

Print ISSN: 1738-3110 / Online ISSN 2093-7717  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.15722/jds.13.2.201502.45>

[Field Research]

## An Investigation into Research Productivity in the Journal of Consumer Behavior

Dong-Jin Shin\*, Mooyul Huh\*\*

Received: January 29, 2015. Revised: February 08, 2015. Accepted: February 13, 2015.

### Abstract

**Purpose** – This study strives to discern trends in research productivity in the Journal of Consumer Behavior. It will identify prolific authors and institutions in articles over ten years (2004-2013).

**Research design, data, and methodology** – The Journal of Consumer Behavior was chosen and articles over ten years were analyzed. Research productivity was determined by categorizing the data into four themes: number of authors per article, author affiliated institutions, a list of prolific authors over a ten-year period, and author-affiliated countries.

**Results** – Authors have a propensity to collaborate on a research paper, yielding a high frequency of articles with two or three authors in a single publication. In addition, author and institution productivity was highest in North America and Europe.

**Conclusions** – The research productivity of the Journal of Consumer Behavior is unprecedented. The trends and insights from this study will allow academics in the area of consumer behavior to observe leading authors and institutions. Moreover, speculations about the leading countries and institutions, not to mention top prolific authors in consumer behavior, will be elucidated in this study.

**Keywords:** Author Productivity, Prolific Institutions, Consumer Behavior, Consumer.

**JEL Classifications:** M10, M30, M31.

### 1. Introduction

The ushering of globalization in the modern times has had profound effects for all areas of discipline in the scholarly world. As such, the area of international business has been no

exception. Markets are now operating on a global scale, catering to not only several specific demographics or countries, but to many countries and businesses, each with their own cultures and values (Kim & Youn, 2014; Potluri, 2014). With the expansion of global markets, the range of consumers also widened and increased (Kim et al., 2011).

In order for the world of business to stay ahead of these phenomenon, it will be imperative to assess the trends and intricacies of consumers and their behaviors (Potluri et al., 2014). More importantly, it will be crucial to not only to target the shifts and changes of consumer behavior, but also assess the authors and institutions that are at the forefront of researching these trends themselves. With a better understanding of some of the prolific authors and the institutions they are affiliated with, scholars will be able to discern the leaders in this area that will herald studies of consumer behavior into new territories and be at the forefront of its development in the future.

It is anticipated that with the rankings of institutions and authors that were prominent over a span of ten years in the Journal of Consumer Behavior, the current study will be able to provide an objective standard based on a quantitative analysis. It will serve to provide scholars with a comprehensive view of research competences of institutions (Morrison & Inkpen, 1991; Rachal & David, 2005; Runyan & Hyun, 2009; Cheng et al., 2003).

The purpose of this current study is to uncover prolific authors and institutions in the Journal of Consumer Behavior. A quantitative method was utilized for an objective perspective on author productivity. Thus, the paper proceeds with a review of literature relevant to areas of author productivity and consumer behavior. After that, the data is compiled and analyzed through SPSS. The results are interpreted, and implications drawn, closing with limitations and proposals for future research.

### 2. Review of Literature

This research scrutinized author productivity in the Journal of Consumer Behavior. Articles in the time frame of ten years (2004-2013) were extracted for study. With the utilization of a quantitative study, scholars will be presented with a comparatively objective rank on author productivity and its affiliated

\* First author, Lecturer, Appenzeller School of Global Business, Pai Chai University. E-mail: jinny774@hotmail.com.

\*\* Corresponding Author, Professor, Division of International Studies, Kongju National University. E-mail: hmyag@kongju.ac.kr.

institutions.

A considerable amount of studies were conducted in varying degrees of author productivity for the areas of management, business, marketing, and consumer studies. For example, Hanna and LaTour (2002) explored the productivity of authors and institutions in the field of logistics. In addition, Fields and Swayne (1991) analyzed in depth of prolific authors in three major marketing journals. Authors who had published more than five articles were considered to be prolific. The results of this study showed that of the proportion of North American universities, there was an increase of prolific authors in southern schools and it is expected to rise significantly in the marketing discipline.

