Rankings in the Eyes of the Beholder: A Vox Populi Approach to Academic Journal Ranking

Kim-Shyan Fam
Victoria University of Wellington

Paurav Shukla
University of Brighton

Ashish Sinha
University of New South Wales

Chung-Leung Luk
City University of Hong Kong

Mathew Parackal
University of Otago

Joe Choon Yean Chai
University of Otago

Abstract

The ranking of academic journals is a contentious issue in the current higher education environment. Across the world, peers judge academics for tenure and promotion on the basis of the quality or prestige of the journals in which they publish. This research proposes a new metric (i.e., the MAG score) to assess journal impact and ranking in the field of marketing using the vox populi approach. The findings show that the vox populi approach provides a more comprehensive measure of journal impact than other impact factor metrics from the perspective of academics.

Keywords: Journal rankings, Perceptions, Impact factor, Marketing journals, Vox populi

Introduction

Most organizations, be they academic or corporate, use various kinds of metrics to assess their progress. However, during the past two decades, the academic discipline has experienced a phenomenal increase in the use of and reliance on various ranking metrics for recruiting and promoting academics and researchers. A growing competition exists among researchers, academic institutions, and journals to achieve high rankings (Bakir et al., 2000; Dibb and Simkin, 2005; Macdonald and Kam, 2007; Mort et al., 2004). As Rynes (2007) observes, publication in major journals significantly influences academic hiring, tenure, and promotion decisions. Citation impact has also become an important measure for evaluating senior academics in academic institutions (Adler and Harzing, 2009; Saad, 2009).

Such measures have a long-term impact on individual and institutional policy for research. For example, as Rynes (2007) notes, individuals and institutions focusing too heavily on these metrics have a very narrow definition of research productivity, which focuses on counting publications in high-impact-factor journals along with citations in the limited set of journals that such ranking systems recognize. Segalla (2008) further observes that such narrow definitions slow the diffusion of ideas and stifle academic dialogue because academics tend not to focus on other specialist journals with lower citation impact.

Rynes (2007) emphasizes that journal publications count highly toward academic promotions in the United States, and a similar trend occurs in the Asian context. Lawrence (2003, p. 259) observes, “scientists are increasingly desperate to publish in a few top journals and are wasting time and energy manipulating their manuscripts and courting editors. As a result, the objective presentation of work, the accessibility of articles, and the quality of research itself are being compromised.”

Adler and Harzing (2009) opine that many academic researchers are involved in developing highly esoteric manuscripts that have questionable contribution in advancing the overall social understanding (Perren et al., 2001).

In their examination of international business journal rankings, Adler and Harzing (2009) find that competing rankings were arbitrary and no consensus exists among researchers on the superiority of any specific ranking approach. Therefore, Adler and Harzing called for an immediate examination of existing ranking systems, suggesting that the current academic assessment systems undermine rather than foster or reward scholarship that matters. To address the calls for research in this area, this article attempts to fill the gap in the literature. A distinguishing feature of this work is the use of the *vox populi* (Latin for “voice of the people”) approach to address the issues raised in the context of academic journal rankings.

Surowiecki (2004) argues that a diverse collection of independently deciding individuals is likely to make certain types of decisions and predictions better than individuals or even experts. Surowiecki outlines four important elements for outlining a wise crowd: (1) diversity of opinion, (2) independence, (3) decentralization, and (4) aggregation. Many scholars believe that the academic community in general possesses

these elements, and therefore the vox populi approach may capture the “wisdom of the crowds.” To enhance the overall approach, the current research also uses the “top-of-the-mind” recall method, which the field of advertising research frequently employs.

This study contributes to the understanding of how marketing academics across the academic spectrum (i.e., from lecturers to professors) rank academic journals and also demonstrates the prevalent trend in publishing among marketing scholars. The study also examines the range of marketing academic publications and highlights whether marketing academics’ approach to publication is becoming significantly marginalized within marketing-related journals. In addition, the study helps identify whether regional differences exist in relation to publication preference. Prior research has observed that the elite of the academic profession, who may not represent the total academic population, created most of the other ranking indices (Theoharakis and Hirst, 2002; Van Fleet et al., 2000). By taking into consideration views from a wide spectrum of academics, this study provides a much more balanced view related to academic journal rankings. Finally, this study examines whether perceptions of journal quality match independent and more objective assessments of the impact of journals.

Background

Several methods that evaluate and rank journals exist; however, each has its own merits and demerits. For example, the scientific community widely uses the impact factor method (Rynes, 2007; Saad, 2009; Segalla, 2008). However, quite a few articles and commentaries have identified inherent problems with the impact factor (Hascall et al., 2007; Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1992; Lange, 2006; Perren et al., 2001). For example, (1) long articles collect many citations and, on average, receive a higher journal impact factor than short articles; (2) journals with a short publication lag allow many short-term journal citations and thus receive a higher journal impact factor; (3) new and specialized journals tend to be excluded from the impact factor; (4) no correlation exists between an individual’s journal articles and the journal impact factor; and (5) authors tend to over-cite themselves (Guerrero, 2002).

