

MARKETING SCHOLARSHIP: EVOLVING RESEARCH STANDARDS

Karl A. Boedecker, University of San Francisco
Fred W. Morgan, University of Kentucky

ABSTRACT

Marketing academics endeavor to conduct research that contributes to the development of cutting edge theories and ideas about marketing. At the same time, they try to incorporate these research findings into their classes through the application of theories to the practice of marketing. Even so, marketing scholarship comes under intermittent attack for being arcane and irrelevant for practitioners. To explore this disconnect between theory and practice, we review the evolution of scholarly research in marketing. We identify the various definitions of scholarship that have evolved as business schools have matured. We conclude that marketing academics must make scholarly contributions, variously defined, in order to maintain contact with the discipline. Our analysis is based on the views of two 60-year-old professors who completed their doctoral work in the early 1970s.

INTRODUCTION

Business faculty hear that their scholarly research is irrelevant with respect to business decision making and is therefore not useful to practitioners (see, e.g., Arenson 1998; Benbasat and Zmud 1999; *Business Week* 1990; Davenport and Markus 1999; Editorial 1998). Critics suggest that research dominates teaching at large state and private universities, resulting in scant attention being paid to undergraduate education (Chacon 1998). Faculty are characterized as focusing on research to the detriment of teaching assignments, and administrators are frustrated in their efforts to evaluate faculty research (Coye 1997; Welsh and Metcalf 2003). Commentators portray doctoral students supervised by these research-oriented faculty as poorly prepared for teaching duties because they have served primarily as research minions (Hershey, Gargeya, and Eatman 1996).

This set of complaints is not unique to the present time. A review of critiques of business education reveals that such comments have been voiced intermittently since at least the 1950s (see, e.g., Simon 1969; Argyris and Schon 1975; Grayson and Hanson 1977; Hayes and Abernathy 1980; Dickinson, Herbst, and O'Shaughnessy 1983; Behrman and Levin 1984; Cheit 1985; Dulek and Fielden 1992; Linder and Smith 1992). Other professions have developed in similar fashion, with practitioners noting concerns about the quality of teaching and relevance of research (see, e.g., Bolton and Stolcis 2003 – public administration; Boyer 1996 – nursing; Entwistle 2003; Prather-Kinsey and Rueschhoff 2004 – accounting; Ivy 1996; Mitgang 1997 – architecture; Lasson 1990 – law; Van Scotter and Culligan 2003 – hospitality services; Oltheten, Theoharakis, and Travlos 2005 – finance). Traditional social science disciplines also seek to define

their contributions in a broader context (Fox 2003; Najman and Hewitt 2003 – sociology; Nicholson 1998 – social psychology).

The present norms for college and university education in business administration derive largely from two major studies undertaken during the 1950's, one sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation – the "Pierson Report" (Pierson et al. 1959) and the other financed by the Ford Foundation – the "Gordon-Howell Report" (Gordon and Howell 1959). The Pierson Report described the history of management education in the United States and examined the direction and quality of effort of undergraduate and graduate business education. This study raised concerns about the impact of a rapid expansion in the sizes and numbers of such programs following the end of World War II. The Gordon and Howell Report explored at length the question of what constituted appropriate academic standards for the preparation of business managers and leaders.

Both reviews mentioned fundamental flaws in business education at the college and university level, including the:

1. technical/vocational nature of curricula,
2. suspect backgrounds and qualifications of faculty,
3. lack of scholarly activity,
4. low esteem in which the rest of the academic community held their business schools,
5. general isolation of the business schools on their campuses, and
6. overall sense that business administration programs were closer to trade school operations than a legitimate part of higher education.

After thoroughly documenting these and related problems, both reports set forth detailed plans for upgrading

the quality of business administration programs in American higher education. Notwithstanding this history, recent developments within both higher education generally and the business administration field specifically now threaten to undermine the reforms that those studies championed successfully. In particular, efforts by accrediting agencies (see, e.g., AACSB 1987, 1991) and commentators (see, e.g., Boyer 1990) to redefine the nature of scholarly research may have the unintended effects of “re-isolating” business schools from the rest of the academic community and lowering the quality of instruction.

While some marketing faculty may abhor these efforts to broaden the scope of scholarly research to include many kinds of published and unpublished works, others might find these proposals appealing. Those business faculty who have struggled to find a respected place for their research and publication within the confines of their business school colleagues’ definitions of scholarly research (shaped, of course, by the Carnegie and Ford Foundation studies) may at first glance find the proposed changes alluring (see, e.g., Bricker 1993; Dorfman 1990; Gardner and Schmit 1995).

In this analysis, however, we consider these alternative approaches and describe how business and marketing education at the college and university level is better served under the traditional standards of scholarship. We first present an overview of the pioneering Pierson and Gordon and Howell studies. We then review the “graduate school model” of scholarly research in the context of graduate business education. We next look at the views of the late Ernest Boyer, former President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. We then summarize the position of the AACSB with regard to academic research. We conclude with our reflections, based on more than 30 years in academe, on the evolving nature of marketing scholarship.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE PIERSON AND GORDON AND HOWELL REPORTS

Pierson et al. (1959, pp. 36–38) traced the origins of a separate identity for business schools in the United States to the establishment of the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce at the University of Pennsylvania in 1881. The Wharton School did not have its own dean and faculty until 1912, existing until then as part of the College of Arts and Sciences. The first college and university level business administration offerings frequently existed within other departments, such as economics (e.g., at the University of Chicago prior to the founding of its business school in 1898) or in the liberal arts colleges. For example, Harvard Business School, established in 1908, remained a subsidiary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences until breaking away in 1913 (Pierson 1959, pp. 36–38). Other Business Administration programs to emerge with their own identities included the School of Commerce,

Accounts, and Finance at New York University in 1900, the Tuck School at Dartmouth University in 1900, and the College of Commerce and Business Administration at Tulane University in 1914 (Pierson 1959, pp. 36–38).