In addition, Pauchant and Douville (1993) inspected 24 prolific authors in the field of crisis management. These results revealed that these authors focused on three macro and four micro areas of research. Kumar and Kundu (2004) ranked author and institution productivity by observing the number of times a publication appeared in one of the top three journals of international business from the years 1991 to 2000. The results showed that the top three universities in productivity were: University of Western Ontario, University of Texas at Austin, and University of South Carolina. Lahiri and Kumar (2012) conducted a continuation of that study, by assessing the top productivity institutions from the years 2001 to 2009.

Moreover, Tanner et al. (1992) probed to see if there was any correlation between research productivity and teaching effectiveness. The results demonstrated that there was not a strong link between these two factors. Koojaroenprasit (1996) delved into the research productivity of marketing departments of business schools that had an AACSB accreditation. The results on the factors that affected research productivity showed to be correlated to the maturity of the marketing programs and the sizes of faculty and doctoral programs.

White et al. (2012) explored the reasons for differences in productivity levels of business school faculty members. The results revealed that those with high productivity levels had better time management skills, higher academic rank, and substantial institutional research support, to name a few. Additionally, Cheng et al. (2003) investigated research productivity in marketing journals for universities located in Asia and the Pacific. The results portrayed that the top 2 universities in terms of research productivity were University of New South Wales, the National University of Singapore, and Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.

In the field of consumer studies, there was particular interest for deciphering graduate research productivity levels in family and consumer sciences area. For instance, Makela (2005) determined author productivity levels for the year 2004. The results showed an increase in dissertations from 2003 to 2004. Pickard (2008) also reported on the graduate research productivity of the area of family and consumer sciences for the year 2007. The results showed a declining rate of the report from universities in the number of master's theses and doctoral dissertations, although the number of graduate students increased. Dodor and Woods (2011) examined levels of graduate research

productivity of students in family and consumer science programs in the United States for the year 2010. The results showed a decrease of titles of graduate research from the previous year. Scholl (2013) conducted a research productivity study on studies completed each year for research in Extension family and consumer sciences. Continuing researches on Family and Consumer Sciences, Kabaci (2013) conducted graduate students' research productivity for 2012. The results showed that the most studies were on nutrition and diabetics. Kabaci (2014) followed up the previous research by examining graduate research productivity for 2013. The results were slightly different, with master's degree theses mostly in Nutrition and Diabetics, while dissertations were mostly in Family Relations.

Overall, there is a plethora of research conducted in author and research productivity across many areas of business. However, more studies will need to be administered in the future for specific areas of consumer studies, with a wide range of analysis on different journals. As publications in journals represent the degree of success in the academic world, it will be vital to assess the productivity levels of authors across many disciplines. Thus, the current study endeavors to conduct an analysis on prolific authors and institutions in the *Journal of Consumer Behavior*.

### 3. Methodology

This research strived to explore productive authors and their affiliated institutions in the *Journal of Consumer Behavior*. Only one journal and a time span from 2004-2013 was examined for a focused analysis in author productivity levels. For an analysis of author productivity, several screenings were initiated and the study samples compiled. First, the author and two graduate students filtered all of the academic articles in the *Journal of Consumer Behavior* and omitted those that were perceived to not be a good representation of empirical research. Excluded articles included editorials, reviews, and comments (Rachal & David, 2005). Then, the data was extracted from the articles, compiled into four themes, and analyzed by SPSS. The four themes in this study were: number of authors per article, top author affiliated institutions, categorization of geographical locations of author affiliated countries, and ranking of prolific authors in the *Journal of Consumer Behavior*.

#### 3.1. Number of Authors per Article

For this study, the author did not only investigate prolific authors and institutions in the *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, but also a compilation of data on the number of authors per article. With the results from this data, it will be able to offer a more comprehensive view of author productivity and some trends that are prevalent throughout the journal. The number of authors per article was organized into yearly increments. A total of five categories were determined: one author, two authors, three authors, four authors, and many authors.

### 3.2. Geographical Affiliation of Authors

The affiliated countries of all the authors were categorized yearly into their respective geographical locations. Referencing Chan et al. (2005), a total of six categories of geographical locations were assembled. They include: North America, Europe, Asia and the Pacific, South America, Africa, and the Middle East.

