

## Publications in Major Marketing Journals: An Analysis of Scholars and Marketing Departments

Ayşen Bakır, Scott J. Vitell, and Gregory M. Rose

---

*This article examines the research productivity of marketing scholars and departments by examining published articles in six major marketing journals (Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Journal of Consumer Research, Journal of Marketing, Journal of Marketing Research, Journal of Retailing, and Marketing Science) from 1991 to 1998. Both the total number of published articles and a fractional score, based on the number of authors of an article, were used for evaluation purposes. The authors evaluate the research production of marketing departments according to faculty size. Finally, a comparison is made with previous studies on the productivity of marketing departments.*

---

Many marketing scholars have strong opinions about the leading research institutions and scholars in the marketing discipline. However, these opinions are often subjective, based on personal impressions generated about marketing scholars and the institutions they represent. Thus, a more objective criterion for evaluating the research productivity of scholars and institutions would be useful. Faculty publication productivity is just such an objective measure. Indeed, many previous studies have used this standard. Niemi (1988) ranked institutions according to faculty research in four journals for the years 1975-85 (*Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Marketing Research*, *Journal of Retailing*, and *Journal of Consumer Research*). Clark (1985) ranked institutions based on the number of publications by each school's faculty in eight marketing journals for the years 1983-84. These journals included *Industrial Marketing Management*, the *Journal of Advertising*, the *Journal of Advertising Research*, the *Journal of Consumer Research*, the *Journal of Marketing*, the *Journal of Marketing Education*, the *Journal of Marketing Research*, and the *Journal of Retailing*. Marquardt and Murdock (1983) used the number of published articles in the *Journal of Marketing* to rank marketing programs for the years 1960-81. Moore and Taylor (1980) ranked the leading research institutions in marketing on the basis of publications in three journals (*Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Marketing Research*, and *Journal of Consumer Research*). More recently, Page and Mohr (1995) analyzed scholar and

institutional productivity from about 1989 to 1993 in three marketing journals (*Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Marketing Research*, and *Journal of Consumer Research*). Finally, Spake and Harmon (1997) analyzed scholar and institutional productivity for the years 1990-96 in four journals (*Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Marketing Research*, *Journal of Consumer Research*, and *Journal of Retailing*) using four different methods.

None of this previous work isolates the 1990s and examines the research productivity of marketing scholars and departments in that decade alone. Additionally, no recent study has included more than four marketing journals or differentiated between large and small departments. The present study makes this differentiation and includes six major marketing journals for the years 1991-98. This study attempts to answer the following research questions: Which marketing scholars are the most productive in terms of publications in the major journals? Which larger (10 or more faculty) U.S. marketing departments are the most productive (i.e., top 25) in terms of publications in the major journals? and Which smaller (less than 10 faculty) U.S. marketing departments are the most productive (i.e., top 25) in terms of publications in the major journals?

### METHODOLOGY

The six leading marketing journals were selected to evaluate the research productivity of scholars and institutions. These journals were selected based on Hult, Neese, and Bashaw's (1997) study that assessed the perceptions of marketing faculty with regard to the importance of marketing-related journals. The selected journals, ranked by faculty at both doctorate-granting and non-doctorate-granting marketing departments, are the *Journal of Marketing (JM)*, the *Journal of Marketing Research (JMR)*, the *Journal of Con-*

---

Ayşen Bakır is a Ph.D. candidate in marketing at the University of Mississippi. Scott J. Vitell is the Phil B. Hardin professor of marketing in the School of Business at the University of Mississippi. Gregory M. Rose is an assistant professor of marketing at the University of Mississippi.

*Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 22 No. 2, August 2000 99-107  
© 2000 Sage Publications, Inc.

TABLE 1  
NUMBER OF ARTICLES PER JOURNAL 1991-98

Journal	Number of Articles	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	Percentage
<i>Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science</i>	247	35	40	35	31	31	26	26	23	17.30
<i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>	314	45	48	48	51	36	27	33	26	22.00
<i>Journal of Marketing</i>	225	22	26	29	34	29	31	25	29	15.76
<i>Journal of Marketing Research</i>	310	45	34	36	43	38	35	41	38	21.72
<i>Journal of Retailing</i>	154	17	17	17	20	18	21	22	22	10.79
<i>Marketing Science</i>	177	21	24	23	22	22	20	21	24	12.40

sumer Research (*JCR*), the *Journal of Retailing* (*JR*), the *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* (*JAMS*), and *Marketing Science* (*MS*).

