

Getting doctored: a proposed model of marketing doctoral student socialization

Philip J. Trocchia

Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, USA, and

David Berkowitz

University of Alabama, Huntsville, Alabama, USA

Keywords *Academic staff, Goals, Personality, Socialization, Students*

Abstract *Addresses the socialization process among marketing doctoral students. Four modes of doctoral student socialization are provided from depth interviews conducted with 28 purposively selected individuals. These four modes are based upon two characteristics: degree of program structure, or formal socialization; and degree of student-faculty interaction, or informal socialization. Reveals five factors that informants identified as contributors toward the professional success of a marketing doctoral student: inner desire, communitas, practicality in research, networking, and brand equity.*

Every year, between 100 and 150 individuals earn their doctoral degrees from US marketing programs (Celec and Lutz, 1994). Some go on to lead successful academic careers, earning respect as effective teachers, capable researchers, and gracious colleagues, while others struggle in pursuit of those same goals. A study conducted by the AMA Task Force on The Development of Marketing Thought (1988) identified weak doctoral training as the primary source of scholars' apparent failure to meet their career goals. The AMA task force also attributed individuals' lack of success to more personal factors, such as:

- starting job hunting too soon;
- taking a job before completing the dissertation;
- taking on heavy teaching responsibilities immediately; and
- doing too much consulting, text writing, and administrative work.

Thus, it is apparent that determinants of one's career success are due to some combination of the academician's doctoral program training as well as to his or her personal characteristics and responsibilities.

The purpose of this exploratory study is to gain insight into the process of socializing marketing doctoral students into the academic community. In doing so, we attempt to reveal the manner in which student characteristics and program attributes interact as the PhD student progresses through his or her doctoral program. We also seek to find how these characteristics and attributes contribute toward a student's attainment of his or her career goals.

We believe that this research is important because both the doctoral-granting institution and the student assume risks in their commitments to one another. The student often commits by leaving a high-paying job to accept

reduced pay for an extended period of time. The doctoral institution commits by agreeing to pay the student's tuition and other expenses while attending school. Beyond this financial commitment, the institution's reputation depends on its ability to produce quality students in order to attract incoming scholars.

However, these risks are offset by potential rewards. The graduating student is often rewarded with a higher salary, more flexible lifestyle, and intrinsic rewards such as a sense of accomplishment. The doctoral institution acquires a relatively inexpensive source of labor to assist with teaching and research. And, if the faculty produces successful academics, its reputation is enhanced.

To date, no study has investigated the socialization process among marketing doctoral students. Two research questions that address this issue are listed below.

Research questions

- (1) How are doctoral students socialized into the academic world?
- (2) What factors contribute most heavily toward the professional success of a doctoral student?

The remainder of the paper employs the following structure. First, we describe the methodology that was employed to conduct the study. Second, we provide answers to the two research questions presented above based on our qualitative research study. Finally, the paper concludes with a brief discussion of limitations and future research directions.

Method

In-depth interviews were chosen as the primary basis for data collection. According to Strauss (1990), qualitative methods such as depth interviews are appropriate when attempting to uncover what lies behind any phenomena about which little is known and when seeking to provide intricate details of phenomena that are difficult to convey with quantitative methods. Additionally, depth interviews are thought to provide more flexibility than the conventional questionnaire approach (Patton, 1990) and have been used in numerous studies seeking to understand motivations (Hirschman, 1992; Otnes *et al.*, 1993).

A purposeful sampling technique was employed. This technique is used to select information-rich cases whose study will provide a comprehensive understanding of the issues (Patton, 1990). Confidentiality to all participants was assured in order to aid open and honest discussion on the part of the informants. This methodology included multiple stage data collection, which was iterative and guided by an emergent design (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). As such, the structure of the interview guide changed based on the results of previous interviews. As the interviews progressed, greater attention was focused on emergent themes.

