

## THE WMEA PROCEEDINGS: AN ELEVEN YEAR RETROSPECTIVE

Bruce L. Stern\*, Portland State University, P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207, (503) 725-3702

### ABSTRACT

This study provides a content analysis of the Western Marketing Educators' Association's eleven volumes of Proceedings from 1981 to 1991. The frequency of contributions by individual authors and by institutions is noted along with insights into topical coverage and type of article.

### INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

Since 1977 the Western Marketing Educators' Association (WMEA) has held conferences annually for the purpose of sharing pedagogical insights and current research. Beginning in 1981 the best of the papers submitted for competitive review were published in the form of a Proceedings. Until now there has not been a comprehensive analysis of the content of these Proceedings and its contributors.

Such an analysis can provide a number of benefits to the WMEA and its members. First, and foremost, it can provide a historical document which can be periodically updated. This document will identify the prominent contributing institutions and authors and, in doing so, point out which are most active and which might be targeted to increase their future participation. By determining the kinds of articles which have been published (i.e.: conceptual vs. empirical) and the subject areas covered, members will have a better idea of what topical territory has already been traversed and the prevailing types of papers that have been accepted.

Given that the WMEA is the only regional or national association in the United States that focuses primarily on marketing education issues, an analysis of its contributions could assist new professors with pedagogical insights along with providing veteran professors with new ideas to improve classroom performance. Possibly even more importantly, such an analysis can show the association leadership where WMEA has been--which is always essential before planning for one's future.

### LITERATURE REVIEW

A number of studies have been conducted in several disciplines which focus on the historical

contributions from journals and proceedings. This literature review will focus on a sample of those retrospective efforts in business administration.

#### Studies of Non-Marketing Literature

Henry and Burch (1974) conducted an analysis of general business and management research productivity. They investigated writing productivity by authors in a number of business subjects.

In a research effort focusing on solely the accounting literature, Dyl and Lilly (1985) profiled the institutional contributors to the literature in their discipline. A few years later Heck and Cooley (1988) itemized the author and institutional contributions which appeared in 15 finance journals.

#### Studies Focusing on the Advertising Literature

An investigation of what advertising research was published in six marketing-oriented journals from 1976-1985 was conducted by Yale and Gilly (1988). They analyzed the volume of literature by journal and topic and detailed what empirical methods were used, the type of sample unit employed, and the type of statistical analysis utilized.

Shortly thereafter, Barry (1990) evaluated the contributions contained in three major advertising journals from their dates of inception through the 1980's. His study detailed those contributions by journal and frequency of appearances by school, author, and academic rank of authors.

#### Studies Focusing on Marketing Literature

In a more focused effort, Clark, Hancock, and Kaminski (1987) examined contributions to one journal, the Journal of Marketing Research, from 1964-1985. Their article detailed author and institutional productivity and whether the article was authored by professors or businesspersons.

A few years earlier, Clarke (1985) content analyzed articles from eight leading marketing journals. He was able to measure and rank the productivity of the top 40 institutional contributors while also developing an active faculty index.

Noting the contributions in the 1980's, Wheatley and Wilson (1987) analyzed the content of five marketing journals and two Proceedings during the majority of that decade. They identified the most frequently published authors, their institutions, and where the authors were trained.

In a sampling of retrospective efforts several studies have been identified which focus on the areas of business and marketing. The scope of this manuscript is to conduct similar research noting the contributions and contributors in the WMEA Proceedings--which is dedicated to the many pedagogical issues impacting marketing education.

#### METHOD OF RESEARCH

All eleven issues of the WMEA Proceedings from 1981-1991 constituted the population of this study. A group of trained, impartial judges examined the volumes noting data on author and institutional identity, and type and subject of article. Most of the judges' decisions involved little judgment (i.e.: author name, institution, etc.), but a few variables (i.e.: subject of article) involved examination of the article content to be able to make a judgment. In the event that the team of two judges did not agree on any of the classifications, a third judge would then reconcile any differences.

For the variables examining the frequency of appearance by author and institution, two measures are offered. The first involves the raw number of appearances. As an example, if an article was co-authored by two persons from the same school each person would be listed with a frequency of one. The school's raw frequency, however, would be two. Adjusted scores are also offered to provide an additional perspective. If an author or school is part of a co-authorship venture, each author (and school) is given a .5 adjusted score. If they are part of a three author work, each would have a .33 adjusted score. The same divisionalization applies for four author papers. This adjusted score for frequency of appearance was earlier utilized by Clarke (1985) and Barry (1990).