While the cutoff at six journals is somewhat arbitrary, our decision was made much easier by the fact that the seventh (*Harvard Business Review*) and eighth (*Journal of Business Research*) ranked journals are not core marketing journals. The current position of marketing science (i.e., ranked fourth by doctorate-granting institutions) and the recent "upgrading" of the *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* (i.e., ranked fifth overall) indicate that the two marketing science journals should be included in any study examining publications in major marketing journals (Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997). Thus, it was decided that six journals would provide a more representative sample of articles and a valid base from which to draw a sample of high-quality scholarly publications.

All published scholarly articles from 1991 to 1998 in these six journals were included in the sample. Editorials, guest editorials, guest commentaries, and book reviews were excluded. The names and number of authors for each article and their affiliated institutions were recorded. A total of 1,427 articles were included in the study. Table 1 shows the breakdown of the articles by the selected journals. The number of published articles in *JM* and *JMR* account for 37.5% of the selected articles, whereas the number of published articles in *JCR* accounts for 22%.

The research productivity of scholars is evaluated in two ways: by the total number of articles and by the fractional score suggested by Lindsey (1980), which is based on the number of authors per article. This approach was also used by Im, Kim, and Kim (1998) in their examination of research productivity in management information systems. In the normal count approach, all the publications that a scholar coauthors are counted equally. For example, an article with three authors counts as a full article for each of the three scholars. Where there are coauthors, each institution also receives full credit for the publication. The fractional approach provides a more realistic representation of scholar and institutional pro-

ductivity (Lindsey 1980). Each coauthor of an article receives only a fraction of the credit for a published article based on the number of authors. For example, an article with two authors provides 0.50 credit for each of the authors, an article with three authors provides 0.33 credit for each, and an article with four authors provides 0.25 credit for each. Each institution also receives a fraction of the credit for each published article. When an article has a single author, 1.00 credit is given to both the scholar and his or her institution.

### SCHOLAR RESEARCH PRODUCTION IN MARKETING

The first research question deals with the research production of marketing scholars. The total number of published articles and fractional score were used to rank scholars' research production. Table 2 lists the top 39 scholars according to the number of published articles, whereas Table 3 lists the research production of the top scholars based on a fractional score. According to Table 2, Dhruv Grewal is the most productive scholar, with 13 articles during the 1990s. Shelby D. Hunt, Donald R. Lehmann, and Barbara E. Kahn are the second most productive scholars with 12 articles each, whereas four scholars have a total of 11 articles each. Shelby D. Hunt is the most productive scholar according to the fractional score ranking (7.83). Overall, the fractional score results indicate that a relatively small number of scholars (28) are responsible for nearly 10% of all articles in the major marketing journals. Note that the institutions for some scholars may have changed. We report the institution with which the scholar is currently affiliated according to the most recent issue of *The Prentice Hall 1998-1999 Guide to Marketing Faculty* (Hasselback 1999).

### INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH PRODUCTION IN MARKETING

As mentioned, while there are varying opinions with regard to the top research institutions in marketing, the number of