### 3.3. Prolific Authors

The productivity of all the authors in the Journal of Consumer Behavior was ranked into the top 50 prolific authors over a span of ten years. The number of appearances of an author in a publication was calculated in two ways: one was the total number of appearances, in which only the number of times an author published an article was counted. For adjusted appearances, it took into account the number of authors in a publication and bestowed different values for varying number of authors (Inkpen & Beamish, 1994; Cheng et al., 2003; Lindsey, 1980).

In the total number of appearances for authors, each time an author published a paper in the Journal of Consumer Behavior, they were counted as one point, regardless of the number of authors that collaborated in that particular research paper. In the category of adjusted appearances, the number of authors in a single publication was taken into account. For example, if only a single scholar was the author of a publication, then that scholar was awarded one full point. If an article was the result of co-authorship, then the authors each received one-half of a point. An article with three authors implied that each author would receive one-third of a point, and four authors in a publication meant one-fourth of a point for each author and so on. Therefore, an N number of authors in a published article meant  $1/N$  of a point for each author in adjusted appearances.

ries: total number of appearances and adjusted number of appearances. With the data gleaned from this research, it would be possible to gauge not only prolific authors, but also productive institutions which will most likely influence and lead the area of consumer behavior in the future as well (Xu et al., 2008).

In the category of adjusted appearance, the number of authors publishing an article was taken into account. However, unlike the system used for prolific authors, not all institutions received  $1/N$  point out of N institutions affiliated in the article. For example, if University of Sydney was affiliated to one author out of three authors, then that institution was awarded one-third of a point. If two authors out of three were affiliated with that institution, then it was awarded two-thirds of a point. Thus, the points for the adjusted appearance of an institution were awarded by the total number of authors with a particular institution over the total number of author affiliated institutions. With this system, the impact of an institution could be measured more accurately and ranked accordingly (Runyan & Hyun, 2009).

## 4. Results

As can be observed below, <Table 1> represents the number of authors per published article in the Journal of Consumer Behavior. The most popular number of authors per article was two authors. It showed the highest frequencies for all years, except 2009 and 2013. In the year 2009, an article published by one author was the most common, with a frequency of 13. In 2013, three authors in a single article was the most popular form, with a frequency of 17. However, two authors in a publication was a close second, with a frequency of 16. The table further illustrates that four authors in a publication was not common, and higher numbers of authors above that were rare. Many times over a span of ten years, articles with many authors

<Table 1> Number of Authors per Article

Author Number	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
One author	4	9	10	6	3	13	7	7	3	5
Two authors	10	10	22	11	16	7	14	13	21	16
Three authors	5	4	10	5	7	5	10	11	15	17
Four authors	2	1	2	2	4	0	0	4	4	8
Many authors	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	1

### 3.4. Author Affiliated Institutions

The numerous institutions of all the authors in the Journal of Consumer Behavior were analyzed and ranked based on adjusted appearances. Similar to the theme of prolific authors, the institutions of the authors were also analyzed into two categories:

were contained only once or not at all in the Journal of Consumer Behavior, with the highest frequency of only 2 in 2012.

<Table 2> exhibits the frequencies of the author affiliated countries in the Journal of Consumer Behavior, and their appropriate categorization into geographically affiliated locations. A total of six geographical locations were procured, each with vary