Kacmar and Whitfield (2000) identify several inherent problems with journal rankings. They suggest that the problem arises because of the generalization in rankings, as each citation is awarded equal weight. This means that an article cited in a “laundry list of references would be given the same impact score as an article that develops a complete research study around the previous research” (Kacmar and Whitfield, 2000, p. 395). The impact factor does not include a negative citation measure, in which the work has been criticized for the shortcomings. The citation index can also be skewed depending on the journal in which an academic wishes to publish and the popularity of certain authors in the field.

Researchers suggest the use of various methods to avoid the inherent bias in journal rankings. The “perceived quality” of journals is one of the methods used to assess the

merit of articles published by academics (Theoharakis and Hirst, 2002). Although this method is widely accepted, a panel of senior academics collates perceived quality journal lists, as in the case of the *Australian Business Deans Journal List* or the *Association of Business Schools' Academic Journal Quality Guide*. The intent of both these lists is to assist promotion/hiring committees and allow review teams to evaluate the quality of the research output of academics.

In New Zealand, although no such “official” list exists, the panel members of the last two PBRF (Performance Based Research Fund) exercises used a combination of recognized perceived quality lists to evaluate academics’ research output. However, a point of contention raised against the perceived quality method is that the list is heavily biased toward those on the panel, as Cudd and Morris (1988) show in their study; here, they observe that respondents who published in top journals tended to give low merit points to low-ranked journals. The tendency also exists to grant a higher grade to journals in which a person him- or herself has published (see Extejt and Smith, 1990; Jobber and Simpson, 1988; Todorov and Glanzel, 1988). Van Fleet et al., (2000) claim that if a panel comprises professors and senior academics that have considerable top journal publications, new and upcoming journals are disadvantaged from developing into quality journals because they are ignored. This disadvantageous positioning may then extend to academics who publish in such journals. Thus, the use of panels to create journal rating lists may be subject to self-preservation and predisposition bias.

Another method involves collecting rating scores from a sample of academics using survey research. The biases discussed when using a panel could still surface in this method, but with a lesser magnitude. Anchors used in the survey questionnaire, which may not reflect the content quality of the journals, introduce a serious bias. Other biases include item order effect and respondent fatigue. Although item order effect can be controlled through randomization, respondent fatigue may be difficult to control because respondents must rate a large number of journals at the same time. For example, in their study, Mort et al. (2004) use a list of 73 journals.

Another concern is that the journal list used in such rating exercises often is recycled from similar studies or contained journals that the researchers believe are appropriate. In either case, the respondents have no input in the creation of the journal list. For institutions, the journal ranking list affects the funding that the institution receives, and for academics, the ranking list plays a major role in their career advancement. Therefore, producing a rating list that is free of bias is imperative.

Methodology

The current study approach is to allow academics the freedom to nominate as many journals as they can recall in a given category. Thus, through unaided recall, top-of-the-mind awareness of a journal among the academics was produced. This established method is used extensively in measuring advertisement effectiveness and brand recall. In the current case, this method is used to assess the awareness of A-, B-, and C-grade

journals among academics. The advantage of unaided recall lies in the requirement for mental processing of retrieving the stored encoded information without any cues (see Bagozzi and Silk, 1983; Finn, 1992; Krugman, 1986; Shapiro and Krishnan, 2001; Stapel, 1998; Till and Baack, 2005). Such an approach would embody more credibility to the journal ranking list given that academics are responsible for generating and disseminating knowledge and, in the process, have seen, read, and/or published in the journals they nominate.

Sampling Approach

The sampling approach used was based on the vox populi notion of Galton (1907), which suggests that the intelligence of the masses far exceeds that of any single individual or of experts. According to the vox populi theory, any judgment respondents make will be free of passion and uninfluenced by rhetoric. Galton (1907, p. 451) claims that the result derived from vox populi is “correct to within 1 percent of the true value and more creditable to the trustworthiness of a democratic judgment than might have been expected.” To implement the vox populi sampling approach, this study developed a sampling frame of academics by scanning marketing, tourism, and international business departmental web sites of universities across the five continents.

For countries such as Singapore, Taiwan, Korea, Malaysia, Canada, the United Kingdom, the Republic of Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, and Hong Kong, the sample included academics in marketing/tourism/international business departments of all the universities in the respective countries. For the United States, in addition to including the top 500 universities based on the Shanghai Jiao Tong Academic Ranking of World Universities List 2007 (ARWU), the sample included another 200 universities not in this list. For continental Europe, Japan, India, Africa, the Middle East, and South America, the sample included universities that were listed in both the Shanghai Jiao Tong ARWU and THES-QS World University Rankings 2007, plus an additional 200 universities not listed in either of these two lists.