The American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business, formed in 1916, had little impact upon business schools until the late 1950’s, according to Pierson. He criticized its earlier lack of “. . . vigor, imagination, and any real sense of purpose . . .” and stated that it had only an “indirect effect” on faculty members (Pierson 1959, pp. 51–52).

Pierson observed that business education, compared to what he regarded as the advanced professions (medicine, law, engineering), did not follow an analytical approach based upon a set of underlying principles that would support a systematic, reasoned approach to solving problems within the field. He noted that the schools for these advanced professions were more selective in admissions than the business schools and could therefore maintain both higher intellectual standards and run more rigorous programs (Pierson 1959, pp. 27–32).

Furthermore, Pierson saw significance in the fact that the advanced professions placed a heavier emphasis upon research and “. . . scientific inquiries of all kinds.” He pointed out that, “. . . in these fields the professional schools are not simply keeping up to date with the best in current practice; they are very much to the fore of practice, concentrating a substantial portion of their faculty and other resources on exploring the frontiers of knowledge” (Pierson 1959, p. 30).

Pierson concluded his review of higher education and the professions by specifying five recommendations for business education (Pierson 1959, p. 32):

1. Raise the level of instruction, thereby requiring students to deal with more complex and demanding problems.
2. Focus the curriculum on a central core of subjects that integrates the knowledge that students obtain from a variety of fields.
3. Have students develop a broad background of knowledge so they can use it in an area of special interest.
4. To the greatest extent possible, place upon students the responsibility for developing the uses of their formal education.
5. Allocate a substantial portion of the business schools’ resources to research and the provision of leadership of new ideas for the entire field.

Both the Pierson and the Gordon and Howell studies found that business schools had fallen substantially behind their professional school counterparts in terms of quality, rigor and status along all dimensions. They identified several reasons for this, among them an excessive emphasis upon specific business practices, an increasing number of courses in business skills (which made for fewer courses in traditional disciplines), growing num-

bers of poorly-qualified students and widespread use of faculty deeply involved in outside business interests rather than research and scholarly activity (Pierson 1959, pp. 40–41).

The net result was a steadily widening gulf between business schools and the rest of the academic community. Pierson noted that this problem became particularly acute with respect to the accounting discipline, where, “Indeed, it later became difficult to tell whether the accounting instructors in these schools were primarily teachers who had an accounting practice on the side, or primarily practicing accountants who wanted to keep their hand in the teaching profession” (Pierson 1959, p. 41).

In addition to sharing many of the concerns expressed in the Pierson report, Gordon and Howell devoted considerable effort to describing the abject state and status of research in the business schools of that era. They recognized that, “As a part of a university, the business school must create as well as transmit knowledge. As a professional school, it must be concerned with research as well as teaching” (Gordon and Howell 1959, p. 377).

They saw a close connection between good research and effective teaching by identifying two functions for research in a professional school: the advancement of knowledge and the enhancement of “stimulating and imaginative teaching.” Overall, a business school must conduct legitimate academic research to justify its presence within the university (Gordon and Howell 1959, p. 377). Thus, “. . . all schools should insist that their faculty members be scholars as well as teachers – that is, that they have the desire and ability to probe deeply and to ask searching questions about what is known and not known in the areas in which they teach. This means a thorough and up-to-date knowledge of one’s field” (Gordon and Howell 1959, p. 378).

Despite these imperatives, Gordon and Howell found that most research was merely descriptive of then-prevailing practices. It lacked underlying conceptual frameworks, sophisticated research designs, and analytical rigor (Gordon and Howell 1959, p. 379). One effect that Gordon and Howell noted is the low status then accorded business programs within academe. Indeed, they expressed alarm and concern that, “Collegiate business education . . . finds itself at the foot of the academic table, uncomfortably nudging those other two stepchildren, education and agriculture” (Gordon and Howell 1959, p. 4).

As a prelude to their recommendations about the types of research appropriate for business faculty, Gordon and Howell (1959, pp. 381–382) noted their scheme for classifying research:

Pure Research. This involves developing theories and concepts, probably from the foundation disciplines of business administration (economics, psychology, sociology, etc.) that are useful for under-

standing business behavior and solving business problems.

Applied Research. This occurs at three levels: analytical, descriptive and observational.

Analytical Research. Using analytical tools to draw inferences from a body of data.

Descriptive Research. Description without the use of analytical tools, i.e., recording and classifying. [Taxonomy.]

Observational Studies. Collecting and reporting facts.

Gordon and Howell (1959, pp. 381–382) went on to recommend that business schools increase their output of pure research and applied research at the highest analytical level. Pierson (1959, pp. 310–311) likewise saw an essential role for scholarship in schools of business:

Research, or the lack thereof, sets the whole tone and direction of a field. It is the contribution which each generation of scholars makes to the work of those who have gone on before. It in turn provides the new base on which the next generation of scholars will build. The direction which any field of learning takes is thus the sum of the contributions of successive groups of investigators and depends on the intellectual leadership each group can provide. In no other way is it possible for a field to gain in strength and influence.

Nonetheless, Pierson (1959, pp. 311–314) found that university leaders, faculty outside the business schools, business executives, and even business school deans themselves believed that business schools had neglected research. As did Gordon and Howell, he held that business research should be analytical rather than merely descriptive, should use data that support the derivation of principles and generalizations, and should explain why things happen, not merely how they happen. In light of this situation, who could wonder that the rest of academia looked down upon business schools as “mere trade schools” engaged in providing vocational training.

