



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Australasian Marketing Journal

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ausmj

Reconceptualising the scholarship of marketing education–SoME futurescapes

Elizabeth Snuggs, Colin Jevons*

Department of Marketing, Monash Business School, 26 Sir John Monash Drive, Caulfield East 3145, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 14 March 2018

Revised 2 May 2018

Accepted 6 May 2018

Available online xxx

Keywords:

Scholarship of Marketing Education (SoME)

Marketing education futurescapes

Scholarship of learning and teaching

Business education

ABSTRACT

Teaching is an important part of marketing academics' work. However research into the scholarship of marketing education (SoME) has not enjoyed the same standing as discipline-based research, a regrettable gap. We present comparative data from other business disciplines, which all value educational research higher than the marketing discipline does. We then discuss the underlying factors and collate various scenarios into three futurescapes as bases for discussion of how to increase SoME's value and reputation in a rapidly-changing environment.

© 2018 Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The term 'teach or perish' is not bandied around in the same way 'publish or perish' is, although teaching forms a substantial part of most marketing academics' workloads. In the academic ecosystem within Australian business schools, a discipline-based research hierarchy aligns best with both the priorities of the school and the university. It has always been the rule that for academics in any discipline to be successful and move up the hierarchy they must focus on the traditional discipline-based research career path. It is no different for marketing academics, and the rise of various objective external ranking and accreditation systems encourages this further. The narrative of the traditional research-focused hierarchy encourages the systemic practice of prioritising one (research) over the other (teaching) when allocating academic effort and reward. In recent times, this hierarchy is being challenged as evidenced by the evolution of the climate and context surrounding education-based research (Nagy, 2011; Olssen and Peters, 2005; Tight, 2012) and marketing education research (Abernethy and Padgett, 2011; Finch et al. 2012; Gray et al., 2012).

Uniquely, research conducted on marketing education provides the opportunity to bridge the gap between the research and teaching aspects of a marketing academic's role. Boshier (2009) has highlighted the difficulties that education research faces in becoming perceived as 'real' research. Ironically, it is this type of research

that most closely aligns with the majority of a marketing academic's day-to-day activities, as well as the perception that industry and the broader community have of marketing academics and their expertise (Harrigan and Hulbert, 2011). We offer this paper to assist the marketing academy in understanding why marketing education research is currently under-valued and perhaps under-developed as well as highlighting the challenges to be overcome so that we can exploit the benefits of investigating the scholarship of marketing education.

Building on work presented at the Australia and New Zealand Marketing Academy (ANZMAC) conference 2017 (Snuggs and Jevons, 2017), we aim to conceptualise possibilities for the scholarship of marketing education (SoME) moving forward. In order to achieve this, we have divided this paper into two parts. In part one, we briefly review the current state of SoME. We draw on themes of power at a system level and perceived value at the business school level as key contributors to the relevance of scholarship of marketing education as a stream of inquiry. In part two, we futurescape the scholarship of marketing education as a valuable activity for marketing academics, outlining different scenarios for its growth and evolution.

We concentrate on the Australian tertiary sector as it provides a solid base for insight. Universities within Australia are rated highly in the global university rankings (Australian Education Network, 2018; Go8, 2018; QS Top Universities, 2018), well above per capita expectations. Australian universities, business schools and marketing departments have an excellent international reputation for teaching and research quality. Education is the third largest Australian export earner and our largest services export, at

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: elizabeth.snuggs@monash.edu (E. Snuggs), colin.jevons@monash.edu (C. Jevons).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2018.05.003>

1441-3582/© 2018 Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

\$28.0 billion in 2016–17, a 16.1% increase over the preceding period. (DET, 2017; Universities Australia, 2018). The higher education sector contributed \$19.1 billion in export income in 2016–17 (DET, 2017) and 15% of all tertiary students in Australia are international (OECD, 2017). As well, many business schools in Australia hold one or more global accreditations with the most popular being the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the Association of MBAs (AMBA), and the Management Development Network (EFMD)'s Quality Improvement System (EQUIS), and at least two business schools in Australia, including one Group of Eight research-intensive university, hold the prestigious "Triple Crown" of all three accreditations. As we propose and encourage positive change, we also hope to strengthen the conversation by highlighting the relevance of scholarship in marketing education within the marketing academy (Australia and globally) and encourage the development of greater systemic, institutional and academic community support when conducting marketing education research. This Australian work is of global relevance since university systems worldwide are struggling with the same issue. We believe that this Australian perspective will contribute to and strengthen the global conversation surrounding this issue.