The survey included academics from all levels (lecturers, senior lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors, professors, and chair professors). In total, 5336 academics from the five continents were approached through their e-mail address. Of these, 425 out-of office auto-generated messages, 390 “undeliverable” e-mails (e.g., invalid e-mail addresses), and 232 responses deemed incomplete could not be used. The survey successfully captured data from 538 academics who indicated the journals they believed were A, B, and C grade. The collective data of the 538 academics were compiled to produce a list titled “The MAG Scholar List.” MAG Scholar is the abbreviation for the Marketing in Asia Group (www.magscholar.com), which initiated the study. This group is an association of researchers from all walks of academia with research interest in Asia and residing in 35 countries.

Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire was divided into two sections. In the first section, respondents nominated up to 10 perceived A-grade journals, including the journals the respondents had published in between 2003 and 2008. Following the nomination of A-grade journals, the next step was to nominate the B-grade and C-grade journals in which the respondents had published. A six-year time frame was deemed appropriate in an attempt to adequately capture the breadth of the respondents' publications. The second section captures the demographic profile of the respondents. This profile includes respondents' highest academic qualification; the country in which they obtained their degree; the percentage of teaching and research activities devoted to marketing, tourism, and international business; affiliation; and gender.

Results

Demographic Profile

The total number of respondents who completed the online survey was 538. The majority (73.4%) of the respondents was male, and roughly 74% of the respondents held a doctoral degree. On the question of teaching and research activities, most of the respondents claimed marketing (76%), followed by international business (15%) and tourism (9%). Respondent affiliation profiles showed that the highest number of respondents were affiliated with the American Marketing Association (36.6%), followed by the European Marketing Academy (18.4%). The smaller groups such as the Australia New Zealand Marketing Academy, Industrial Marketing and Purchasing, and MAG Scholar registered less than 10% of respondents. The majority of the respondents were from U.S./Canada (41.3%), U.K./Europe (26.3%), Australia/New Zealand (21.2%), and Asia/Africa (11.2%). In total, 30 countries were represented in this study.

Perceived A-grade Refereed Journals

The 538 respondents recalled 364 different so-called A-grade journals. The range in number of unaided recalls was from a low of one to a high of 10 journals. Six journals had more than 100 unaided recalls, eight journals had between 50 and 99 unaided recalls, and 16 journals had between 25 and 49 unaided recalls. The remaining journals had less than 25 unaided recalls. *Journal of Marketing* had the highest number of unaided recalls, occupying 9% of the share of voice. *Journal of Marketing Research* (347) was next, with a share of voice of 8%. Of the 364 different A-grade journals, the respondents had published in only 20.4% of them since 2003. The low publication rate would further support this study's unbiased results compared with other similar studies in which responses were usually heavily contaminated by respondents who had an interest in the journals.

Regionally, *Journal of Marketing* and *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* were the most-published outlet for academics from the United States and Canada (frequency = 7.7%). The academics from Australia and New Zealand published mainly in *Journal of Marketing* (5.9%), *Marketing Science* (5.9%), and *Journal of Business Research* (5.5%). European and U.K. academics published in *Journal of Marketing* (7.1), *Journal of Consumer Research* (5.7), and *Journal of Business Research* (5.3%). Finally, Asian academics preferred journal outlets such as *Journal of Business Research* (7.8%) and *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* (7.8%), followed by *European Journal of Marketing* (6.5%).

The journals in which respondents published the most are primarily marketing related; however, the journals in which respondents published the least show an interesting trend. Among the U.S. and Canadian academics, the least-published outlets were *Academy of Management Journal* (frequency = 0.4%), *Academy of Management Review* (0.4%), *Harvard Business Review* (0.4%), and *Administrative Science Quarterly* (0.4%). A similar trend occurred across the sample. Although the aforementioned journals are highly ranked according to their impact factor scores, marketing academics did not publish in them. This trend also highlights the increasing divide between marketing- and non-marketing-oriented journals. With a fewer number of academics preferring to publish in these journals, the divide may grow larger in the future.

Determining MAG Score and Index

To determine whether the perceived journal quality list matches the more abstract bibliometric indices, this study undertook compilation of the MAG Scholar Journal List. The list included the total unaided recalls of A-, B-, and C-grade journals. This study combined all three grade journals because most of the journals in the A-grade list included B- and C-grade journals. In addition, this study intended to produce a list generated by the respondents based on the total number of unaided recalls for each journal. A combined high recalls reflect the importance of the journal. After “clean-up,” which included deleting repeated entries for the same journal in each unaided recall and journals that were marginally unrelated to the business and management discipline, the total number of journals dropped to a manageable list. Because each journal has own features and merits, the first unaided recalled journal was allocated more weight than the second, third, fourth, and so on, until the tenth position. The study designed a formula to capture the relative standing of these journals. The sum of each journal’s value was labeled MAG score, and this score was used to rank the journal relative to the others.

$$\text{MAG score} = \sum_n (X_{in} / T_n) \times (1/n),$$

Where x is the number of unaided recalls, i is the type of journal, n is the order of journal recalls (n = 1, 2, 3, ..., 10), and T is the total number of journal recalls.

