

Why you should not develop a list of acceptable marketing journals
In response to REQUEST – Marketing Journal Rankings

ELMAR Contribution by J. Scott Armstrong
July 5, 2002

The practice of developing lists of acceptable marketing journals as a basis for evaluation is detrimental to the development of scientific knowledge. The primary reason is that innovative and useful findings are likely to be rejected by mainstream journals. What happens is that as interest focuses on a few journals, rejection rates increase and, along with this there are appeals for “fairness.” Fairness is equated with votes by reviewers, and reviewers often vote against papers with useful findings. Fairness is the enemy of innovation. Another reason is that by focusing on a distant proxy (“paper was published in an acceptable journal”), reviewers devote less attention to examining whether it presents useful findings. I am not unusual in my opinion that the major journals in marketing seldom publish useful findings. For empirical evidence on these statements, see the draft of my paper “Discovery and Communication of Important Marketing Findings: Evidence and Proposals,” forthcoming in the *Journal of Business Research* under “full text papers” at <http://jscottarmstrong.com>.

In particular see the section “What Can Business Schools Do?” on pages 32-36. For example, I describe a paper by Van Fleet, et al. (2000), showing that only 14% of 252 schools surveyed used lists of acceptable journals and these tended to be low-prestige schools.