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL MODEL AND THE BURDENS IT IMPOSES ON MARKETING SCHOLARSHIP

In the aftermath of these reports, business schools made a whole-hearted commitment to “the graduate school model” for research and scholarly publication. This approach rests upon the graduate school training that prepares doctoral students for careers as scholars. While each program has its own design and character, all require that candidates learn the intellectual history of their respective disciplines. They must demonstrate knowledge of the literature from its origins to the present, acquire competence in a research methodology, and show that they can apply it to solve significant problems in the field. In

business school disciplines, this generally involves either an empirical, statistically-based inquiry or the use of a sophisticated modeling technique as a means of explaining a type of business behavior. Doctoral education in business administration culminates in the design and execution of a research project that amounts to an original contribution to the literature that extends the boundaries of the discipline.

This set of activities prepares graduates to conduct scholarly research reviewed by and directed to an audience of other researchers. The Ph.D.-trained scholar reaches this group through publication in scholarly journals and participation in academic conferences.

The adoption of this graduate school model more than 40 years ago has not fully legitimized business administration faculty in the minds of campus colleagues in older, more traditional disciplines. In fact, the influx of faculty from these disciplines into business administration may have exacerbated the situation. For example, someone holding a doctorate in psychology may increase her earning power by 50 percent or more by accepting a position in marketing as opposed to psychology, where the supply of doctorates outstrips demand (Ivey, Schefler, and Zazzali 1998).

Ironically, business administration faculty sometimes look askance at colleagues from more traditional fields that have longer-standing research traditions. Marketing faculty have been known to question quality of scholarship of those investigating problems in selling and sales management (Kellerman, Gordon, and Hekmat 1995). Business communications faculty holding doctorates in English occasionally find themselves regarded with suspicion by business faculty (Locker 1998). Business law faculty sometimes encounter questions about whether the J.D. degree is a research degree.

SCHOLARSHIP RECONSIDERED – THE VIEWS OF ERNEST BOYER

In 1990, Ernest Boyer published “Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate,” a Carnegie Commission special report (Boyer 1990). Boyer set out to redefine the nature of scholarship in American colleges and universities because, as he saw it, “. . . the most important obligation now confronting the nation’s colleges and universities is to break out of the tired old teaching versus research debate and define, in more creative ways, what it means to be a scholar” (Boyer 1990, p. xii).

Boyer identified three stages of scholarship that defined the purpose of higher education in America during each of these overlapping phases. In the first stage, colonial colleges focused upon the intellectual and moral development of their students. These institutions followed the English model of using education to develop the student’s character. Faculty responsibilities centered on

teaching and religious commitment. Harvard College’s founders expected that institution to “. . . provide a continuous supply of learned clergy for ‘the city on the hill’ that the Massachusetts Puritans hoped would bring redemptive light to all mankind” (Boyer 1990, pp. 3–4).

A subsequent era, marked by the creation of Land Grant Colleges through the Morrill Act of 1862, saw the primary purposes of American higher education shift from developing individual character to teaching practical skills that would increase economic output (Boyer 1990, pp. 5–6). The emphasis was upon agriculture and applied science, such as engineering. Colleges and universities were to develop improved production techniques through their applied research and then disseminate this knowledge through their curricula and extension services. Most business schools today would regard such activity as service, rather than true research, and downgrade its significance in the academic reward system accordingly.

The third stage of scholarship that Boyer identified in American higher education consists of an emphasis upon basic research. This includes adopting the German model of a research university, the growth of graduate education and, in the post-WWII era, a large infusion of U.S. government money to support college and university research. The definition of scholarship became that of basic, theoretical research published in academic journals and books written for fellow scholars (Boyer 1990, pp. 7–12).

Boyer criticized this system-wide paradigm shift that recognized only basic research as “pure scholarship” for being overly restrictive and discouraging what he saw as other important academic work. Thus, he proposed an alternative, broader definition of scholarship (Boyer 1990, pp. 16–24) for an empirical investigation of the relative importance of these dimensions, see, Srinivasan, Kemelgor, and Johnson 2000):

Scholarship of Discovery. This consists of basic research that expands the boundaries of human knowledge.

Scholarship of Integration. This includes interdisciplinary work that makes significant connections between original work in different fields, thereby yielding new insights.

Scholarship of Application. This involves using one’s specialized knowledge to serve the outside community, much as the land grant schools were established to do.

Scholarship of Teaching. This encompasses transmitting, transforming and extending knowledge by means of reading, class discussions and student-professor exchanges.

This approach extends the range of acceptable scholarship to include applications and teaching-related development, making these activities every bit as worthy as the scholarship that the graduate school model produces.

Boyer's scheme would even include work published in applied media as long as it involved ". . . activities that relate directly to the intellectual work of the profession and [are] carved out through consultation, technical assistance, policy analysis, program evaluation, and the like" (Boyer 1990, p. 36; see, also, Sandmann et al. 2000).

Nonetheless, following Boyer's recommendations in their entirety would not resolve every issue surrounding the definition of appropriate scholarly work for all marketing faculty. While he is willing to extend recognition for scholarship to applied research, he asserts that all professors should first prove themselves capable of producing work under the graduate school model. Thus, ". . . all faculty should establish their credentials as researchers. Whether or not they choose specialized, investigative work on an ongoing basis, every scholar must, we believe, demonstrate the capacity to do original research, study a serious intellectual problem, and present to colleagues the results. Indeed, this is what the dissertation . . . is all about" (Boyer 1990, p. 27).