As Table 1, Column 4, shows, *Journal of Marketing* has a MAG score of 0.4168 and a MAG index of 100. *Journal of Marketing Research* is next with a MAG index of 60.94 (0.2540/0.4168). The “Difference” column indicates the MAG score difference between *Journal of Marketing* (0.4168) and *Journal of Marketing Research* (0.2540) multiplied by 1000. The use of 1000 is to amplify the difference. Using the figures in the “Difference” column (Column 6), the study scientifically identified a “break” between a group of high AAA-grade journals and the second-best group. For example, a significant break occurs between *Journal of the Retailing* (11.30) and *Journal of International Business Studies*, between *Academy of Management Journal* (9.78) and *Academy of Management Review* (0.05), and between *Journal of Travel Research* (2.10) and *Journal of International Marketing* (0.80). Overall, the study identified six AAA-rated, eight AAB-rated, and 15 ABB-rated journals. This statistically derived difference suggests a large distinction among the AAA-, AAB-, ABB-, and BBB-ranked journals.

Table 1 MAG Score and Index of Top 30 Journals

Rank	Journal	Total Recalls	MAG Scores	MAG Index	Difference	Group
1	Journal of Marketing	394	0.4168	100.00	162.78	AAA
2	Journal of Marketing Research	347	0.2540	60.94	47.92	AAA
3	Journal of Consumer Research	305	0.2061	49.44	64.68	AAA
4	Marketing Science	242	0.1414	33.92	61.33	AAA
5	Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science	178	0.0800	19.20	22.09	AAA
6	Journal of Retailing	125	0.0580	13.91	11.30	AAA
7	Journal of International Business Studies	67	0.0467	11.19	2.69	AAB
8	European Journal of Marketing	76	0.0440	10.55	1.22	AAB
9	Journal of Business Research	82	0.0427	10.26	1.77	AAB
10	International Journal of Research in Marketing	89	0.0410	9.83	1.40	AAB
11	Management Science	74	0.0396	9.50	0.96	AAB
12	Annals of Tourism Research	43	0.0386	9.27	0.83	AAB
13	Journal of Advertising	67	0.0378	9.07	0.68	AAB
14	Academy of Management Journal	51	0.0371	8.90	9.78	AAB
15	Academy of Management Review	38	0.0273	6.56	0.05	ABB
16	Journal of Consumer Psychology	53	0.0273	6.55	0.51	ABB

Rank	Journal	Total Recalls	MAG Scores	MAG Index	Difference	Group
17	International Marketing Review	34	0.0268	6.42	0.09	ABB
18	Tourism Management	35	0.0267	6.40	0.99	ABB
19	Journal of Consumer Behaviour	28	0.0257	6.17	0.07	ABB
20	Marketing Letters	28	0.0256	6.15	0.76	ABB
21	Journal of Advertising Research	47	0.0249	5.96	1.27	ABB
22	Journal of Services Marketing	30	0.0236	5.66	0.50	ABB
23	Strategic Management Journal	40	0.0231	5.54	1.62	ABB
24	Harvard Business Review	34	0.0215	5.15	0.90	ABB
25	Industrial Marketing Management	37	0.0206	4.94	0.33	ABB
26	Administrative Science Quarterly	30	0.0202	4.86	0.20	ABB
27	Journal of Service Research	40	0.0200	4.81	0.61	ABB
28	Journal of Marketing Management	33	0.0194	4.66	2.10	ABB
29	Journal of Travel Research	24	0.0173	4.16	2.10	ABB
30	Journal of International Marketing	30	0.0152	3.65	0.80	BBB

Note: For a full listing, please see www.magscholar.com.

Validation of MAG Score

To further validate the MAG score, this study carried out a correlation test with SSCI and Scopus indices. Primarily, the goal of the comparison is to identify whether similarity exists between the MAG score and the more widely known and established assessments of the impact of journals. Thomson's ISI Web of Knowledge (SSCI) and Elsevier's Scopus database have approximately 2470 and 2850 social sciences titles, respectively. The citation index measures the number of times authors cite an average article in a journal in related journals. Both indices provide a proxy for the quality of an article/journal.

