

A TEN-YEAR RETROSPECTIVE OF ADVERTISING RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY, 1997–2006

John B. Ford and Altaf Merchant

ABSTRACT: Given institutional accountability and ever-increasing pressure to gain recognition with high-quality research at the highest academic levels, objective performance benchmarks are needed to reward faculty, enhance institutional image, and attract needed funding. Two studies were undertaken to examine advertising scholarship for 1997–2006. The first study examined refereed publications in the top three U.S. advertising journals (*Journal of Advertising*, *Journal of Advertising Research*, and *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*), while the second study added a variety of other sources of advertising scholarship. A comprehensive picture of advertising scholarship is developed and suggestions for the discipline are provided.

Academic accountability is at an all-time high. Public universities have descended from “state supported” to “state assisted” with commensurate operational funding dropping from over 50% to as little as 20% in some cases (Mason 1995). With increased competition for funding from ever-diminishing resources, universities must not only justify the need for funding; they must also provide concrete evidence of how the funds have been used to improve the academic performance of their faculties and raise their institutional image (Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997). More than ever before, faculty members are being judged by their research output (Siemens et al. 2005). As a result, objective benchmarks for performance are vital for purposes of academic accountability to a wide range of stakeholders (Chen, Gupta, and Hoshower 2006; Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997; Mason 1995; Sheth and Sisodia 2002; Siemens et al. 2005).

Sheth and Sisodia (2002) have argued that marketing’s fundamental problem as a discipline is the low productivity of its faculty and the lack of accountability. This low productivity was illustrated in a 1998 study by Powers et al., which found that over a 20-year period, two-thirds of the 374 marketing academics who were the focus of the study were characterized as either nonproducers (no publications) or low producers (one to four publications). Why is this important? In 2005, Siemens et al. found that business school research productivity was highly correlated with perceptual rankings of both undergraduate and graduate business programs by *Business Week* and *U.S. News & World Report*. Over 50% of the

variance in ratings was explained by the business school’s research productivity. The point is that research productivity is extremely important to both show funding sources that educational investment is warranted and to raise the image and awareness of various institutions to allow them to attract the better students and prove their relevance and value to students, state legislators, business leaders, alumni, and their local communities.

This concern about relevance and accountability also applies to the various academic subdisciplines within the university fabric. Advertising research productivity has been a subject of interest for over 20 years (Soley and Reid 1983, 1988), and one important attempt to benchmark advertising research was seen in the study by Barry (1990), which included the time period preceding 1988; this time period was brought forward to 1996 by Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas in 1998. As noted by Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998), advertising research must keep up with rapid technological changes, so the ability to stay on the cutting edge of research not only allows advertising researchers to maintain their value to their academic discipline, but also provides the forum for dissemination of that information to their academic discipline, their students, and the business community at large. The business community is a vital conduit for funding dollars that would provide helpful supplements for dwindling public resources.

As argued by Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998), increasing critical assessments of higher education have driven administrators to find ways to measure the performance of their faculty members to justify their relevance (Udell, Parker, and Pettijohn 1995). While the development of strategic plans driven by academic mission statements becomes a necessity to achieve or maintain AACSB (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) accreditation, strategic plans are often nebulous and done to meet requirements rather than

John B. Ford (Ph.D., University of Georgia) is a professor of marketing and international business, Old Dominion University.

Altaf Merchant (Ph.D., Old Dominion University) is an assistant professor of Marketing, University of Washington, Tacoma.

to provide concrete strategic direction for the institution. As a result, these plans are often of little value in securing and justifying needed funding. Now more than ever, objective performance benchmarks are vital to institutional survival and success.

THE NATURE OF ADVERTISING SCHOLARSHIP

To examine advertising scholarship in a meaningful light, two studies were undertaken. If one takes a narrow view of advertising scholarship, then it might be relevant to examine productivity from the standpoint of those who have published in the top advertising journals. Benchmark productivity studies for these top advertising journals were published in 1990 and 1998 covering scholarship through 1996 (Barry 1990; Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas 1998) in the top three advertising journals. On the other hand, if one takes a broader view, advertising scholarship can come from other types of journals as well. As Soley and Reid (1983) suggest in their review of advertising productivity from 1971 to 1980, advertising scholarship can emanate from such sources as communication journals, general marketing journals, interdisciplinary journals, and general business journals. They opened up their study to 16 different journals.

We feel that both of these approaches have merit, and as a result, two separate studies were carried out to assess advertising productivity from both the narrow and the broader views. As a result, our first study is a replication and extension of the Barry (1990) and Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998) studies, which examined author and institution productivity in the top three U.S.-based advertising journals: *Journal of Advertising* (JA), *Journal of Advertising Research* (JAR), and *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising* (JCIRA). Our second study is an extension of the studies by Soley and Reid (1988, 1983), which examined author and institutional productivity from a broader perspective across a variety of publishing segments. For the second study, we examined the author and institutional productivity for all advertising-focused articles published not only in the aforementioned top advertising journals, but also in a series of general marketing journals, journalism/communications journals, interdisciplinary journals, general business journals, and in an international advertising journal. Both of these studies will cover the period from 1997 to 2006.

STUDY 1: PRODUCTIVITY IN MAJOR ADVERTISING JOURNALS

Without a doubt, the study by Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998) is one of the most commonly referred to in terms of institutional benchmarking with the designation "centers of excellence," and it is often referred to on faculty Web sites and

in institutional public relations' materials. As an example, following that study, the University of Georgia had a major press release pertaining to its ranking. Many individual authors have featured this information on their Web sites and in their promotion and tenure materials. Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998) added additional insight via their comparison of their findings with the earlier Barry (1990) work. However, ten years have now passed, which is literally an academic lifetime for many. The current research builds on the precedent set by the earlier studies, which examined advertising scholarship, and brings a longer time period of study (10 years, compared with 8 for Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas) into focus.

In addition, over the last decade, many institutions and authors have invested heavily in their advertising scholarship in the top three journals. Many of these institutions and authors were noteworthy in the previous work, and clearly there are some newcomers who are attempting to emerge as new advertising scholarship "powerhouses." Naturally, this injects some competitive excitement and energy into this scholarship process, and in so doing, helps sustain the drive and determination of senior scholars, junior faculty, and last but not least, the next "crop" of energetic doctoral students wishing to make their mark as their mentors did.

As dictated by the Barry (1990) and Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998) studies, the data for this study were taken from the three leading U.S. academic journals dedicated to advertising (*Journal of Advertising*, *Journal of Advertising Research*, and *Journal of Current Issues and Research Advertising*) for the years 1997 through 2006. In keeping with both of these previous studies, only full-length articles were included in the analysis, which would exclude editorial essays and book reviews. As was accomplished in the prior studies, the actual number of appearances was tracked for authors and institutions along with adjusted rankings to reflect partial authorship (e.g., if two authors were listed, then the proportional contribution for each would be .5). There were 748 articles that were published in the three journals during the 10-year period under investigation (268 in JA, 119 in JCIRA, and 361 in JAR), with a total of 1,566 author appearances, bringing the total of author appearances per article to 2.09, which is quite close to the 2.0 average reported by Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998). All codings were undertaken by two of the authors, and there was 100% agreement for the articles to be included, author names, university affiliations, academic ranks, author and institution appearances, and weighted appearances.

THE FINDINGS

Departmental Affiliations of Authors

As can be seen in Table 1, the current study found a different breakdown in departmental affiliation from those of the

TABLE I
Percentage Distribution of Fractional Author Credit Among Departments and Journals

Department	Current study			Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998)			Barry's study (1990)			
	JA	JCIRA	JAR	Total	JA	JCIRA	JAR	JA	JCIRA	JAR
Marketing	67.1	61.6	47.2	57.1	73.9	73.6	55.8	45.0	45.0	29.0
Advertising, journalism, communications	19.5	23.6	14.4	17.8	14.3	18.3	10.9	20.0	22.0	6.0
Other business disciplines	6.8	7.4	7.1	7.0	7.0	4.7	5.8	9.0	10.0	11.0
Nonacademic affiliations	3.3	4.5	29.1	15.4	3.4	2.2	26.0	17.0	11.0	44.0
Other academic disciplines	3.3	2.9	2.2	2.7	1.4	1.2	1.5	9.0	12.0	10.0

Notes: JA = *Journal of Advertising*; JCIRA = *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*; JAR = *Journal of Advertising Research*.

TABLE 2
Percentage Author Distribution by Academic Rank

Study	Assistant	Associate	Full	Other
Barry (1990)	29.0	31.0	27.0	13.0
Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998)	33.7	31.0	28.8	6.5
Current	26.5	24.2	34.4	14.9

previous two studies. In this case, 57.1% of the articles are published by marketing faculty as opposed to 64.6% in the Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998) study and 37% in the Barry (1990) study. The recent downturn in marketing faculty authors reflects increases in advertising, journalism, and communications faculty from the Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998) study. Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998) reported 13% of all author-listed affiliations as advertising, journalism, or communications, as compared to 17.8% in the present study and up from only 11% in the Barry (1990) study. When examining these percentages across the three journals, it would appear that proportionally, *JAR* is maintaining its strong focus on practitioner manuscripts, while a stronger presence of advertising, journalism, and communications faculty manuscripts are being published (23.6%) by *JCIRA*. The disparity between *JAR* on the one hand and *JA* and *JCIRA* on the other once again appears to reflect the heavier emphasis on practitioner readership for *JAR*, contrasted by heavier academic focus for *JA* and *JCIRA*.