**<Table 2>** Categorization of Author Affiliated Countries

Author Country	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	TOTAL=775
North America											324(41.81%)
USA	17	16	29	23	26	17	30	31	36	55	280
Canada	4	3	2	7	3	3	4	4	12	2	44
Europe											323(41.68%)
Denmark	0	1	4	2	0	3	1	2	6	5	24
United Kingdom	11	18	23	17	8	11	7	7	26	21	149
Norway	3	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	17
France	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	9
Belgium	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Germany	2	0	8	3	11	3	0	1	5	10	43
Austria	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5
Ireland	0	3	4	2	0	0	3	0	0	1	13
The Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	5
Slovenia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Sweden	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	8
Finland	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	2	3	3	14
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Portugal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
Greece	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	0	0	8
Spain	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	16
Italy	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Asia and the Pacific											111(14.32%)
Taiwan	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	4	2	0	11
New Zealand	0	3	2	0	1	0	4	4	5	1	20
Australia	6	0	0	1	3	2	13	4	6	13	48
Singapore	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Hong Kong	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	5
Korea	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
China	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Korea	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
India	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	8
Malaysia	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	4	6
Vietnam	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
South America											3(0.39%)
Brazil	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	3
Africa											2(0.26%)
Morocco	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Middle East											12(1.55%)
Israel	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	5
Egypt	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Saudi Arabia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
United Arab Emirates	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Qatar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

ing numbers of represented countries. North America was represented by two countries: USA and Canada. Europe was represented by 17 countries, which included United Kingdom, Ireland, Finland, Spain, Italy, and The Netherlands. Asia and the Pacific were portrayed by 12 countries, including Taiwan, Australia, Singapore, New Zealand, China, and India. South America and Africa were each represented by a single country, which was Brazil and Morocco, respectively. Lastly, the Middle East was depicted by six countries, such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey.

As can be observed, the geographical locations North America and Europe accounted for roughly more than 80% of all author affiliated countries. The frequencies of these two locations were similar: North America had the most number of author affiliated countries, with 324 (41.81%) affiliations, and Europe was a close second, with 323 (41.68%) affiliations. USA was heavily represented in North America, and United Kingdom for Europe. Asia and the Pacific ranked third in the number of author affiliated countries, with a frequency of 111 (14.32%). Middle East, South America, and Africa brought up the rear, with each a frequency of 12 (1.55%), 3 (0.39%), and 2 (0.26%), respectively.

<Table 3> shows a list of the top 50 most prolific authors over a span of ten years in the Journal of Consumer Behavior. The authors were ranked based on the number of adjusted appearances, and not the total number of appearances. As can be examined, H el ene Cherrier had the most number of adjusted appearances. Next was Sylvie Laforet from the University of Sheffield, with an adjusted number of 2.00. John C. Mowen had the same number of adjusted appearances as Kathy Hamilton, Torben Hansen, and Maria Piacentini, but his total appearance was greater, with a frequency of 4. An interesting observation to be made is that a majority of the top 50 authors were those that are affiliated with institutions in North America or Europe. There were authors that were represented whose countries were located in Asia and the Pacific, but it was usually dominated by those in Australia and New Zealand, which are largely influenced by Western-culture, despite its geographical location. Only one author, Couchen Wu, from the National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, was an author that was Asian. Authors affiliated with institutions in countries from South America, Africa, or the Middle East was not represented.

<Table 3> Top 50 Prolific Authors

Rank	Author Name	Institution	Country	Adjusted Number	Total Number
1	Cherrier, H�el�ene	University of Sydney	Australia	2.50	3
2	Laforet, Sylvie	University of Sheffield	United Kingdom	2.00	2
3	Mowen, John C.	Oklahoma State University	USA	1.83	4
4	Hamilton, Kathy	University of	United	1.83	3

