The current issue and full text archive of this journal is available at
www.emeraldinsight.com/0263-4503.htm

Received March 2006
Revised February 2007
Accepted February 2007

POINT OF VIEW

Ethnocentricity in academic marketing journals

A study of authors, reviewers, editorial boards and editors

Göran Svensson
Oslo School of Management, Norway, and
Greg Wood
Bowater School of Management and Marketing, Deakin University, Australia

Abstract

Purpose – This paper aims to examine and compare a set of key characteristics of ethnocentricity that influence the policy of academic marketing journals, and hence the provenance, authorship and nature of articles in academic marketing journals.

Design/methodology/approach – The "fundamental" characteristics of three major marketing journals, published in the USA, the UK and New Zealand, were examined for the six-year period from the start of 2000 to the end of 2006. Data were collected from editorials and web homepages. Analysis was conducted of 811 articles, 1,676 authors, three editorial teams and three sets of reviewers.

Findings – There is a challenging academic ethnocentricity in the management and implied policy of the three journals. The extent varies, but the inescapable conclusion is that the world-wide research community in marketing is not properly represented by leading journals.

Research limitations/implications – The sample was intentionally small, and unrepresentative of any category except "leading quality". The findings are intended to add momentum to a debate and point ways forward, not to provide generalisable answers.

Practical implications – The findings suggest that: the editorial boards and reviewing teams should be made more representative geographically; editorships should be organized around the concept of a team of geographically differentiated editors; editorial and review teams should be ethnographically representative of individuals who do research and wish to publish it, particularly beyond the English-speaking world. In general, the world-wide research community in marketing would benefit from less ethnocentricity in academic journals, and these leading examples should strive to reduce it.

Originality/value – The impact of ethnocentricity is underestimated in this context. The issue needs to be discussed, because of paradigmatic influences that it can have on a journal and the profile of its authors, and hence on journal ranking and perceptions of journal quality.

Keywords Journals, Marketing, Ethnocentrism, Geography, Publishing

Paper type Viewpoint

A note on the geographical terminology

In this paper, geographical data are broken down to the level of "continents" rather than countries. The following definitions are taken from www.wordnet.princeton.edu. Asia is the largest continent, with 60 per cent of the earth's population; it contains countries south of Russia, from the Middle East to Japan. Australasia comprises

Marketing Intelligence & Planning
Vol. 25 No. 3, 2007
pp. 252-270
© Emerald Group Publishing Limited
0263-4503
DOI 10.1108/02634500710747770

www.mana

Australia, New Zealand and the neighbouring islands in the South Pacific. Africa is the second largest continent, comprising all countries south of the Mediterranean. North America is a continent that contains Canada, the USA, Mexico, Greenland, Bermuda and St Pierre-et-Miquelon. South America contains all countries south of Central America, which links Mexico with Colombia to complete "The Americas". Central and South America together are often called "Latin America" by virtue of being largely Spanish-speaking. Europe is the second smallest continent, technically the western part of "Eurasia" stretching from the British Isles and Iceland in the west to the Caucasus in the east.

Introduction

Academic journals serve as a communicative interface between scholars in the field of a research discipline, such as researchers, lecturers and students. They are also designed to a greater or lesser extent as a communicative channel for scholars to reach such practitioners as executives, managers and consultants or vice versa. Academic journals are also the window through which other research disciplines and their research communities observe the current state of the art in marketing.

The discussion of the characteristics of academic journals has been in progress for more than three decades in the field of economics (Hawkins *et al.*, 1973; Danielsen and Delorme, 1976) and for about two in marketing (Jobber and Simpson, 1988; Luke and Doke, 1987; Fry *et al.*, 1985). In fact, this paper is an extension of a viewpoint on a similar topic in *Marketing and Intelligence & Planning* (Svensson, 2005).

Kim (1991) and Mason *et al.* (1997) remark that two principal characteristics have been used to evaluate and compare academic journals: one based on citations (Jobber and Simpson, 1988; Baumgartner and Pieters, 2003) and the other on perceptions (Luke and Doke, 1987). Polonsky *et al.* (1999) base their comparisons upon accessibility. Czinkota (2000), Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft (2005) and Svensson (2005) examine the author affiliations in key academic marketing journals. Day and Peters (1994) use a variety of characteristics, and provide an extensive review of practice based upon the quality indicators used by journal publishers. Most recently, Svensson (2006) has examined the methodological and data collection characteristics of top marketing journals.

Consequently, the literature addresses different characteristics in evaluation and comparison of journals. For example, most authors describe ranking lists (Hawes and Keiller, 2002), but others have noted that the characteristics making up these rankings contain ambiguities (Uncles, 2004; Polonsky, 2004). So far, the examined and compared characteristics have rarely included the underlying ethnocentricity of academic marketing journals (Czinkota, 2000; Svensson, 2005), as expressed in the number and geographical location of editors, editorial boards, reviewers and authors. Rice and Stankus (1983) and Parnell (1997) refer to these as the "fundamentals" of journals. The issue of ethnocentricity can be crucial, as academic marketing journals are in a sense made up of the people who manage them and contribute to them, who will naturally bring certain pre-determined world views to not only the discipline, but also to the "accepted body of knowledge" within that discipline.

The impact of ethnocentricity may well be underestimated in the examination and comparison of journals in our field. We contend that this is an important issue which needs to be raised and discussed in the literature, because of the paradigmatic

www.mana

influences that ethnicity among editors, editorial boards, reviewers and authors may have on a journal and its characteristics, and in turn on its perceived rank and quality. Our objective is to compare the "fundamentals" of selection of marketing journals, by examining the affiliations of their editors, review boards, reviewers and authors.

Frame of reference

In this section, we present a frame of reference that underpins our examination and comparison of academic marketing journals.