Data gathering

Interviews were conducted by two doctoral students and one tenured professor, who also serves as coordinator of the student researchers' doctoral program. Access to a wide range of marketing academicians was readily available, since members of the research team are active participants in this community. The research format included structured face-to-face and telephone interviews with 28 individuals familiar with the marketing doctoral education process. The sample included seven students, ten untenured professors, and 11 tenured professors. Informants were asked to participate in a study on "doctoral student socialization and determinants of a successful marketing academic career." In addition, the student researchers conducted numerous informal conversational interviews (Patton, 1990) with other marketing students and faculty members. The sample was a geographically diverse cross-section of the USA[1]. In order to help ensure interviewer-informant rapport (Hirschman, 1992), all informants were personally known by at least one of the three researchers. We believe that this may have contributed to greater participant openness during the interviews.

Each formal interview lasted between 30 and 90 minutes and was audiotaped. A written transcript of each audiotaped interview was produced. The researchers subsequently met and discussed each interview to find points of interest on which to focus during subsequent interviews. Finally, coding of each interview followed a procedure that was reflective of the coding schemes suggested by Strauss (1983) and Ely *et al.* (1992). As suggested by these schemes, "significant" ideas and findings were identified in the margins of each interview transcript. The ideas and findings were categorized by content. These categories developed into themes, because they appeared many times, and/or appeared infrequently but carried important analytical impact (Ely *et al.*, 1992).

After all interviews were completed, member checks (Celsi *et al.*, 1993; Denzin and Lincoln, 1994) were conducted. First, all informants were delivered copies of their typewritten interview transcripts along with (when necessary) stamped envelopes addressed to the researcher. They were asked to state whether any remark had been misquoted, and were encouraged to add any comments they felt would enhance the clarity of their previous thoughts. Second, all informants were asked to respond to a series of written follow-up questions based on information received in subsequent interviews with other participants. Third, emergent themes were presented to several key informants; the informants were asked if the quotes attributed to them were taken in their proper context.

Socialization defined

Danziger (1971) defines socialization as "the process by which an individual becomes a participating member of the organization to which s/he aspires." Two models of teacher socialization dominate the education literature: Wisconsin and functionalist. The model of socialization upon which we chose

to build our study is the Wisconsin model, so named because its early proponents worked at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (Lawson and Stroot, 1993). This model holds that each individual has ultimate control of his or her own destiny in life (Danziger, 1971). The Wisconsin model recognizes the abilities of individuals to make meanings from their experiences, establish goals, and engage in social negotiations (Lawson and Stroot, 1993).

In contrast, the functionalist school of socialization views individuals as passive and accepting. The functionalist perspective does not acknowledge individuals' ability to negotiate their socialization (Danziger, 1971; Lawson and Stroot, 1993). We feel that the Wisconsin model is more appropriate for use in this study since most participants expressed, through a variety of personal experiences, that they did indeed at least partially influence the manner in which they were socialized.

Individuals may be socialized into their communities through both formal and informal mechanisms (Bauer and Green, 1994). In the context of doctoral education, formal socialization takes place in the form of numerous required seminars, rigorous methodological training, a comprehensive examination, and an expectation of mandatory student attendance at such events as brown bag seminars, dissertation proposals and defenses, and guest speaking engagements. Further, student participation in the selection of incoming doctoral students and new faculty members is often encouraged. Informal socialization occurs in the form of work-related and social interaction between students and faculty members, as well as between students. In general, informants felt that students have little control over their formal socialization, but that they exhibit a great deal of control over their informal socialization experiences. To illustrate, we interviewed several sets of students who graduated from the same doctoral institutions but who described very different informal socialization experiences from one another. We therefore propose that formal socialization can be thought of as largely "university-driven" (advanced by the norms and culture of the institution), while informal socialization can be thought of as largely "student-driven" (motivated by the personality of the student and the outcomes that the student desires from his or her doctoral education).