#### RESULTS

##### Contributions by Author

A listing of authors with four or more appearances in the Proceedings is detailed in Table 1. There were 26 individuals who appeared as an author 4

or more times in the 11 years of the Proceedings' existence. This figure represents 7.9 percent of the total number of authors appearing over the years. Eighteen individuals appeared 3 times, 57 appeared twice, and 228 individuals appeared once as an author in the Proceedings. It is interesting to note that the top contributor is from outside of the western region, which is the domain of the WMEA.

Analysis of the number of authors per article reflected that the average WMEA Proceedings article had between one and two authors (mean = 1.57). In total, 55.3 percent of the articles were single authored, about one-third (34.3 percent) were co-authored, and 10.4 percent had three or four authors. No significant variability was found over time, although the year 1982 produced a much higher proportion of single authorships and 1983 and 1985 produced higher than normal multiple authorships.

TABLE 1  
Authors Ranked In Order of Appearance

Name	Number of Appearances	Adjusted Score
Morgan, Fred	11	8.50
Orsini, Joseph	7	6.00
Cohen, William	7	6.00
Ghym, Kyung-Il	6	4.50
Kelley, Craig	6	4.83
Walker, Bruce	6	4.83
Gottko, John	6	4.00
Dommeyer, Curt	5	3.50
Stern, Bruce	5	3.66
Jacobs, Lawrence	5	3.16
Safavi, Farrokh	5	5.00
Brown, Daniel	5	2.50
Brown, William	5	3.00
McNabb, David	5	2.66
Zimmer, Robert	5	2.50
Saltzman, Arthur	4	3.25
Czepiec, Helena	4	2.50
Mills, Michael	4	2.50
Razzouk, Nabil	4	2.33
Spratlen, Thaddeus	4	3.50
Guseman, Dennis	4	1.58
Hugstad, Paul	4	4.00
McCain, Gary	4	2.00
Demirdjian, Andy	4	3.50
Boedecker, Karl	4	3.00
Sherwood, Charles	4	1.83

## Contributions by Institution

The authors' institutions are presented and ranked by number of appearances in Table 2. Twenty-three of the 115 different schools represented by contributing authors had 8 or more appearances in WMEA's Proceedings. These same 23 schools represented 57 percent of the total number of author appearances. This leads to the conclusion that about one-fifth of the schools are contributing about three-fifths of the article authors in the WMEA Proceedings. This may assist WMEA in defining who their real market is and where the unmet potential for future participation lays.

The three west coast states of California, Oregon, and Washington produce the most WMEA authors. California, by far the largest contributing state, also represents over two-thirds of WMEA's membership.

TABLE 2  
Institutions Ranked In Order of Appearance

Name of Institution	Number of Appearances	Adjusted Score
Oregon State Univ.	26	16.00
Arizona State Univ.	21	12.83
Portland State Univ.	21	10.92
Calif. State Univ., Fullerton	19	13.83
Calif. State Univ., Sacramento	17	10.83
Wayne State Univ.	16	11.00
San Jose State Univ.	13	12.00
Calif. State Univ., Bakersfield	13	5.33
Calif. State Univ., Long Beach	13	11.00
Calif. State Univ., Northridge	12	9.50
Calif. State Univ., San Bernardino	12	7.58
Calif. State Univ., Los Angeles	11	8.00
Calif. State Univ., Hayward	11	8.00
Pacific Lutheran Univ.	11	5.00
Calif. Poly, Pomona	10	8.50
Boise State Univ.	10	6.17
Calif. State Univ., Fresno	10	5.00
Univ. of San Francisco	9	6.00
Univ. of Nevada, Reno	9	6.50
Univ. of Nevada, Las Vegas	9	4.50
Univ. of Southern California	9	6.00
Univ. of Calgary	8	3.00
Univ. of New Mexico	8	6.00

## Conceptual Vs. Empirical Emphasis

To better understand the type of articles which have been published in WMEA Proceedings, the judges classified them into two broad categories. For an article to be considered empirical, it had to report results obtained first hand by the authors. Articles which were not empirical in nature were classified as conceptual, although a few actually were explanations of theoretical mathematical models. Given this classification, the majority (59.6 percent) of WMEA Proceeding articles were conceptual in nature, with the balance (40.4 percent) being empirical. Only in one year, 1983, were there more empirical than conceptual articles.