THE AMERICAN ASSEMBLY OF COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS OF BUSINESS VIEWS

The 1987 Final Report of the AACSB Task Force on Research had previously attempted to define appropriate research for business school faculty and did so in a way similar to Boyer's scheme but in a broader manner. The fundamental definition produced by the task force stated: "Research must be written, be subject to scrutiny and criticism by one's peers, and extend the boundaries of current knowledge" (AACSB 1987, p. 4).

The task force further expounded upon this definition by describing specific categories (AACSB 1987, p. 5):

Theoretical or Empirical "Discovery" Research.

This includes integrative and interdisciplinary research that makes new discoveries by linking avenues of thought across diverse disciplines.

Applied Research. The application of others' discovery research to new contexts, fields, industries, firms, nations, time periods, etc.

Teaching Cases. These should be written and accompanied by an instructor's manual that can be scrutinized and critiqued by one's peers.

Computer Software. This should be circulated and not totally proprietary.

Textbooks and Other Pedagogical Writing. This should extend the boundaries of knowledge, circulate and be subject to critique.

A subsequent AACSB Task Force, convened in 1992, undertook another attempt to redefine scholarship, this time in light of the 1991 revisions of AACSB program accreditation standards. Their specific objectives included broadening the definition of scholarship to encompass aspects of teaching and service (AACSB 1991).

Thus, the 1992 Task Force undertook to add its own gloss to the accreditation standards that the entire membership had approved in 1991. The original standards for intellectual contributions appear in Table 1, and the italicized material that follows each section represents the Task Force's commentary on the actual standards.

Marketing faculty who have difficulty fitting their research into the graduate school model requirements should be able to meet these revised standards with their alternative components of scholarship. Indeed, so could much of their other work that they have never attempted to describe as scholarship. Most marketing professors should meet the research standards for promotion and tenure if allowed to count summarizing the original research of others, bringing accounts of business world experiences into the classroom, teaching in executive education programs, advising students, and preparing teaching materials for classes. These various categories, taken together, provide a very broad perspective of academic research.

OTHER INFLUENCES ON MARKETING SCHOLARSHIP

Influences from Outside the University

In the early 1970s, when we completed our doctoral work, doctoral education required investigating only a few academic journals, including the *Journal of Marketing (JM)*, the *Journal of Marketing Research (JMR)*, the *Journal of Retailing*, and the *Journal of Business*. Occasional assignments included the *Harvard Business Review*, the *Sloan Management Review*, *Business Horizons*, and *MSU Business Topics*. We recall the initial issues of the *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *Marketing Science*, and the *Journal of Consumer Research*. We occasionally looked at economics journals as well as publications of the Academy of Management.

How many marketing journals are accessible today? More to the point, how many journals consider manuscripts that focus on topics in marketing? We cannot say with certainty, but we identified well over 100 journals that have included marketing-related articles within the last five years. A feature of publishing today is the wide availability of journals operated by for-profit publishers. Tenure and promotion at research-oriented universities in the 1970s was earned via publication in journals sponsored primarily by professional associations or universities. Today's junior faculty may submit manuscripts not only to the same journals, but also to a host of new journals published under the auspices of Elsevier Science, Haworth Press, MCB University Press, Sage Publications, Wiley Interscience, and others. As other market opportunities are identified, i.e., as scholarly niches reveal themselves, new journals will emerge to provide outlets for research.

TABLE 1
1991 AACSB TASK FORCE REVIEW OF ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

Intellectual Contributions	1992 Task Force Commentary
Basic Scholarship: The Creation of new knowledge	<i>Outputs from basic scholarship activities include publication in refereed journals, research monographs, scholarly books, chapters in scholarly books, proceedings from scholarly meetings, papers presented at academic meetings, publicly available research working papers, and papers presented at faculty research seminars.</i>
Discovery research, the testing of theories, is included along with developing theories based on case development.	<i>Interdisciplinary work across fields, e.g., environmental studies and management, or language studies and international business, are also included.</i>
Applied Scholarship: The application, transfer, and interpretation of knowledge to improve management practice and teaching.	<i>Outputs from applied scholarship activities include publication in professional journals, professional presentations, public/trade journals, in-house journals, book reviews, and papers presented at faculty workshops.</i> <i>Also included are case writing to illustrate existing theories, adapting pure research of others into text, service to community (e.g., internships and case enrichment) interpreting real world experience to classroom use that is generalizable and reusable, and interdisciplinary work across fields such as environmental studies in management or language studies and international business.</i>
Instructional Development: The enhancement of the educational value of instructional efforts of the institution or discipline	<i>Outputs from instructional development activities include textbooks, publications in pedagogical journals, written cases with instructional materials, instructional software, and publicly available materials describing the design and implementation of new courses.</i> <i>Also included are executive education course teaching, internships supervised by faculty, and materials used to enhance student learning, e.g., for advising and mentoring students and for assessment. In addition, developing new curriculum materials or support materials to be used by others (slides, video presentations, computer software, and teachers' manuals).</i>

Specialty journals emerged at first because prospective authors, seeking a forum for their work, found that journals like *JM* rarely published articles on certain substantive topics. So prominent scholars or universities supported the development of new journals. For example, Thomas Kinnear and his home university, the University of Michigan, introduced and underwrote the *Journal of Marketing & Public Policy* (later renamed the *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* at the behest of the American Marketing Association). Journals examining international business issues originated in this fashion.

At the same time journals examining specific marketing functions began to publish work that *JM* found to be

narrowly conceived or not of broad interest. This fragmentation continues with the current generation of new journals. The abundance of outlets for marketing scholarship exacerbates the timeless debate concerning journal rankings. The next iteration may well spawn more narrowly focused scholarship, technically possible via web-based journals with virtually no page constraints.