Number of marketing journals

During the last few decades, the number of marketing journals has continuously increased (Baumgartner and Pieters, 2003); Cabell (1998) has listed more than 550. One reason for the increase is that they have become specialised into sub-disciplines or sub-areas (Malhotra, 1999; Baumgartner and Pieters, 2003). Another is the need among scholars to publish their research (Moxley, 1992). Mort *et al.* (2004) observe that publishing in journals is the standard route by which academics communicate their research. In consequence, a series of books has been published to facilitate publication by providing guidelines for authors (Day, 1996; Rozakis, 1999; Booth *et al.*, 2003; Lester and Lester, 2005). In addition, Day and Peters (1994) discuss the quality indicators used by academic publishers. The focus of the research reported in this paper is the peer-reviewed academic marketing journal.

Fundamentals of journals

The evaluation of a research discipline's journals may be based on many different characteristics (Rice and Stankus, 1983; Beed and Beed, 1996; Jones *et al.*, 1994; Parnell, 1997; Zinkhan and Leigh, 1999; Hawes and Keiller, 2002). For example, Parnell offers a taxonomy of journal quality based upon expert opinion surveys, citation counts or a combination of both. More then 20 years ago, Rice and Stankus took a wider selection of characteristics into account: citation analysis (e.g. *Social Sciences Citation Index*), acceptance rate (e.g. *Cabell's Directory*), sponsorship (e.g. American Marketing Association), editorial objective (e.g. methodological approaches and readership) and "fundamentals" of the journal (e.g. affiliations of authors, editor and review board). This last factor was of particular interest in our research study, in the form of the "ethnocentric characteristics" of a journal (Czinkota, 2000; Svensson, 2005), because that is an under-investigated attribute which could be strongly argued to have a more significant impact on the "knowledge" that is published than it might appear to at first sight.

Content of journals

Hawes and Keiller (2002) assert that higher status is usually attributed to journals which publish articles that are theoretical, scholar-oriented, highly quantitative or technical in nature. Evaluations are often based upon single-item measures, such as perception (Luke and Doke, 1987) or citation (Jobber and Simpson, 1988). There is an ongoing discussion of how marketing journals are perceived, and how they have been ranked by different sources (Clark, 1985; Niemi, 1988; Petry and Settle, 1988; Ganesh *et al.*, 1990; Fields and Swayne, 1991; Pol, 1991; Spake and Harmon, 1998; Bakir *et al.*, 2000; Trieschmann *et al.*, 2000).

المنارة للاستشارات

www.mana

The dilemma is that the focus appears to be too centred on the perceived rank and quality of selected academics, rather than on the knowledge communicated in published articles. Interestingly, Armstrong (2004) argues that research papers in academic marketing journals, to a large extent, do not provide useful knowledge. Crosier (2005) raises the issue of the stated intention of editorial boards to communicate "useful learning" to practitioners, but notes that in many cases this desire may just be that: always no more than a hope, as the focus of many has become to be scholarly for the sake of their self-perceived value, rather than to be enlightening for practitioners. McKenzie *et al.* (2002) conclude that published articles by marketing faculty do not gain the readership of practitioners.

We believe that this conclusion is no surprise, because the lack of interest and understanding from practitioners may be derived from a publication process governed by academic characteristics as defined and determined by the editors, the editorial boards, the reviewers and the authors constructing the journals. Of course there always will be exceptions to this assertion. "Crossover" journals that succeed in bridging this divide in the marketing discipline are *Admap*, the *International Journal of Market Research*, the *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management* and *Industrial Marketing Management*, and *Marketing Intelligence & Planning* itself (by no means and exhaustive list). In the broader business arena, there are of course, the *Harvard Business Review* and *Management Today*, plus such titles as *Long Range Planning*, *Business Horizons* and the *European Management Journal*.

Nevertheless, November (2004) provides seven reasons why marketing practitioners should ignore academic research in marketing, namely: they are not the targeted customers; they tend to use their own personal practice as a frame of reference; they will not appreciate the dangers inherent in studying small parts of systems; they might be deluded into making conclusions that are poorly substantiated in reality; a few generalisations only corroborate what practitioners already know; research sometimes makes false or misleading statements about causality; and its truth-value is highly questionable. Furthermore, the outcome of research is affected by the non-response rate, and the generalisability of the sample and the subsequent findings (Blair and Zinkhan, 2006).

Listings of journals

There are numerous lists based upon the perceptions of journal quality (Enomoto, 1993; Hult *et al.*, 1997; Nisonger, 1999; DuBois, 2000; Trieschmann *et al.*, 2000; Van Fleet *et al.*, 2000; Mylonopoulos and Theoharakis, 2001). Informal lists are also used in business schools (Brumbaugh, 2002). The access to formal lists appears to be important when research is evaluated (Hult *et al.*, 1997; Theoharakis and Hirst, 2002; Van Fleet *et al.*, 2000), as academics in the UK and Australia, for example, are being urged to publish in "higher quality" journals. This perceived need is driven in the USA and Australia by the desire to achieve "tenure". The process that is formalised in many countries by government directives and protocols that rank universities and groups of constituent departments in "league tables" based upon performance indicators that include publication. A prerequisite of academic survival for individual academics is thus to be published in these "anointed" journals. The question is, how does one recognise those higher quality journals, and does it follow that they necessarily communicate higher-quality research?

المنارة للاستشارات

www.mana

There has been much discussion of league tables of marketing journals in the literature over the years (Hult *et al.*, 1997; Theoharakis and Hirst, 2002; Mort *et al.*, 2004). It shows that most efforts to rank marketing journals have stemmed from North America (Fry *et al.*, 1985; Luke and Doke, 1987; Hult *et al.*, 1997), a few have been developed in the Asia-Pacific region (Polonsky and Waller, 1993; Polonsky *et al.*, 1999; Mort *et al.*, 2004), one has focused on the UK (Easton and Easton, 2003). There has been only one world-wide survey, by Theoharakis and Hirst (2002).