**TABLE 2**  
**TOP SCHOLARS IN MARKETING: TOTAL NUMBER OF ARTICLES**

Author	Institution	Rank	Number of Articles
Dhruv Grewal	University of Miami	1	13
Shelby D. Hunt	Texas Tech University	2T	12
Barbara E. Kahn	University of Pennsylvania	2T	12
Donald R. Lehmann	Columbia University	2T	12
Pradeep K. Chintagunta	University of Chicago	5T	11
Wayne S. DeSarbo	Pennsylvania State University	5T	11
Joan Meyers-Levy	University of Minnesota	5T	11
A. Parasuraman	University of Miami	5T	11
Leonard L. Berry	Texas A&M University	9T	10
Wagner A. Kamakura	University of Iowa	9T	10
Lakshman Krishnamurthi	Northwestern University	9T	10
Richard G. Netemeyer	Louisiana State University	9T	10
Birger Wernerfelt	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	9T	10
Paul E. Green	University of Pennsylvania	14T	9
Sunil Gupta	Columbia University	14T	9
Stephen J. Hoch	University of Pennsylvania	14T	9
Bernard J. Jaworski	University of Southern California	14T	9
Scott W. Kelley	University of Kentucky	14T	9
V. Kumar	University of Houston	14T	9
Robert A. Peterson	University of Texas at Austin	14T	9
Steven P. Brown	Southern Methodist University	21T	8
Randolph E. Bucklin	University of California, Los Angeles	21T	8
Scot Burton	University of Arkansas	21T	8
Jan B. Heide	University of Wisconsin-Madison	21T	8
Jeffrey J. Inman	University of Wisconsin-Madison	21T	8
Ajay K. Kohli	University of Texas at Austin	21T	8
Donald R. Lichtenstein	University of Colorado, Boulder	21T	8
John G. Lynch Jr.	Duke University	21T	8
Vijay Mahajan	University of Texas at Austin	21T	8
Christine Moorman	University of Wisconsin-Madison	21T	8
Mark E. Parry	University of Virginia	21T	8
Laura A. Peracchio	University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	21T	8
David C. Schmittlein	University of Pennsylvania	21T	8
Itamar Simonson	Stanford University	21T	8
Kannan Srinivasan	Carnegie Mellon University	21T	8
Richard Staelin	Duke University	21T	8
Jan-Benedict E. M. Steenkamp <sup>a</sup>	Catholic University of Leuven	21T	8
Rajan P. Varadarajan	Texas A&M University	21T	8
Michel Wedel	University of Groningen	21T	8

a. The author is also a professor of international marketing research at the University of Groningen.

publications is an objective criterion for evaluating the research production of institutions. However, the size of the faculty is also an important factor that should be considered in this evaluation process, since the research production of an institution would be expected to increase as the number of faculty increases. Thus, two separate research questions were posited and examined with regard to institutional research production. Marketing departments were divided into two groups, those with 10 or more faculty members and those with less than 10 faculty members. The *Wiley Guide to Marketing Faculty* (Hasselback 1995) was used for determining the number of faculty for each institution. The mean department size according to *Wiley* was 8.7 faculty members, which provided the rationale for "larger" departments' having 10 or

more faculty members and "smaller" departments' having less than 10.

*Wiley* provides a faculty count compiled in 1994 and published in 1995, the middle years of this study (Hasselback 1995). Because the number of faculty is dynamic, it is difficult to have anything other than a fairly accurate estimate for most institutions. Thus, rather than dividing the number of articles for a department by the reported number of faculty members, we simply divided marketing departments into two groups: small and large. Both total publications and fractional scores were used to evaluate the research production of the institutions examined. For example, in the case of coauthored articles, based on the total publication score, each institution received full credit for each author. Thus, a publication with

TABLE 3  
TOP MARKETING SCHOLARS: ADJUSTED NUMBER OF ARTICLES

Author	Institution	Rank	Number of Articles <sup>a</sup>
Shelby D. Hunt	Texas Tech University	1	7.83
Birger Wernerfelt	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	2	7.32
Pradeep K. Chintagunta	University of Chicago	3	6.91
Joan Meyers-Levy	University of Minnesota	4	6
Barbara E. Kahn	University of Pennsylvania	5	5.74
Donald R. Lehmann	Columbia University	6	5.65
Laura A. Peracchio	University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	7	5
Sunil Gupta	Columbia University	8	4.99
Robert A. Peterson	University of Texas at Austin	9	4.91
Aradhna Krishna	Columbia University	10	4.83
Scott W. Kelley	University of Kentucky	11	4.82
Jagdip Singh	Case Western Reserve University	12	4.66
George S. Day	University of Pennsylvania	13T	4.5
Marsha L. Richins	University of Missouri	13T	4.5
Christine Moorman	University of Wisconsin-Madison	15	4.49
A. Parasuraman	University of Miami	16	4.47
Wagner A. Kamakura	University of Iowa	17	4.41
Jan B. Heide	University of Wisconsin-Madison	18T	4.33
David Glen Mick	University of Wisconsin-Madison	18T	4.33
Leonard L. Berry	Texas A&M University	20	4.31
Dhruv Grewal	University of Miami	21	4.22
Paul E. Green	University of Pennsylvania	22T	4.16
Lakshman Krishnamurthi	Northwestern University	22T	4.16
Itamar Simonson	Stanford University	22T	4.16
Makoto Abe	University of Tokyo	25T	4
Robert A. Ping Jr.	Wright State University	25T	4
Devavrat Purohit	University of California, Berkeley	25T	4
Barbara B. Stern	Rutgers University (Newark)	25T	4

a. Adjusted for an authorship (single author = 1.0 point, two authors = 0.5 point, etc.).

three authors from the same school was counted three times for the representing institution. However, in such cases, the fractional score more accurately reflects the research production of that institution. For the fractional score, each represented institution receives only a fraction of the normal score (i.e., an article written by scholars at three institutions provides 0.33 credit for each of the institutions represented).