Additional factors also contribute to the expanding nature of academic marketing research. The domain of marketing continues to change, with some areas migrating toward other disciplines, e.g., the broadening of strategy research (Silk 1993, p. 403). Some topics are best studied with large databases, available only from practi-

tioners on a proprietary basis (Fern and Monroe 1996). As marketing continues to change, so too will the nature of the academic marketing research process.

To some extent, faculty research is becoming more applied, perhaps not so much as a reflection of the preceding standards for academic research, but more as a response to opportunities and pressures from the business world (Porter 1997). Business school deans, through their advisory boards, can provide access for marketing faculty to practitioners with real problems and real databases. Along with their interest in impressing academic colleagues, marketing faculty would like to help resolve legitimate business problems. In fact, some marketing faculty have joined the voices criticizing academic research for being arcane and irrelevant (see, e.g., Rotfeld 1995; Rudolph 1995), urging marketing academics to concentrate on applied research.

Some universities have aligned aspects of their teaching and research objectives. Vanderbilt's Owen School was among the first to offer an electronic commerce (EC) emphasis (AACSB 1998; Tergesen 1999) as well as a telecommunications and electronic commerce concentration in its MBA program, the latter having more of a technology focus. Marketing faculty at Owen now direct a research center, funded by corporate sponsors, looking at the marketing implications of commercial World Wide Web sites. The research philosophy guiding these activities is that "good EC research is multidisciplinary and good EC practice is cross-functional" (AACSB 1998, p. 18).

The importance of faculty research in forging alliances with business school benefactors is being recognized by both faculty and administrators (AACSB 1997a; Trahan and Gitman 1995). Business schools that develop recognition for specific research expertise can leverage this competence to build relationships with businesses for several purposes: (1) data sources for faculty research, (2) consulting opportunities for faculty, (3) focused executive education programs, (4) discussion of broader curriculum issues, and (5) sources of funds for a variety of purposes.

Influences from Within the University

Faculty themselves have helped to escalate the "stakes" in the "research game." Numerous studies have developed rankings of business journals (see, e.g., Barrett, Olia, and Bailey 2000; Black and Gunnigle 1967; Browne and Becker 1979; Coe and Weinstock 1983; Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997; Luke and Doke 1987), and bibliometric approaches to studying the impact of journals and authors have proliferated in marketing (see, e.g., Robinson and Adler 1981; Cote, Leong, and Cote 1991) and other business disciplines (see, e.g., Beed and Beed 1996; Fishe 1998). Studies have correlated research productivity and business school rankings (see, e.g., Siemens

et al. 2005). Many journals that focus on specific marketing functions have published articles summarizing the "most prolific contributors" to the field (see, e.g., Albaum and Peterson 1984; Barry 1990; Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas 1998; Sprott and Miyazaki 2002). The authors of such articles often appear high on the lists of frequent contributors (see, e.g., Malhotra 1996).

From the perspective of a faculty member, the annual performance appraisal provides another instrumental view of valued research. Teaching several courses per semester with multiple preparations, faculty must view research output as a secondary objective. In this environment, if a faculty member is evaluated on the basis of annual research output, then he/she must target journals and conferences that emphasize quick turnaround and topical breadth. Rarely can these faculty afford to take the time to examine cutting edge problems, either in terms of theory development or research methods.

Some universities proclaim lofty research goals, utilizing faculty evaluations procedures that involve publishing in journals appearing on an approved list of outlets. Faculty in such programs often find that administrators rely on journal count rather than content to dole out merit raises for research. For faculty, the real battle centers on securing a spot on the list of valued journals for one's favored outlet. Administrators who count articles rather than read them are shirking some of their supervisory duties and are providing impetus for further expansion of the journal pool. This sort of institutional drift has been documented (Jacobson 1992; Milem, Berger, and Dey 2000).

Faculty at universities with prominent research objectives are expected to contribute regularly to top-tier journals in their fields because of their reduced teaching loads, typically six hours per semester, perhaps less. While the competition for scarce journal space is fierce, research goals and research support allow these universities to establish annual evaluation and tenure and promotion criteria that ensure an enduring research orientation.

In recent years, the specter of post-tenure review has caused senior faculty to re-examine their research programs, perhaps even retooling to become current in new fields (Reiland 1996; Strauss 2000). While post-tenure review is a controversial topic (see, e.g., AACSB 1997b; Sowell 1998), many universities are considering such reviews. A critical issue regarding research is whether the senior faculty job description will include a substantial research dimension and, if so, how research is defined. In other words, does it make sense for a tenured faculty member with 25 years experience to continue to implement the assistant professor model that includes an emphasis on scholarly research (Gilliland 1997; *HR On Campus* 1998)?

Post-tenure review leads directly to a consideration of the career cycles of a faculty member. Marketing academics have devoted attention to this topic and have

concluded that clearly distinct career stages exist (see, e.g., Berry 1993). Research requires considerable attention during the first 10–15 years, at least in the sense of mainstream academic publications (King, O’Hara, and Cudd 1994; Shapiro 1984). In later years faculty expand into different interest areas, sometimes maintaining research programs. Often, however, senior faculty gravitate toward textbooks, consulting, and applied research. Faculty essentially follow multiple paths (see, e.g., Brand 2000).

Influences from Within . . .

As senior faculty (30+ years in the profession) at our respective institutions, we have seen our research interests expand, as have our institutions’ views of our roles. Our retrospective on our own research programs suggests an evolution. We struggled early to develop systematic research programs, opting instead to pursue research topics that were timely but outside our areas of expertise. We eventually embraced research topics of interest to us and congruent with our college’s promotion and tenure standards. In the past 20 years, subsequent to pressures to meet promotion standards, we have focused on what we believe to be interesting and perhaps important research questions (Creamer 1999). Like many senior faculty (Frost and Jean 2003), our interests have become multidisciplinary as we seek to connect our research with potentially related work in other fields.