As research requirements have been ratcheted up since the time of the Barry study (1990), it would be expected that advertising researchers should aim their work at the top advertising academic specialty journals (Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas 1998; Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997). In the present study, 84.6% of all contributors showed an academic affiliation, leaving only 15.4% as nonacademically affiliated, which comes close to the results of the Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998) study (15.0%), which was a significant drop from the 30% in the Barry (1990) study.

Academic Ranks of Authors

Table 2 presents an overview of the ranks of the 84.4% of authors who were listed with academic affiliations. The proportion of authors with ranks as assistant professors dropped from 33.7% in the Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998) study to 26.5% in the present study. Another proportional drop occurred for associate professors, with the present study showing 24.2% as opposed to 31.0% for both of the earlier studies. The proportional downturns for both assistant and associate professors was made up for by increases for full professors and academics with "other" types of affiliations (e.g.,

lecturer, senior lecturer). In the present study, 34.4% of the academic authors indicated ranks of full professor, which was up from 28.8% in 1998 and 27.0% in 1990, while 14.9% indicated ranks from the "other" category, up from 6.5% in 1998 and 13.0% in 1990.

Individual Contributors to the Top Three U.S. Academic Advertising Journals

In the present study, there were 62 authors who had published four or more journal articles in these three journals since 1996 (see Table 3). These 62 make up only 5.9% of the total 1,049 authors represented in the complete listing, and the examination of weighted fractional author contribution indicates that this 5.9% of authors reflects weighted contributions of 9.9% of the total of 1,566 author appearances in the 10-year period under study. Nine of the 62 authors were also listed among the most frequent contributors in the Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998) study, and two of the authors (Henry Assael and Fred S. Zufryden) appeared on all three of the top contributor lists across the three time periods involved.

Table 3 contains the list of authors, their total number of appearances in the three journals, their ranking based on the total number of appearances, their weighted average number of appearances (fractional contribution calculations), and finally, their rankings based on weighted average number of appearances. In the present study, the absolute rankings and the weighted appearance rankings are quite different for the top five, with Marla Stafford and Don Schultz tied for the lead with 10 absolute appearances and Barbara Stern, Charles R. Taylor, Chang-Hoan Cho, and Avery Abernathy all tied for third with eight appearances each. When the weighted appearances were calculated, the ranks changed considerably, with Barbara Stern taking first place, Marla Stafford in second, Andrew Ehrenberg in third, Erwin Ephron in fourth, and finally, Stephen Gould in fifth.

Author appearances for each of the three journals are found in Table 4. While few authors show up in all three journals, there are quite a few who appear in two of the three publications. The top publishers in *JA* during the period with six appearances each are Barbara Stern, Charles R. Taylor, and Michael S. LaTour. The highest number of appearances in

TABLE 3
Comparative Author Ranking (JA + JAR + JCIRA)

Author name	Current study				Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998)				Barry (1990)			
	Rank	TA	WA rank	WA	Rank	TA	WA rank	WA	Rank	TA	WA rank	WA
*Maria Royne Stafford	1	10	2	5.15	1	16	2	6.33	1	23	1	11.57
Don E. Schultz	1	10	7	3.91	2	9	1	8.50	2	19	4	9.99
*Barbara B. Stern	3	8	1	5.66	4	8	3	6.16	3	16	7	8.74
Charles R. Taylor	3	8	5	3.99	4	8	7	3.07	4	15	8.5	8.00
Chang-Hoan Cho	3	8	8	3.82	4	8	4	3.83	5	14	10.5	7.50
*Avery M. Abernethy	3	8	9	3.66	6	7	13	2.83	7	12	3	10.00
Andrew Ehrenberg	7	7	3	4.41	9	6	15	2.58	7	12	2	10.50
Stephen J. Gould	7	7	5	3.99	9	6	22	2.24	7	12	5	9.49
Carrie La Ferle	7	7	13	3.33	9	6	23	2.08	9	11	6	8.83
*Michael S. LaTour	7	7	22	2.66	9	6	17	2.50	10.5	10	8.5	8.00
George M. Zinkhan	7	7	23	2.65	9	6	22	2.24	10.5	10	35	3.39
Micael Dahlén	12	6	10	3.58	15	5	25	1.99	12.5	9	10.5	7.50
Douglas West	12	6	16	3.16	15	5	9	3.00	12.5	9	26	4.32
Steven M. Edwards	12	6	29	2.49	15	5	18	2.49	16	8	34	3.49
Leonard N. Reid	12	6	37	2.32	15	5	10	2.92	16	8	14	6.83
*Russell N. Laczniak	12	6	37	2.32	15	5	9	3.00	16	8	20	5.00
T. Bettina Cornwall	12	6	43	2.15	15	5	6	3.33	16	8	18	5.33
Erwin Ephron	18	5	4	4.00	15	5	20	2.33	16	8	28	4.03
Barbara J. Phillips	18	5	11	3.50	27.5	4	5	3.50	25	7	24.5	4.33
Nancy Spears	18	5	16	3.16	27.5	4	24	2.00	25	7	15.5	6.50
Sanjay Putrevu	18	5	24	2.58	27.5	4	34	1.33	25	7	36	3.32
Brian D. Till	18	5	25	2.50	27.5	4	20	2.33	25	7	21	4.66
Wenyu Dou	18	5	29	2.49	27.5	4	27	1.83	25	7	24.5	4.33
*Darrel D. Muehling	18	5	39	2.16	27.5	4	13	2.83	25	7	12.5	7.00
Kenneth R. Lord	18	5	39	2.16	27.5	4	35	1.25	25	7	32	3.66
Peter C. Neijens	18	5	39	2.16	27.5	4	30	1.66	25	7	30.5	3.83
Pola B. Gupta	18	5	39	2.16	27.5	4	27	1.83	25	7	17	5.50
Kathryn Braun-LaTour	18	5	46	2.00	27.5	4	27	1.83	25	7	15.5	6.50
Nan Zhou	18	5	72	1.82	27.5	4	17	2.50	25	7	38.5	2.99
James Gentry	18	5	73	1.70	27.5	4	13	2.83	25	7	19	5.16
Hairong Li	18	5	79	1.57	27.5	4	33	1.36	25	7	12.5	7.00
Dwane Hal Dean	32	4	11	3.50	27.5	4	32	1.50	38	6	40.5	2.83
Carolyn A. Lin	32	4	13	3.33	27.5	4	20	2.33	38	6	30.5	3.83
Charles E. Young	32	4	13	3.33	27.5	4	29	1.75	38	6	33	3.50
*Fred S. Zufryden	32	4	18	3.00	27.5	4	13	2.83	38	6	42.5	2.66

(continues)

TABLE 3 (continued)

Author name	Current study			Henthorne, La Tour, and Loraas (1998)			Barry (1990)					
	Rank	TA	WA rank	Author	Rank	TA	WA rank	Author	Rank	TA	WA rank	WA
*Henry Assael	32	4	25					Robert C. Grass	38	6	44	2.32
Shelly Rodgers	32	4	25			2.50		Jerome D. Greene	38	6	22.5	4.50
Gordon C. Bruner II	32	4	31	* Also on Barry's list (1990)		2.33		Priscilla A. LaBarbera	38	6	22.5	4.50
*Naveen Donthu	32	4	31			2.33		Lyman E. Ostlund	38	6	27	4.16
Nigel Hollis	32	4	31			2.33		Charles H. Patti	38	6	29	4.00
Tom Reichert	32	4	44			2.08		John K. Ryans	38	6	40.5	2.83
William D. Wells	32	4	44			2.08		John L. Stanton	38	6	42.5	2.66
Arch G. Woodside	32	4	46			2.00		Stuart Van Auken	38	6	37	3.16
Jill K. Maher	32	4	61			1.83		Bruce G. Vanden Bergh	38	6	38.5	2.99
Michael T. Elliott	32	4	61			1.83						
Pascale Quester	32	4	61			1.83						
Paul Surgi Speck	32	4	61			1.83						
Philip J. Kitchen	32	4	61			1.83						
Qimei Chen	32	4	61			1.83						
Thomas F. Stafford	32	4	61			1.83						
George R. Franke	32	4	74			1.66						
Margaret Morrison	32	4	74			1.66						
Surendra Singh	32	4	76			1.58						
Esther Thorson	32	4	80			1.50						
Alan J. Bush	32	4	99			1.49						
Denise E. DeLorme	32	4	99			1.49						
Edith G. Smith	32	4	99			1.49						
Karen Whitehill King	32	4	99			1.49						
Victoria D. Bush	32	4	99			1.49						
Brett A. S. Martin	32	4	104			1.41						
Neil Barnard	32	4	104			1.41						
Paul W. Miniard	32	4	106			1.33						
*Also on the list of Henthorne, La Tour, and Loraas (1998)												
50 Authors												
162 Authors												
775 Authors												

Notes: JA = *Journal of Advertising*; JAR = *Journal of Advertising Research*; JCIRA = *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*; TA = total appearances; WA = weighted appearances.