Based on this premise, we create a contingency framework of socialization. We term the two socialization modes in which formal socialization is high as nurturing and top-down. We term the two socialization modes in which formal socialization is low as near peer and platonistic. Table I presents the four modes noted above. We begin by answering our first research question and examining each mode in detail.

(1) How are doctoral students socialized into the academic world?

To answer this question, we describe the four modes of socialization discussed in Table I. Each mode is based on the interaction between university characteristics and student characteristics.

- (1) *Nurturing*. In the nurturing socialization mode, students experience a high degree of formal socialization (as defined above) and receive considerable informal guidance from faculty, as well as from other students. Students who classified their socialization mode as nurturing generally believed that the high level of interaction between themselves and faculty members (particularly dissertation chairs) helped ensure that their dissertation was, in the words of one informant, “marketable, ‘do-able,’ and completed in a timely manner.” These students also believed that the high degree of required coursework, while time consuming and often difficult, would benefit them in the long-run. The interaction between high levels of formal and informal socialization characterizing this socialization mode creates a unique benefit for students socialized in this fashion. The frequent coaching, interest, and support that the student receives from an interested faculty member (who frequently becomes the student’s dissertation chair) helps the student to focus on a particular substantive area while taking many substantively different seminars. One nurtured doctoral student stated the following, “With the help of [my mentor], every project completed in each class was geared toward the goal of adding to the dissertation and publishing in my area.” However, one drawback is that this focus allows for less exploration and “horizon expanding” on the part of the student. One nurtured student lamented “I wish now I had [researched] other things.” Our interviews suggest that those individuals choosing to be nurtured are more likely to think “within the box”. That is, they tend to think within existing paradigms and are content to make incremental changes in theory rather than developing new theories or paradigms. The fact that these individuals choose to be guided through their programs suggests that nurtured students are more conservative, less-risk-taking personalities than their top-down counterparts (discussed next).
- (2) *Top down*. Like the nurturing mode, top-down socialization affords the faculty a high level of control over the material to which their doctoral students are formally exposed. Unlike their nurtured counterparts, however, students whose socialization modes are characterized as top-down tend to manage themselves, choosing to obtain less direction from informal mentor, faculty, and student interaction. Students who viewed themselves as having been socialized in this mode often viewed it as, in

Table I.
A contingency
framework of doctoral
student socialization
modes

	Formal socialization		Low Informal socialization	
	High Informal socialization	Low Informal socialization	High Informal socialization	Low Informal socialization
High Nurturing		Low Top-Down	High Near Peer	Low Platonistic

the words of one participant, an “unaccompanied journey”. These students viewed themselves as their own best advisors and were frequently content to produce research by themselves. Top-down students generally described their research as more avant-garde than did their nurtured counterparts. The fact that these individuals choose not to be mentored suggests that they are independent-minded and hence, more likely to push the envelope of current marketing thought. However, these individuals were generally more critical of their doctoral programs than their nurtured counterparts. For instance, one informant whose socialization was classified as top-down described his professors in these terms, “big names, bad managers, bad educators, excellent researchers”. One top-down student stated his position this way, “They made us do so much shit that wasn’t really relevant to what I was doing...seminars, workshops...I’m just hoping that it will do me some good down the road.”

Students expressing positive emotions toward their top-down socialization felt that the formal structure gave them the necessary analytical skills and a broad understanding of the various sub-disciplines within marketing. The less interactive informal training provoked one top-downer to explain, “You can go to your new position as a complete package instead of as a derivative of someone else. It makes you self-reliant, more self-directed.” One top-down student described his doctoral experience as “setting my own agenda and sticking to it.” Students thought to be most successful in a top-down mode are highly self-motivated, capable of integrating material from a variety of formal sources (e.g. seminars, courses, presentations) and capable of successfully closing projects without assistance.