The reality of the research environment has shaped our research programs in other ways. We remain current in substantive research areas, but we have seen the gap widen between our data analysis and manipulation skills and the techniques currently employed in highly regarded scholarly journals. So we work instead in areas that require analytical thinking and reasoning with less emphasis on numerical analysis. At one point in our careers we were troubled by our lack of data analysis prowess, but the topic is no longer of any real concern to either of us, due in part to the availability of talented junior colleagues. We have not had a discussion about retooling in more than a decade. We know many senior colleagues who have experienced the same kind of transition.

Our research partnership is another aspect of our careers that has directed our interests and enhanced our research productivity. Friends for a decade before becoming collaborators, our first coauthored paper appeared in 1980. Since then, we have managed to add at least one collaborative resume line in every year but three. Our partnership has yielded 55 articles and conference papers on a variety of topics. We cannot begin to count the number of conversations that begot an idea for the “next great JM,” only to decide upon later reflection that our enthusiasm was misplaced. It is probably no coincidence

that many of these ideas entered the world in the company of premium gin martinis.

One of the real benefits of our partnership is our disparate ways of looking at and writing about research questions. The combination results in ideas and articulations that neither of us would arrive at on our own. Over the years we have also learned to be critical of each other’s work in ways that lead to manuscript improvements without defensive reactions. Our interactions while moving a paper to completion have helped each of us learn more about our research domains because of the availability of a trusted colleague. And we have each managed to pull the other through at least one period of reduced enthusiasm for research brought on by the vagaries of “life its own self” (adapted from Jenkins 1984).

We rarely target major journals anymore, even at the outset of a research adventure. The competition for that journal space is fierce, and our substantive research interests are generally outside the academic mainstream of marketing. Nonetheless, we look at the major journals and a number of specialty journals to track contemporary thinking and to try to maintain a working knowledge of current research topics. While we may view some topics and articles as arcane or myopic, we routinely find interesting ideas or propositions that find their way into classroom discussions. Implications sections of published articles may seem predictable or incomplete, so our job is to extend these sections in the context of our teaching and research activities.

Given all of this, we continue to use our research findings in our classes. Or, perhaps more accurately, in the classroom we utilize analytical skills, honed by decades of organizing and implementing research projects from start to finish. In addition, we bring to the classroom synopses of our own research and, more importantly, others’ research that we have distilled in formulating our own research questions and conclusions.

CONCLUSION

Broadly drawn definitions of scholarship seem to allow nearly all faculty members to participate in the research process. We believe that faculty in any discipline who do not maintain an active research agenda will soon lose their ability to do meaningful teaching. No matter how ardent their advising, how highly developed their pedagogy, how slick their teaching materials, or how up-to-the-minute their instructional media, effective teachers must sustain the sort of passion for their discipline that includes active involvement in scholarship, however broadly defined. Without that, college professors will eventually reach the point of having little new to say, no matter how engagingly they might be able to say it.