TABLE 4
Author Appearances by Journal

Current study					
JA		JCIRA		JAR	
*Barbara B. Stern	6	Kenneth R. Lord	5	Don E. Schultz	10
Charles R. Taylor	6	*Marla Royne Stafford	4	Andrew Ehrenberg	7
*Michael S. LaTour	6	*Russell N. Laczniaik	4	Avery M. Abernethy	6
George M. Zinkhan	5	Sanjay Putrevu	4	Erwin Ephron	5
Hairong Li	5	Carrie La Ferle	3	Alan Baldinger	4
Marla Royne Stafford	5	Chang Hoan Cho	3	*Arch G. Woodside	4
Barbara J. Phillips	4	Jill K. Maher	3	Charles E. Young	4
Brian D. Till	4	Nancy Spears	3	*Fred S. Zufryden	4
Chang-Hoan Cho	4	Pola Gupta	3	*Henry Assael	4
Dwane Hal Dean	4	Stella L. M. So	3	James Peltier	4
Kathryn A. Braun-LaTour	4	Surendra Singh	3	Neil Barnard	4
Leonard N. Reid	4	Amir Hetsroni	2	Nigel Hollis	4
Paul Miniard	4	Charles A. McMellon	2	Pascale G. Quester	4
*Darrell Muehling	3	*Darrel D. Muehling	2	Philip J. Kitchen	4
Denise E. DeLorme	3	Eric J. Karson	2	Wenyu Dou	4
Douglas C. West	3	Huiuk Yi	2	William D. Wells	4
Esther Thorson	3	James A. Karhh	2	Alan J. Bush	3
James Gentry	3	James W. Gentry	2	Alex Wang	3
Keith S. Coulter	3	Jeffrey J. Maciejewski	2	Bill Harvey	3
Nan Zhou	3	Jens Nordfalt	2	Carolyn A. Lin	3
Richard H. Kolbe	3	*Karen Whitehill King	2	Carrie La Ferle	3
Steven Kates	3	Kim Bartel Sheehan	2	*David F. Poltrack	3
T. Bettina Cornwell	3	*Leonard N. Reid	2	David N. Laband	3
Tina M. Lowrey	3	*Les Carlson	2	Douglas West	3
Tom Reichert	3	Mark E. Hill	2	Joel Rubinson	3
William E. Baker	3	Maryon F. King	2	John A. Schibrowsky	3
		Micael Dahlén	2	Micael Dahlén	3
68 Authors	2	Michael Hu	2	*Naveen Donthu	3
360 Authors	1	Michael T. Elliott	2	Peter C. Neijens	3
		Paul Surgi Speck	2	Qimei Chen	3
		Stephen J. Gould	2	Shelly Rodgers	3
		Steven Edwards	2	Stephen J. Gould	3
		Sunkyu Jun	2	Stephen W. Pruitt	3
		*Thomas F. Stafford	2	T. Bettina Cornwell	3
		Wendy Macias	2	Victoria D. Bush	3
		Yong J. Hyun	2	Xinshu Zhao	3
		164 Authors	1	73 Authors	2
				434 Authors	1

*Also on the list of Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas 1998

Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998)

JA		JCIRA		JAR	
*Darrel D. Muehling	5	Darrel D. Muehling	10	*Valentine Appel	4
Michael R. Solomon	5	Russell N. Laczniaik	5	Henry Assael	4
Barbara Stern	5	Richard H. Kolbe	4	*Hugh Cannon	4
Avery Abernethy	4	Barbara Stern	4	Peter J. Danaher	4
J. Craig Andrews	4	Avery Abernethy	3	Naveen Donthu	4
Michael R. Hyman	4	Les Carlson	3	Arthur J. Kover	4
Michael A. Kamins	4	Robert H. Ducoffe	3	Henry A. Laskey	4
Richard Tansey	4	Craig J. Andrews	2	Fred S. Zufryden	4

(continues)

Table 4 (continued)**Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998)**

JA		JCIRA		JAR	
Srinivas Durvasula	3	Yvan Boivin	2	Linda F. Alwitt	3
Basil Englis	3	Clarke Caywood	2	Margaret Blair	3
*Betsy Gelb	3	Charles R. Duke	2	Bruce Buchanan	3
Sanford Grossbart	3	Michael R. Hyman	2	John Burnett	3
John Eric Haley	3	Karen Whitehall King	2	Richard J. Fox	3
Ronald Paul Hill	3	Frederick W. Langrehr	2	Lynn J. Jaffe	3
Pamela Homer	3	*Leonard N. Reid	2	William L. James	3
Russell N. Laczniak	3	Marla Royne Stafford	2	Helen Hatz	3
Michael S. LaTour	3	Thomas F. Stafford	2	Dean M. Krugman	3
Kenneth R. Lord	3	Thomas Stevenson	2	Michael S. LaTour	3
*Roland Rust	3	Richard Tansey	2	*Paul C. Michell	3
Robert E. Smith	3	Spencer F. Tinkham	2	David F. Poltrack	3
		Ruth A. Weaver-Lariscy	2	Thomas J. Reynolds	3
				David W. Stewart	3
				*Arch G. Woodside	3

* Also on Barry's list (1990)

Barry (1990)

JA		JCIRA		JAR	
Leonard N. Reid	13	Leonard N. Reid	8	William D. Wells	12
Lawrence C. Soley	10	Lawrence C. Soley	5	Leo Bogart	10
John D. Leckenby	8	Thomas E. Barry	4	Joel N. Axelrod	9
Thomas E. Barry	6	Ivan L. Preston	4	Arch G. Woodside	9
Jesse E. Teel	6	Donald Sciglimpaglia	4	Joseph M. Kamen	8
Hugh M. Cannon	5	David W. Stewart	4	Seymour Banks	7
Terence A. Shimp	5	Richard J. Harris	3	Hugh M. Cannon	7
Arch G. Woodside	5	John D. Leckenby	3	Paul E. Green	7
George M. Zinkhan	5	Herbert J. Rotfeld	3	Russell I. Haley	7
Kent M. Lancaster	4	Dinod Vanier	3	Herbert E. Krugman	7
Ernest F. Larkin	4	Gary M. Armstrong	2	James MacLachlan	7
James H. Leigh	4	David J. Barnaby	2	Wallace H. Wallace	7
Darrel D. Muehling	4	Marsha M. Boyd	2	Lewis C. Winters	7
Charles H. Patti	4	David Brinberg	2	Valentine Appel	6
William M. Pride	4	Alan J. Bush	2	Thomas E. Barry	6
Roland T. Rust	4	Isabella C. M. Cunningham	2	Robert C. Grass	6
John K. Ryans	4	Jeffrey E. Danes	2	Jerome D. Greene	6
Richard J. Semenik	4	Tony M. Dubitsky	2	David A. Aaker	5
Nancy Stephens	4	David H. Furse	2	Kevin J. Clancy	5
Bruce L. Stern	4	Sanford Grossbart	2	John U. Farley	5
Stuart Van Auken	4	Metin N. Guroi	2	Ronald E. Frank	5
William O. Bearden	3	Jacob Hornik	2	Jonathan Gutman	5
Richard M. Durand	3	Jacob Jacoby	2	Benjamin Lipstein	5
Charles F. Frazer	3	Thomas C. Kinnear	2	Paul C. Michell	5
Betsy D. Gelb	3	John L. Lastovicka	2	James H. Myers	5
Elizabeth C. Hirschman	3	William J. Lundstrom	2	Lyman E. Ostlund	5
Dean M. Krugman	3	Linda M. Maddox	2	Michael Perry	5
Subhash C. Lonial	3	Gordon E. Miracle	2	Mary Jane Schlinger	5
Jeffrey A. Lowenhar	3	William C. Moncrief	2	Hugh G. Wales	5
J. Barry Mason	3	Sandra Ernst Moriarty	2		
Anthony E. McGann	3	Louis A. Morris	2		
Frazier Moore	3	Connie Pechmann	2		
Fred D. Reynolds	3	Larry Percy	2		
Marshall D. Rice	3	Richard W. Pollay	2		

(continues)

Table 4 (continued)

Barry (1990)			
JA		JCIRA	JAR
Herbert J. Rotfeld	3	Kim B. Rotzoll	2
Kim B. Rotzoll	3	Frederick A. Russ	2
Debra L. Scammon	3	Ruth B. Smith	2
John L. Stanton	3	R. Dale Wilson	2
Mary Ann Stutts	3	Eric J. Zanot	2
Stuart H. Surlin	3	George M. Zinkhan	2
Bruce G. Vanden Bergh	3	Fred S. Zufryden	2
J. B. Wilkinson	3		
Eric J. Zanot	3		

Notes: JA = *Journal of Advertising*; JCIRA = *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*; JAR = *Journal of Advertising Research*.

JCIRA at five is found for Kenneth R. Lord; Don E. Schultz has the top position for JAR with 10 appearances (which reflects an average of one appearance per year over the 10-year period involved). This is quite an impressive figure.

Institutional Contributions

The listing of academic institutions ranked in terms of their appearances as affiliations with each of the listed authors is found in Table 5. The top institution over the course of all three studies is the University of Georgia in total appearances, but it drops to number 2 in terms of weighted appearances to be passed by Michigan State University. It is interesting to note that the University of Georgia is the only institution that ranks in the top five in actual and weighted appearances across all three studies. Since the Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998) study, the University of Texas is the only other institution that appears in the top 10 in both actual and weighted appearances. In the present study, the top eight in actual appearances are the University of Georgia, followed by Michigan State University, the University of Alabama, the University of Florida, Auburn University, Southern Illinois University, and Iowa State University and the University of Memphis tied for seventh place. When adjustments are made for weighted appearances, the rankings change somewhat, with the University of Georgia taking the top slot, followed in order by Michigan State University, the University of Alabama, the University of Florida, Rutgers University, Southern Illinois University, Auburn University, and the University of North Texas.