- (3) *Near peers.* Like individuals who are nurtured, those students undergoing near peer socialization are exposed to heavy informal faculty interaction, but formalized learning is more sparse than students socialized in the nurturing mode. Near peer students learn from example. We liken this socialization experience to the Chinese tradition of “sitting at the feet of the master”. Usually caring is expressed by the mentor, but not necessarily by the rest of the marketing faculty. Students who have a clear vision of their future and a knowledge of the type of research they wish to pursue seem to be especially suited for this socialization route. These students seek out faculty members who have similar interests to their own and diligently pursue working with these individuals. These students’ research focus allows them to avoid taking classes that they believe will be of little value to them and to concentrate on seeking out resources that will.

Near peer students often strive to be like their mentors. Near peers appeared to develop the strongest personal relationships with their mentors. An extreme example of such a relationship is a near peer who, in expressing great fondness and admiration for his deceased mentor,

named his child after that person. Other near peers were only slightly less enthusiastic about the relationship with their mentors. "I just think the world of him," was a quote expressed by another near peer. This quote characterized the typical faculty-student relationship detected in this socialization mode.

Aside from having a vision of the research they wish to pursue, students who are thought to benefit most from the near peer socialization mode are those that have a high need for affiliation. One student talked about his relationship with his mentor in this manner, "I can recall one day walking through campus and he (his mentor) put his arm on my shoulder and he said, 'If you don't get your degree by this time next year I'm going to kick your butt.'" This former student subsequently describes his relationships with his own students in the following manner:

The way I view it we have a responsibility to mentor our students in all aspects of their education – to expose them to the research process and to expose them to all the various activities you would participate in as a faculty member. To me, it's the most critical part of the education, both in terms of creating research values and giving impressions of how to solve problems and ways to think. One of the most critical parts is getting to know the students and interacting with them – not keeping distance with them. To me, it's the most important thing far and above coursework and examinations – having the right contact with them.

- (4) *Platonistic* [2]. Students socialized in the Platonistic mode receive less direction from faculty than do their near peer counterparts. The Platonistic mode is best summed up by the following informant quote, "Go off and do your work and come back with something good." Although we did not formally interview anyone who felt they received this type of socialization experience, our interviews indicate that this socialization mode more closely resembles the European mode of education than the North American. Because we did not speak to a true Platonist, the following description is based on conversations with faculty members and on our own speculation. The prototypical platonist is hypothesized to be an individual who is interested in research for the sake of learning. This socialization mode suits individuals who have a strong personal desire, motivation, and interest in doing research. Typically, these individuals enjoy gaining knowledge for its own sake; they tend to have a particularly strong intellectual curiosity. One mentor described something close to Platonistic socialization. He suggested that his student "look into a specific literature." The mentor related that the student went off for six months without ever consulting him again. When he returned, the student had read every piece of literature on this topic and had made it the basis for his dissertation. It is apparent that the bulk of the Platonistic student's socialization to the discipline appears to come from reading. Students who we believe would benefit most from a platonistic environment are those who are extremely self-motivated and individualistic [3].

(2) *What factors contribute most heavily toward the professional success of a marketing doctoral student?*

Five themes consistently emerged when informants were asked what characteristics they believed contributed to one's success as a marketing academician. The theme of inner desire emerged across socialization modes. Expressions of *communitas* and networking, on the other hand, were more prevalent among individuals who had experienced high degrees of informal socialization than among those who did not.

Inner desire. Nearly all respondents suggested that a doctoral student's inner desire was a key component – perhaps *the* key component – to professional success. One respondent identified inner desire as a “need to have a fire in your belly.” Another stated this construct in terms of a “desire to know.” Other respondents referred to the similar notion of “commitment.” The interviews suggest that individuals can be committed to achieving such objectives as keeping current with the literature, completing their dissertations, developing a research stream, and/or performing well in the classroom.