2. Part A: understanding the current context surrounding the scholarship of marketing education in Australia

In highlighting the current state of scholarship in marketing education, broader narratives surrounding neoliberalism and the increasingly competitive nature of academia should be considered (Olssen, 2016). This is due to the impact these narratives have on decision-making at both system and institutional levels, leading to the constant evaluation of performance and productivity (Shore and Wright, 1999, 2015). The competitiveness of academia means priorities are constantly evaluated and the concept of performativity is prevalent, where productivity is measured through benchmarks, rankings and audits (Ball, 2012). For research that marketing academics undertake, journal quality is a critical objective measurement for success internally within the institution, and externally by the Australian Federal Government as represented by the Australian Research Council (ARC) and its "Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA)" framework (ARC, 2018). For published outcomes of business research, where marketing is one "Field of Research" (FoR), the ARC draws on the Australian Business Deans' Council (ABDC) journal quality list. This list ranks academic journals (across all business disciplines) into groups based on quality thresholds: A* (6.9% of journals listed), A (20.8%), B (28.4%), and C (43.9%) (ABDC, 2018). These benchmarks and evaluations can be career-defining at an individual level and reputationally important at an institutional level, where excellent results attract more and higher-quality staff and students.

2.1. Power in relation to the scholarship of marketing education

When conducting research in the sub-field of marketing education, the outcomes are limited, particularly for our dominant paradigm of journal publication (Snuggs and Jevons, 2017). Drawing on Michel Foucault's classic power/knowledge construct, this could be viewed as an outcome of power relationships within the system where language and practices minimise the attractiveness of an area (Foucault, 1991; Rabinow, 1991). The lack of high-ranking journals under the marketing FoR code (1505) that focus on the scholarship of marketing education is an example of this. There are only 5 journals out of 140 in the 1505 FoR in the ABDC's quality journal list that focus on marketing education, all of which are ranked B or lower (ABDC, 2018), shown in Table 1. A lack of A* and A level vehicles available to publish in lessens the appeal of conducting research in this area. This is a system level issue where

power is concentrated elsewhere, which consequently encourages inquiry elsewhere (Ball, 2012; Olsson and Heizmann, 2015). This leads to two options. One is to publish in a lower ranked journal under the marketing FoR and the other is to publish in a higher-ranked journal in a different FoR. This potentially reduces the benefits flowing back to the authors and their department or business school, which in turn affects career and institutional success. However, workarounds are possible if leadership support is there. For example, at least one department of marketing in Australia has persuaded its business school authorities to rank this journal, AMJ, as an A rather than the ABDC's B. This is a neat tweak to the current ranking system which could be emulated by others.

While it has been recognised that discipline-based education research is an important line of work in its own right (Marketing Educators Association, 2018; Academy of Management, 2018), the lack of authority and profile enjoyed by SoME regrettably undervalues this research, which is consequently undervalued in the constructs of success for a marketing academic and a business school. An obvious rejoinder to the complaint that SoME has less value or prestige than discipline-based research is that this differentiation is justified by a lack of rigour or quality in published research in marketing education. A comparison with other disciplines' rankings may help inform this discussion. For example, management (as a discipline) shares many similarities to marketing in its approach to research, but it differs in its treatment of discipline-based education research. For management, there are greater support mechanisms in place with multiple opportunities to publish education-related research in top tier journals (A* and A), and there is a wider range of quality journals to choose from. Table 2 outlines education-based journals for each discipline as per the ABDC journal quality list (ABDC, 2018) (A*, A, and B only). Management as a discipline dominates the list with a wide range of journals to select from including respected A* journals: *Academy of Management Learning and Education* and the *Journal of Vocational Behavior*.