Approaches to evaluation

Among the numerous attempts at evaluation, ranking and rating (Hawes and Keiller, 2002), a few principal approaches recur. One is based upon citation analyses (Baumgartner and Pieters, 2003; Jobber and Simpson, 1988), which are often interpreted as being unbiased and a true reflection of rank. However, it can be argued that this approach may bias the evaluation. Nobes (1985) observes that journals from some regions may be omitted from the data. Day and Peters (1994) argue that the conventional citation index is dangerously flawed in that it is heavily biased towards high circulation journals, suffers from a single-item syndrome, and therefore, does not correlate directly with quality *per se*. There is also the question of time lag (Jobber and Simpson, 1988). In addition, databases tend be restricted to a selection of journals and thereby exclude others that might change the result (Neway and Lancaster, 1983), such as those published in languages other than English. Uncles (2004) identifies imperfections arising from three "problems": journal selection, respondent familiarity and respondent confusion.

An alternative approach to the compilation of ranking tables is based upon perceptual evaluations (Luke and Doke, 1987), which may also be biased for any number of reasons. The objective of the evaluation may have an impact (Polonsky and Waller, 1993). More specifically, rankings may be influenced by regional variations (Danielsen and Delorme, 1976; Theoharakis and Hirst, 2002) or by institutional and individual demographics (Hult *et al.*, 1997). They may focus on leading institutions (Theoharakis and Hirst, 2002) or on leading figures within schools and departments (Mort *et al.*, 2004). The focus of a particular journal may influence its ranking (Danielsen and Delorme, 1976; Hawkins *et al.*, 1973).

To sum up this section, Polonsky (2004) raises three fundamental questions: why rank journals? How should journals be evaluated? To what extent are aspirations met?

Aggregated comparisons

The separate "league tables" discussed so far have been aggregated into meta-rankings. For example, Harzing (2006) compiles "journal quality" lists that are updated periodically. The current table ranks 861 journals by 16 criteria, collating lists from a variety of sources. It applies a top-down approach, in which one overall criterion (that is, a single-item measure) usually underpins each constituent list.

By contrast, Emerald (2005) took a bottom-up approach, in which several criteria (that is, a multi-item measure) underpinned the compilation of four separate lists ranking over 400 world-wide journals across a range of disciplines, including marketing. Every article in each issue of all journals was independently reviewed with respect to four criteria: research implications, practical implications, originality and readability. The reviewers' star-ratings were converted to scores and combined into

المنارة للاستشارات

www.mana

four annual average scores for each journal. This unique approach was discontinued at the end of 2004, in the face of concerns from some quarters that the articles reviewed in this way had already been reviewed and accepted for publication in the conventional way. If they had already been judged to be of acceptable academic quality, why review them again and then rank them?

Methodology

Formal evaluation and comparison of marketing journals varies according to the characteristics measured. Polonsky and Waller (1993), Polonsky *et al.* (1999) and Hawes and Keiller (2002) note that the measures are frequently single-item. We contend that this is a major dilemma in the field of journal evaluations. Little is known about the aggregated ethnocentricity of academic marketing journals, in terms of their editors, editorial boards, reviewers and authors. In this study, university affiliation has been used as a proxy for geographical location, and hence for ethnicity. It is important to recognise that the geographical location of editors and reviewers will not necessarily correspond to their nationality or citizenship, but we argue that it does give an indication of the academic and cultural paradigm within which they work, and upon which they will make their judgments of worth. In other areas of marketing research, ethnocentricity is a natural part of the examination of research characteristics, and is an underlying foundation of comparisons. In this case, it may be part of the explanation of other characteristics of academic marketing journals, such as research designs, research questions, methodological issues and data collection procedures. Therefore, our research objective was to examine the aggregated characteristics of ethnocentricity in a selection of academic marketing journals.

Our research sample is restricted to three academic marketing journals during a six-year period. The titles were chosen to represent the ethnocentric marketing research communities located in Australasia, Europe and North America. They are the *Australasian Marketing Journal* (*AMJ*), the *European Journal of Marketing* (*EJM*) and the *Journal of Marketing* (*JM*), generally perceived to be the major journals in the discipline in those continents. This judgment is obviously debateable, but seems not unreasonable.

We have chosen to focus on the various characteristics of academic marketing journals that have been used in most of the previous research studies reported in the literature, as summarised in Table I. We define these collectively as descriptors of the "ethnocentricity" of the three journals (as distinct from the straightforward ethnic profiles of the people who contribute to them in one way or another). Characteristics such as citations, perceptions, accessibility, measured in other studies, do not describe the actual ethnocentricity of a journal, but represent merely superficial and aggregate measures. We have thus deliberately restricted our examination and comparison to a selection of research variables that collectively describe ethnocentricity. Within the journals, an item qualifies as an "article" if it reports research, reviews a literature, offers a synoptic review of an issue or topic, presents a conceptual argument, reviews a book, or offers a commentary.

Data relating to the editorial mission of the selected journals were collected from their internet home pages, supplemented by information requested from the editors. An initial browsing yielded initial insights, and provided the basis for the time frame for the data collection, which was issues published between beginning of 2000 and the

www.mana

Journal article	Journal title
a) journal title b) year of publication (i.e. volume) c) issue of publication (i.e. number) d) number of authors per journal article e) geographical location of author affiliation(s) per journal article	f) number of current editors g) geographical location of affiliation of current editor(s) h) number of previous editors i) geographical location of affiliation of previous editor(s) j) number of members of editorial review board k) geographical location of affiliation of member of editorial review board l) number of *ad hoc* reviewers m) geographical location of affiliation of *ad hoc* reviewers

Table I.
Research variables

end of 2005. Every article in those issues was classified by reference to the categories in Table I. The data were quantified, and used in cross-tabulations of journal characteristics against geographical location an affiliations of authors. In total, this analysis took in 811 articles.

Tentatively, the resulting empirical evidence of ethnocentricity may be indicative of the characteristics of other academic journals in the field of marketing. The three titles investigated were chosen as leading exemplars, but are not necessarily different in any particular sense from the typical academic marketing journal. Indeed, they may be quite representative of the majority, if not of all others.