	Kathy	Strathclyde	Kingdom		
4	Hansen, Torben	Copenhagen Business School	Denmark	1.83	3
4	Piacentini, Maria	Lancaster University	United Kingdom	1.83	3
7	Nuttall, Peter	University of Bath	United Kingdom	1.75	3
8	Olsen, Svein Ottar	University of Troms�o	Norway	1.50	4
9	Ballantine, Paul W.	University of Canterbury	New Zealand	1.50	3
10	Black, Iain R.	University of Edinburgh	United Kingdom	1.50	2
10	Denegri-Knott, Janice	Bournemouth University	United Kingdom	1.50	2
10	Foxall, Gordon R.	Cardiff University	United Kingdom	1.50	2
10	Gr�onh�oj, Alice	Aarhus University	Denmark	1.50	2
10	Hoffmann, Stefan	University of Rostock	Germany	1.50	2
10	Mittal, Banwari	Northern Kentucky University	USA	1.50	2
10	Molesworth, Mike	Bournemouth University	United Kingdom	1.50	2
17	Martin, Brett A.S	Queensland University of Technology	Australia	1.38	3
18	Albinsson, Pia A.	Appalachian State University	USA	1.33	3
18	Spears, Nancy	University of North Texas	USA	1.33	3
18	Szmigin, Isabelle	University of Birmingham	United Kingdom	1.33	3
21	Holbrook, Morris B.	Columbia University	USA	1.33	2
21	Mathur, Anil	Hofstra University	USA	1.33	2
23	Belk, Russell W	York University	Canada	1.17	3
24	Tinson, Julie	University of Stirling	United Kingdom	1.08	3
25	Kenning, Peter	Zeppelin University	Germany	1.03	3
26	Agante, Lu�sa	NOVA School of Business and Economics	Portugal	1.00	2
26	Arnould, Eric J	University of Nebraska-Lincoln	USA	1.00	2
26	Ball, A. Dwayne	University of Nebraska-Lincoln	USA	1.00	2
26	Chatzidakis, Andreas	University of Nottingham	United Kingdom	1.00	2
26	Conroy, Denise	Massey University	New Zealand	1.00	2
26	D'Astous, Alain	HEC Montr�eal	Canada	1.00	2

26	Iyer, Easwar S	University of Massachusetts	USA	1.00	2
26	Johnstone, Micael-Lee	Victoria University of Wellington	New Zealand	1.00	2
26	Kashyap, Rajiv K	William Paterson University	USA	1.00	2
26	Penz, Elfriede	Vienna University of Economics and Business	Austria	1.00	2
26	Perera, B. Yasanthi	New Mexico State University	USA	1.00	2
37	Bardhi, Fleura	Northeastern University	USA	0.83	2
37	Carrigan, Marylyn	University of Birmingham	United Kingdom	0.83	2
37	Elliott, Richard	University of Bath	United Kingdom	0.83	2
37	Eckhardt, Giana M	Suffolk University	USA	0.83	2
37	Gentina, Elodie	University of Lille Nord de France	France	0.83	2
37	Grier, Sonya A	American University	USA	0.83	2
37	Kemp, Elyria	University of New Orleans	USA	0.83	2
37	Maclaran, Pauline	Keele University	United Kingdom	0.83	2
37	Moschis, George P	Georgia State University	USA	0.83	2
37	Stokburger-Sauer, Nicola E	University of Mannheim	Germany	0.83	2
37	Shukla, Paurav	Glasgow Caledonian University	United Kingdom	0.83	2
37	Trocchia, Philip J	University of South Florida St. Petersburg	USA	0.83	2
37	Wu, Couchen	National Taiwan University of Science and Technology	Taiwan	0.83	2
50	Debevec, Kathleen	University of Massachusetts	USA	0.75	2

of all the author affiliated countries were in North America or Europe, with only New Zealand and Australia as representatives of Asia and the Pacific. Thus, the results are consistent with those in <Table 2>, where North America and Europe held more than 80% of all author affiliated countries, and Asia and the Pacific accounted for around 15%.

<Table 4> Top 30 Author Affiliated Institutions

Author Affiliation	Country Name	Adjusted Appearances	Total Appearances
1. University of Nebraska	USA	3.66	7
2. Copenhagen Business School	Denmark	3.50	5
3. University of Mannheim	Germany	3.50	4
4. University of Southern Denmark	Denmark	3.50	4
5. Oklahoma State University	USA	3.25	5
6. Northern Kentucky University	USA	3.16	4
7. University of Strathclyde	United Kingdom	3.03	5
8. University of Massachusetts	USA	3.00	5
9. University of Manchester	USA	3.00	4
10. Aarhus University	Denmark	3.00	3
11. Stockholm School of Economics	Sweden	3.00	3
12. Lancaster University	United Kingdom	2.50	3
13. Vienna University of Economics and Business	Austria	2.50	3
14. University of Tromsø	Norway	2.32	3
15. Simon Fraser University	Canada	2.16	4
16. Ohio State University	USA	2.00	4
17. University of Auckland	New Zealand	2.00	3
18. Bentley University	USA	2.00	2
19. Bournemouth University	United Kingdom	2.00	2
20. Coventry University	United Kingdom	2.00	2
21. NOVA School of Business and Economics	Portugal	2.00	2
22. Pennsylvania State University	USA	2.00	2
23. University of Canterbury	New Zealand	2.00	2
24. University of Sheffield	United Kingdom	2.00	2
25. University of Sydney	Australia	2.00	2
26. Arizona State University	USA	1.93	3
27. University of Lincoln	United Kingdom	1.90	3
28. University College Dublin	Ireland	1.86	3
29. University of Bath	United Kingdom	1.75	3
30. University of Hawaii	USA	1.66	2