An individual's inner desire frequently manifests itself as a goal. For example, one informant stated, “an internalized person asks ‘What are my goals and objectives, what is important to me internally?’” According to Locke (1967), “If the student has a goal, then s/he is able to deal with rejection and failure more easily and will continue to pursue that goal.” Locke (1968) found that goals provide four benefits:

- (1) they direct attention,
- (2) mobilize on-task effort,
- (3) encourage task persistence, and
- (4) facilitate the development of strategies.

Evidence of each of these dimensions was supported in the interviews and can be found in informants' statements. For example, directing attention and mobilizing on-task effort are exemplified by one professor who stated, “We need to know what our core principles are. Then it is easier to say ‘yes’ and ‘no’ to things.” Clearly, focus and direction are vital to one's success. Encouraging task persistence can manifest itself in different ways. One student said that the papers he turned in to his advisor would “go into the trash.” The student related that his major professor would tell him, “It's good here and there but try again.” Because the student had a strong internal goal (to become an accomplished contributor in the field of marketing channels), this humbling experience did not dissuade him. In fact, he was appreciative of his mentor's seemingly harsh treatment. The student learned to accept this rejection in order to become a contributing scholar. Finally, facilitating the development of strategies is also a key element in the academic's pursuit of success. One professor believes that the pursuit of “life-long growth” is essential to survival. He stated, “You can only be as good as you are current.” In order to meet his goal of life-long growth, he related that “[You need to] figure ways to expose yourself [to the

latest information] to accomplish that objective of growth.” His strategies included subscribing to trade publications and keeping track of innovations in education, the business climate, and different technology in the classroom.

However, sometimes a student’s internal desire conflicts with other demands of the program. Rizzo *et al.* (1970) describe role conflict as “conflict between the person’s internal standards or values and the defined role behavior.” Related to this topic, one student stated that the program placed too many unnecessary demands on her time. These demands conflicted with her goal of completing her dissertation. Socialization mode sometimes heightens the role conflict experienced by students. For instance, one nurtured (high formal/high informal socialization) student whose concentration is consumer behavior stated, “It would help if you didn’t have to concentrate on things that weren’t in your own area. Who needs [to study] channels?”

Inequities are sometimes exacerbated when a student experiences role conflict. One nurtured informant (high formal/high informal socialization), when speaking of inequities in graduate assistantships, bitterly stated, “If I had known that being married and having kids would help get me out of things (attending presentations, giving campus tours, working registration), I would have lied a long time ago and said I had a husband and three kids.” This statement supports Jackson and Schuler’s (1985) findings suggesting that role conflict results in decreased satisfaction and commitment to the offending organization.

Communitas. Communitas is a sense of camaraderie that occurs when individuals from various walks of life share a common bond of experience that all participants consider special or sacred (Belk *et al.*, 1989; Celsi *et al.*, 1993). The prime facilitators of communitas are the mentor/student and peer relationships. A number of respondents noted that they would like for their students to also be their friends. One professor said, “All my PhD students [from my previous universities] know each other. When we see each other at meetings we often go to dinner or lunch together.” Referring to the success of his doctoral students, another professor noted, “there is a sense of pride and accomplishment present.” Yet another professor stated, “I hope to develop a lasting relationship [with my students] – both professional and personal.” However, the relationship may not always work out well. One informant stated, “If you’re working with a person for three years, they become a colleague, a friend – or they become the guy you hate.”

It was evident in the interviews that most students go through a process of teaming with an experienced professor, or mentor. The mentor often becomes the person primarily responsible for socializing the student within the academic community. The mentor’s guidance helps the individual make the transition from student to academic. As noted by one informant (a tenured professor), the mentor helps professionally by providing, a “one-to-one transfer of knowledge.” It was apparent from the interviews that mentors often provide informal instruction to the student about how to act, think, teach, and write. Several respondents, for instance, reported that they had changed their writing

style to be like that of their mentor. One informant spoke of his mentor suggesting “structural plagiarism” as a method of learning how to write for journals. When asked for the definition of structural plagiarism, he said “You use someone else’s structure and copy it.”