The limitations inherent in this study are primarily due to the nature of the original study design used by Barry (1990) and Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998). Only the three top American advertising journals were included, which precludes other high quality academic advertising publications, as well as general marketing and business publications (e.g.,

International Journal of Advertising [IJA], *Journal of Marketing* [JM], *Journal of Consumer Research* [JCR], *Journal of Marketing Research* [JMR], *Journalism Quarterly*, and *Journal of Business*). There are many top advertising scholars who publish in these other journals who should be recognized for their contributions to advertising thought and practice.

Another limitation involves the focus on multiple authorships as a reflection of appearances without taking into consideration the ordering of the authors. If one person is usually a first author and another is usually a third or fourth author, an equal number of appearances by these authors does not really reflect their respective potential contributions to those studies. Future efforts should include some kind of adjustments in weightings of contributions to reflect order of author involvement in the various studies under consideration. The university listings may also be limited in their importance in that there are no adjustments made for the sizes of the various faculties involved. This could have a significant impact on rankings of institutions represented.

STUDY 2: PRODUCTIVITY ACROSS PUBLICATION SEGMENTS

Given the previous discussion of the limitations of the methodologies of the prior studies (Barry 1990; Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas 1998), it was felt that providing the same information for a variety of other key scholarly publication outlets that publish advertising research would be beneficial. Soley and Reid (1988, 1983) examined a variety of different publication avenues for advertising research that extended beyond just the major advertising journals to include marketing journals, interdisciplinary journals, general business journals, and communications/journalism journals. In keeping with this need to extend beyond the "big three" advertising journals, the past 10 years of *Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of*

TABLE 5
Comparative Institutional Ranking (JA + JAR + JCIRA)

Institution	Current study				Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998)				Barry (1990)					
	Rank	TA	WA rank	WA	Rank	TA	WA rank	WA	Rank	TA	WA rank	WA		
*University of Georgia	1	34	1	13.00	*University of Georgia	1	43	1	18.37	University of Georgia	1	64	3	31.9
*Michigan State University	2	31	2	12.5	*Rutgers University	2	28	2	16.98	University of Illinois—Urbana	2	63	1	41.7
*University of Alabama	3	27	3	10.31	University of Tennessee	3	23	8	7.96	University of Texas	3.5	55	4	28.2
*University of Florida	4	23	4	9.16	Auburn University	4.5	21	4	11.15	Michigan State	3.5	55	5	26.3
*Auburn University	5	18	7	7.75	Washington State University	4.5	21	6	8.74	New York University	5	54	2	32.1
*Southern Illinois University	6	17	6	7.83	*University of Southern California	6	20	3	11.74	University of South Carolina	6	41	11	19.7
*Iowa State University	7	16	10	7.16	*City University of New York	7	18	5	10.66	Arizona State University	7	40	6	23.3
University of Memphis	7	16	13	6.66	University of Texas, Austin	8	16	7	7.99	Baruch College, City University of New York	8	38	7	22.1
*University of Texas at Austin	9	15	17	6.25	Marquette University	9.5	14	14	5.24	Southern Methodist University	9	33	14	16.1
University of Nevada, Las Vegas	9	15	24	5.25	University of North Texas	9.5	14	9	6.82	Columbia University	10.5	31	8	21.7
Monash University, Australia	9	15	13	6.66	*New York University	11.5	12	12.5	5.83	Wharton	10.5	31	13	17.5
University of Amsterdam	9	15	13	6.66	*Wayne State University	11.5	12	8	4.81	Texas A&M University	12	30	15	15.6
Northwestern University	13	14	19	6.08	Clemson University	13.5	11	10	6.16	University of Houston	13	29	16	14.6
*University of North Texas	13	14	8	7.66	Cleveland State University	13.5	11	11	6.00	University of Southern California	14	26	9	20.8
*Louisiana State University	13	14	9	7.41	*Kent State University	17.5	10	19.5	4.66	University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill	15.5	25	26	9.36
*University of Tennessee	13	14	21	5.83	*University of Alabama	17.5	10	22	4.32	Northwestern University	15.5	25	10	20.5
*Washington State University	13	14	12	6.83	*University of Houston	17.5	10	24.5	4.16	University of Wisconsin—Madison	17	24	12	17.8
*Rutgers University	18	13	4	9.16	*University of Michigan	17.5	10	12.5	5.83	University of Alabama	18	21	23	10.6
Stockholm School of Econ., Sweden	18	13	13	6.66	*Vanderbilt University	17.5	10	21	4.49	Penn State	19.5	20	17	14.5
*Villanova University	20	12	33	4.49	Florida International University	17.5	10	45	2.40	Georgia State	19.5	20	28	8.97
*University of Minnesota	20	12	18	6.16	California State University, Fullerton	22.5	9	23	4.26	Stanford	21.5	19	19	13
Baruch College	20	12	22	5.75	*Indiana University	22.5	9	15	5.16	University of California—Berkeley	21.5	19	22	11
University of Arkansas	23	11	25	5.16	Iowa State University	22.5	9	30	3.40	Harvard University	23.5	16	20	11.7
City University of Hong Kong	23	11	29	4.83	Southern Illinois University	22.5	9	16	5.00	Rutgers	23.5	16	18	13

*Oklahoma State University	23	11	43	3.91	26	8	17	4.82	26	15	30	7.82
*University of Auckland, New Zealand	23	11	34	4.33	26	8	31.5	3.33	26	15	21	11
*University of North Carolina	23	11	20	5.91	26	8	27	3.82	26	15	25	9.5
South Bank University, U.K.	23	11	25	5.16	33	7	51	2.65	30	14	34	7.07
Old Dominion University	23	11	31	4.66	33	7	24.5	4.16	30	14	35	7.02
*University of Southern California	23	11	10	7.16	33	7	19.5	4.66	30	14	32	7.49
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	31	10	37	4.16	33	7	26	3.83	30	14	50	4.41
Chinese University of Hong Kong	31	10	25	5.16	33	7	43	2.98	30	14	29	8.31
University of Kansas, Lawrence	33	9	52	3.41	33	7	51	2.65	34.5	13	38	6.99
*University of South Carolina	33	9	42	3.99	33	7	40	2.99	34.5	13	40	6.82
*Clemson University	33	9	53	3.16	33	7	40	2.99	34.5	13	33	7.32
*Hofstra University	33	9	34	4.33	33	7	49	2.74	34.5	13	44	5.64
*University of Oregon	33	9	23	5.66	33	7	40	2.99	39	12	41	6.49
*University of Houston	33	9	40	4.00	33	7	28	3.66	39	12	27	8.99
*Georgia State University	39	8	31	4.66	41.5	6	31.5	3.33	39	12	38	6.99
University of Missouri-Columbia	39	8	25	5.16	41.5	6	62	2.24	39	12	42	6.32
*Cleveland State University	39	8	34	4.33	41.5	6	44	2.91	39	12	24	10
University of Missouri-St. Louis	39	8	45	3.66	41.5	6	51	2.65	44.5	11	36	7
*Pennsylvania State University	39	8	29	4.83	41.5	6	33	3.16	44.5	11	51	3.97
University of Queensland, Australia	44	7	74	2.33	41.5	6	83	1.83	44.5	11	53	3.66
*Wayne State University	44	7	67	2.66	52.5	5	47	2.83	44.5	11	31	7.5
University of Nebraska at Lincoln	44	7	56	3.03	52.5	5	78.5	1.99	44.5	11	45	5.49
*New York University	44	7	37	4.16	52.5	5	40	2.99	44.5	11	38	6.99
*University of Hawaii at Manoa	44	7	53	3.16	52.5	5	35.5	3.00	50.5	10	46	5.16
National University of Singapore	44	7	49	3.5	52.5	5	35.5	3.00	50.5	10	52	3.81
University of Central Florida	50	6	74	2.33	52.5	5	56	2.50	50.5	10	47	4.83
Florida International University	50	6	74	2.33	52.5	5	47	2.83	50.5	10	43	5.65
*Kent State University	50	6	67	2.66	52.5	5	95.5	1.50	50.5	10	49	4.65
University of Northern Iowa	50	6	57	3.00	52.5	5	60	2.49	50.5	10	48	4.82
Mississippi State University	50	6	85	2.08	52.5	5	87	1.75				

(continues)

TABLE 5 (continued)

Institution	Current study				Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998)				Barry (1990)			
	Rank	TA	WA rank	WA	Rank	TA	WA rank	WA	Rank	TA	WA rank	WA
University of Texas at San Antonio	50	6	53	3.16	52.5	5	35.5	3.00				
Hong Kong Baptist University	50	6	74	2.33	52.5	5	40	2.99				
Boston College	50	6	45	3.66	52.5	5	56	2.50				
Saint Louis University	50	6	57	3.00	52.5	5	78.5	1.99				
University of Saskatchewan	50	6	40	4.00	52.5	5	61	2.83				
*University of Connecticut	50	6	37	4.16								
*Marquette University	50	6	45	3.66								
Western Michigan University	50	6	44	3.75								
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	50	6	64	2.83								
Florida Atlantic University	50	6	57	3.00								
University of Pennsylvania	50	6	57	3.00								
Ghent University, Belgium	50	6	70	2.50								
Memorial University	50	6	87	2.00								
University of South Alabama	68	5	106	1.50								
Columbia University	68	5	105	1.66								
Florida State University	68	5	103	1.75								
Drexel University	68	5	98	1.83								
University of Mississippi	68	5	98	1.83								
Mercer University	68	5	97	1.91								
Western Illinois University	68	5	74	2.33								
*City University of New York	68	5	74	2.33								
*Kansas State University	68	5	70	2.50								
University of Miami	68	5	74	2.33								
Griffith University, Australia	68	5	48	3.58								
Saint Joseph's University	68	5	57	3.00								
University of Nebraska at Omaha	68	5	106	1.50								
*San Diego State University	68	5	87	2.00								
* Also on the list of Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas 1998												
24 Universities			4									
35 Universities			3									
83 Universities			2									
171 Universities			1									

Notes: JA = *Journal of Advertising*; JAR = *Journal of Advertising Research*; JCIRA = *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*; TA = total appearances; WA = weighted appearances.