To compare the MAG score with the SSCI and Scopus indices, the study compiled a MAG Scholar List of the top 100 journals. This list was used to identify similar journals indexed in SSCI and Scopus. In total, SSCI and Scopus have 44 and 74 journals that appeared in the top 100 MAG Scholar List, respectively. Then, all the 2009 articles (N) that appeared in each of these journals were counted. Also identified

was the impact article citation index (I) for each journal. Next, the number of articles was multiplied by the citation index ($N \times I$) to estimate the total annual citation impact factor (TIF) for each journal. After identifying the total impact factor (TIF) for each journal, the study conducted a correlation analysis to find the overall similarity among SSCI, Scopus, and the MAG score. The correlation between Scopus and the MAG score was significant ($r = 0.488, p < 0.001$). A strong and significant correlation was found for the top 20 journals ($r = 0.420, p < 0.001$). This analysis indicates that the MAG Scholar List is similar to the broadly defined Scopus index. The significant correlation implies that perceptions match independent, more objective assessments of the impacts of journals. However, no significant correlation appeared between the SSCI and the MAG score. This could be due to SSCI's narrower business and management database.

Table 2 Comparison between MAG Score, SSCI and SCOPUS Indices

No.	Journal Name	2009 Publ	Scopus IF	Scopus TIF	Scopus Rank-ing	SSCI IF	SSCI TIF	SSCI Rank-ing	MAG Score	MAG Rank-ing
1	Journal of Marketing	62	4.23	262.36	10	4.10	253.89	4	0.417	1
2	Journal of Marketing Research	77	2.58	198.65	6	2.57	198.20	22	0.254	2
3	Journal of Consumer Research	78	1.60	124.55	25	1.59	124.18	61	0.206	3
4	Marketing Science	88	2.41	212.12	19	3.31	291.19	9	0.141	4
5	Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science	41	2.25	92.39	75	1.29	52.85	76	0.080	5
6	Journal of Retailing	45	3.91	175.91	49	4.10	184.28	4	0.058	6
7	Journal of International Business Studies	93	2.62	243.70	41	2.99	278.26	12	0.047	7
8	European Journal of Marketing	76	1.04	79.17	283	0.71	54.11	132	0.044	8
9	Journal of Business Research	172	1.28	220.34	127	0.94	162.20	108	0.043	9
10	International Journal of Research in Marketing	39	1.81	70.60	71	1.61	62.83	60	0.041	10
11	Management Science	141	2.69	379.89	31	2.35	331.91	29	0.040	11
12	Annals of Tourism Research	40	1.70	68.00	126	1.10	44.16	Z	0.039	12
13	Journal of Advertising	34	0.94	32.07	154	1.00	34.00	102	0.038	13
14	Academy of Management Journal	63	5.50	346.31	9	6.08	382.98	2	0.037	14
15	Academy of Management Review	43	6.19	266.13	21	N/A	N/A	X	0.027	15
16	Journal of Consumer Psychology	69	2.26	156.07	Z	2.84	196.03	16	0.027	16

No.	Journal Name	2009 Publn	Scopus IF	Scopus TIF	Scopus Rank -ing	SSCI IF	SSCI TIF	SSCI Rank -ing	MAG Score	MAG Rank -ing
17	International Marketing Review	32	1.33	42.50	246	1.16	37.25	84	0.027	17
18	Tourism Management	91	1.81	164.47	134	1.27	115.93	77	0.027	18
19	Journal of Consumer Behaviour	28	N/A	N/A	Z	N/A	N/A	X	0.026	19
20	Marketing Letters	22	0.74	16.38	101	0.70	15.36	135	0.026	20
21	Journal of Advertising Research	34	0.54	18.48	235	0.61	20.81	144	0.025	21
22	Journal of Services Marketing	46	0.86	39.66	272	N/A	N/A	X	0.024	22
23	Strategic Management Journal	72	3.32	239.12	32	3.34	240.77	8	0.023	23
24	Harvard Business Review	286	0.81	230.85	38	1.79	512.80	47	0.021	24
25	Industrial Marketing Management	107	1.77	189.86	133	1.40	150.12	70	0.021	25
26	Administrative Science Quarterly	14	1.83	25.63	34	2.85	39.94	14	0.020	26
27	Journal of Service Research	27	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.020	27
28	Journal of Marketing Management	30	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.019	28
29	Journal of Travel Research	39	1.12	43.77	Z	N/A	N/A	X	0.017	29
30	Journal of International Marketing	20	1.97	39.49	189	1.67	33.34	58	0.015	30
31	Journal of Economic Surveys	33	1.44	47.47	Z	0.73	24.16	Z	0.014	31
32	Australasian Marketing Journal	22	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.014	32
33	Journal of Public Policy and Marketing	24	0.93	22.22	13	N/A	N/A	X	0.014	33
34	Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing	51	0.59	30.28	214	N/A	N/A	X	0.013	34
35	Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice	28	0.78	21.78	386	N/A	N/A	X	0.013	35
36	Journal of Product Innovation Management	50	2.48	124.07	67	2.65	132.50	19	0.012	36
37	Marketing Intelligence and Planning	51	0.57	28.92	308	N/A	N/A	X	0.012	37
38	International Journal of Wine Marketing	0	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.012	38
39	Advances in Consumer Research	0	0.10	0.00	531	N/A	N/A	X	0.012	39
40	Journal of Business Ethics	415	1.18	487.75	249	1.02	424.55	99	0.012	40
41	Psychology and Marketing	39	1.27	49.71	91	N/A	N/A	X	0.011	41