Table 4 shows the top 25 institutions with 10 or more faculty members according to total publications, and Table 5 shows the top 25 institutions based on a fractional score. Although the rankings of the institutions differed slightly (the University of Cincinnati and Louisiana State University did not appear in the fractional score rankings), the majority of institutions appeared in both rankings. Table 6 shows the top 30 institutions that have less than 10 faculty members based on total publications, whereas Table 7 shows the top 25 institutions based on the fractional score. Again, the rankings of the institutions differed only slightly.

If institutions had not been divided into large and small departments, then the overall top 25 rankings (based on total publications) would have included only five of the smaller schools: the University of California, Los Angeles; the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; the University of Miami; the University of California, Berkeley; and the University of Pittsburgh. The overall top 25 rankings based on a fractional

score would have only included the University of California, Berkeley; the University of California, Los Angeles; and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. This clearly indicates that size is a critical factor in determining research production. Overall, the top 25 large departments when combined with the top five small departments account for more than 44% of all articles published in the major marketing journals.

It appears to be difficult for smaller departments to compete with larger departments. Perhaps small departments do not have the critical mass necessary to produce sufficient numbers of articles in major journals. Thus, it may be especially critical for smaller institutions to hire their assistant professors from the top larger institutions, since these individuals may already have the contacts in place with scholars at other institutions, a benefit both to them and to the school that hires them. Also, when recruiting new doctorate students, smaller departments may need to emphasize the more individualized attention and more collegial environment that they can provide, or emphasize research in a particular area of marketing such as sales or services. That is, a "niche" strategy may be best for smaller schools.

An analysis based on the actual number of publications per faculty member provides a more accurate measure of research production than the approach used here. However, because this study covers an 8-year time frame, and because

**TABLE 4**  
**LARGE INSTITUTIONS WITH TOP MARKETING DEPARTMENTS: TOTAL NUMBER OF ARTICLES**

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Number of Articles</i>
University of Pennsylvania	1	102
University of Texas at Austin	2	80
University of Chicago	3	69
Northwestern University	4	56
University of Florida	5	55
University of Michigan	6	54
Columbia University	7	52
New York University	8	49
Pennsylvania State University	9T	48
University of Wisconsin–Madison	9T	48
Ohio State University	11T	45
University of Southern California	11T	45
Duke University	13	43
Arizona State University	14	42
Stanford University	15T	41
Texas A&M University	15T	41
University of South Carolina	17	40
University of Minnesota	18	38
Indiana University	19	37
University of Arizona	20	35
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	21	31
Georgia State University	22	30
Harvard University	23	29
Louisiana State University	24T	28
University of Cincinnati	24T	28

NOTE: Departments must have 10 or more faculty members.

**TABLE 5**  
**LARGE INSTITUTIONS WITH TOP MARKETING DEPARTMENTS: ADJUSTED NUMBER OF ARTICLES**

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Adjusted Score</i>
University of Pennsylvania	1	49.73
University of Texas at Austin	2	36.13
University of Chicago	3	32.37
Columbia University	4	28.18
New York University	5	24.86
University of Florida	6	24.78
Northwestern University	7	24.46
University of Wisconsin–Madison	8	24.26
Pennsylvania State University	9	22.3
University of Michigan	10	21.08
Stanford University	11	20.64
University of Southern California	12	20.62
Arizona State University	13	18.35
Ohio State University	14	18.25
Duke University	15	18.19
Texas A&M University	16	17.84
University of Minnesota	17	16.37
University of Arizona	18	16.2
Indiana University	19	16.19
Harvard University	20	16.08
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	21	15.71
Texas Tech University	22	15.24
Georgia State University	23	14.64
University of South Carolina	24	13.92
Southern Methodist University	25	12.28

NOTE: Departments must have 10 or more faculty members.