Marketing Research, Journal of Consumer Research, Public Opinion Quarterly (POQ), Journal of Consumer Affairs (JCA), Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media, Journal of Communications, Public Relations Review, Harvard Business Review, Journal of Business, Journal of Business Research (JBR), and Journal of Retailing (JR) were also examined and tables were prepared to reflect author and institutional productivity. Soley and Reid (1983) had argued for these journals in their advertising productivity study, but one other journal that was felt to be relevant in this instance was the *International Journal of Advertising*, which represents an up-and-coming journal, reflecting an important international contribution to the advertising literature. It was felt that including these 14 additional journals with the other three journals in an overall comparison would provide a more complete representation of advertising scholarship than would be reflected in the top advertising journals.

Again, codings were undertaken by two of the authors. Again, there was 100% agreement on the codings involving authors, institutions, academic ranks, author and institution appearances, ranks, and weighted appearances and ranks. The only area where there could have been significant variance in codings involved the identification of the particular articles that focused on advertising issues from each of the nonadvertising journals, but there was no disagreement between the two coders.

The authors followed the same procedure as Soley and Reid (1988) to determine whether an article should be identified as an advertising article. Articles were included that used "advertising," "advertisement," or "commercial" in the heading. Articles were also included that used advertisements as stimuli or referred to sales promotion techniques, media planning, or advertising copywriting. All full-length articles in the *Journal of Advertising, Journal of Advertising Research, Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, and the *International Journal of Advertising* were coded as advertising articles.

THE FINDINGS

Publication Segments

In keeping with the Soley and Reid studies, Table 6 presents an overview of the number of advertising articles by publication segment and compares the present study to the 1983 Soley and Reid study. The two studies covered 10-year periods, so the comparison of the counts involved is interesting. There were 1,324 articles published in total in the present study, with 748 articles from the top three advertising journals, 222 articles from the international advertising journal, 90 from the two marketing journals, 84 from the interdisciplinary

journals, 113 from journalism/communication journals, and 67 articles from business journals. Out of the total pool, it is interesting to note that the top three journals only represent 56.5% of the total advertising research output in terms of numbers of articles. Comparisons with the decade covered by Soley and Reid (1983) show some marked changes. Soley and Reid found 962 articles in total across the 16 journals (*IJA* was not included in their 1983 study). There were 117 more articles published in the top three advertising journals than in the present study, while *JM* and *JMR* published only 90 advertising articles, a drop of 47 articles. In terms of the interdisciplinary journals (*JCR, POQ, and JCA*), *JCA* remained constant, *POQ* dropped, and *JCR* increased dramatically. The least change was found for the journalism/communication journals, with 113 advertising articles in both time periods. The final category, business journals, showed a marked increase in advertising articles, with the biggest increases found for *JBR* (from 4 to 41) and *JR* (from 3 to 8).

Disciplinary Affiliations of Authors Across Publication Segments

Table 7 provides a comparative view of the disciplinary affiliation and publication segment from which the articles were authored. Of the total number of articles included in the study (1,324), there were a number that were identified as authored by practitioners, so these articles were eliminated from the table. There were 161 articles authored by practitioners, and these were removed from the analysis, leaving a total number of 1,163 authored by academics. Of these 1,163 articles, 57.6% were attributed to marketing disciplinary faculty members (670 articles). Advertising, journalism, and communications accounted for the next highest affiliation, with 24.2% of the total (281 articles). This was followed in turn by other business disciplines (7.5%), unknown (5.7%), and finally, other nonbusiness disciplines (5.1%). This compares quite similarly to the findings of Soley and Reid (1983), who found the following disciplinary breakdown: marketing (55.0%); advertising, journalism, and communications (21.3%); other business disciplines (14.6%); unknown (5.0%); and finally, other nonbusiness disciplines (4.0%). It would appear that the sources of advertising scholarship across a variety of disciplines have remained stable over the periods involved in the two 10-year studies.

When examining contributions across the publication segments, the top three advertising journals were responsible for 53.4% of the total number of articles (621 articles), followed in turn by the international advertising journal with 17.4% (202 articles), journalism/communication journals with 9.4% (110 articles), marketing journals with 7.4% (86 articles), interdisciplinary journals with 7.1% (83 articles), and finally,

TABLE 6
Number of Advertising Articles by Publication Segment

	Soley and Reid (1983)	Current study
Advertising journals	631	748
<i>Journal of Advertising</i>	216	268
<i>Journal of Advertising Research</i>	380	361
<i>Current Issues and Research in Advertising</i>	35	119
International advertising journals*	—	222
<i>International Journal of Advertising</i>	—	222
Marketing journals	137	90
<i>Journal of Marketing Research</i>	77	53
<i>Journal of Marketing</i>	60	37
Interdisciplinary journals	52	84
<i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>	25	61
<i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i>	7	2
<i>Journal of Consumer Affairs</i>	20	21
Journalism/communication journals	113	113
<i>Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly</i>	52	62
<i>Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media</i>	21	21
<i>Journal of Communication</i>	34	23
<i>Public Relations Review</i>	6	7
Business journals	29	67
<i>Harvard Business Review</i>	8	7
<i>Journal of Business</i>	14	11
<i>Journal of Business Research</i>	4	41
<i>Journal of Retailing</i>	3	8
Total	962	1,324

* Not in Soley and Reid (1983) study.

business journals with 5.3% (62 articles). This varied source base of advertising scholarship is somewhat different from that seen in the Soley and Reid (1983) study, which reported the following order: advertising journals (58.5%), marketing journals (17.2%), journalism/communication journals (14.6%), interdisciplinary journals (6.5%), and business journals (3.1%). Of particular note is that journalism/communication journals appeared to be a larger source of advertising scholarship in the present study as compared with that of Soley and Reid (1983).

Academic Ranks of Authors Across Publication Segments

The various ranks for the academically authored articles are shown in Table 8. It would appear here that full professors are the largest contributor of academically authored articles (29.0%), and they are followed in turn by assistant professors (25.3%), associate professors (20.2%), other academic ranks (18.5%), and then unknown (7.0%). The balance is quite even across the various ranks, which indicates some interesting changes from the Soley and Reid (1983) study. In the earlier study, the order was as follows: assistant professors (32.1%),

associate professors (30.4%), full professors (21.7%), other academic ranks (9.8%), and unknown (5.9%). Proportionally, it is interesting in the present study to see the role of full professors as compared with the earlier study. Obviously, changes in publication requirements over the years, research-focused doctoral programs, and AACSB issues may have caused some of the shifts here, and one important possibility is that the productive assistant professors in the earlier study would now be full professors if they kept up their publications during their careers.