No.	Journal Name	2009 Publn	Scopus IF	Scopus TIF	Scopus Rank -ing	SSCI IF	SSCI TIF	SSCI Rank -ing	MAG Score	MAG Rank -ing
42	Journal of Consumer Marketing	49	0.66	32.32	234	N/A	N/A	X	0.011	42
43	Journal of Finance	81	4.08	330.63	5	4.02	325.46	5	0.011	43
44	Tourism Economics	51	0.51	26.12	312	N/A	N/A	X	0.011	44
45	Journal of Personality and Social Psychology	154	5.15	792.77	Z	5.04	775.39	Z	0.010	45
46	Organization Science	50	2.68	133.93	29	2.58	128.75	21	0.010	46
47	Journal of Product and Brand Management	53	0.59	31.49	275	N/A	N/A	X	0.010	47
48	Event Management	0	0.33	0.00	510	N/A	N/A	X	0.010	48
49	Journal of Marketing Education	27	0.72	19.50	149	N/A	N/A	X	0.010	49
50	Journal of Interactive Marketing	0	1.66	0.00	53	0.91	0.00	112	0.009	50
51	Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics	26	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.009	51
52	Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research	25	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.009	52
53	Business Horizons	63	0.67	42.37	274	N/A	N/A	X	0.009	53
54	International Journal of Advertising	38	0.59	22.35	610	0.79	30.06	124	0.009	54
55	Journal of Brand Management	52	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.008	55
56	Logistics Quarterly	0	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.008	56
57	International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management	57	0.77	43.85	267	N/A	N/A	X	0.008	57
58	Journal of Business and Psychology	28	0.62	17.38	204	0.41	11.59	163	0.008	58
59	International Journal of Service Industry Management	28	1.53	42.82	87	0.87	24.22	117	0.008	59
60	Journal of Consumer Behavior	22	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.008	60
61	Journal of Business Logistics	16	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.008	61
62	Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management	17	0.88	15.04	160	N/A	N/A	X	0.008	62
63	Qualitative Market Research	25	0.56	14.00	373	N/A	N/A	X	0.007	63
64	Health Marketing Quarterly	24	0.03	0.65	63	N/A	N/A	X	0.007	64
65	Journal of Relationship Marketing	18	0.21	3.83	497	N/A	N/A	X	0.007	65
66	Journal of Business	0	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.007	66

No.	Journal Name	2009 Publn	Scopus IF	Scopus TIF	Scopus Rank -ing	SSCI IF	SSCI TIF	SSCI Rank -ing	MAG Score	MAG Rank -ing
	Ethics Education									
67	Marketing Theory	32	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.007	67
68	Journal of Euro-Marketing	11	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.007	68
69	Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services	57	N/A	N/A	271	N/A	N/A	X	0.007	69
70	International Journal of Hospitality Management	107	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.007	70
71	Journal of Business to Business Marketing	9	0.76	6.81	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.006	71
72	International Economic Review	45	1.15	51.62	Z	1.15	51.75	Z	0.006	72
73	Sloan Management Review	25	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.006	73
74	Journal of Selling and Major Account Management	0	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.006	74
75	Sustainable Tourism	0	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.006	75
76	Journal of Occupational Health Psychology	34	2.53	86.13	Z	1.91	65.08	Z	0.006	76
77	American Economic Review	224	2.27	508.35	Z	2.29	511.84	Z	0.006	77
78	Management Review	0	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.006	78
79	Journal of World Business	40	1.58	63.19	171	1.52	60.96	62	0.006	79
80	Journal of Media and Economics	13	0.48	6.24	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.006	80
81	Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising	0	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.006	81
82	Journal of Global Marketing	23	0.10	2.30	377	N/A	N/A	X	0.006	82
83	Journal of Promotion Management	25	0.12	2.94	398	N/A	N/A	X	0.006	83
84	Journal of Applied Psychology	117	4.27	499.48	Z	3.77	440.97	Z	0.006	84
85	British Food Journal	78	0.64	50.27	Z	N/A	N/A	X	0.005	85
86	International Business Review	48	1.07	51.20	184	1.20	57.60	82	0.005	86
87	Journal of Management	60	3.82	229.46	45	3.08	184.80	10	0.005	87
88	Journal of Management Studies	58	2.92	169.60	68	2.56	148.36	23	0.005	88
89	Quantitative Marketing and Economics	11	1.23	13.48	298	N/A	N/A	X	0.005	89