The Education discipline does not have a broadly-accepted journal ranking system in the way that Business does through the ABDC. We therefore draw from a Group of Eight university's education faculty journal ranking list and show all education-related journals that are also B and above on the ABDC list and also satisfy Education's quality measure, a source normalized impact per paper (SNIP) score above 0.500 at the time of the list's publication (Winter, 2014). The SNIP score is determined by Scopus which is the citation data provider for the ARC's ERA framework (ARC, 2018).

The highest-ranked marketing education focused journal out of the five education-related journals classified in the Marketing 1505 FoR code is *Journal of Marketing Education*, SNIP 1.718, which is the only one ranked at B. Of course, articles published in B-ranked journals may be of high quality and have strong impact, but it would be naive to ignore the dominant paradigm that defines the perceived and accepted expectations of a journal's quality. In comparison the management discipline has fourteen journals ranked B or higher, accounting has three journals ranked B or higher, economics has two and statistics has two. This is critical from a comparative perspective as the ARC, through the ERA, uses the ABDC list as the basis of its research quality evaluation. We recognise that special issues of good quality journals can add value, for example the *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 2017, Vol. 25 No. 2 on "Adding Value to Marketing Education: Best Practice Teaching in a Modern Education Environment". However special issues are by their nature ephemeral and do not provide an ongoing stream of research in their topic area. Viewing this through the lens of power, other disciplines have more power and the opportunity to achieve higher levels of success, as it broadens the field of research beyond the discipline's theoretical knowledge base to provide op-

Table 1
Rankings of journals focused on SoME within the Marketing Field of Research (1505).

SoME journals	FoR	ABDC quality ranking	SNIP [#]
Journal of Marketing Education	1505	B	1.718
Journal for Advancement of Marketing Education	1505	C	1.182 [*]
Journal of Advertising Education	1505	C	Not Stated
Journal of Marketing for Higher Education	1505	C	0.981
Marketing Education Review	1505	C	Not Stated

[#] Source Normalised Impact per Paper (SNIP) was calculated by Scopus using data from 30 April, 2017 (Scopus, 2018), unless otherwise stated.

[^] SNIP provided by Journal Guide (2018), date calculated unknown.

Table 2
Education focused journal rankings in the ABDC journal quality list (A*, A and B only).

Education journals listed in the ABDC journal quality list (A*, A and B only)	FoR	ABDC quality ranking	SNIP [#]	Faculty of education recommended journals List [^]
Academy of Management Learning and Education	1503	A*	2.098	Yes
Journal of Vocational Behavior	1503	A*	1.846	Yes
British Journal of Educational Technology	806	A	1.815	Yes
Economics of Education Review	1402	A	1.839	Yes
Gender and Education	1503	A	0.841	Yes
Higher Education	1503	A	1.77	Yes
Issues in Accounting Education	1501	A	1.075	Yes
Studies in Higher Education	1503	A	1.814	Yes
Accounting Education: An International Journal	1501	B	0.532	Yes
Australian Journal of Environmental Education	1503	B	0.401	Yes**
Education Economics	1402	B	0.651	Yes
Educational and Psychological Measurement	1503	B	1.632	Yes
Educational Management Administration & Leadership	1503	B	1.132	Yes
Higher Education Quarterly	1503	B	1.042	Yes
International Journal of Educational Management	1503	B	0.909	Yes
Journal of Accounting Education	1501	B	1.155	Yes
Journal of Career Development	1503	B	0.814	Yes
Journal of Education and Work	1503	B	1.078	Yes
Journal of Higher Education	1503	B	2.062	Yes
Journal of Management Education	1503	B	0.946	Yes
Journal of Marketing Education	1505	B	1.718	Yes
Journal of Statistics Education	104	B	0.533	Yes
Statistics Education Research Journal	104	B	0.627	Yes

[#] Source Normalised Impact per Paper (SNIP) was calculated by Scopus using data from 30 April, 2017 (Scopus, 2018), unless otherwise stated.

