



## Perception of academic profession regarding publication in Finance, HR & Marketing & co authorship situation in Pakistan

Tanvir Ahmed<sup>1</sup>, Akmal Shahzad<sup>2</sup>, Irfan Ahmed<sup>3</sup> and Bashir Ahmed Khilji<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Business Administration, AIOU, Islamabad

<sup>2,3</sup>Iqra University, Islamabad.

<sup>4</sup>Eco Department, NUML University, Islamabad.

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received: 12 April 2011;

Received in revised form:

21 May 2011;

Accepted: 28 May 2011;

#### Keywords

Publication,  
Scholar,  
Journal,  
Finance,  
Marketing,  
Human Resources.

### ABSTRACT

Publication has its own importance for professionals. It is better to examine and encourage the young scholars. This article examines the perceptions of the professional faculty regarding the difficulty in publication in the field of finance, marketing, human resources management. Data was collected from Rawalpindi/Islamabad professionals. In this study descriptive tools used to analyzed the data. There was mixed response regarding the publication in Journals. It is also observed that institution tend more credit to the co authorship.

© 2011 Elixir All rights reserved.

### Introduction

The evaluation of academic research is a significant device to examine and encourage scholars. It provides important information about the real position of scholarly work, its statistics and value standards allowing measure scholarly output. This information is beneficial to improve work situation in academia [faria, 1998]. It is also helpful to make polices intended at enhancing scholars effectiveness, as well as assuring fairness in both assessment and incentive of academic accomplishment. Therefore, it is a step forward to set a meritocratic environment.

Now a day the trend toward academic research has increased in all over the world. This is due to the increase of journals means available to researchers. Universities all over the world have put emphasis on research. The number of new M Phil & PhDs has increased, due to this increase publishing opportunities.

Academics in all disciplines are paying attention in the publication records of their peer, at country, department or individual level of analysis. There are many reasons apart from general interest. Firstly we, as academics, have to make decisions based on judgment of research output. The decision may be about our own career, for jobs concern and when to look for support (Read et al., 1998; Tompkins et al., 1996).

Other than this, we may able to take the decision about career of others, as appointment panels, advancement committees and external assessors or of judging whether probationary obstacle has passed (Zivney and Bertin, 1992, Hasselback and Reinstein, 1995; Zivney et al., 1995) Secondly, publication analysis have a major contribution to developed our scholarly knowledge by increasing our understanding in both social and cognitive aspect (Borgman, 1990) In all disciplines, Finance, Human Resources and Marketing, the publication records have grown faster. Number of studies

conduct in most developed countries such as US, UK, AUS, NZ (Lukka and Kasanen, 1996). Mostly studies only focused on academic journal articles. Other studies report only on the most creative author and departments who have significant role to research and present view about limited area of publishing activity (Zivney et al, 1995). The assessment of research quality and productivity and the assignment of credit for independent research effort is topics that have received increasing attention in the literature. Research on author ordering and co-authorship is one area of investigation that has garnered much interest. While there is substantial interest in the topic simply from an applied, empirical basis associated with peer assessment, recent articles provide a theoretical foundation for the use of the alphabetic author ordering method and the increasing number of co-authored papers. Engers et al (1999) show that rational authors should support alphabetic author ordering and that bargaining between authors should generate such a method in an equilibrium state. Joseph et al (2005) link co-authorship, alphabetic author ordering, and journal quality. Under their basic assumption that the higher quality research requires substantial input form all participants, researchers should gravitate to an alphabetic author ordering standard and the use of the alphabetic author ordering rule should be associated with higher quality research. These works provide the framework for empirical assessment.

Education plays a primary role in human capital formation. It raises the production and effectiveness of individuals and thus constructs capable manpower that is competent to lead economy toward the economic development. In the developing country, like Pakistan, education sector situation is not inspiring. The reason for poor performance of the education sector is because of lake of trained teacher, lack of infrastructure and proper planning. Fund allocation at govt level is also skewed to higher education where most of beneficiary belongs to higher income

Tele:

E-mail addresses: [everbrighter2011@gmail.com](mailto:everbrighter2011@gmail.com),

[Tanviraou@hotmail.com](mailto:Tanviraou@hotmail.com)

class. Mostly student stays there after completing education for better jobs. Like the govt sector, the public sector investment is too low which need to increased. This article explores the research attitude of Pakistani scholar in the developing country like Pakistan. I think it is the first attempt in Pakistan to get an opinion from the academic professional regarding the research publication and allocation of credit in co authorship situation. It can provide useful information to those researchers and professionals regarding publication and allocation of credit in co authorship situation. This study also provides information to different authors who want to publish their research paper in co authorship situations. The survey has covered the academic professions of Finance, marketing and human resource management of the universities Islamabad only. So, the results are generalized to Islamabad in Pakistan.