Findings

The findings of our analysis of 811 articles in three journals over a six-year period are summarised in Tables II-XI.

Total number of authors

Table II shows that 1,676 authors were involved in writing the 811 articles, meaning that the co-authorship was the norm, rather than solo or multiple. Articles by one and two authors accounted for roughly a third of the total each (32.3 and 36.6 per cent). Exactly a quarter had three authors. All articles written by more than three collaborators amounted to only 6 per cent of the total, the largest number being seven in one case.

Number of authors	Number of articles	Number of authors	Percentage of articles
1	262	262	32.3
2	297	594	36.6
3	203	609	25.0
4	39	156	4.8
5	6	30	0.7
6	3	18	0.4
7	1	7	0.1
Total	811	1,676	100.0

Table II.
Total number of articles and authors in the sample

www.mana

Overall geographical distribution of authors

Table III shows that almost half of the 811 articles (i.e. 44.6 per cent) had at least one author based in Europe. Those with at least one based in North America accounted for 40 per cent of the total, and those emanating from Australasia for another quarter of the total. There was then a wide gap before the 7 per cent contributed by authors based in Asia. Africa and South America contributed only five authors all told, out of 1,676. The dominance of Europe and North America, with and 85 per cent share of authorship between them is a striking feature of Table III, perhaps worrying, as is the negligible contribution from the second-world countries of Africa and, especially, South America. In the latter case, language is the obvious explanation. Clearly, the worldwide research community is not represented satisfactorily.

Location of authors by article

Table IV links the data in Tables II and III. It shows that all authors are based in the same geographical location (though not necessarily the same institution) in as many as 85 per cent of all cases. In other words, the vast majority of articles published over the six year in those three major journals show no evidence of cross-cultural collaboration at all. Homogeneous European and North American contributions account for around a third of the total, each, and a further one in six is the product of an all-Australasian collaboration. All-Asian teams wrote 25 of the 811 articles. The one South American author had written alone, while all of those based in Africa had collaborated with others elsewhere. These data confirm the general finding of Table III, that the provenance of articles in these three journals is highly skewed geographically.

Intercontinental collaboration

Table V shows that 690 articles had a homogeneous authorship – that is, all authors were based in the same one of the six continents – leaving only 121 articles exhibiting international collaboration, with the proviso that the European Union consists of 25 countries and the notion of "Europe" embraces some 30 nationalities. Of that minority, 96 per cent cross only one boundary, the remaining 4 per cent representing only five articles altogether. Only five (i.e. 4.1 per cent) have three or more different geographical locations of author affiliations (i.e. 121-116).

The increasingly familiar proportion of about a third of the total is accounted for by a "dual mix" of authors based in North American and European author affiliations. North American collaborations with authors in Australasia and Asia account for a further 13 and 12 per cent, respectively. Europe-based authors collaborated with

Author affiliation	Number of articles	Percentage of articles[a]
Africa	5	0.6
Asia	57	7.0
Australia	185	22.8
Europe	362	44.6
North America	327	40.3
South America	1	0.1
Total	937	

Note: [a]Base = 811 articles

Table III.
Geographical provenance of articles

www.mana

Author affiliation	Relative geographical location of authors per article[a]							
	100 (per cent)	75 (per cent)	67 (per cent)	60 (per cent)	50 (per cent)	33 (per cent)	25 (per cent)	20 (per cent)
Africa	1 (0.1)	–	–	–	2 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	–	–
Asia	25 (3.1)	–	3 (0.4)	1 (0.1)	16 (2.0)	8 (1.0)	4 (0.5)	–
Australia	133 (16.4)	2 (0.2)	15 (1.8)	–	24 (3.0)	9 (1.1)	2 (0.2)	–
Europe	282 (34.8)	3 (0.4)	18 (2.2)	–	38 (4.7)	17 (2.1)	3 (0.4)	1 (0.1)
North America	249 (30.7)	2 (0.2)	15 (1.8)	–	38 (4.7)	18 (2.2)	4 (0.5)	1(0.1)
South America	–	–	–	–	1 (0.1)	–	–	–
Total	690 (85.1)	7 (0.9)	51 (6.3)	1 (0.1)	119 (14.7)	54 (6.7)	13 (1.6)	2 (0.2)

Notes: [a]Number of single or multiple affiliations and percentages of 811 articles; figures in parentheses are in percentage

Table IV.
Geographical location of authors, by article

المنارة للاستشارات

www.mana

Geographical location of dual authorships Author affiliation	Africa	Asia	Australia	Europe	North America	South America	Total[a]
Africa		– (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	2 (2)	– (0)	4
Asia	– (1)		7 (8)	7 (10)	14 (18)	– (1)	28
Australia	1 (1)	7 (8)		26 (27)	16 (18)	– (1)	50
Europe	1 (1)	7 (10)	26 (27)		41 (45)	1 (1)	76
North America	2 (2)	14 (18)	16 (18)	41 (45)		– (0)	73
South America	– (0)	– (1)	– (1)	1 (1)	– (0)		1
Count of three of more geographical locations							5
Total[a]	4	28	50	76	73	1	116/121

Notes: [a]Number of authors per article divided by two, with total number of mixed geographical locations in parentheses

Table V.
International collaboration

Journal	Number of authors per article 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Australasian Marketing Journal	50 (43.9)	37 (32.5)	21 (18.4)	6 (5.3)	–	–	–	114
European Journal of Marketing	158 (34.9)	166 (36.6)	100 (22.1)	21 (4.9)	4 (0.9)	3 (0.7)	1 (0.2)	453
Journal of Marketing	54 (22.1)	94 (38.5)	82 (33.6)	12 (4.9)	2 (0.8)	–	–	244
Total	262 (32.3)	297 (36.6)	203 (25.0)	39 (4.8)	6 (0.7)	3 (0.4)	1 (0.1)	811(100)