**TABLE 6**  
**SMALL INSTITUTIONS WITH TOP MARKETING DEPARTMENTS: TOTAL NUMBER OF ARTICLES**

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Number of Articles</i>
University of California, Los Angeles	1	43
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	2	41
University of Miami	3	39
University of California, Berkeley	4	35
University of Pittsburgh	5	31
Cornell University	6	28
University of Kentucky	7	27
Carnegie Mellon University	8	24
Purdue University	9	23
Vanderbilt University	10	22
Dartmouth College	11T	18
University of Texas at Dallas	11T	18
State University of New York at Buffalo	13T	17
University of Virginia	13T	17
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	13T	17
Santa Clara University	16T	16
University of California, Irvine	16T	16
University of Mississippi	18T	15
University of Missouri	18T	15
University of Iowa	20	14
University of Central Florida	21	11
University of Kansas	22T	10
University of Oregon	22T	10
Rutgers University (Camden)	24T	9
Rutgers University (New Brunswick)	24T	9
University of California, Davis	24T	9
University of Rochester	24T	9
University of Texas at Arlington	24T	9
Washington University	24T	9
Yale University	24T	9

NOTE: Departments must have less than 10 faculty members.

the size of marketing departments is typically in a state of flux, there was no valid way to determine faculty size for analysis purposes. Thus, while not perfect, large versus small is a more than adequate way to compare departments.

### COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS STUDIES

As mentioned, previous studies have examined the research productivity of marketing departments. Spake and Harmon (1997) ranked schools based on articles in four journals (*JM*, *JMR*, *JR*, and *JCR*) for the years 1990-96 and found that the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Texas at Austin, the University of Florida, the University of Michigan, and Columbia University represented the top five marketing programs. Page and Mohr (1995) based their study on articles in just three journals (*JM*, *JMR*, and *JCR*) for the years 1989-93 and found that the University of Pennsylvania was ranked 1st. However, they found that the University of Florida and the University of South Carolina were tied for 2nd, and the University of Texas at Austin and the University of Chicago were ranked 4th and 5th, respectively. The most significant difference between these two studies may be that the University of South Carolina was only ranked 15th by Spake

and Harmon. Consistent with the more recent study, the University of South Carolina was ranked 17th in the present study.

Niemi (1988) ranked institutions according to faculty research in four journals for the years 1975-85 (*JM*, *JMR*, *JR*, and *JCR*). The University of Wisconsin-Madison, the University of Pennsylvania, Northwestern University, Stanford University, Columbia University, the University of Texas at Austin, New York University, Indiana University, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Harvard University were the top-ranked departments based on total pages published in *JM* and *JMR*. Although the rankings of the departments changed somewhat, most of these departments were still in the top 10 when the other two journals, *JR* and *JCR*, were added to the study. The University of California, Los Angeles, and the University of South Carolina replaced the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University in the top 10 rankings. Most of these departments were also ranked in the top 10 in the present study, based on the number of articles published.

Clark (1985) ranked institutions based on the number of publications by each school's faculty in eight marketing journals for the years 1983-84 (*Industrial Marketing Manage-*

TABLE 7  
SMALL INSTITUTIONS WITH TOP MARKETING DEPARTMENTS: ADJUSTED NUMBER OF ARTICLES

Institution	Rank	Adjusted Score
University of California, Berkeley	1	21.65
University of California, Los Angeles	2	20.44
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	3	19.76
University of Miami	4	15.13
Cornell University	5	15.01
University of Pittsburgh	6	13.54
University of Kentucky	7	12.28
Vanderbilt University	8	11.48
Purdue University	9	10.97
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	10	10.5
Carnegie Mellon University	11	9.08
University of Missouri	12	8.85
University of Texas at Dallas	13	8.23
Dartmouth College	14	7.96
State University of New York at Buffalo	15	7.84
University of California, Irvine	16	7.31
University of Iowa	17	6.82
Rutgers University (New Brunswick)	18	6.66
Santa Clara University	19T	6.63
University of Virginia	19T	6.63
University of Mississippi	21	5.43
Washington University	22	5.33
University of Oregon	23	5.32
University of Rochester	24	5.16
University of Colorado, Denver	25	4.58

NOTE: Departments must have less than 10 faculty members.

ment, *Journal of Advertising*, *Journal of Advertising Research*, *Journal of Marketing Education*, *JCR*, *JM*, *JMR*, and *JR*). The University of Texas at Austin, New York University, the University of Illinois, Columbia University, Arizona State University, Texas A&M University, Ohio State University, the University of Pennsylvania, Northwestern University, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison were the top 10 marketing departments. In the present study, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Texas at Austin, Northwestern University, Columbia University, New York University, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison were ranked among the top 10 marketing departments based on the number of articles published.