## Contribution by Article Length

Article length was classified either as abbreviated if it was one or two pages or full if it was three pages or longer. During the first two years of the Proceedings' existence only abstracts of accepted articles were published, and, as such, all 44 of those articles were categorized as abbreviated. From 1983 until the present authors had the option of publishing full-length articles or abbreviated abstracts. Since 1983 the majority (59.1 percent) of articles appearing in the WMEA Proceedings were full length, leaving the remaining 40.9 percent as abbreviated abstracts. In each of the last nine years there have been a greater number of full articles than abbreviated ones.

## Contributions by Subject Matter

As one might expect in over 300 articles in 11 volumes, there is a very broad representation of topics impacting marketing education. Table 3 details the most frequently occurring article topics. Nearly one third of the total number of articles are tied directly to the theme of marketing education by focusing on courses, curriculum issues, and teaching techniques. A number of articles, though, deal with more specific courses or issues. From the very beginning, as an example, there have been a steady stream of articles most every year which focus on computer applications, international marketing, and legal issues in marketing.

TABLE 3  
Frequency of Topics Mentioned in Proceedings

Topics Mentioned	Number of Appearances
Courses and Curriculum	64
Teaching Techniques	43
International Marketing	33
Research Techniques and Results	19
Microcomputers and Software	19
Consumer Behavior	14
Legal Issues in Marketing	14
Advertising Research	12
Decision-Making Techniques	10
Attitudes of Students	10
Marketing Strategy	9
Marketing of Services	8
Social Issues in Marketing	8
Marketing Theory and Practice	7
Evaluation of Marketing Educators	7
Distribution Channels	6
Challenges for Marketing Depts.	6
Evaluation of Students	6
Other Topics	43

#### CONCLUDING COMMENTS

This study provides a foundation for understanding where WMEA has been during its eleven years of publishing its Proceedings. The answers to the fundamental questions of "who, what, where, and when" were explored in this study. As to the question of "why," after looking back over the contributions the answer becomes fairly clear. People who contribute to the WMEA Proceedings do so because of their love of marketing education. This is not to imply that the major contributors are more interested in teaching than research--on the contrary, most of the contributors are also prolific researchers. What this says about WMEA is that teaching is important too.

#### REFERENCES

- Barry, Thomas E. (1990), "Publication Productivity in the Three Leading U.S. Advertising Journals: Inaugural Issues through 1988," Journal of Advertising, 19 (1), 52-60.
- Clarke, Gary L. (1985), "Productivity Ratings of Institutions Based on Publication in Eight

Marketing Journals: 1983-1984," Journal of Marketing Education, 7 (Fall), 12-23.

Clark, Gary L., William Hancock, and Peter F. Kaminski (1987), "An Analysis of Leading Contributors to the Journal of Marketing Research: 1964-1985," in AMA Educators' Proceedings, Susan P. Douglas, et al., eds., Chicago: American Marketing Association, (August), 250-253.

Dyl, E. A. and M. S. Lilly (1985), "A Note on Institutional Contributions to the Accounting Literature," Accounting Organizations and Society, 10 (2), 171-175.

Heck, J.L. and P. L. Cooley (1988), "Most Frequent Contributors to the Finance Literature," Financial Management, 17 (3), 100-108.

Henry, W. R. and E. E. Burch (1974), Institutional Contributions to Scholarly Journals and Business", The Journal of Business, 47 (January), 56-66.

Wheatley, John J. and Lawrence C. Wilson (1987), "The Origins of Published Marketing Research in the 1980's", in AMA Educators' Proceedings, Susan P. Douglas, et al., eds., Chicago: American Marketing Association, (August), 260-265.

Yale, Laura and Mary C. Gilly (1988), "Trends in Advertising Research: A Look at the Content of Marketing-Oriented Journals from 1976 to 1985", Journal of Advertising, 17 (1), 12-22.

\*The author would like to thank Kurt Van Orden, Raman Nayyar, Miky Sukiman, Rudy Sandjaja, Liang Ang, and Karen Wasserzieher for their assistance in this project.