The interviews confirmed the notion that marketing doctoral students progress through a series of stages while becoming a member of the community. For instance, the first stage constitutes successful completion of coursework, writing papers, and in the words of one respondent “staying unpolitical.” The second stage is completed upon passing the comprehensive exams. One respondent, a full professor, viewed “comps” as a quality check. He stated, “Without comps a person might not integrate what they have learned. That person might be an embarrassment to the university.” The final stage of acceptance for some individuals occurs upon successful completion of the dissertation. One professor had stated, “Once I defended my dissertation, [my mentor] treated me different. I was in the club, so to speak.” For other individuals, the final stage of acceptance occurs only after publishing in whatever his or her peers refer to as “quality” journals.

Practicality in research. Several respondents suggested that a key component to success in today’s changing environment is conducting managerially relevant or “practical research.” One professor, who is also acting dean of his business school, suggested, “We need to find gaps in the real world. The research to fill these gaps can still be theoretically grounded. However, we cannot lose touch with the business constituency.” Another tenured informant regarded the marketing discipline in its current state as “too inwardly focused.” In addition, it was suggested by an assistant professor that the discipline needs “to be more responsive to societal issues.”

These comments indicate that the complexion of the publication agenda may be changing. For example, the AMA has a new publication, *Marketing Management*, whose audience is primarily composed of practitioners. Scholars who publish here have the ability to disseminate the practical implications of their research. This is also going to reflect what they bring into the classroom. The emphasis on research practicality will “lend an air” of authenticity to the classroom experience, which is consistent with Weaver’s (1990) conceptualization of a dynamic teacher.

Our findings indicate that future contributors are likely to need the ability to solve practical problems. This implies that practical business experience is taking on increasing importance for incoming doctoral students. For example, one coordinator claims that the emphasis placed by his department on prior business experience is greater than ever. In addition to having corporate contacts, the student who has business experience is more likely to possess a well-developed schema, or mental representation (Fiske and Taylor, 1993) of the business community and the manner in which it functions. This schematic conceptualization is likely to result in more practical research since the student can use his mental representation in constructing the research design.

Informants implied that the greater the practicality of the research, the more likely the research is to be funded by the business community. Also, a more practical orientation provides increased opportunities for research. One professor stated "important research topics are those for which there is a collective consensus between the academic and the practitioner community." Another stated the benefits of consulting by claiming, "Better professors are the ones who do consulting. They inspire ideas through their consulting." Yet another informant suggested, "We have to focus on problem-oriented research. We're losing it. We're not respected by the business community because we're not communicating with them. We need to work on the problems they're interested in. We can't create our own little system and live for our own existence. We are tied to the environment around us." The following quote sums up the general attitude that we received regarding the practicality issue, "If a PhD student is going to spend two years of his life working on a dissertation, and it is not worth \$15,000 to someone, they shouldn't do it."

Brand equity. Our research found support for Crane's (1965) hypothesis that the most capable individuals attend the best programs. This implies that there is a strong preconceived perceived difference between graduates of different programs. We view this difference as a form of brand equity. "Brand equity is the outcome of long-term investments designed to build a sustainable differential advantage relative to competitors" (Kamakura and Russell, 1993, p. 9). Based on our data, students have a market value in the academic community that is based largely on two general levels of brand equity.

The first level concerns the brand equity of the departmental faculty. The brand equity of the faculty comprises two components. The first component is based on the faculty's collective success in the academic community. The second component is based on the faculty's ability to produce successful students.

The second level concerns the brand equity associated with the person who served as the student's mentor – specifically, the dissertation chair. The mentor/chair passes on a tradition and lineage to his/her student that seems to be uniquely within the domain of academia. This is reflected by the previously mentioned role that the mentor plays as "socializer" to the student. Additionally, one professor stated that "your future track record is built in because you are expected to write with your mentor." Likewise, some mentors/chairs believe they have a responsibility to the academic community to produce "quality products." One respondent stated, "If the mentor believes that the product [the student] is inferior, it is [his/her] responsibility to inform the marketing community." This serves as protection for the mentor's own "brand equity". In this situation, the mentor portrays the inferior student as atypical in quality for students normally produced by that individual.