<Table 4> portrays the top 30 author affiliated institutions and their corresponding countries. Similar to <Table 3>, the top 30 authors were ranked based on the number of adjusted appearances, and not the number of total appearances. The results for the top five author affiliated institutions are as follows in rank order: University of Nebraska in USA, Copenhagen Business School in Denmark, University of Mannheim in Germany, University of Southern Denmark in Denmark, and Oklahoma State University in USA. One-third of the author affiliated institutions were located in USA. In addition, a staggering majority

## 5. Discussion

The current study has investigated the prolific authors and its institutions in the *Journal of Consumer Behavior*. All the articles in the time span of ten years from 2003-2013 was examined in the journal. As could be perceived from the results of our research, many interesting trends could be deduced.

In the theme of the number of authors in a single publication, it could be examined that there was a resounding preference of the authors to co-publish a research paper. It was evident in the results that showed that two authors in a publication contained the highest frequency for eight out of ten years. It can be implied from the results that authors usually prefer to research alone or in small numbers up to three people. Numbers exceeding four people per paper was not preferred and showed the least numbers. While the reasons for this phenomenon vary from scholar to scholar, it can be inferred that small numbers people working together in a scholarly article might reduce the amount of work and analysis needed to be exerted per person. In addition, with the contribution of more than one person's perspective and ideas in a publication, the quality of the article will be enhanced overall.

Moreover, the results for the geographical locations of author affiliated countries showed a majority were located in North America and Europe. Asia and the Pacific accounted for around 15% of the total, and only a small fraction accounted for countries in the Middle East, Africa, and South America. One speculation for high frequencies of author affiliated countries in North America and Europe is that the concept of consumer behavior, and more broadly, business and management, stems from Western ideologies. In order for the field of consumer behavior studies to advance and reflect on the globalization of the modern world, more research will need to be implemented for other parts of the world as well, such as Asia and Africa.

Usually, the number of research conducted for authors in Asia and the Pacific, Africa, South America, and the Middle East increased with the passage of time. Nevertheless, more research from scholars in these areas is encouraged for a more comprehensive outlook of unique consumer behaviors or characteristics in many different areas of the world. The results from the geographical locations of author affiliated countries are reflected in the results for top 30 author affiliated institutions and top 50 prolific authors. The prolific authors and institutions for the *Journal of Consumer Behavior* showed that North America and Europe were heavily represented. The inclusion of countries in Asia and Pacific were usually Western oriented countries, such as Australia and New Zealand.

Furthermore, many insights could be gleaned from the results for the top prolific authors and institutions. The rankings were able to portray not only a quantitative significance of an institution and author's productivity, but also the speculation that they will continue to lead the direction of future consumer behavior research. The top five prolific authors were affiliated with countries such as Denmark, Australia, USA and the United Kingdom. Similarly, the top author affiliated institutions were lo-

cated in Denmark, USA, and Germany. Thus, it can be said that the institutions and authors in these countries hold a substantial influence on the past and future directions of consumer behavior (Xu et al., 2008).

An interesting thing to note from the results is the fact that authors and institutions in countries located in the Middle East, Africa, and South America were not present in the top 30 and 50 rankings of institutions and authors. Several reasons can be surmised for this phenomenon. One is the possibility of the lack of motivation of scholars for productivity in areas of consumer behavior. As mentioned by Hedjazi and Beharavan (2011), facilitating joint research opportunities with other scholars or financial rewards for research might be a good method for instigating more productivity from scholars and faculty members alike. In addition, the advancement of analytical software and other technological advances might foster scholarly output, increasing productivity of the authors and raising the prominence of an institution as well (Barnard-Brak et al., 2011).