No.	Journal Name	2009 Publn	Scopus IF	Scopus TIF	Scopus Rank -ing	SSCI IF	SSCI TIF	SSCI Rank -ing	MAG Score	MAG Rank -ing
90	Journal of Sustainable Tourism	42	1.23	51.61	216	N/A	N/A	X	0.005	90
91	Service Industries Journal	107	0.50	53.50	352	0.45	48.36	160	0.005	91
92	Tourism Review	12	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.005	92
93	Journal of Vacation Marketing	20	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.005	93
94	Marketing Education Review	13	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.005	94
95	Journal of Business Venturing	40	2.68	107.16	59	2.14	85.72	35	0.005	95
96	Management International Review	32	0.79	25.17	303	N/A	N/A	X	0.004	96
97	Consumption Markets and Culture	12	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.004	97
98	Current Issues in Tourism	30	0.98	29.46	371	N/A	N/A	X	0.004	98
99	The Marketing Review	18	N/A	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	X	0.004	99
100	Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing	15	0.17	2.57	483	N/A	N/A	X	0.004	100

Note: Z = Journals not in Business Category; X: No information is available for this journal; Subject Category Analyzed: Business and Management; IF: Impact Factor; TIF: Total Impact Factor

Conclusions

Across the world, researchers debate the issue of journal rankings and the measurement of academic performance based on such rankings. This debate has led researchers to question the measures used in such rankings (Adler and Harzing, 2009; Rynes, 2007; Segalla, 2008). This study used the vox populi approach to explore how marketing academics across the spectrum rank academic journals. The findings highlight several important aspects related to (1) the development of the MAG score, which captures how academics themselves rank journals; (2) top-of-the-mind recall of journals academics want to publish in; (3) regional preferences among academics regarding the top journals and their publications pattern; and (4) comparison of the MAG score with other established measures (i.e., SSCI and Scopus) to augment the current assessment of journal rankings. The findings should help active researchers identify journals that are highly ranked among their peer groups and, in turn, increase their publication visibility. The findings should also help university managers, administrators, and policy makers understand the “collective psyche” of marketing academics across the globe and make better judgments about tenure, grants, and employment decisions.

The commonalities and distinctions between the MAG score and the other measures suggest the need for caution in employing any single journal ranking list in isolation

for decision making. Scopus focuses on broader management journals, while the MAG score focuses highly on the marketing, tourism, and international business journals. However, the highly significant correlation between overall as well as the top 20 journals in Scopus and the MAG score suggests that decision makers can use these lists as complementary to each other. Such complementarity will assist more informed decision making in evaluating marketing scholarship among academics around the world.

Researchers who seek visible reputation and financial rewards in their academic careers experience pressures to follow the rules of research committees, many of which use the journal rankings as a barometer of an individual's success. Many scholars have identified such rankings as arbitrary and have criticized them for their top-heavy approach (e.g., Adler and Harzing, 2009), in which only senior academics are involved in deciding the ranking of the journals (Mort et al., 2004). The approach this study uses captures a wide spectrum of academics (see Mort et al., 2004; Perren et al., 2001) and, as such, provides a balanced ranking. Although the vox populi approach has not been used previously to examine journal rankings, the significant correlation with Scopus suggests that the MAG score is a robust measure for journal rankings. The strong correlation between the measures also provides the evidence that results developed from academic perceptions about journal rankings are as good an indicator as the bibliometrics that Scopus or SSCI provides.

The comparative findings from Scopus and the MAG score show the popularity of U.S. journals over others. As both measures are global in nature, this study can conclude that the top journals with global influence in academic circles are primarily of U.S. origin. Of the top 10 journals, eight are U.S. based and two are European based. This demonstrates the significant influence of U.S. academic and professional bodies on the marketing discipline on a global scale. As for the European journals among the top 10, the *International Journal of Research in Marketing* is the official journal of the European Marketing Academy, which represents the largest body of European marketing academics. However, *European Journal of Marketing* is not tied to an association and is the only journal with a regional association title.

Among the top 10 Scopus journals in the management field, five relate to the field of marketing, of which four also are represented in the MAG score. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* is ranked 33 in the MAG score list. In addition, only one general business-related journal appears in the top 10 (i.e., *Journal of Business Research*) of the MAG score. The other nine journals strongly focus on the marketing discipline. The study results show a clear preference among marketing academics toward journals that focus on the marketing discipline only. This lower recall as well as publication preference toward broader management journals is alarming. Most journal rankings regard journals such as *Academic of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, and *Administrative Science Quarterly* highly. The lower inclination to publish in management journals may be detrimental to the marketing discipline at large. Marketing academics need to change their mindset toward management journals if the field is to obtain broader acceptance among academics from other disciplines as well as practitioners. Changing the current mindset will

encourage cross-fertilization of ideas that are necessary for a healthy and impactful academic dialogue.