Table VI.
Number of authors per article, by journal

Journal	Shared geographical location of author per article[a] Africa	Asia	Australia	Europe	North America	South America	Total
Australasian Marketing Journal	–	2 (1.8)	80 (70.2)	16 (14.0)	8 (7.0)	–	106 (93.0)
European Journal of Marketing	1 (0.2)	20 (4.4)	53 (11.7)	256 (56.5)	45 (9.9)	–	375 (82.8)
Journal of Marketing	–	3 (1.2)	–	10 (4.1)	196 (80.3)	–	209 (85.7)
Total[b]	1 (0.1)	25 (3.1)	133 (16.4)	282 (34.8)	249 (30.7)	0	690 (85.1)

Notes: [a]Bases = *AMJ*, 114; *EJM*, 453; *JM*, 244); [b]base = 811

Table VII.
Homogeneity of multiple authorship

co-authors in Australasia (22 per cent) and Asia (6 per cent). Seven articles represented European-Asian collaboration and another were European-African co-productions. All other combinations were very rare, perhaps surprisingly including both North-South America and Australasia-Asia. Collaboration across three or more continents is negligible.

Associations among authors in North America, Australasia and Europe dominate, collectively accounting for more than two thirds of all cases. This finding, in combination with rarity of collaboration in the Americas or between Australasia and

www.mana

Table VIII.
Location of authors, by journal

Journal	Relative geographical location of authors: Africa	Asia	Australia	Europe	North America	South America	Total[a]
Australasian Marketing Journal	1 (0.9)	7 (6.1)	93 (81.6)	17 (14.9)	10 (8.8)	–	114
European Journal of Marketing	4 (0.9)	42 (9.3)	88 (19.4)	309 (68.2)	92 (20.3)	1 (0.2)	453
Journal of Marketing	–	8 (3.3)	4 (1.6)	36 (14.8)	225 (92.2)	–	244
Total	5	57	185	362	327	1	937/811

Note: [a]Number of articles in each journal

Table IX.
Location of editors

Journal	Editors
Australasian Marketing Journal	Two in Australia
European Journal of Marketing	Two in Europe
Journal of Marketing	One in the USA

Table X.
Location of editorial boards

Journal	Geographical location of editorial board members: Africa	Asia	Australia	Europe	North America	South America	Total
American Markenting Journal	–	8 (19.5)	28 (68.3)	2 (4.9)	3 (7.3)	–	41
European Journal of Marketing	–	2 (3.1)	9 (13.8)	46 (70.8)	8 (12.3)	–	65
Journal of Marketing	–	–	2 (2.3)	8 (9.1)	78 (88.6)	–	88
Total	0	10	39	56	89	0	194

Table XI.
Location of reviewers

Geographical location	Number and percentage of reviewers: *AMJ* (per centage)	*EJM* (per centage)[a]	*JM* (per centage)
Africa	–	–	–
Asia	–	10.0	7 (2.3)
Australia	21 (67.8)	15.0	7 (2.3)
Europe	5 (16.1)	65.0	23 (7.7)
North America	5 (16.1)	15.0	263 (87.7)
South America	–	–	–
Total	31 (100)	(100)	300 (100)

Note: [a]Percentages provided by *EJM*

المنارة للاستشارات

www.mana

Asia, suggests that language both motivates and inhibits co-authorship, at the required level of academic rigour. One hopes that is so, rather than that paradigmatic views and common cultural research values are predicated upon a cultural chauvinism amongst a community of scholars which excludes other academic traditions and viewpoints.

Number of authors per article

Table VI shows that the ratio of solo to dual and multiple authorship varied among the three journals studied over the six-year period. Articles by single authors accounted for fewer than half of the totals in all three journals over the period of the study. The proportion was highest in the *AMJ*, at 44 per cent of the total, followed by the *EJM* at 35 per cent. The *JM* was the least likely to include sole-authored articles. The differences were much smaller with respect to multiple authorship, with one exception: the *JM* contained almost twice as many cases of triple authorship as the *AMJ*, at 34 per cent versus 18 per cent. An intriguing pattern emerged in the subset of articles with more than four authors. The *AJM* published none, the *JM* sub-sample included one with five authors, but no fewer than eight articles in the EJM had been written jointly by between 5 and 7. Though interesting, these findings suggest no obvious explanations.

Homogeneity of multiple authorship

Table VII shows that by far the most usual pattern in multiple authorship was for all collaborators to come from the same geographical location, with the proviso as before that Europe is uniquely more diverse among the main sources of published articles in terms of the number of languages and cultures it embraces. For example, 93 per cent of the articles in the *AMJ* were by authors based in Asia. The proportions in the *JM* and *EJM* were 86 and 83 per cent, respectively.

Unsurprisingly, four out of every five articles in the *JM* were contributed by individuals or teams based in North American author affiliations. All-European and all-Asian combinations accounted together for only 5 per cent of the total, and no articles were the product of homogeneous groups of collaborators from any of the other continents. In the case of the *EJM*, more than half of all multiple-authored articles were all-European collaborations, one in eight was all-Australasian, and one in ten was written by authors all based in the USA. A total of 20 articles had been contributed by all-Asian teams of authors, but that is less than 5 per cent of the sub-sample total. The only other example was one all-African article. Of the 114 multiple-authorship articles in the *AMJ* sub-sample, 70 per cent were all-Australasian collaborations and 14 per cent all-European. Of the remainder, eight articles had been contributed by all-American writing teams, and two were all-Asian.

These findings point to particularly strong ethnocentricity in the *JM*, compared with its European and Australasian counterparts.

Location of authors by journal

Table VIII analyses the geographical location of authorship in aggregate, whether solo, dual or multiple. There is again a conspicuous divergence among the three journals surveyed.

