark D. (2004), "Journal Rankings: How Much Credence Should We Give Them?," *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 12 (2), 67-72.

Vernon, Raymond (1966), "International Investment and International Trade in the Product Life Cycle," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 80 (2), 190-207.

Zinkhan, George M. (2004), "Assessing Academic Research through an E-Database: Issues of Journal Quality and Knowledge Use," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32 (4), 369-370.

Zinkhan, George M. and Thomas W. Leigh (1999), "Assessing the Quality Ranking of the *Journal of Advertising*, 1986-1997," *Journal of Advertising*, 28 (2), 51-70.

Zinkhan, George M., Martin S. Roth, and Mary Jane Saxton (1992), "Knowledge Development and Scientific Status in Consumer-Behavior Research: A Social Exchange Perspective," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19 (September), 282-291.