Based on preliminary investigation with the help of the extensive literature review and several interviews from academic professional; it is revealed that the academic research publication are increased as compared to previous years and the lead author tend to give more credit in co authorship situation. This study multi leveled and following object have to achieve.

To get the opinion of the academic professions regarding publications in the field of Finance, Marketing and Human Resource Management

To know the allocation of credit in co authorship situation.

To study the co-authorship patterns in the fields of finance, marketing and human resource management.

To create awareness in the academic researchers about the publication and credit allocation in co authorship situation.

I think it is first attempted in Pakistan to get opinion from the academic professional regarding the research publication and allocation of credit in co authorship situation. It can provide useful information to those researchers and professionals regarding publication and allocation of credit in co authorship situation. This study also provides the information to different authors who want to publish their research paper in co authorship situations.

### **Literature Review**

Schinski et al (1998) provide a finding that finance professors give more than  $1/N$  credit to the lead authors. Holder et al (2000) also examine author sequencing and suggest that finance professors in universities with doctoral programs prefer to use alphabetical ordering.

Angers et al (1999) showed that intelligent authors should support alphabetic author ordering and that bargaining between authors should generate such a method in an equilibrium state. Joseph et al (2005) link co-authorship, alphabetic author ordering, and journal quality. Under their basic assumption that higher quality research requires substantial input from all participants, researchers should gravitate to an alphabetic author ordering standard and the use of the alphabetic author ordering rule should be associated with higher quality research. These works provide the framework for empirical assessment.

There are two classes of literature in the subject area of research association. The first class focuses on the view of authors with respect to their knowledge in co authorship. These studies use qualitative research methods and survey authors' belief on the research credit distribution among coauthors. Tompkins et al (1997), Schinski et al (1998), and Holder et al (2000) offer their survey findings in finance.

The second class of the literature focuses on the quantitative part of co-authorship matter. These studies describe various co-

authorship models and explain the author-ordering rule. There are two methods in this literature. The first provides theoretical models to give details the author-ordering rule. Engers et al (1999) apply a bargaining behavioral model to give an explanation the reasons behind the authority of the alphabetical-ordering rule among authors in economics publications. They argue that, as articles with alphabetically ordered authors quiet the contribution signal to outsiders, every coauthor "does not lose" in terms of outside perception to the relative contribution. They conclude that the alphabetical-ordering rule is a bargaining equilibrium outcome among coauthors. In addition, they also suggest that the larger the team size (the number of coauthors), the less likely that the coauthors will use an alphabetical ordering rule.

Joseph et al (2005) offered a stochastic model of author behavior to relate the quality of an article to co-author ordering. In high quality article, the author use alphabetical-ordering rule. It is because every coauthor would contribute significantly to a high quality article, leaving no room for a slacker. The contribution of the author in the article is difficult to measure. However, Joseph et al declared it theoretical in nature and offer no empirical evidence, however.

A number of studies has find out those different aspects of publishing in finance journals. Zivney and Bertin (1992) provide comprehensive publication performance data by studying the publication output of finance graduates over a 25-year period. The data explored one publication in finance journal per year over a period is a truly remarkable accomplishment, met by only 5% of finance doctorates. Heck and Cooley (1988) study the main contributors to the body of published economic research to provide benchmarks for research productivity. They identified and ranked the authors whose work has appeared most frequently in finance journals, along with their academic.

Zivney and Reichenstein (1994) attempted to rank finance and economic journals according to quality and impact. They define a set of core finance journals and then use citations from these core journals to rate a large set of journals by their impact on economic research. Publication policies and practices of leading finance journals studied by Mitenko and Diamond (1994) through a survey of the journal editors.

### **Methodology**

#### **Sample**

The survey has been commenced in the universities of Islamabad and Rawalpindi regions. Survey has been conducted on two different ways; first questionnaire has been mailed to different intellectual professional but received no response. We have visited personally to a different university in Islamabad/Rawalpindi. The sample of pedagogical universities has been selected on the bases of easily access able and approachable.

#### **Measures**

There are two parts of this questionnaire. The first part contains questions asking for the respondents opinions on the following Whether it have become more difficult to publish in finance, marketing and human resource management or in a leading journal and so on. The second part of questionnaires contains the question regarding the co-authorship publication, allocation of credit on co authorship situation.

#### **Procedure**

Most of the survey questionnaire has been self-administered and distributed personally among respondents. We explained the research idea prior to distribution of questionnaire. The survey

was cross sectional and, data were obtained from the respondents once. Telephone calls and E-mails have also been made for data collection. The total numbers of questionnaires distributed among the respondents were up to 70 but got responses 50 filled questionnaire from the respondents.

#### Results & Discussions

SPSS descriptive tool used to analyze data. We computed frequency distribution and percentage to described the response of respondent.