In the *JM*, the authorship of 92 per cent of 244 articles contained at least one author based in North America. Europe-based authors figured in 15 per cent of all cases,

المنارة للاستشارات

www.mana

but those based in Asia and Australasia collectively accounted for only 5 per cent of the total. In the *AMJ*, authorship of 82 per cent of 114 included at least one author based in Australasia. The 15 per cent of all cases including at least one author from Europe exactly mirrors their comparative presence in the *JM*. The proportions of authors from other geographical locations are a little higher than in the *JM*, but there were still only 9 and 6 per cent based, respectively, in North America and Asia. In the *EJM*, the proportion of "domestic" authorship, as it were, is the lowest of the three, at only just over two thirds. On the other hand, the proportions of authors based outside the journal's home country are notably higher. The authorship of one in five of all articles included at least one based in North America or Australasia, and an author based in Asia figured in one in ten.

In all three journals, the contribution of authors from Africa and South America was negligible over the period of the study.

Location of editors

Table IX analyses the geographical location of the editors of the three journals during the period of the study. Country of residence does not necessarily correspond to nationality, but it is a reasonable that people of this seniority in their field will at the least have accommodated to the culture in which they are working, and will very probably have been significantly affected by it. In all three cases, the editor is located in the country in which the journal is published, which is in turn included in the corresponding continental group used as the basis for disaggregation in this study. Thus, the editor of the *AMJ*, which is the official journal of the Australia and New Zealand Marketing Academy is based at a university in New Zealand. The two editors of the *EJM* are both based in the United Kingdom, a member state of the European Union. Editors of the *JM*, which is the official journal of the American Marketing Association have been based in American universities throughout its long history.

Location of editorial boards

During the period of the study, the geographical location of editorial boards appears to have been very closely tied to the geographical location of the journals. It is again necessary to add the proviso that "Europe" is a diverse and flexible concept.

The figures for the single year 2005 in Table X show that 89 per cent of the members of the editorial board of the *JM* are based in North America. The corresponding proportions for the *EJM* are 71 per cent based in European countries, and for the *AMJ* 68 per cent in one Australasian country, Australia. In the special case of the *EJM*, the European contingent represents 11 countries and nine languages from the Republic of Ireland in the west to Hungary in the east.

Location of reviewers

Table XI analyses the location of members of the reviewing teams used by the three journals over the period of the study, as distinct from their editorial advisory boards.

In the *AMJ* during 2004, two thirds of 31 reviewers were based in Australia. Five each had European and North American affiliations. There were none from the other continents, including Asia. In the *EJM* during 2005, the proportion based in Europe was again two thirds, the remainder being drawn from roughly equally from North

المنارة للاستشارات
www.mana

America, Australasia and Asia. In the *JM* between Summer 2004 and Summer 2005, fully 88 per cent of 300 reviewers used were based in North America. Of the remainder, 8 per cent were based in Europe and only 2 per cent each in Australasia or Asia.

It is clear that the geographical distribution of the reviewers follows the pattern of the editorial boards very closely. Given that an editor is largely responsible for the choice of reviewers and must have some influence over the membership of the editorial board, the findings described in the last two sections offer another hint of proactive ethnocentrism on the part of the *JM*.

Concluding thoughts and proposals

In this final section, we present a number of thoughts and proposals based upon the empirical findings in Tables II-V, which describe the ethnocentricity of the three academic marketing journals at the aggregate level, and Tables VI-XI, which deal with them individually.

The total number of authors whose articles were published in the *AMJ*, *EJM* and *JM* during the six years covered by the study is considerable. By that yardstick, the *EJM* is the largest academic marketing journal, with 453 articles over six years. The *JM* comes second with 244, and the *AMJ* third with 114. In other words, each journal is about twice as big, in numbers of articles published, as the one below it.

The 811 articles in total shared 1,676 authors. By a small margin, the most usual number of authors per article was two, just ahead of sole authorship. Those two plus triple authorship account for 94 per cent of all articles in the sample. Clearly, collaboration with fellow academics is a popular strategy for achieving publication in a journal. Joint expertise and common effort evidently enhance the quality of articles and improve their prospects in the peer-review process.

The geographical locations of authors are to a large extent confined to Europe, North America and Australasia, in that order, despite the large populations in Africa, Asia and South America, and the famously rapid economic development of several of their constituent countries. However, the academic communities in those continents are generally proportionally smaller, and there will be troublesome language barriers to successful authorship in these three English-speaking journals, for academics whose first language is Spanish, French, Chinese or any number of others. Australia is disproportionately well represented among the authors in the sample, considering its relatively small population. The explanation is almost certainly that its research community is well-developed and a tradition exists of looking to the world outside for publication of one's work.

A large proportion of authors shared the geographical location of the journal in which their articles appeared, and international collaboration is comparatively rare. The reason may be that physical distances and cultural differences make it difficult to establish effective research relationships at the required level of intensity. When there was a mix of geographical locations, they were typically limited to pairs of continents, rather than being genuinely global. The pairings in question were most often within Australasia, Europe and North America.

The number of authors per article varied considerably among the three journals. Sole authorship is comparatively unusual in the *JM*, but not in the *AMJ*. The situation is the exact opposite if articles with three authors are singled out. The *EJM* was more likely than the other two to contain articles by more than three collaborating authors.

المنارة للاستشارات

www.mana

A tentative explanation might lie in the fact that the *JM* uses a larger number of *ad hoc* reviewers per article submitted than the other two journals. From the author's point of view, the intellectual demands of responding in detail to penetrating reviews, possibly more than once, may well be too disheartening for an individual but feasible in collaboration with others.

There is a skewed ethnocentricity in the *AMJ* and *JM* with respect to the geographical location of authors. The vast majority publishing in the *AMJ* were based in Australasia, and in the *JM* in North America. The *EJM* is less ethnocentric in this respect, and even more so when one considers the number of nationalities and cultures within "Europe" as against the relative homogeneity of North America or Australasia. The observable ethnocentricity of the *AMJ* and *JM* may reflect more homogenous research cultures and related paradigmatic values. The environment in which the *EJM*'s home-based authors work and research may well have accustomed them to varying research designs, and encouraged flexibility.