Individual Contributors Across Publication Segments

The comparative author ranking for the 17 journals is found in Table 9. For the period in question, 1997–2006, there were 1,604 authors represented. The top 12 contributors in terms of numbers of publications would be in order: Don Schulz, Michael Ewing, Marla Royne Stafford, Leonard Reid, George Zinkhan, Tim Ambler, Barbara Stern, Chang Hoan Cho, Charles (Ray) Taylor, Douglas West, Carrie La Ferle, and Dhruv Grewal. When adjustments are made for numbers of authors involved in the various articles, the weighted rankings

TABLE 7
Advertising Article Credit by Discipline Affiliation and Publication Segment

	Advertising journals	International advertising journals	Marketing journals	Interdisciplinary journals	Journalism/communication journals	Business journals	Total
Marketing department	396.26 (63.8%)	123.88 (61.4%)	72.36 (83.9%)	62.30 (75.5%)	2.50 (2.3%)	12.75 (20.6%)	670.05 (57.6%)
Advertising/journalism/communication departments	136.17 (21.9%)	42.47 (21.0%)	1.32 (1.5%)	6.49 (7.9%)	94.62 (86.3%)	0 (0%)	281.07 (24.2%)
Other business departments	45.58 (7.3%)	18.18 (9.0%)	9.16 (10.6%)	4.60 (5.6%)	3.11 (2.8%)	6.16 (9.9%)	86.79 (7.5%)
Other academic departments	18.67 (3.0%)	17.28 (8.6%)	3.39 (3.9%)	9.12 (11.1%)	9.44 (8.6%)	1.00 (1.6%)	58.90 (5.1%)
Unknown	24.04 (3.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	42.11 (67.9%)	66.15 (5.7%)
Total	620.72 (53.4%)	201.81 (17.4%)	86.23 (7.4%)	82.51 (7.1%)	109.67 (9.4%)	62.02 (5.3%)	1,163 (100%)

TABLE 8
Advertising Article Credit by Academic Rank

	Advertising journals	International advertising journals	Marketing journals	Interdisciplinary journals	Journalism/ communication journals	Business journals	Total
Assistant professor	170.29 (27.4%)	28.20 (14.0%)	29.75 (34.5%)	28.22 (34.2%)	37.71 (34.4%)	.50 (.8%)	294.67 (25.3%)
Associate professor	143.74 (23.2%)	31.75 (15.7%)	21.97 (25.5%)	19.41 (23.5%)	16.97 (15.5%)	.83 (1.3%)	234.67 (20.2%)
Professor	208.14 (33.5%)	50.58 (25.1%)	28.34 (32.9%)	23.84 (28.9%)	21.36 (19.5%)	4.66 (7.5%)	336.92 (29.0%)
Other academic ranks	84.54 (13.6%)	89.45 (44.3%)	6.17 (7.2%)	9.85 (11.9%)	25.18 (23.0%)	.50 (.8%)	215.69 (18.5%)
Unknown	14.01 (2.3%)	1.83 (.9%)	0 (0%)	1.19 (1.4%)	8.45 (7.7%)	55.53 (89.5%)	81.01 (7.0%)
Total	620.72 (53.4%)	201.81 (17.4%)	86.23 (7.4%)	82.51 (7.1%)	109.67 (9.4%)	62.02 (5.3%)	1,163 (100%)

TABLE 9
Comparative Author Ranking (All 17 Journals)

Author name	Rank	TA	WA rank	WA
Don E. Schultz	1	13	4	5.57
Michael T. Ewing	2	12	11	4.31
Marla Royné Stafford	3	11	3	5.65
Leonard N. Reid	4	10	17	3.98
George M. Zinkhan	4	10	19	3.73
Tim Ambler	6	9	1	6.33
Barbara B. Stern	6	9	2	6.16
Chang Hoan Cho	6	9	6	4.82
Charles R. Taylor	6	9	7	4.49
Douglas West	6	9	10	4.32
Carrie La Ferle	6	9	12	4.16
Dhruv Grewal	6	9	26	3.10
Avery Abernethy	13	8	20	3.66
T. Bettina Cornwell	13	8	21	3.65
Gerard Prendergast	13	8	23	3.49
Andrew Ehrenberg	16	7	8	4.41
Micael Dahlén	16	7	13	4.08
Stephen J. Gould	16	7	16	3.99
Tom Reichert	16	7	18	3.78
Paul Miniard	16	7	34	2.91
Philip J. Kitchen	16	7	37	2.78
Michael S. LaTour	16	7	38	2.66
Steven M. Edwards	16	7	52	2.33
Joyce M. Wolburg	24	6	5	4.83
Carolyn Lin	24	6	9	4.33
Barbara J. Phillips	24	6	14	4.00
Naveen Donthu	24	6	24	3.33
Kathryn A. Braun-LaTour	24	6	28	3.00
Karen Whitehill King	24	6	50	2.49
Rik Pieters	24	6	59	2.32
Russell N. Laczniak	24	6	59	2.32
Wei-Na Lee	24	6	59	2.32
Deborah MacInnis	24	6	63	2.24
Scot Burton	24	6	65	2.19
Denise DeLorme	24	6	71	2.15
Hairong Li	24	6	74	2.07
Michael Barone	24	6	95	1.91
Richard Netemeyer	24	6	96	1.85
Nancy Spears	39	5	25	3.16
Gerard J. Tellis	39	5	27	3.08
Edward McQuarrie	39	5	28	3.00
Bruce Pinkleton	39	5	33	2.99
Jacqueline Hitchon	39	5	35	2.83
Keith S. Coulter	39	5	35	2.83
Sanjay Putrevu	39	5	40	2.58
Brian D. Till	39	5	42	2.50
Wenyu Dou	39	5	50	2.49
Darrel D. Muehling	39	5	65	2.16
Kenneth R. Lord	39	5	65	2.16
Pola B. Gupta	39	5	65	2.16
Pradeep K. Korgaonkar	39	5	65	2.16
George Franke	39	5	92	1.99
Peter C. Neijens	39	5	92	1.99
Siva Balasubramanian	39	5	92	1.99
Nan Zhou	39	5	97	1.83

(continues)

TABLE 9 (continued)

Author name	Rank	TA	WA rank	WA
Brett A. S. Martin	39	5	115	1.74
James Gentry	39	5	116	1.70
Pierre Berthon	39	5	124	1.58
James Peltier	39	5	171	1.41
Michel Laroche	39	5	209	1.16
Chingching Chang	61	4	14	4.00
Dwane Hal Dean	61	4	22	3.50
Fred S. Zufryden	61	4	28	3.00
James A. Karhh	61	4	38	2.66
Mike Reid	61	4	41	2.53
Angela Lee	61	4	42	2.50
Henry Assael	61	4	42	2.50
Michelle Roehm	61	4	42	2.50
Shelly Rodgers	61	4	42	2.50
Anne Brumbaugh	61	4	52	2.33
Gordon C. Bruner II	61	4	52	2.33
Joep P. Cornelissen	61	4	52	2.33
Hyun Seung Jin	61	4	65	2.16
Stewart Shapiro	61	4	65	2.16
William Wells	61	4	72	2.08
Xinshu Zhao	61	4	72	2.08
Arch G. Woodside	61	4	75	2.00
David Luna	61	4	97	1.83
Jill K. Maher	61	4	97	1.83
Laura Peracchio	61	4	97	1.83
Michael T. Elliott	61	4	97	1.83
Pascale G. Quester	61	4	97	1.83
Paul Surgi Speck	61	4	97	1.83
Qimei Chen	61	4	97	1.83
Sonya Grier	61	4	97	1.83
Thomas F. Stafford	61	4	97	1.83
Dana L. Alden	61	4	117	1.66
Eric J. Karson	61	4	117	1.66
Flemming Hansen	61	4	117	1.66
Margaret Morrison	61	4	117	1.66
Michelle R. Nelson	61	4	124	1.58
Sejung Marina Choi	61	4	124	1.58
Surendra Singh	61	4	124	1.58
Esther Thorson	61	4	129	1.50
Alan J. Bush	61	4	165	1.49
Dawn Lerman	61	4	165	1.49
Edith G. Smith	61	4	165	1.49
Jisu Huh	61	4	165	1.49
Michel Wedel	61	4	165	1.49
Victoria D. Bush	61	4	165	1.49
Kevin Lane Keller	61	4	172	1.33
David McArthur	61	4	203	1.25
Tom Griffin	61	4	203	1.25
Pradeep Chintagunta	61	4	207	1.24
Kenneth C. Manning	61	4	220	1.08
Leyland F. Pitt	61	4	223	1.00
86 Authors		3		
262 Authors		2		
1,150 Authors		1		
Total academic authors		2,515		
Nonacademic authors		303		

Notes: TA = total appearances; WA = weighted appearances.

change to the following top 12: Tim Ambler, Barbara Stern, Marla Royne Stafford, Don Schultz, Joyce Wolburg, Chang Hoan Cho, Charles (Ray) Taylor, Andrew Ehrenberg, Carolyn Lin, Douglas West, Michael Ewing, and Carrie La Ferle. If Table 9 is compared to Table 3, it is interesting to note that several new names appear on the broader top contributor list that were not reflected in the top advertising journals. In particular, Michael Ewing, Tim Ambler, Dhruv Grewal, Gerard Prendergast, Tom Reichert, Paul Miniard, and Philip Kitchen are all seen as adding significantly to the advertising discipline, but are not necessarily reflected in the examination of the top advertising journals. It would be a mistake not to recognize these authors for their contributions to the discipline. There are certainly a number of names that appear on both lists, but this study reflects the broader contributions to advertising from an array of publication segments.

The institutional affiliations are found in Table 10. Of the total 573 institutions represented, there were 171 with five or more appearances (as compared to 81 with five or more appearances in the top three journals, as shown in Table 5) in the 17 journals, and of these, the top 21 were as follows in order: University of Georgia, Michigan State University, University of Florida, University of Texas at Austin, Northwestern University, Pennsylvania State University, Washington State University, University of Minnesota, Monash University, University of Alabama, University of Southern California, Leeds University, University of North Texas, University of Amsterdam, University of Wisconsin–Madison, Hong Kong Baptist University, University of Miami, Southern Illinois University, London Business School, Auburn University, and Iowa State University. When these are adjusted to reflect weighted rankings, the order changes as follows in order: University of Georgia, University of Florida, Michigan State University, University of Texas at Austin, Northwestern University, Pennsylvania State University, Washington State University, University of Minnesota, University of Southern California, Rutgers University, London Business School, Monash University, University of Alabama, University of North Texas, Leeds University, University of Amsterdam, University of Wisconsin–Madison, University of Connecticut, Hong Kong Baptist University, University of Miami, and Southern Illinois University. What is particularly noticeable if this Table is compared to Table 5 is that there are more international institutions in the top schools than were found in the top advertising journals. This raises questions about possible publication outlets that would be chosen by international academics that may be different from those chosen by domestic academics. Again, the concern is that scholarly contributions to advertising may come from a variety of publication outlets across different segments, and these publication outlets should not be overlooked.