Three issues need further attention. First, according to the journal ranking lists, the top 30 journals are highly established in their respective fields, and following these lists may create a bias among academics toward not publishing in low-rated journals. In this sense, newer journals are particularly disadvantaged (Adler and Harzing, 2009; Lawrence, 2003; Mort et al., 2004). Therefore, future research needs to develop further measurement that focuses on new journals appearing in the field. Second, journal ranking lists themselves are dynamic; they change according to the debate in the field as well as journals' overall impact. In turn, this may affect academic perceptions as well, and therefore perceptual studies should be undertaken on a regular basis. Third, caution should be exercised in following the journal ranking lists alone as a measure for decisions regarding promotion, tenure, and other significant decisions because publication in a high-ranking journal does not specify the quality of the article. As mentioned previously, measures such as citations of an article, peer evaluation, and industry impact should also be considered when making judgments about an academic's scholarship.

References

- Adler, N.J. and Harzing, A.W. (2009), "When knowledge wins: Transcending the sense and nonsense of academic rankings", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 72-95.
- Bagozzi, R.P. and Silk, A.J. (1983), "Recall, recognition, and the measurement of memory for print advertisements", *Marketing Science*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 95-134.
- Bakir, A., 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.
- Cudd, M. and Morris, J. (1988), "Bias in journal ratings", *Financial Review*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 117-125.
- Dibb, S. and Simkin, L. (2005), "Benchmarking the RAE returns of marketing professors' journal publications", *Journal of Marketing Management*, vol. 21, no. 7, pp. 879-896.
- Extejt, M.M. and Smith, J.E. (1990), "The behavioral sciences and management: An evaluation of relevant journals", *Journal of Management*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 539-551.
- Finn, A. (1992), "Recall, recognition and the measurement of memory for print advertisements: A reassessment", *Marketing Science*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 95-100.
- Galton, F. (1907), "Vox populi", *Nature*, vol. 75, pp. 450-451.

- Guerrero, R. (2002), "Misuse and abuse of journal impact factors", *European Science Editing*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 58-59.
- Hascall, V.C., Bollen, J. and Hanson, R.W. (2007), "Impact factor page rankled", *ASBMB Today*, pp. 16-19.
- Jobber, D. and Simpson, P. (1988), "A citation analysis of selected marketing journals", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 137-142.
- Kacmar, K.M. and Whitfield, J.M. (2000), "An additional rating method for journal articles in the field of management", *Organizational Research Methods*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 392-406.
- Kirkpatrick, S.A. and Locke, E.A. (1992), "The development of measures of faculty scholarship", *Group and Organization Management*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 5-23.
- Krugman, H.E. (1986), "Low recall and high recognition of advertising", *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 79-86.
- Lange, T. (2006), "The imprecise science of evaluating scholarly performance: Utilizing broad quality categories for an assessment of business and management journals", *Evaluation Review*, vol. 30, no. 4, 505.
- Lawrence, P.A. (2003), "The politics of publication: Authors, reviewers, and editors must act to protect the quality of research", *Nature*, vol. 422, no. 6929, pp. 259-261.
- Macdonald, S. and Kam, J. (2007), "Aardvark et al.: Quality journals and gamesmanship in management studies", *Journal of Information Science*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 702-717.
- Mort, G.S., McColl-Kennedy, J., 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.
- Perren, L., Berry, A. and Blackburn, R. (2001), "The UK small business research community and its publication channels: Perceptions and ratings", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 76-90.
- Rynes, S.L. (2007), "Academy of Management Journal editor's forum on citations: Editor's forward", *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 489-490.
- Saad, G. (2009), "Applying the h-index in exploring bibliometric properties of elite marketing scholars", *Scientometrics*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 117-120.
- Segalla, M. (2008), "Publishing in the right place or publishing the right thing: Journal targeting and citations' strategies for promotion and tenure committees", *European Journal of International Management*, vol. 2, no. 2, 122-127.
- Shapiro, S. and Krishnan, H.S. (2001), "Memory-based measures for assessing advertising effects: A comparison of explicit and implicit memory effects", *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 1-13.

Stapel, J. (1998), "Recall and recognition: A very close relationship", *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 41-45.

Surowiecki, J. (2004), *The Wisdom of Crowds: Why the Many Are Smarter Than the Few and How Collective Wisdom Shapes Business, Economies, Societies, and Nations*, Doubleday Books, New York, NY.

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

Till, B.D. and Baack, D.W. (2005), "Recall and persuasion: Does creative advertising matter?", *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 47-57.

Todorov, R. and Glanzel, W. (1988), "Journal citation measures: A concise review", *Journal of Information Science*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 47-56.

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. 839-861.