The *JM* has the most extreme homogeneity in the geographical location of its authors; very few articles by non-North American authors were published during the period of the study. Though the AMJ and EJM may be less "local" in their author profiles, their coverage of the world is hardly broad; authors from South America, Asia and Africa were notably under-represented, if present at all.

The editors of the three journals were even more "local" than the authors: the current editors of the *AMJ* and *EJM* were located where their journals are published, as has been every editor of the *JM* since its foundation. The ethnocentricity of editorial boards is also notably skewed in all three, and the usual continents are not represented at all.

To sum up, we believe that there is a challenging degree of ethnocentricity in the selected journals, and that both they and the worldwide academic marketing community would benefit from less of it. The phenomenon is not peculiar to marketing, and has been noted in many other areas (Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft, 2005; Svensson, 2005; Czinkota, 2000). Nevertheless, it should be addressed urgently by editors and the editorial boards, who should strive to broaden the geographical profiles of their authors, editors and reviewers, in order to minimise the counterproductive consequences of ethnocentricity at the current levels. If they avoid the issue, the worldwide research community will continue to be inadequately represented in these three important international journals.

Therefore, we offer a few debatable proposals. We do not pretend that they can be easily implemented. Change will need to be gradual, so as not to sacrifice the scientific identity of the journal. The initiative for reform lies with editors, in these three cases and in general. The last thing that the discipline needs in its own journals is marketing myopia.

With the support of their boards, editors could re-configure the boards themselves to include representatives of under-represented and absent geographical locations, and pursue a reviewer-recruitment policy that achieves representativeness of the real world of marketing, rather than their own. Reviewers could be allocated to match the geographical location of newly broadened author bases. The concept of sole or dual editorship could be extended into a policy of appointing associate editors in regions of the world beyond the home base, according to their strategic potential.

المنارة للاستشارات

www.mana

These proposals, and more besides for others to recognise, have the potential to enhance the worldwide reach of academic marketing journals, promote diversity in research and publication, and encourage broader horizons. Both our discipline and its research community would benefit. The fact is that we know too little about marketing phenomena in Africa, South America and most of Asia, not to mention the newly expanded European Union or the remains of the former USSR. What we do know is that many large-scale cultural differences are reflected neither in our research nor in the journals that publish it: a closed loop of cause and effect.

Consequently, would it not be a shot in the arm for the discipline of marketing and its research community if the ethnocentricity of its academic journals were diminished? Or would that interfere too much with paradigmatic beliefs and research values between continents? Is it perhaps a kind of academic imperialism that governs what is categorized as of appropriate research quality and achieves publication in the top-ranked journals? If so, it is a geopolitical strategy that will deprive our research community of new and exciting insights into to the weird and wonderful world of marketing ... everywhere.

References

Armstrong, J.S. (2004), "Does an academic research paper contain useful knowledge? No ($p < 0.5$)", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 62-3.

Bakir, M.J., Vitell, S.J. and Rose, G.M. (2000), "Publications in major marketing journals: an analysis of scholars and marketing departments", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 99-107.

Baumgartner, H. and Pieters, R. (2003), "The structural influence of marketing journals: a citation analysis of the discipline and its subareas over time", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 67 No. 2, pp. 123-39.

Beed, C. and Beed, C. (1996), "Measuring the quality of academic journals: the case of economics", *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 369-96.

Blair, E. and Zinkhan, G.M. (2006), "Nonresponse and generalizability in academic research", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 4-7.

Booth, W.C., Colomb, G.G. and Williams, J.M. (2003), *The Craft of Research*, Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Brumbaugh, A. (2002), "Response: marketing journal rankings", *ELMAR*, July (available at: www.elmar-list.org).

Cabell, D.W.E. (1998), *Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Management and Marketing*, Cabell Publishing Co., Beaumont.

Clark, G.L. (1985), "Productivity ratings of institutions based upon publication in eight marketing journals", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 7, pp. 12-23.

Crosier, K. (2005), "How effectively do marketing journals transfer useful learning from scholars to practitioners?", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 22 No. 5, pp. 540-56.

Czinkota, M.R. (2000), "International information cross-fertilization in marketing", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 34 Nos 11/12, pp. 1305-14.

Danielsen, A. and Delorme, C.D. Jr (1976), "Some empirical evidence on the variables associated with the ranking of economics journals", *Southern Economic Journal*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 1149-60.

Day, A. (1996), *How to Get Research Published in Journals*, Gower House, Hampshire.

المنارة للاستشارات

www.mana

Day, A. and Peters, J. (1994), "Quality indicators in academic publishing", *Library Review*, Vol. 43 No. 7, pp. 4-72.

DuBois, F.L. (2000), "Ranking the international business journals", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 689-705.

Easton, G. and Easton, D.M. (2003), "Marketing journals and the research assessment exercise", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 19 Nos 1/2, pp. 5-25.

Emerald (2005), "Management journal rankings", *Emerald Management Reviews*, available at: www.emeraldinsight.com (accessed January).

Enomoto, C.E. (1993), "A stratified approach to the ranking of economics journals", *Studies in Economic Analysis*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 74-94.

Fields, D.M. and Swayne, L.E. (1991), "Contributions of southern authors in major marketing publications", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 22, pp. 33-45.

Fry, E.H., Walters, C.G. and Scheuermann, L.E. (1985), "Perceived quality of fifty selected journals: academicians and practitioners", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 13, pp. 352-61.

Ganesh, G.K., Chandry, P.R. and Henderson, G.V. (1990), "Awareness and evaluation of selected marketing journals inside and outside the discipline: an empirical study", *Akron Business & Economic Review*, Vol. 21, pp. 93-106.

Harzing, A.-W. (2006), "Journal quality list", available at: www.harzing.com (accessed January).

Hawes, J.M. and Keiller, B. (2002), "Assessing marketing journals: a mission-based approach", *Journal of the Academy of Business Education*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 70-86.

Hawkins, R.G., Ritter, L.S. and Walter, I. (1973), "What economists think of their journals", *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 81 No. 4, pp. 1017-32.