Marquardt and Murdock (1983) used published articles for the ranking of marketing departments in *JM* for the years 1960-81. Northwestern University, the University of Texas at Austin, and Pennsylvania State University were ranked in the top three. Ohio State University, Harvard University, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison tied for 4th. Columbia University and Michigan State University tied for 7th. The University of Illinois ranked 8th, and the University of Minnesota and Indiana University tied for 9th. Moore and Taylor (1980) ranked the leading research institutions in marketing on the basis of publications in *JM*, *JMR*, and *JCR*. The University of Pennsylvania, the University of Illinois, Columbia University, Purdue University, the University of Texas at Aus-

tin, and Stanford University were the top six marketing departments. The University of Wisconsin-Madison and Indiana University tied for 7th; and Northwestern University and the University of California, Los Angeles, ranked 9th and 10th, respectively.

While the top 25 to 30 ranked schools have been somewhat consistent over time, there has been considerable shifting within those rankings as witnessed by the change in rank for the University of South Carolina mentioned above. Some of the differences are due to the fact that not all studies were based on the same set of journals, nor were all marketing departments static in terms of their size during the years covered by the studies. Nevertheless, one can note a few significant trends. The University of Miami, Texas A&M University, and the University of Southern California have significantly improved their rankings in the 1990s as compared with previous time periods. Additionally, the University of Michigan has significantly advanced in the rankings according to recent studies (including the present study). Conversely, the rankings of some institutions have dropped significantly in recent years. Most notable among these are the University of Illinois and the University of South Carolina. Still, overall, there is considerable agreement among these studies as to the top marketing departments. Table 8 provides a detailed comparison between the present study and all other studies cited.

TABLE 8  
COMPARISON WITH OTHER STUDIES

Institution	Current Study <sup>a</sup>	Number of Articles	Spake and Harmon (1997) Rank <sup>b</sup>	Number of Articles	Page and Mohr (1995) Rank <sup>c</sup>	Number of Articles	Page	Number of Articles	Niemi (1988) Rank <sup>d</sup>	Number of Pages	Clark (1985) Rank <sup>e</sup>	Number of Articles	Marquardt and Murdock (1983) Rank <sup>f</sup>	Number of Articles	Moore and Taylor (1980) Rank <sup>g</sup>	Number of Articles	
University of Pennsylvania	1	102	1	48	1	42	1	749	1	7	11	7	1	31	22	11	45
University of Texas at Austin	2	80	2	45	4	32	4	468	9	1	16	2	2	32	5	29	29
University of Chicago	3	69	6	30	5	30	5	287	21	1	16	14	14	17	22	11	11
Northwestern University	4	56	7	34	7	25	7	620	5	9	10	1	1	43	9	23	23
University of Florida	5	55	3	42	2	36	2	381	13	19	6	6	13	18	20	12	12
University of Michigan	6	54	4	29	10	21	10	361	15	30	4	4	4	26	3	36	36
Columbia University	7	52	5	37	17	19	17	698	3	4	14	7	7	17	34	4	4
New York University	8	49	10	30	13	20	13	614	6	1	16	14	14	17	34	4	4
Pennsylvania State University	9T	48	19	15	24	15	24	214	33	19	6	3	3	31	22	11	11
University of Wisconsin-Madison	9T	48	10	31	10	21	10	714	2	9	10	4	4	27	7	26	26
Ohio State University	11T	45	8	24	21	17	21	438	11	7	11	4	4	27	12	17	17
University of Southern California	11T	45	14	25	13	20	13	168	42	21	11	21	21	11	27	7	7
Duke University	13T	43	19	16	23	16	23	231	30	19	6	6	6	11	10	20	20
University of California, Los Angeles	13T	43	23	20	10	21	10	578	7	19	6	6	6	11	10	20	20
Arizona State University	15	42	9	23	8	24	8	134	47	5	13	21	21	11	10	20	20
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	16T	41	28	7	40	7	40	322	19	30	4	20	20	12	17	13	13
Stanford University	16T	41	19	24	13	20	13	688	4	30	4	4	12	19	6	27	27
Texas A&M University	16T	41	13	22	21	17	21	251	27	6	12	6	6	19	6	27	27
University of South Carolina	19	40	15	21	2	36	2	472	8	16	7	7	23	10	17	13	13
University of Miami	20	39	26	6	44	6	44	322	19	16	7	7	23	10	17	13	13
University of Minnesota	21	38	15	27	8	24	8	262	24	30	4	4	10	20	7	26	26
Indiana University	22	37	10	21	13	20	13	440	10	30	4	4	10	20	7	26	26
University of Arizona	23T	35	19	22	6	28	6	236	29	30	4	4	10	20	7	26	26
University of California, Berkeley	23T	35	28	21	24	28	24	363	14	24	5	5	14	17	17	13	13
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	25T	31	32	15	24	15	24	392	12	3	15	15	9	24	2	37	37
University of Pittsburgh	25T	31	18	20	35	10	35	220	31	23	10	10	23	10	2	37	37

a. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Journal of Consumer Research, Journal of Marketing Research, Journal of Retailing, Marketing Science.*

b. *Journal of Marketing, Journal of Marketing Research, Journal of Consumer Research, Journal of Retailing.*

c. *Journal of Marketing, Journal of Marketing Research, Journal of Consumer Research.*

d. *Journal of Marketing, Journal of Marketing Research, Journal of Retailing, Journal of Consumer Research.*

e. *Industrial Marketing Management, Journal of Advertising, Journal of Advertising Research, Journal of Consumer Research, Journal of Marketing Education, Journal of Marketing Research, Journal of Retailing.*

f. *Journal of Marketing.*

g. *Journal of Marketing Research, Journal of Marketing, Journal of Consumer Research.*



## CONCLUSIONS

This article examined the research production of marketing scholars and departments by examining published articles in six major marketing journals from 1991 to 1998. Both a normal score and a fractional score were used for evaluation purposes. One of the major contributions of this article was the evaluation of the research production of marketing departments according to faculty size, since the research production of an institution may be affected directly by the overall number of faculty members. Supporting this, only five of the small departments would be ranked in the top 25 overall based on the total number of publications. Future research might examine additional variables such as teaching loads, availability of graduate assistants, and the existence of a graduate program to determine the nature of productivity differences based on the size of departments.

Additionally, this study examined the research production of marketing scholars and found that the top 28 scholars are responsible for about 10% of the total research production in major journals within the discipline. Similarly, the top 25 large departments when combined with the top five small departments combine for more than 44% of all research in the major marketing journals. Finally, it is interesting to note that while the overall set of ranked schools is somewhat consistent over time (perhaps, in part, because of perceived reputation), the relative ranks within this set are quite dynamic.

## REFERENCES

- Clark, Gary L. 1985. Productivity ratings of institutions based on publication in eight marketing journals: 1983-1984. *Journal of Marketing Education* 7 (Fall): 12-23.
- Hasselback, James R. 1995. *Wiley guide to marketing faculty, 1995*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- . 1999. *The 1998-1999 Prentice Hall guide to marketing faculty, 1999*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hult, G. Tomas M., William T. Neese, and R. Edward Bashaw. 1997. Faculty perceptions of marketing journals. *Journal of Marketing Education* 19 (Spring): 37-52.
- Im, Kun Shin, Kee Young Kim, and Joon S. Kim. 1998. An assessment of individual and institutional research productivity in MIS. *Decision Line* (December-January):8-12.
- Lindsey, Duncan. 1980. Production and citation measure in the sociology of science: The problem of multiple authorship. *Social Studies of Science* 10:145-62.
- Marquardt, Raymond A., and Gene W. Murdock. 1983. Analysis of authorship in the *Journal of Marketing*, 1960-1981. *Journal of Marketing Education* 5 (Fall): 53-57.
- Moore, Laurence J., and Bernard W. Taylor III. 1980. Institutional publications in business-related academic journals. *Quarterly Review of Economics and Business* 20 (Spring): 87-97.
- 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. *American Marketing Association* 6:417-24.
- Spake, Deborah, and Susan K. Harmon. 1997. Assessing productivity based on publication in the top four marketing journals. 1990-1996: A multiple method approach. *American Marketing Association* 8:191-98.