The last table presents an examination of the author appearances for each of the publication segments. There are five segments represented in this study, and each is reflected with the top authors by appearances in Table 11. What is of interest here is that the top producers in each segment are quite different. This makes the case quite strongly how disparate the sources of advertising scholarship are. The one name that appears across segments more than any other is Dhruv Grewal, who has a total of nine appearances in three of the segments (marketing journals, interdisciplinary journals, and business journals). If we were to examine only advertising journals, his contributions would not be noted, yet it would be suspect to suggest that his work is not helping to shape the advertising discipline.

DISCUSSION

Given the acute nature of institutional accountability and the ever-increasing pressure to gain recognition with high-quality research at the highest academic levels (Chen, Gupta, and Hoshower 2006; Hult, Neese, and Bashaw 1997; Mason 1995; Sheth and Sisodia 2002; Siemens et al. 2005), objective evidence of academic excellence is vital for properly rewarding faculty, enhancing institutional image, improving links to industry, and attracting needed outside funding. The purpose of this study has been to examine advertising scholarship from two different perspectives, and it is interesting that the conclusions drawn from both are similar. These types of benchmarks are healthy for the discipline because they help junior faculty to establish meaningful goals for their research productivity, and the tangible evidence of quality can be used to effectively position academic institutions not only for state funding agencies and certifying bodies (AACSB), but also for practitioners and the community. What is apparent here is that most of the players will change over time due to attrition and changing priorities; however, the increasing proportion of senior faculty in the publications examined may indicate that senior faculty are still finding it worthwhile to continue to publish in a variety of academic journals.

Have things improved for senior faculty in terms of financial rewards for quality publications? King, O'Hara, and Codd (1994) painted a pretty bleak picture, arguing that senior faculty were tending to reach a point of diminishing returns with their publications since consulting was more lucrative for them than publishing in the top tier journals. Is it possible that financial rewards are once again being offered to keep productive faculty publishing as they reach senior status? This should be examined in greater detail.

As with previous studies, a new array of faculty is reflected in the appearances of authors, which is a healthy sign for the discipline. What is particularly encouraging here is the

TABLE 10
Comparative Institutional Ranking (All 17 Journals)

Institution	Rank	TA	Rank WA	WA
University of Georgia	1	52	1	20.59
Michigan State University	2	43	3	18.10
University of Florida	3	42	2	19.28
University of Texas at Austin	4	37	4	16.02
Northwestern University	5	31	5	15.33
Pennsylvania State University	6	29	6	14.37
Washington State University	7	28	7	12.94
University of Minnesota	7	28	8	12.03
Monash University, Melbourne	9	25	12	10.24
University of Alabama	10	24	13	10.04
University of Southern California	11	22	9	11.81
Leeds University	12	21	15	9.73
University of North Texas	13	20	14	9.96
University of Amsterdam	13	20	16	9.64
University of Wisconsin–Madison	13	20	17	9.53
Hong Kong Baptist University	13	20	19	9.48
University of Miami	13	20	20	9.36
Southern Illinois University	13	20	21	9.30
London Business School, United Kingdom	19	19	11	10.98
Auburn University	19	19	22	8.73
Iowa State University	19	19	23	8.30
Rutgers University	22	18	10	11.49
University of Memphis	22	18	27	8.00
Baruch College	24	17	28	7.89
University of Pennsylvania	24	17	29	7.83
University of Auckland, New Zealand	24	17	30	7.33
University of Nevada, Las Vegas	24	17	47	5.83
Louisiana State University	28	16	24	8.24
University of Houston	28	16	30	7.33
University of Arkansas	28	16	40	6.86
Colorado State University	28	16	102	3.45
University of Connecticut	32	15	18	9.50
New York University	32	15	25	8.16
Indiana University	32	15	32	7.24
Villanova University	32	15	35	7.00
University of Kansas	32	15	43	6.74
Stockholm School of Economics, Sweden	37	14	34	7.16
Copenhagen Business School	37	14	36	6.98
Georgia State University	37	14	36	6.98
University of North Carolina	37	14	39	6.90
University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign	37	14	45	6.32
University of South Carolina	37	14	48	5.82
University of Michigan	37	14	50	5.60
Chinese University of Hong Kong	44	13	26	8.15
City University of Hong Kong	44	13	51	5.47
Concordia University	44	13	77	3.83
University of Oregon	47	12	41	6.83
University of Missouri–Columbia	47	12	42	6.75
Arizona State University	47	12	44	6.50
Cleveland State University	47	12	45	6.32
Kansas State University	47	12	49	5.73
Old Dominion University	47	12	53	5.00
South Bank University, United Kingdom	47	12	63	4.65
Oklahoma State University	47	12	66	4.39
Marquette University	55	11	33	7.19

(continues)

Institution	Rank	TA	Rank WA	WA
University of Tennessee	55	11	53	5.00
Southern Methodist University	55	11	55	4.99
Ohio State University	55	11	56	4.98
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore	55	11	58	4.81
Columbia University	55	11	90	3.63
University of Oklahoma	61	10	38	6.91
University of Arizona	61	10	59	4.75
National University of Singapore	61	10	60	4.74
University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee	61	10	61	4.66
Florida Atlantic University	61	10	70	4.32
McGill University	61	10	73	4.02
Wayne State University	61	10	74	4.00
University of Massachusetts, Amherst	61	10	82	3.66
Florida International University	61	10	82	3.66
University of Washington	61	10	91	3.58
University of Chicago	61	10	103	3.41
University of Alabama, Huntsville	61	10	105	3.40
Curtin University of Technology, Australia	61	10	111	3.32
University of Mississippi	61	10	118	3.10
University of California at Berkeley	75	9	57	4.83
Manchester Business School, United Kingdom	75	9	65	4.48
Hofstra University	75	9	67	4.33
University of Hawaii at Manoa	75	9	77	3.83
Florida State University	75	9	81	3.74
Hong Kong University	75	9	82	3.66
Tilburg University, Netherlands	75	9	89	3.65
University of California, Irvine	75	9	92	3.50
Mississippi State University	75	9	103	3.41
University of Virginia	75	9	106	3.36
University of Central Florida	75	9	108	3.33
Clemson University	75	9	117	3.14
Dartmouth College	75	9	137	2.61
Wake Forest University	88	8	61	4.66
City University of New York	88	8	67	4.33
Saint Josephs University	88	8	71	4.08
University of Saskatchewan	88	8	74	4.00
Boston College	88	8	77	3.83
University of Missouri–St. Louis	88	8	82	3.66
Kent State University	88	8	100	3.49
Bentley College	88	8	113	3.24
University of New South Wales, Australia	88	8	114	3.16
University of Queensland, Australia	88	8	132	2.81
University of Adelaide, Australia	88	8	136	2.63
University of Tennessee, Knoxville	99	7	67	4.33
University of Iowa	99	7	82	3.66
Saint Louis University	99	7	92	3.50
Harvard University	99	7	92	3.50
Massey University, New Zealand	99	7	106	3.36
University of Texas at Arlington	99	7	112	3.25
Stanford University	99	7	114	3.16
University of Nebraska at Lincoln	99	7	119	3.03
San Diego State University	99	7	130	2.82
Duke University	99	7	130	2.82
Hull University, United Kingdom	99	7	140	2.49
Babson College	99	7	143	2.41
Memorial University	99	7	150	2.31
University of South Alabama	99	7	153	2.16
National Chengchi University, Taiwan	113	6	52	5.33

(continues)

TABLE 10 (continued)

Institution	Rank	TA	Rank WA	WA
University of Otago, New Zealand	113	6	64	4.50
Griffith University, Australia	113	6	71	4.08
Western Michigan University	113	6	80	3.75
University of Birmingham, United Kingdom	113	6	82	3.66
University of Maryland—College Park	113	6	92	3.50
Santa Clara University	113	6	92	3.50
University of Delaware	113	6	92	3.50
Fordham University	113	6	100	3.49
Clark University	113	6	108	3.33
University of Texas at San Antonio	113	6	114	3.16
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	113	6	120	3.00
University of Northern Iowa	113	6	120	3.00
University of Kentucky	113	6	138	2.53
Ghent University	113	6	140	2.49
Pace University	113	6	151	2.25
Erasmus University, the Netherlands	113	6	152	2.24
Drexel University	113	6	158	2.15
University of Alberta	113	6	161	2.00
University of Wisconsin—Whitewater	113	6	177	1.91
29 Universities		5		
27 Universities		4		
60 Universities		3		
103 Universities		2		
212 Universities		1		
Total university WA		1,162.96		
Nonacademic WA		161.04		
Total articles		1,324.00		

Notes: TA = total appearances; WA = weighted appearances.

fact that the top producers are responsible for a significantly smaller portion of the total publications reflected in the 10-year period of the study. While in the Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998) study, the top 5% of authors were responsible for 18% of the total number of publications, this proportion dropped in the present study, with the top 5.9% responsible for only 9.9% of the total number of publications. This was also seen in the broader examination across different segments as well. This indicates a better balancing of the authorships, while the publication volume and variety of different contributors is wider than ever before, indicating a dynamic and healthy discipline.