REFERENCES

- AACSB (1987), *Accreditation Council Policies and Standards*. St. Louis, MO: American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business.
- _____ (1991), *Final Report, AACSB Accreditation Project*. St. Louis, MO: American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business.
- _____ (1997a), "Corporate and Campus-Based B-Schools Take Strategic Approach to Alliances," *Newsline*, 28 (Fall), 1–7.
- _____ (1997b), "Post-Tenure Review: Is It the Answer to Questions of Accountability?" *Newsline*, 27 (Spring), 8–9.
- _____ (1998), "Electronic Commerce Emerging in MBA Curricula," *Newsline*, 28 (Summer), 18.
- Albaum, Gerald and Robert Peterson (1984), "Empirical Research in International Marketing, 1976–1982," *Journal of International Business Studies*, 15 (Spring/Summer), 161–73.
- Arenson, Karen W. (1998), "Undergraduate Education Is Lacking, Report Finds," *New York Times*, (April 20), A12.
- Argyris, Chris and Donald A. Schon (1975), *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Barrett, Christopher B., Aliakbar Olia, and Dee Von Bailey (2000), "Subdiscipline-Specific Journal Rankings: Whither Applied Economics?" *Applied Economics*, 32 (February), 239–48.
- Barry, Thomas E. (1990), "Publication Productivity in the Three Leading U.S. Advertising Journals: Inaugural Issue Through 1998," *Journal of Advertising*, 19 (January), 52–66.
- Beed, Clive and Cara Beed (1996), "Measuring the Quality of Academic Journals: The Case of Economics," *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, 18 (March), 369–85.
- Behrman, Jack N. and Richard I. Levin (1984), "Are Business Schools Doing Their Job?" *Harvard Business Review*, (January/February), 140–46+.
- Benbasat, Izak and Robert W. Zmud (1999), "Empirical Research in Information Systems: The Practice of Relevance," *MIS Quarterly*, 23 (March), 3–18.
- Berry, Leonard L. (1993), "Our Roles as Educators: Present and Future," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 15 (Fall 1993), 3–8.
- Black, M.K. and R. Gunnigle (1967), "Is *JMR* a Success?" *Journal of Marketing Research*, 4 (February), 88–90.
- Bolton, Michael J. and Gregory B. Stolcis (2003), "Ties That Do Not Bind: Musing on the Specious Relevance of Academic Research," *Public Administration Review*, 63 (September/October), 626–30.
- Boyer, Ernest L. (1990), *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, special report for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- _____ (1996), "Clinical Practice as Scholarship," *Holistic Nursing Practice*, 10 (April), 1–5.
- Brand, Myles (2000), "Changing Faculty Roles in Research Universities," *Change*, (November), 42–48.
- Bricker, Robert (1993), "Toward Understanding Academic Research: Accounting," *The CPA Journal*, 63 (February), 52–58.
- Browne, William G. and Boris W. Becker (1979), "Perceived Quality of Marketing Journals," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 1 (November), 6–15.
- Business Week* (1990), "Is Research in the Ivory Tower 'Fuzzy, Irrelevant, Pretentious?'" (October 29), 62–66.
- Chacon, Richard (1997), "Report Offers Guide to Test Professors," *Boston Globe*, (August 25), A1.
- Cheit, Earl F. (1985), "Business Schools and Their Critics," *California Management Review*, (Spring), 43–62.
- Coe, Robert K. and Irving Weinstock (1983), "Evaluating Journal Publications of Marketing Professors: A Second Look," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 5 (Spring), 37–42.
- Cote, Joseph A., Siew Meng Leong, and Janet Cote (1991), "Assessing the Influence of *Journal of Consumer Research*: A Citational Analysis," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18 (3), 402–10.
- Coye, Dale (1997), "Ernest Boyer and the New American College: Connecting the 'Disconnects,'" *Change*, 29 (May), 20–28.
- Creamer, Elizabeth G. (1999), "Knowledge Production, Publication Productivity, and Intimate Academic Partnerships," *Journal of Higher Education*, 70 (May/June), 261–73.
- Davenport, Thomas H. and M. Lynne Markus (1999), "Rigor vs. Relevance Revisited: Response to Benbasat and Zmud," *MIS Quarterly*, 23 (March), 19–25.
- Dickinson, Roger, Anthony Herbst, and John O'Shaughnessy (1983), "What Are Business Schools Doing for Business?" *Business Horizons*, (November/December), 46–51.
- Dorfman, Mark S. (1990), "Insurance in the Undergraduate Curriculum," *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, 57 (March), 47–58.
- Dulek, Ronald E. and John S. Fielden (1992), "Why Fight the System? The Non-Choice Facing Beleaguered Business Faculties," *Business Horizons*, 35 (September), 13–19.
- Editorial (1998), "Learning through Inquiry – Boyer Report: Finding Ways to Improve Education of Students at Research Institutions," *Baltimore Sun*, (April 25), 12A.
- Entwistle, Gary M. (2003), "Do the Right Thing: The 'Research' Curriculum," *Issues in Accounting Education*, 18 (February), 25–27.
- Fern, Edward F. and Kent B. Monroe (1996), "Effect-Size

- Estimates: Issues and Problems in Interpretation," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 23 (September), 89–103.
- Fishe, Raymond P.H. (1998), "What are the Research Standards for Full Professor of Finance?" *Journal of Finance*, 53 (June), 1053–70.
- Fox, Nick J. (2003), "Practice-Based Evidence: Towards Collaborative and Transgressive Research," *Sociology: The Journal of the British Sociological Association*, 37 (February), 8–102.
- Frost, Susan H. and Paul M. Jean (2003), "Bridging the Disciplines: Interdisciplinary Discourse and Faculty Scholarship," *Journal of Higher Education*, 74 (March/April), 119–49.
- Gardner, Lisa A. and Joan T. Schmit (1995), "Collegiate Risk Management and Insurance Education," *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, 62 (December), 625–38.
- Gilliland, Martha W. (1997), "Organizational Change and Tenure: We Can Learn from the Corporate Experience," *Change*, 29 (May 15), 29–37.
- Gordon, Robert A. and James E. Howell (1959), *Higher Education for Business*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Grayson, Jr., C. Jackson, and Kermit O. Hanson (1977), "The Business of Business Schools," *Wharton Magazine*, (March), 46–53.
- Hayes, Robert H. and William J. Abernathy (1980), "Managing Our Way to Economic Decline," *Harvard Business Review*, (July/August), 67.
- Henthorne, Tony L., Michael S. LaTour, and Tina Loraas (1998), "Publication Productivity in the Three Leading U.S. Advertising Journals: 1989 Through 1996," *Journal of Advertising*, 27 (June), 52–70.
- Hershey, Gerald L., Vidyaranya B. Gargeya, and John Eatman (1996), "Are Business Doctoral Graduates Prepared to Teach?" *Selections*, 13 (Autumn), 17–26.
- HR On Campus* (1998), "Post-Tenure Review Requires Institutions to Examine Roots," 1 (July).
- Hult, G. Tomas M., William T. Neese, and R. Edward Bashaw (1997), "Faculty Perceptions of Marketing Journals," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 19 (Spring), 4–16.
- Ivey, Susan L., Richard Scheffler, and James L. Zazzali (1998), "Supply Dynamics of the Mental Health Workforce: Implications for Health Policy," *The Milbank Quarterly*, 76 (March 22), 25–38.
- Ivy, Robert (1996), "Carnegie Study Sets Goals for Educating Architects; Calls for Renewal," *Architectural Record*, (May), 22–25.
- Jacobson, R.L. (1992), "Public-College Officials Struggle to Respond to Growing Concern over Faculty Productivity," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, (November 11), A17–18.
- Jenkins, Dan (1984), *Life Its Own Self: The Semi-Tougher Adventures of Billy Clyde Puckett and Them*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kellerman, Bert J., Peter J. Gordon, and Firooz Hekmat (1995), "Product and Pricing Courses Are Underrepresented in Undergraduate Marketing Curricula," *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 4, 18–25.
- King, John O., Bradley S. O'Hara, and Mike Cudd (1994), "Perceived Causes, Effects, and Remedies for Plateauing Among Marketing Professors," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 16 (Spring), 15–24.
- Lasson, Kenneth (1990), "Scholarship Amok: Excesses in the Pursuit of Truth and Tenure," *Harvard Law Review*, 103 (February), 926–57.
- Linder, Jane C. and H. Jeff Smith (1992), "The Complex Case of Management Education," *Harvard Business Review*, (September/October), 16–23.
- Locker, Kitty O. (1998), "The Role of The Association for Business Communication in Shaping Business Communication as an Academic Discipline," *Journal of Business Communication*, 35 (January), 14–49.
- Luke, Robert H. and E. Reed Doke (1987), "Marketing Journal Hierarchies: Faculty Perceptions, 1986-87," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 15 (Spring), 74–78.
- Malhotra, Naresh K. (1996), "Analysis of the Research Published in JAMS," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 24 (Fall), 291–98.
- Milem, Jeffrey F., Joseph B. Berger, and Eric L. Dey (2000), "Faculty Time Allocation," *Journal of Higher Education*, 7 (July), 454–69.
- Mitgang, Lee D. (1997), "Saving the Soul of Architectural Education," *Architectural Record*, (May), 124–35.
- Najman, Jake M. and Belinda Hewitt (2003), "The Validity of Publication and Citation Counts for Sociology and Other Selected Disciplines," *Journal of Sociology*, 38 (March), 62–80.
- Nicholson, Ian A.M. (1998), "The Approved Bureaucratic Torpor: Goodwin Watson, Critical Psychology, and the Dilemmas of Expertise, 1930–1945," *Journal of Social Issues*, 54 (Spring), 29–52.
- Oltheten, Elisabeth, Vasilis Theoharakis, and Nickolaos G. Travlos (2005), "Faculty Perceptions and Readership Patterns of Finance Journals: A Global View," *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 40 (March), 223–39.
- Pierson, Frank C. et al. (1959), *The Education of American Businessmen: A Study of University-College Programs in Business Administration*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Porter, Lyman W. (1997), "A Decade of Change in the Business School: From Complacency to Tomorrow," *Selections*, 13 (Winter), 1–8.
- Prather-Kinsey, Jenice J. and Norlin G. Rueschhoff (2004), "An Analysis of International Accounting Research in U.S.- and Non-U.S.-Based Academic Accounting Journals," *Journal of International Accounting Research*, 3 (1), 63–81.