#### Conclusion & Recommendations

The study examines the perceptions of professional faculty regarding the difficulty in publication in the field of finance, marketing, human resource management and the credit given by their institutions in various co authorship situations. It helps readers to compare perceptions of their peers regarding the discipline and provides documentation of the expectations and reward structure academicians face. Our survey results suggest that most academic researcher feel publication in the field of finance, marketing and human resources management become more difficult.

Publication in top journal is more difficult, A unanimous verdict by the respondent. The survey results indicate that, in general, institutions tend to give more than proportionate credit for co authorship and that being the lead author tends to increase the amount of credit allocated. The responses also revealed some widely differing perceptions regarding the credit assigned by different institutions.

#### References

1. Chung, Kee H. and Raymond A.K. Cox, 1990, "Patterns of Productivity in the Finance Literature: A Study of the Bibliometric Distributions," *The Journal of Finance* 45 (No. 1, March), 301-309.
2. Heck, Jean Louis, 1994, *Finance Literature Index*, 4th Edition, New York, NY, McGraw-Hill
3. Arnold, John (1987) 'The Research Board's Role: The Profession's Debt', *Accountancy*, December, pp. 93-4.
4. Barnes, Paul (1990) 'Research and the scheme of things', *Accountancy*, February, p. 73.
5. Mabry, Rodney H. and Arthur D. Sharplin, 1985, "The Relative Importance of Journals Used in Financial Research," *The Journal of Financial Research* 8 (No. 4, Winter), 287-296.
6. McDowell, John M. and Michael Melvin, 1983, "The Determinants of Co-Authorship: An Analysis of the Economics Literature," *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 65 (February), 155-160.
8. Petry, Glenn H. and Kerr, Halbert S., 1981, "The Rising Incidence of Coauthorship as a Function of Institutional Reward Systems," *Journal of Financial Education* 10 (Fall), 78-84.
10. Zivney, Terry L. and William Reichenstein, 1994, "The Pecking Order in Finance Journals," *Financial Practice and Education* 4 (No. 2, Fall/Winter), 77-87.

#### 4.1 Major specialization

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid finance	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
marketing	19	38.0	38.0	70.0
HR	15	30.0	30.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.1 shows the respondents main subject specialization. The result shows that 32% of responded belongs to finance, 38% have major in marketing and remaining and 30% belongs to HR specialization.

#### 4.2 When did you to publish in journals

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid first attempt 2000-2004	11	21.6	22.0	22.0
first succeed 2000-2004	8	15.7	16.0	38.0
last attempt 2004-2009	20	39.2	40.0	78.0
last succeed 2004-2009	11	21.6	22.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Total	50	100.0		

Table 4.2 shows that 16% out of 21% of respondents succeeded to publish their work during 2000 -2004. The percentage of respondent who attempted last time to publish in the period of 2004-2009 was 40 percent and only 22 percent successes in publication.

#### 4.3 Are the faculties at your institution expected to have published at least one sole authored article in order to achieve tenure?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	6	12.0	12.0	12.0
no	37	74.0	74.0	86.0
unsure	7	14.0	14.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.3 shows that 74 percent of the respondent reports that institution demanded at least one one sole author article. While some respondent says that it is compulsory.

#### 4.4 Who will bear the expenses of publication

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid author	6	12.0	12.0	12.0
institution	25	50.0	50.0	62.0
HEC	19	38.0	38.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.4, 50 percent of the respondents reported that the expenses of publication expenses should be a bear to the institution and 38 percent of the respondent reported that it should be a bear to the HEC and 12 percent of the respondent said it should be the author.

#### 4.5 Highest degree that your institution offers in business Program

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid MBA	12	24.0	24.0	24.0
PhD	38	76.0	76.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.5 shows that 76 percent of the respondent reports that they offer the PhD degree in their institutions and 12 percent offers MBA only the highest degree

#### 4.6 The business program at your institution HEC accredited

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	50	100.0	100.0	100.0

It is observed that respondent institutions are HEC recognized.

#### 4.7 What is your academic rank

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid full professor	5	10.0	10.0	10.0
associate professor	29	58.0	58.0	68.0
assistant professor	16	32.0	32.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Our respondents are professors, associate professor and assistant professors.

#### 4.8 How many articles have you published in the field of Finance

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1-5	26	52.0	52.0	52.0
6-10	17	34.0	34.0	86.0
11-15	4	8.0	8.0	94.0
16-20	2	4.0	4.0	98.0
20-100	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.8 shows that 52 percent (the publication from one paper to five papers published) of the respondent published their paper in finance journal, 34 percent of the respondent (No of publication from six to ten), 8 percent of the respondent (No of publication from 11-15) and 4 percent of the respondent (No of publication from 20 to above)

#### 4.9 How many articles have you published in the field of Marketing

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1-5	24	48.0	48.0	48.0
6-10	23	46.0	46.0	94.0
11-15	1	2.0	2.0	96.0
16-20	1	2.0	2.0	98.0
21-100	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

This table shows that no of publication in the field of Marketing. The number of publication from one paper to five papers are 48 percent, from six paper to ten paper are 46 percent, eleven to fifteen papers are 2 percent and above the 20 are 2 percent.