Hult, G.T.M., Neese, W.T. and Bashaw, R.E. (1997), "Faculty perceptions of marketing journals", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 37-52.

Jobber, D. and Simpson, P. (1988), "A citation analysis of selected marketing journals", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 137-42.

Jones, M.J., Brinn, T. and Pendlebury, M. (1994), "Journal evaluation methodologies: a balanced response", *Omega: International Journal of Management Science*, Vol. 24 No. 5, pp. 607-12.

Kim, M.T. (1991), "Ranking journals in library and information science: a comparison of perceptual and citation-based measures", *College & Research Libraries*, Vol. 52 No. 1, pp. 24-37.

Lester, D.J. and Lester, D.J. Jr (2005), *Writing Research Papers*, Pearson Education, Harlow.

Luke, R.H. and Doke, E.R. (1987), "Marketing journal hierarchies: faculty perceptions, 1986-1987", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 74-8.

McKenzie, C.J., Wright, S., Ball, D.F. and Baron, P.J. (2002), "The publications of marketing faculty – who are we really talking to?", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 36 Nos 11/12, pp. 1196-208.

Malhotra, N.K. (1999), "The past, present and future of the marketing discipline", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 116-9.

Mason, P.M., Steagall, J.W. and Fabritius, M.M. (1997), "Economics journal rankings by the type of school: perceptions versus citations", *Quarterley Journal of Business & Economics*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 60-79.

Mort, G.S., McColl-Kennedy, J.R., Kiel, G. and Soutar, G.N. (2004), "Perceptions of marketing journals by senior academics in Australia and New Zealand", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 51-61.

المنارة للاستشارات

www.mana

Moxley, J.M. (1992), *Publish, Don't Perish: The Scholar's Guide to Academic Writing and Publishing*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT.

Mylonopoulos, N.A. and Theoharakis, V. (2001), "Global perceptions of IS journals", *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 44 No. 9, pp. 29-37.

Neway, J.M. and Lancaster, F.W. (1983), "The correlation between pertinence and rate of circulation duplication in multidatabase searches", *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 292-3.

Niemi, A.W. Jr (1988), "Publication performance of marketing departments, 1975-1985", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 8-12.

Nisonger, T.E. (1999), "JASIS and library and information science journal rankings: a review and analysis of the last half century", *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, Vol. 50 No. 11, pp. 1004-20.

Nobes, C.W. (1985), "International vacations in perceptions of accounting journals", *Accounting Review*, Vol. 60 No. 4, pp. 702-5.

November, P. (2004), "Seven reasons why marketing practitioners should ignore marketing academic research", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 39-48.

Parnell, J.A. (1997), "Assessing management journal quality: a methodological critique and empirical analysis", *The Mid-Atlantic Journal of Business*, Vol. 33, pp. 69-83.

Petry, G. and Settle, J. (1988), "A comprehensive analysis of worldwide scholarly productivity in selected US business journals", *Quarterly Review of Economics and Business*, Vol. 28, pp. 88-104.

Pol, L.G. (1991), "Demographic contributions to marketing: an assessment", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 19, pp. 53-9.

Polonsky, M.J. (2004), "Journal rankings: does one size fit all?", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 64-6.

Polonsky, M.J. and Waller, D.S. (1993), "Marketing journals and Asia-Pacific marketing academics", *Asia-Australia Marketing Journal*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 61-9.

Polonsky, M.J., Jones, G. and Kearsley, M.J. (1999), "Accessibility: an alternative method of ranking marketing journals?", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 181-93.

Rice, B.A. and Stankus, T. (1983), "Publication quality indicators for tenure or promotion decisions: what can the librarian ethically report?", *College & Research Libraries*, Vol. 44, pp. 173-8.

Rosenstreich, D. and Wooliscroft, B. (2005), "What does it take to get published in a top marketing journal from Australasia", paper presented at 30th Annual Macromarketing Seminar, St. Petersburg, FL, May 28-31.

Rozakis, L. (1999), *Schaum's Quick Guide to Writing Great Research Papers*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

Spake, D.F. and Harmon, S.K. (1998), "Institutional and individual research productivity: a comparison of alternative approaches", *Marketing Education Review*, Vol. 8, pp. 67-77.

Svensson, G. (2005), "Ethnocentricity in top marketing journals", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 23 No. 5, pp. 422-34.

Svensson, G. (2006), "The paradoxnoia of top marketing journal(s)", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 40 Nos 11/12, pp. 1153-68.

Theoharakis, V. and Hirst, V. (2002), "Perceptual differences of marketing journals: a worldwide perspective", *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 389-402.

المنارة للاستشارات

www.mana

Trieschmann, J.S., Dennis, A.R., Northcraft, G.B. and Niemi, A.W. Jr (2000), "Serving multiple constituencies in business schools: MBA program versus research performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 43 No. 6, pp. 1130-41.

Uncles, M.D. (2004), "Journal rankings: how much credence should we give them?", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 67-72.

Van Fleet, D.D., McWilliams, A. and Siegel, D.S. (2000), "A theoretical and empirical analysis of journal rankings: the case of formal lists", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26 No. 5, pp. 839-61.

Zinkhan, G.M. and Leigh, T.W. (1999), "Assessing the quality ranking of the journal of advertising, 1986-1997", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 51-70.

Further reading

Australasian Marketing Journal (2006), available at: www.marketing.unsw.edu.au/amj (accessed January 5).

European Journal of Marketing (2006), available at: www.emeraldinsight.com/info/journals/ejm (accessed January).

Journal of Marketing (2006), American Marketing Association, available at: www.marketingpower.com (accessed January).

Corresponding author

Göran Svensson can be contacted at: goran-svensson@set.hh.se

To purchase reprints of this article please e-mail: **reprints@emeraldinsight.com**
Or visit our web site for further details: **www.emeraldinsight.com/reprints**

www.mana

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

www.manaraa.com