A positive aspect from the results is the number of countries that represented the Middle East. Although the overall frequency of author affiliated numbers were weak, the authors affiliated with the countries in the Middle East was significantly higher than other areas with low frequencies, such as South America and Africa. With consistent increase of scholarly output in the future, the Middle East will be able to become an emerging area of scholastic endeavors and research productivity in the area of consumer behavior.

## 6. Conclusion

### 6.1. Summary

The present study examined the prolific authors and institutions in the *Journal of Consumer Behavior*. Articles published in a time period of ten years, from 2004-2013, were reviewed for a quantitative analysis. Over a span of ten years, it was deduced from the results that co-authorship of an article was the most popular form, but authors exceeding four in a research project was not preferred. In addition, authors in the *Journal of Consumer Behavior* were usually affiliated with countries in North America and Europe. The rankings of top 30 author affiliated institutions and top 50 prolific authors showed similar results as well. Among the results shown in this study, the rankings of prolific authors and institutions hope to serve as an aid in gauging productivity objectively, as productivity is hard to measure and can be subjective (Shane, 1997; Cox & Catt, 1977).

### 6.2. Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

As one of the first research articles to conduct author productivity in the *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, it contained some limitations. One was the focus of only one research jour-

nal in this study. The goal of this study was to examine author productivity of only one journal for a concentrated analysis. Thus, the prolific authors and institutions portrayed here is not representative of the productivity levels of the field of consumer behavior as a whole. In addition, a limited period of ten years was chosen for analysis. Thus, suggestions for future research include the incorporation of a longer time frame with an analysis of more journals to measure author productivity. It will garner different and interesting results. Another limitation of this study is that the current productivity rankings may not necessarily be consistent for future productivity levels. Although the current study can be a good indication of leading institutions and authors in the present, it does not guarantee that the rankings will hold in the future.

Other proposals for future research includes comparing other journals in this area, as it will offer a broader and more encompassing picture of author and institution productivity in the field of consumer behavior. Other disciplines are also in need of author productivity, as it is a good indicator of past and present leading institutions and countries in a particular area of research, as well as a glimpse into the future. An example is the field of distribution, which serves as an important factor in many aspects of the business field. In particular, markets and consumers largely affect the growth and changes in distribution environments (Kim, 2013). As mentioned by Lee (2014), economic growth is affected by distribution and other factors, which further enhance its importance in the business area. Thus, conducting studies in the area of distribution will be able to advantageous in deciphering the trends of economic factors or consumer variables in the future. Furthermore, other forms of quantitative analysis can be implemented into studies of consumer behavior, such as citation analysis and content analysis.