- Reiland, Ralph (1996), "Should Colleges and Universities Abolish Academic Tenure?" *Insight on the News*, (November 25), 24.
- Robinson, L.M. and R. Adler (1981), "Measuring the Impact of Marketing Scholars and Institutions: An Analysis of Citation Frequency," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 9 (Spring), 147–62.
- Rotfeld, Herbert (1995), "Start Making Sense: In the Academic World, To Be Incomprehensible Is to Be Respected," *Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, (July 16), 5R.
- Rudolph, Bennett L. (1995), "Higher Education in Marketing: Continuously Improving Irrelevance," *Marketing News*, (January 16), 4.
- Sandmann, Lorilee R., Pennie G. Foster-Fishman, James Lloyd, Warren Rauhe, and Cheryl Rosaen (2000), "Managing Critical Tensions: Outreach Component of Academic Research to Help Communities," *Change*, 32 (January), 45–53.
- Shapiro, Stanley J. (1984), "Let's Relaunch Silent Seniors Who Wish to Publish," *Marketing News*, 18 (July 20), 2–23.
- Siemens, Jennifer Christie, Scot Burton, Thomas Jensen, and Norma A. Mendoza (2005), "An Examination of the Relationship Between Research Productivity in Prestigious Business Journals and Popular Press Business School Rankings," *Journal of Business Research*, 58, 467–76.
- Silk, Alvin J. (1993), "Marketing Science in a Changing Environment," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30 (Fall), 401–5.
- Simon, Herbert A. (1969), *Sciences of the Artificial*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Sowell, Thomas (1998), "Titanic Problems in Academe," *Forbes*, (November 30), 82.
- Sprott, David E. and Anthony D. Miyazaki (2002), "Two Decades of Contributions to Marketing and Public Policy: An Analysis of Research Published in *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 21 (Spring), 105–26.
- Srinivasan, S., Bruce Kemelgor, and Scott D. Johnson (2000), "The Future of Business School Scholarship: An Empirical Assessment of the Boyer Framework by U.S. Deans," *Journal of Education for Business*, 76 (November), 75–87.
- Tergesen, Anne (1999), "E-Commerce@Ivorytower.com," *Business Week*, (September 13), 10.
- Strauss, Valerie (2000), "The Trouble with Tenure," *Washington Post*, (May 14), W16.
- Trahan, Emery A. and Lawrence J. Gitman (1995), "Bridging the Theory-Practice Gap in Corporate Finance: A Survey of Chief Financial Officers," *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 35 (Spring), 73–87.
- Van Scotter, James R. and Patrick E. Culligan (2003), "The Value of Theoretical Research and Applied Research for the Hospitality Industry: The Hospitality Industry Could Benefit from More Theoretical Research—Because Theoretical Principles Can Guide Practitioners' Decision," *Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 44 (April), 14–27.
- Welsh, John F. and Jeff Metcalf (2003), "Faculty and Administrative Support for Institutional Effectiveness Activities: A Bridge Across the Chasm?" *Journal of Higher Education*, 74 (July/August), 445–68.

Copyright of *Journal for Advancement of Marketing Education* is the property of *Marketing Management Journal* and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.