If professors actually view students as products of their doctoral programs, then it is likely that they subscribe to the functionalist school of socialization (Danziger, 1971), which views individuals as passive and unable to control their own destiny. This view manifested itself in comments such as "stay

unpolitical”, and “keep your nose clean.” Although stated in jest, one full professor remarked “(Students should think of themselves as) worms.” It may be for this reason that some students reported that their programs placed little emphasis upon student considerations such as fairness and equity. If students are indeed thought of as products in some university settings, they would not be expected to engage in behaviors that would impact on their educational experiences.

Networking. Several respondents noted the importance of networking. Networking is an essential skill not only for finding a job but also for building research contacts (Jungnickel and Creswell, 1992). A respondent indicated that mentors frequently play a critical role in the networking process. One student used the faculty’s network to find contacts for jobs. He stated, “I’d send the cover letter directly to the person that the faculty member knew, rather than going to the contact person. Then schools started to call.” A senior faculty member suggested that conferences were important in establishing contacts, but that it was important that the student not “over do it.” She further advised, “Go to conferences, but don’t be effusive.” In a nurturing environment, students go to conferences with faculty members who help introduce them to colleagues. One full professor noted the advantage of bringing his students to conferences. It allowed him to introduce them in a less formal way. His only objective was to make the introductions that would allow his students to begin building their networks.

Networking not only occurs within the academic community but is important for forging relationships in the business community as well. For example, one professor relies on funding for dissertations to come from faculty relationships with the business community. One institution has secured corporate funding for dissertations largely because of this networking ability. Informants believed that these ties help the student, the business, and the academic community come together to solve problems of interest to all three parties.

Limitations and future research

This research study employed depth interviews with a relatively small, though geographically diverse set of informants. Analysis of our depth interview data yielded a novel framework of socialization modes for marketing academicians. Clearly, more work needs to be done in order to expand on this framework and provide answers to the following questions: What are the relative percentages of students who fall into each socialization mode? How do personal characteristics of individual students differ according to socialization mode? From which socialization mode do the most productive scholars come? To answer the first two questions, a standardized survey instrument needs to be developed wherein students are asked to provide detailed information about themselves, their program requirements, and the nature of their informal faculty-student relationships. In order to answer the third question mentioned above, a longitudinal study needs to be performed which correlates

socialization mode with scholarly achievement. This may be accomplished by tracking survey respondents as their careers progress.

We believe that this exploratory research study serves as an important first step in identifying individual characteristics and environmental determinants of scholarly productivity among marketing academicians. Further, the study can be viewed as a resource for not only the individual contemplating a career as a marketing academician but also the marketing professor who wants to improve the quality of his or her marketing doctoral program.

Notes

1. Informants were employed at institutions in the following states: Alabama, Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Washington.
2. The term "Platonistic" is derived from the Greek philosopher's form of education wherein the students educated themselves.
3. Since, as indicated earlier, informal socialization is largely student-driven while formal socialization is largely university-driven, those students who are not highly motivated and individualistic should opt for the near peer socialization experience rather than platonistic. The near peer model will allow a mentor to motivate the unmotivated student and provide direction to less creative students.