## References

- Barnard-Brak, L., Saxon, T. F., & Johnson, H. (2011). Publication productivity among Doctoral Graduates of educational psychology program at research universities before and after the year 2000. *Educational Psychology Review*, 23, 65-73.
- Chan, K. C., Hung-Gay, F., & Lai, P. (2005). Membership of editorial boards and rankings of schools with international business orientation. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(4), 452-469.
- Cheng, L. T., Chan, K. C., & Chan, R. Y. (2003). Publications in major marketing journals: An analysis of research productivity of Asia-Pacific universities. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 25(2), 163-176.
- Cox, M. W., & Catt, V. (1977). Productivity ratings of graduate programs in psychology based on publication in the journals of the American Psychological Association. *American Psychologist*, 32(10), 793-813.
- Dodor, B. A., & Woods, B. A. (2011). 2010 graduate research productivity in Family and Consumer Sciences. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 40(2), 200.
- Fields, M. D., & Swayne, L. E. (1991). Contribution of southern authors in major marketing publications. *Journal of Business Research*, 22(1), 33.
- Hanna, J. B., & LaTour, M. S. (2002). Building bridges through logistics publication: Author and institution productivity in business most applied science. *American Business Review*, 20(1), 43-49.
- Hedjazi, Y., & Behravan, J. (2011). Study of factors influencing research productivity of agriculture faculty members in Iran. *Higher Education*, 62(5), 635-647.
- Inkpen, A. C., & Beamish, P. W. (1994). An analysis of twenty-five years of research in the Journal of International Business Studies. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25, 703-713.
- Kabaci, M. J. (2013). A report of Family and Consumer Sciences graduate research productivity in 2012. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 42(2), 91.
- Kabaci, M. J. (2014). Family and Consumer Sciences graduate research productivity in 2013. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 43(2), 107.
- Kim, E. H., Kim, E. H., and Kim, M. J. (2011). The effect of distributor private brand product type on consumer attitude. *East Asian Journal of Business Management*, 1(1), 13-20.
- Kim, G. C. (2013). A study on the effects of super-supermarket service quality on satisfaction in store selection. *International Journal of Industrial Distribution & Business*, 4(2), 41-49.
- Kim, N. M., and Youn, M. K. (2014). Global distribution enterprises' entry into the Chinese market: Focus on the Three Northern Provinces. *International Journal of Industrial Distribution & Business*, 5(3), 25-34.
- Koojaroenprasit, N. (1996). Research productivity by marketing faculty. *UMI Dissertations Publishing*, 9632209.
- Kumar, V., & Kundu, S. K. (2004). Ranking the international business schools: Faculty publication as the measure. *Management International Review*, 44(2), 213-228.
- Lahiri, S., & Kumar, V. (2012). Ranking international business institutions and faculty members using research publications as the measure. *Management International Review*, 52(3), 317-340.
- Lee, J. W. (2014). The impact of product distribution and information technology on carbon emissions and economic growth: Empirical evidence in Korea. *Journal of Asian Finance and Business*, 1(3), 17-28.
- Lindsey, D. (1980). Production and citation measure in the sociology of science: The problem of multiple authorship. *Social Studies of Science*, 10, 145-162.
- Makela, C. J. (2005). Family and Consumer Sciences theses and dissertations: 2004 graduate research productivity. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 34(2), 173-179.
- Morrison, A. J., & Inkpen, A. C. (1991). An analysis of significant contributions to the international business

- literature. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 22(1), 143-153.
- Pauchant, T. C., & Douville, R. (1993). Recent research in crisis management: A study of 24 authors' publications from 1986 to 1991. *Organization & Environment*, 7(1), 43-66.
- Pickard, M. J. (2008). A concise report of Family and Consumer Sciences graduate research productivity reported for 2007. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 37(2), 234-240.
- Potluri, R. M., Abikayeva, M., Usmanova, N., & Challagundla, S. (2014). A study on Kazakh woman's consumer behavior. *International Journal of Industrial Distribution & Business*, 5(4), 5-11.
- Potluri, R. M., Ansari, R., Challa, S. K., & Puttam, L. (2014). A treatise on the cross-cultural analysis of Indian consumers' conspicuous consumption of Veblen products. *International Journal of Industrial Distribution & Business*, 5(3), 35-43.
- Pucciarelli, D. L., & Faith, S. L. (2012). Trends in Family and Consumer Sciences graduate research productivity in 2011. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 41(2), 198.
- Rachal, J. R., & David, W. W. (2005). Institutional and individual publication productivity in selected adult education journals, 1993-2002. *The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 19(1), 1-73.
- Runyan, R. C., & Hyun, J. (2009). Author and institution rankings in retail research: An analysis of the four retail journals from 1994-2008. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 19(5), 571-586.
- Scholl, J. (2013). A century of graduate research productivity in Extension Family and Consumer Sciences. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*, 105(4), 23-28.
- Shane, S. A. (1997). Who is publishing the entrepreneurship research?. *Journal of Management*, 23, 83-95.
- Tanner, J. R., Manakyan, H., & Hotard, D. G. Management-Faculty research productivity and perceived teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Education for Business*, 67(5), 261.
- White, C. S., James, K., Burke, L. A., & Allen, R. S. (2012). What makes a "research star"? Factors influencing the research productivity of business faculty. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 61(6), 584-602.
- Xu, S., Yalcinkaya, G., & Seggie, S. H. (2008). Prolific authors and institutions in leading international business journals. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 25, 189-207.