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Writing Refereed Journal Articles – An Editor’s View

New academics frequently ask for advice on getting their work published in refereed journals. This short paper, which is based on a presentation given to the Academy of Marketing on 7th July 2004, offers some guidance on selecting and targeting journals, considers the refereed review process, and discusses other key issues which may be of interest to researchers.

Selecting and Targeting Journals

The first rule is to match the paper to the journal. This may seem obvious, but editors frequently receive papers which are not relevant to their journal. Contributors need to devote time to a careful reading of the Editorial Objectives, the Notes for Contributors and Manuscript Requirements, all of which are easily available, either within the journal itself or on the publisher’s website. The Mission Statement offers a clear steer to would-be authors. For example, the mission statement of the International Marketing Review reads as follows:

"IMR is the 'International Marketing' Review NOT an international ‘Marketing Review’. This means it seeks to publish interesting, well written and academically robust papers which communicate clearly on international marketing issues. It is not a home for general marketing papers."

This seems very clear to us, but it may be worth breaking this statement down and considering each element separately:

- "interesting, well written and academically robust papers"

Of course, what one of us thinks is interesting another may find tedious in the extreme, but perhaps the acid test of this statement is whether or not the author can answer the ‘so what?’ question. WHY are you doing WHAT you are doing in the WAY you are doing it and WHO cares anyway?

- "... international marketing issues. It is not a home for general marketing papers."

This is still an issue for us as would-be authors continue to submit single-country studies, which for some of our readers means their content would be
domestic, on general marketing topics.

Further, issues relating to quality as well as relevance are safeguarded by good journals through rigorous review procedures. Rigorous can be defined as strict, exact and accurate, which is something we strive for in the reviewing process. However, there is no intention here to suggest that any methodology is inherently more rigorous than any other. Rather it is application of a particular methodology by a rigorous researcher which is key. More crucial is whether the paper makes a contribution (theoretical, methodological, or managerial). This is the most important criterion and the one against which many papers fail to make the grade.

Of course, in addition to the published guidelines, there may be a sub-text which would-be authors should not ignore. It is important to be aware of ongoing academic discussion in the journal you target, and to ensure that recent special issues are not ignored in your discussion. If it seems that your paper includes some element that may bias certain reviewers against it, bring this to the editor’s attention in a covering letter. For example, a paper which demonstrates the use of a unique methodology or which challenges existing orthodoxy might then be targeted by the editor at more open-minded reviewers.

Finally, would-be authors should make themselves aware of niche journals and forthcoming special issues, not least since in the case of the latter lead times to publication can be considerably reduced.

The Refereed Review Process

Consideration of this process should begin before submission of the paper. We only have one chance to make a first impression and, as Ketchen (2002) has suggested “first impressions are lasting impressions”. Ketchen goes on to suggest that a paper’s introduction is pivotal and advises authors to make it clear how their paper “looks to close the gap between what we know and what we need to know about a subject”. He also recommends that authors “look to friendly peers for guidance before the review process begins”. It is important not to rush the submission, but to reflect on the paper, and consider the comments of peers, incorporating their suggestions for improvement. Until the manuscript is accepted for publication it is a working document and should be treated as such. It is worth remembering that, like it or not, the UK Research Assessment Exercise measures four pieces of research output per person. This is less than one a year, so it makes sense to do one paper at a time and do it well.

After submission, all papers received by the Editor/s are pre-screened for relevance to the journal mission and objectives as discussed above. If they meet these requirements they are forwarded for blind review to two or three reviewers, who are usually members of the Editorial Advisory Board or Editorial Review Panel (listed in the journal) with all author details removed. However, on occasion Editors will ask others with specific subject expertise to assist in the reviewing process. Once a paper has been reviewed, there
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are three possible outcomes: rejection - which is more likely than not; revision - a positive outcome; and acceptance - highly unlikely at this first stage.

If a paper is rejected, authors are advised not to rush into action immediately on receipt of the letter, but to take time to reflect. Rejection should NEVER be taken personally (hard though this may be); it is a process of ‘fit’...the paper with the journal. Nevertheless, if you feel there has been a genuine misunderstanding it can be worth writing to the editor - but there is no point simply arguing with the reviewers. Rather, their comments should be carefully considered in revising the paper prior to targeting another journal.

Where the recommendation is revision, this is a cause for some celebration, since the paper still has a chance of being accepted by the journal. It is important to take time to think about the comments/recommendations of the reviewers (who will remain anonymous). Where a reviewer’s comment is unclear, it can be useful to seek clarification from the editor (although we would recommend that this is not done by phone, since queries about a specific paper can rarely be answered there and then - it may be an important paper to the author, but the editor has many such papers on file). Make the changes needed or, if you are clear that some changes are not warranted and cannot be made, defend why you have not made them and detail your response on a separate sheet.

If the paper is accepted at this stage, then you deserve to celebrate. Of course, the recommendation might very well be more revision, in which case the process will need to be gone through again, with more careful thinking about and responding to the comments of the reviewers. Or the paper might be rejected at this stage, requiring a careful targeting of another journal. Most importantly, use the experience in a positive way to enhance your own understanding of the publishing process.

It is worth remembering that reviewers are chosen by Editors for their expertise. They are usually busy academics who review out of goodwill to the journal and who, in the main, offer helpful, timely and supportive comments. The review process should be constructive - positive, fair BUT rigorous - but like any other human process, it is not perfect. Editors, too, are busy academics, so it makes sense not to make things difficult for them. Do what is required in terms of submission; if three copies of a manuscript are required at submission, submit three, not one or two. Only enquire as to what is happening with the review process after a decent interval (in our case, reviewers are given about six weeks to respond)

Additional Thoughts

To develop as a researcher, it is important to try to follow a research trajectory and continue in a particular stream of research. Expertise has limited scope and continuity in research is almost always rewarded.
Once a paper has been accepted for publication, it is worth copying and mailing it to others. This may seem inappropriate but at some point in your career citation indices will be important and this might be an opportunity to work with others who are interested in the same area of research.