References

- AMA Task Force on the Development of Marketing Thought (1988), "Developing, disseminating, and utilizing marketing knowledge," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 52, October, pp. 1-25.
- Bauer, T.N. and Green, S.G. (1994), "Effect of newcomer involvement in work-related activities: a longitudinal study of socialization," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 79 No. 2, pp. 211-23.
- Belk, R.R., Wallendorf, M. and Sherry, J.F. (1989), "The sacred and profane in consumer behavior: theodicy on the odyssey," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 16, June, pp. 1-38.
- Celec, S.E. and Lutz, R.J. (1994), "Demographics of business PhD programs," Research Committee Association of Directors of Doctoral Programs in Business, Summer.
- Celsi, R.L., Rose, R.L. and Leigh, T.W. (1993), "An exploration of high risk leisure consumption through skydiving," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 20, June, pp. 1-23.
- Crane, D. (1965), "Scientists at major and minor universities: a study in productivity and recognition," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 30, pp. 699-714.
- Danziger, K. (1971), *Socialization*, Penguin, Baltimore, MD.
- Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y.S. (1994), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Ely, M., Anzul, M., Friedman, T., Garner, D. and McCormack Steinmetz, A. (1992), *Doing Qualitative Research: Circles within Circles*, The Falmer Press, London.
- Fiske, S.T. and Taylor, S.E. (1993), *Social Cognition*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Hirschman, E.C. (1992), "The consciousness of addiction: toward a general theory of compulsive consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 19, September, pp. 155-79.
- Jackson, S.E. and Schuler, R.S. (1985), "A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role ambiguity and role conflict in work settings," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 36, pp. 16-78.

-
- Jungnickel, P.W. and Creswell, J.W. (1992), "Workplace correlates and scholarly performance of clinical pharmacy faculty," Association for the Study of Higher Education, Annual Meeting Paper.
- Kamakura, W.A. and Russell, G.J. (1993), "Measuring brand value with scanner data," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 10, pp. 9-22.
- Lawson, H.A. and Stroot, S.A. (1993), "Footprints and signposts: perspectives on socialization research," *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, Vol. 12, pp. 437-46.
- Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E. (1985), *Naturalistic Inquiry*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Locke, E.A. (1967), "Motivational effect of knowledge results: knowledge or goal setting," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 51, pp. 324-9.
- Locke, E.A. (1968), "Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives," *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 3, pp. 157-89.
- Long, J.S. (1978), "Productivity and academic position in the scientific career," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 43, pp. 899-908.
- Otnes, C., Lowery, T. and Kim, Y.C. (1993), "Gift giving for easy and difficult recipients," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 20, September, pp. 229-44.
- Patton, M.Q. (1990), *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
- Rizzo, J.R., House, R.J. and Lirtzman, S.I. (1970), "Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 15, pp. 150-63.
- Strauss, A.L. (1987), *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Weaver, R.L. (1990), "The dynamic teacher," *Vital Speeches*, Vol. 57 No. 1, pp. 13-16.

Further reading

- Bailey, T.G. (1992), "Faculty research productivity," Association for the Study of Higher Education, Annual Meeting Paper.
- Baird, L.L. (1986), "What characterizes a productive research department," *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 211-25.
- Benke, R.L. and Roof, B.M. (1990), "Scholarly productivity and teaching effectiveness," *Management Accounting*, Vol. 72, pp. 54-5.
- Blackburn, R.T., Behymer, C.E. and Hall, D.E. (1978), "Research note: correlates of faculty publication," *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 51, pp. 132-41.
- Butters, R.S. (1990), *Research on Doctoral Study: An Annotated Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations on Doctoral Study*, Creative Learning Services, Naples, FL.
- Crase, D. (1993), "Highly productive scholars: what drives them to success," *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, August, pp. 80-2.
- Lawrence, J.H. (1989), "Predicting faculty publication output: evaluation of the model across institutional types," Association for the Study of Higher Education, Annual Meeting Paper.
- Orczyk, C.L. (1990), "A model of scholastic development: faculty socialization," Association for the Study of Higher Education, Annual Meeting Paper.
- Smart, D.T. and Conant, J.S. (1990), "Marketing dissertations: profiling the successful thesis candidate," *Journal of Marketing Education*, Fall, pp. 2-8.