Many universities have increased the emphasis on faculty research and publication productivity as a means of enhancing their reputation. Such emphasis contributes to the increased competition for available journal space, heightened pressures on the efficiency of the editorial system, and increases the temptation to lower ethical research and publication standards. A survey of 328 marketing academicians about their perceptions of ethical and unethical research and publication practices for academicians, editors, and review board members revealed wide variation among respondents' perceptions of what constitutes ethical academic conduct. In particular, the respondent's level of publication experience was found to be significantly related to his/her assessment of the ethicality of research practices. The authors suggest that a recognized code of ethics for the marketing academic community would be valuable in maintaining professional standards, increase justice in the academic reward system, and further the growth of knowledge in our discipline.

INTRODUCTION

Few marketing academicians would disagree with either the benefits of a code of ethics or the advantages of maintaining standards within their discipline. Most professional marketing associations have developed some statement concerning ethical behavior for their membership. The recently revised American Marketing Association code of ethics is a general one dealing with ethical marketing practice for both practitioners and academicians. However, there is currently no code of ethical behavior specifically for academicians.

Do marketing academicians need a separate code of ethical conduct? We would argue yes. One of the primary characteristics that sets the academician apart from the practitioner is the academician's desire to conduct and publish his/her research efforts. The publication of academic research serves at least two purposes: (1) the communication of newly discovered knowledge among researchers, and (2) career advancement and recognition of individuals within the discipline, based on the nature and level of their publication activity. A code of ethics tailored specifically for marketing academicians—both authors and those evaluating their work—would promote equity in the review process and provide normative guidelines for researchers, assisting in the attainment of both these goals.
Communication of Knowledge

Editors, review board members, ad hoc reviewers, and individuals who organize conferences exert great influence over the research findings that are ultimately communicated within the marketing discipline. Astley (1985) discusses the influence of such gatekeepers in academia, claiming these gatekeepers determine which articles are published by prestigious journals. Opinions of what is good science and who has done good work are based on judgments made by these gatekeepers through the particular discipline’s formal evaluation system.

The efficiency and objectivity achieved by a discipline’s editorial procedures for publishing manuscripts has interested sociologists and psychologists for over two decades (c.f., Armstrong 1982; Crane 1967; Mahoney 1979; and Rodman and Mancini 1977). There is evidence, however, that the editorial process utilized in some academic disciplines lacks effectiveness. For example, Peters and Ceci (1982) resubmitted twelve previously published papers to the same top level psychology journals which had published them within the past three years. Only three papers were detected as having been previously published, and out of the remaining nine papers, eight were rejected by reviewers for reasons concerning “methodological shortcomings.” Reviewers said nothing about a lack of contribution to existing literature.

Author behavior has also been criticized. Beyer (1978) reports anecdotal evidence concerning the following authorship practices which attempt to circumvent the review process: (a) leaving some names out of the acknowledgments so that these persons will not be ruled out as referees; (b) citing some person prominently because you want them to review the manuscript; (c) citing more work from the par-

FIGURE 1
Ratio of Number of Authors to Published Manuscript

![Graph showing the ratio of number of authors to published manuscripts over years.](image)

- Ratio of Number of Authors to Published Manuscript
- Year of Publication
- Journal of Marketing
- Journal of Marketing Research

1 Ratios are calculated using a centered three-year moving average.