**4.10 How many articles have you published in the field of HR**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1-5	39	78.0	78.0	78.0
6-10	11	22.0	22.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

This table shows the total number of publication in the field of HR. one paper to five paper publication in HR field are 78 percent of the respondent and six to ten papers publication are 22 percent.

**4.11 How many of these articles have been coauthored in Finance**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1-5	39	78.0	78.0	78.0
6-10	9	18.0	18.0	96.0
11-15	2	4.0	4.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

This table shows the total number of co authorship publication in the field of Finance. One paper to five paper publication in co authorship in the field of finance is 78 percent of the respondent, six to ten papers publication are 18 percent and 11-15 co authorship publication are 4 percent.

**4.12 How many of these articles have been coauthored in Marketing**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1-5	25	50.0	50.0	50.0
6-10	21	42.0	42.0	92.0
11-15	4	8.0	8.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

This table shows the total number of co authorship publication in the field of marketing. One to five publications in co authorship in the field of marketing is 50 percent of the respondent; six to ten publications are 42 percent and 11-15 co publications are 8 percent.

**4.13 How many of these articles have been coauthored in HR**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1-5	42	84.0	84.0	84.0
6-10	6	12.0	12.0	96.0
11-15	2	4.0	4.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

This table shows the total number of co authorship publication in the field of HR. one paper to five paper publication in co authorship in the field of human resource management are 82 percent of the respondent, six to ten papers publication are 12 percent and 11-15 co authorship publication are 4 percent. With regard to the difficulty of publishing in the field of finance, would you say that over the last decade

**4.14 With regard to the difficulty of publishing in the field of finance, would you say that over the last decade**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid it has become more difficult	7	14.0	14.0	14.0
It has become somewhat more difficult to publish	17	34.0	34.0	48.0
the difficulty has not charges	23	46.0	46.0	94.0
it has become some what easier to publish	3	6.0	6.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Regarding difficulty in publication in field of finance, diverse response observed. 46% of responded thought it is difficult. 14% of responded said it is more difficult. 34% thought it is somewhat difficult and less than 6% favored to some what easier to publish.

**4.15 With regard to the difficulty of publishing in the field of Marketing, would you say that over the last decade**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid It has become more difficult to publish	2	3.9	4.0	4.0
it has been somewhat more difficult to publish	19	37.3	38.0	42.0
the difficulty has not changed	29	56.9	58.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Total	50	100.0		

Number of the respondent reported that there is still difficulty in the field of marketing and the difficulty has not been changed? The result reveals that 4% respondent thinks more difficult, 38% favored some what difficult, 58% feels it has not changed.

**4.16 With regard to the difficulty of publishing in the field of HR, would you say that over the last decade?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid It has become significantly more difficult to publish	12	23.5	24.0	24.0
It has become somewhat more difficult to publish	15	29.4	30.0	54.0
the difficulty has not changed	19	37.3	38.0	92.0
it has become somewhat easier to publish	4	7.8	8.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Total	50	100.0		

Most of respondent described that publication in HR discipline is still difficult.

**4.17 With regard to the difficulty of publishing in the top journal, would you say that over the last decade?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid it has become significantly more difficult to publish	22	43.1	44.0	44.0
it has become some what more difficult to publish	25	49.0	50.0	94.0
the difficulty has not changed	3	5.9	6.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Total	50	100.0		

Table 4.17 shows that it has become some difficult in publication to top journals because the requirement of publishing in the leading journal is very high. There should be some contributions to the literature and also for the general public. The result revealed that 49% of respondent feels publication in top journal become more difficult while 43% think some what painstacnic. Only 3% responded think difficulty not change.

**4.18 Percentage of articles coauthored**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 100% credit in coauthorship	35	68.6	70.0	70.0
99-85% credit in coauthorship	13	25.5	26.0	96.0
84-70% credit in coauthorship	2	3.9	4.0	100.0
Total	50	98.0	100.0	
Total	50	100.0		

Table 4.18 shows the results of the allocation of credit in co authorship situation. In the literature independent researchers have different remarks regarding the allocation of credit in co authorship situation. Some researchers say that it should be 100 percent credit in co authored and some argue some different levels. The results of Table show that 70 percent of the respondent reported that it should be 100 percent credit in co authorship, while 26 percent of the respondent reported that it should be 99-85 percent in co authorship and 4 percent respondent reported that it should be 84-70 percent credit in co authorship situation