Finally, there is no effort here to reflect the significance of the contributions of the various articles involved. Not all publications have the same impact, and there needs to be some adjustment involved in future studies to reflect impact (i.e., citational counts) on the discipline.

Advertising as a discipline is healthy and attracting an increasing array of top scholars who publish in a variety of publication outlets. The results here would suggest that some of the findings of Soley and Reid (1983) are as pertinent today

as they were back in 1983. They found that (1) academics and nonacademics are both contributing to the advancement of the advertising discipline, and (2) faculty from a wide variety of universities are publishing advertising articles, but there is a limited number of key scholars who are making a proportionally larger contribution to advertising thought than others. Their other findings are not supported in the two present studies. They found that (1) the majority of advertising articles were published by authors from marketing and business faculties, and (2) there was an inverse relationship between advertising productivity and academic rank. In the present studies it was found that marketing and advertising/journalism/communications disciplines were the heaviest contributors and that there is a balance in productivity across different academic ranks. This suggests that the discipline is healthier than ever.

One last conclusion is that, as before, there are certain key schools that are focused on high-quality advertising research, and students interested in pursuing advertising as a discipline would be well advised to apply to these schools and work with key opinion leaders.

TABLE II
Comparative Author Appearances by Publication Segments

Advertising journals (JA + JAR + JCIRA + IJA)			Marketing journals			Interdisciplinary journals			Journalism/communication journals			Business journals		
Name	TA	Name	TA	Name	TA	Name	TA	Name	TA	Name	TA	Name	TA	
Don E. Schultz	13	Angela Lee	3	Dhruv Grewal	4	Jacqueline Hitchon	5	Dhruv Grewal	3					
Michael Ewing	12	Deborah MacInnis	3	Laura Peracchio	4	Bruce Pinkleton	3	Georges Zaccour	2					
Marla Royné Stafford	10	Michel Wedel	3	David Luna	3	Donna Rouser	3	Girish Punj	2					
Carrie La Ferle	9	Pradeep Chintagunta	3	Brian Sternthal	2	J. Robyn Goodman	3	Rajesh Chandrashekaran	2					
Douglas C. West	9	Richard G. Netemeyer	3	Chris Janiszewski	2	Leonard Reid	3	140 Authors	1					
George M. Zinkhan	9	Rik Pieters	3	David Glen Mick	2	Michael D. Slater	3							
Avery M. Abernethy	8	Scott Burton	3	Edward McQuarrie	2	Stephen Lacy	3							
Barbara B. Stern	8	Ambar Rao	2	G. Douglas Olsen	2	Carolyn Lin	2							
Chang-Hoan Cho	8	Carl F. Mela	2	Jennifer Aaker	2	Dmitri Williams	2							
Charles R. Taylor	8	Carolyn J. Simmons	2	Jennifer Edson Escalas	2	Erica Weintraub Austin	2							
Gerard Prendergast	8	Cornelia Pechmann	2	Karen H. Smith	2	Fredrick Beauvais	2							
Tim Ambler	8	Dhruv Grewal	2	Larry D. Compeau	2	H. Allen White	2							
Andrew Ehrenberg	7	Dominique Hanssens	2	Mary Ann Sturts	2	Hyun Seung Jin	2							
Micael Dahlén	7	Donald Lehman	2	Michelle Roehm	2	Joyce Wolburg	2							
Michael LaTour	7	Edward Fern	2	Parthasarathy Krishnamurthy	2	Karen Whitehill King	2							
Phillip J. Kitchen	7	Gerard Tellis	2	Patti Williams	2	Kevin Murphy	2							
Stephen J. Gould	7	J. Craig Andrews	2	Richard Petty	2	Leo Jeffres	2							
Steven M. Edwards	7	Joan Meyers-Levy	2	Rik Pieters	2	Lisa Duke	2							
T. Bettina Cornwell	7	Koen Pauwels	2	Rohini Ahluwalia	2	Lyndia Lee Kaid	2							
James Gentry	6	Kusum Ailawadi	2	Stewart Shapiro	2	Melanie Domnch-Rodriguez	2							
Leonard N. Reid	6	Michael Barone	2	132 Authors	1	Michelle Nelson	2							
Russell N. Laczniak	6	Pattana Thaiwanich	2			Moniek Buijzen	2							
Wei-Na Lee	6	Paul Miniard	2			Patti Valkenburg	2							
Barbara J. Phillips	5	Prasad Naik	2			Soonae An	2							
Brett A. S. Martin	5	Puneet Manchanda	2			Susan Tyler Eastman	2							
Brian D. Till	5	Rajesh Chandy	2			Tom Reichert	2							
Darrel D. Muehling	5	Rohit Deshpande	2			Yuki Fujioka	2							
Erwin Ephron	5	Siva Balasubramanian	2			184 Authors	1							
Hairong Li	5	Sonya Grier	2											
James A. Karrh	5	Sridhar Narayanan	2											
James Peltier	5	Tulin Erdem	2											
Kathryn A. Braun-LaTour	5	V. Kumar	2											
Kenneth R. Lord	5	151 Authors	1											
Nan Zhou	5													
Nancy Spears	5													
Peter C. Neijens	5													
Pierre Berthon	5													
Pola Gupta	5													
Pradeep K. Korgaonkar	5													
Sanjay Putrevu	5													
Wenyu Dou	5													
Alan J. Bush	4													
Arch G. Woodside	4													
Carolyn A. Lin	4													

(continues)

Chingching Chang	3
Cristel Antonia Russell	3
Dana L. Alden	3
David F. Poltrack	3
David N. Laband	3
Dayananada Palihawadana	3
Edward F. McQuarrie	3
Erdener Kayank	3
Eric Haley	3
Fred Beard	3
George R. Franke	3
Giles D'Souza	3
Goutam Chakraborty	3
Graham Spickett-Jones	3
Jan LeBlanc Wicks	3
Joel Rubinson	3
John B. Ford	3
John D. Leckenby	3
John Philip Jones	3
John R. Rossiter	3
Joo-Hyun Lee	3
Joyce M. Wolburg	3
Keith S. Coulter	3
Kim Bartel Sheehan	3
Les Carlson	3
Lori D. Wolin	3
Maggie Geuens	3
Marc G. Weinberger	3
Michael Fay	3
Michael J. Barone	3
Patrick De Pelsmacker	3
Pedro Hidalgo	3
Richard H. Kolbe	3
Robert Heath	3
Roger Marshall	3
Scot Burton	3
Sharon Shavitt	3
Siva K. Balasubramanian	3
Stella L. M. So	3
Stephen W. Pruitt	3
Sunkyu Jun	3
Terence A. Shimp	3
Tina Lowery	3
Toshio Yamaki	3
Wendy Macias	3
William E. Baker	3
Woonbong Na	3
Yi Zheng Shi	3
204 Authors	2
1,018 Authors	1

Notes: JA = Journal of Advertising; JAR = Journal of Advertising Research; JCIRA = Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising; IJA = International Journal of Advertising; TA = total appearances.

REFERENCES

- Barry, Thomas E. (1990), "Publication Productivity in the Three Leading U.S. Advertising Journals: Inaugural Issues Through 1988," *Journal of Advertising*, 19 (Spring), 52–60.
- Chen, Yining, Ashok Gupta, and Leon Hoshower (2006), "Factors That Motivate Business Faculty to Conduct Research: An Expectancy Theory Analysis," *Journal of Education for Business*, 81 (4), 179–190.
- 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 (Summer), 53–63.
- Hult, G. Tomas M., William T. Neese, and R. Edward Bashaw (1997), "Faculty Perceptions of Marketing Journals," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 18 (Spring), 37–53.
- King, John O., Bradley S. O'Hara, and Mike Codd (1994), "Perceived Causes, Effects, and Remedies for Plateauing Among Marketing Professors," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 15 (Spring), 15–24.
- Mason, J. Barry (1995), "Marketing Education in the 1990's: A Dean's Retrospective and Prospective View," *Marketing Education Review*, 5 (Spring), 1–8.
- Powers, Thomas L., John E. Swan, Theodore Bos, and John Frank Patton (1998), "Career Research Productivity Patterns of Marketing Academicians," *Journal of Business Research*, 42 (1), 75–86.
- Sheth, Jagdish N., and Rajendra S. Sisodia (2002), "Marketing Productivity: Issues and Analysis," *Journal of Business Research*, 55 (5), 349–360.
- 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 (4), 467–477.
- Soley, Lawrence, and Leonard Reid (1983), "Advertising Article Productivity of the U.S. Academic Community," *Journalism Quarterly*, 60 (3), 464–469, 542.
- , and ——— (1988), "Advertising Article Productivity Updated," *Journalism Quarterly*, 65 (1), 157–164.
- Udell, Gerald G., Steve Parker, and Charles Pettijohn (1995), "An Examination of the Research Productivity of Marketing Faculty at Newly Minted AACSB Schools," *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 3 (2), 106–113.

Copyright of *Journal of Advertising* is the property of M.E. Sharpe Inc. 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.