Research streams and questions worthy of scholarly inquiry can be identified in various ways. One starting point would be to review the Marketing Science Institute’s (MSI) Research Priorities - the most recent as well as the past research priority statements dating back to 1984 (www.msi.org). Interesting conceptual developments can be ‘spotted’ in leading journals, as well as by attending ‘leading’ mainstream and specialist conferences (AM, AMA, MSI, EMAC, ACR, AIB etc), where a dialogue with a network of other researchers can begin to be developed. Reading outside the discipline in cognate areas can be a good way of identifying new approaches and ‘importing’ them into the marketing discipline.

However, it is important to be confident in your own views. Considerable diversity will always exist in research topics that individual researchers view as ‘hot’; i.e. topics which are intellectually challenging, interesting, intriguing and invigorating, and plurality of research interests within a discipline is a favourable characteristic.

Perhaps the last word should go to Shelby Hunt: “Rather than endlessly searching for today’s ‘hot topic’, potential contributors to the Journal of Marketing are well-advised to write and do research in those areas where they believe they can make the most CONTRIBUTION” (Hunt, 1985). This view is just as applicable today, as it was in 1985, for all refereed journals.
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Editorial Comment

As noted in the Editorial the advice given by Jeryl is echoed by many other Editors of major journals. Accordingly, as Editor of TMR I though readers might be interested in the notes I made at a seminar at Monash University on March 12th 2003 when Professor Parssu Parasuraman talked about "getting published". His contribution was based on the presentation he made to a "meet the editors session" during the period when he was editor of JAMS. from 1997 to 2000. This presentation was entitled "The decisions that lead to THE decision"

To begin with Parasuraman discussed the appointment/removal of editorial board members. While the rewards for reviewing are intrinsic and attract no direct recognition, editorial board appointments are prestigious and give esteem. While the main work of reviewing is undertaken by full members of the editorial board, ad hoc reviewers are also used. It was suggested that younger academics should offer their services as ad hoc reviewers as this is a very useful learning experience, especially as you get to see the other reviews and learn the process, as well as bringing you to the attention of more experienced colleagues.

Quite often papers are rejected by an editor without being put out for review. The main grounds for desk rejection are:

- Lack of fit with the journals positioning;
- Absence of "academic" Rigour;
- No overlap between the reference list and extant marketing literature. Such contributions often come from persons working in other fields unaware of what is going on within the marketing discipline. There is always a need to anchor one's work within the current literature.
- Evidence of serious sloppiness. The lack of attention to detail and presentation.

In deciding how to assign reviewers to a paper the following are taken into account:

- the papers main topic(s) and theme(s);
- authors cited in the references;
a combination of board members and ad hoc reviewers.

Paršu also commented on the number of reviewers, usually three for JAMS identified as R1, R2, and R3, and assured the audience that the numbering assignment of reviewers has no significance. He also indicated that it was possible for authors to nominate or deselect reviewers if they had strong reasons for believing certain persons might not be suitable for whatever reason. In passing, he also commented on the fact that Management Science is a single blind review journal in that the reviewers know the identity of the authors.

When it comes to interpreting the reviewers as an Editor, attention is given to the care with which the review has been prepared; the reviewers recommendation to the editor; the reviewers past reviewing history (as an editor he tended to look at the reviewers track record as some may always reject or accept a paper almost irrespective of the content of their review: this emphasises the importance of the editors input to the final selection) finally Editors look for the degree of consistency across reviewers.

In terms of his personal approach to making editorial decisions he seeks to minimise the number of rounds of reviewing, and tries to identify promising manuscripts after round one. He then played a hands-on role in strengthening these submissions. He also prefers to give authors the benefit of the doubt so that, if the collective feedback at the end of the second round of reviewing suggests that the decision could well go either way, he would tend to find in favour of the authors.

While not encouraging appeals there is need for such a process, which usually involves the appointment of a referee. While accepting that there is always a possibility of a type one error in the reviewing process – rejecting a good papers which deserved to be published - whilst this has a non-zero probability, it is a very small one.

In Parsu's opinion, research is the defining role of tenure track or tenured faculty, and marks the difference between the creation, and dissemination of knowledge. In passing he commented that while there is a "publish or perish" syndrome, there is no "teach or be terminated", or "serve or be severed" condition on most academics' employment. Usually, this is because others can provide these inputs who are unable or unwilling to do research.

In considering where to publish one's research he drew attention to multiple channels, including:

- broadly based journals
- specialised academic journals
- scholarly books/chapters
- applied journals
- textbooks
- business books
As a working generalisation new scholars should start with the first of these and, over their career, work towards the book end of the spectrum. In general the influence of these outlets could be summarised as:

- scholarly discourse
- doctoral students (the future gatekeepers)
- thoughtful practitioners
- immediate managerial application
- pedagogical aids for preparing students to be successful managers.

In his opinion:

1. All channels and targets merit consideration.
2. Some pathways are more appropriate to others in early career stages and one should start with the scholarly journals.
3. It is advisable to consider multiple and varied journals within the realm of scholarly publishing.
4. To make a long lasting impression you need to cover all the publication pathways; e.g. Aaker, Kotler, Sheth.