[^] There is no one standard list (in the same way Business Schools have in the ABDC journal quality list) rather each Education Faculty at each university can set their own list. The information here is from a Go8 university Education Faculty's recommended journal publication list. For a journal to appear in their list it had to have been coded in part to education according to the Scopus Title List, and have a SNIP score above 0.500 (Winter, 2014).

** SNIP score was above the 0.500 threshold when the most recent education faculty list was released in 2014.

portunities to incorporate the potential scholarly contribution of an academic's pedagogical expertise.

2.2. Perceived value of scholarship of marketing education in business schools

The idea that it is only research if it 'counts' still permeates not only in the marketing academy but is reinforced broadly across the tertiary sector (Boshier, 2009; Nagy, 2011). This has not been helped by the closure of the Federal Government's Office of Learning and Teaching and its associated grant and fellowship schemes, which could signal a de-prioritisation of these types of activities. Overall, this logic has implications for education-based research in business schools, particularly in relation to decisions surrounding research priorities and resource allocation. It is possible for academics to build informal networks and support systems relating to education research, these activities are often limited in impact with small pockets of collaborators working together with little or no institutional level support and consequently such academics can be vulnerable from a career viewpoint.

And, while much research in marketing undoubtedly helps to improve business and societal efficiency, the value of the new knowledge that we marketing academics create is rather more dif-

icult to justify to a taxpayer or funding body, such as the ARC Discovery grant scheme which very rarely supports the 1505 FoR, marketing. Further to this, Harrigan and Hulbert (2011) show that external stakeholders value the teaching aspects of a marketing academic's role highly. Some business schools emphasise this perceived strength by differentiating themselves through subscribing to forward-looking initiatives such as PRME (Principles of Responsible Management Education) and GRLI (Globally Responsible Leadership Initiative) reinforcing the message that teaching increases the value of their graduates to society. The perception of external stakeholders supports the relevance of teaching and as an extension of this, conducting research in into teaching and learning. This could imply that SoME would be also accepted as a natural extension of a marketing academic's role.

Adding to the perceived value of scholarship, Arbough et al. (2017) recently analysed publications of education based research in business schools and the findings presented were particularly interesting from an Australian perspective. Out of the top ninety-nine scholars in business education, ten were from Australian institutions, which proportionately speaking represents an excellent outcome for Australia. However, only one of these ten scholars was based at a 'Group of Eight' research-intensive university, (Go8, 2018). So why does relatively little education-based research come

out of business schools in this research-intensive grouping? The answer in part could link back to points noted previously, where performativity influences decision making at system and institutional levels, the lack of high quality vehicles in some disciplines (including marketing) to publish in and the perception of value to the institution education-based research can deliver. This could provide an opportunity for universities outside the Group of Eight to differentiate themselves by establishing research expertise in SoME, which could be attractive to potential students and their stakeholders.

It should be noted that business scholar profiles in Australia are similar to those globally; [Abernethy and Padgett \(2011\)](#) found relatively lower productivity of marketing education research among American institutions with marketing doctoral programs, and raised the question of whether teaching scholarship is adequately valued by these schools. Of course in America the majority of academics are employed not at Ivy League institutions but at state universities or colleges where there is relatively greater emphasis on teaching than on research. With only one of the ten Australian scholars listed from a Group of Eight university, this could suggest that from both a cultural and value perspective, business education researchers may not be aligned with the research agendas at the business schools of these universities. This could be seen as a lost opportunity to contribute to our higher education–industry and take a leadership position in SoME.

From a marketing education perspective, [Arbaugh et al \(2017\)](#) show that only two of the top twenty business education researchers are from the marketing discipline (six are from accounting and four from information systems). Of the ninety-nine scholars listed across all disciplines, only eighteen were from the marketing discipline, and none of these are based at an Australian university. This is in contrast to accounting, where five out of ten Australian scholars came from this discipline. Although pockets of business (and marketing) scholars exist, developing education-based research is often not viewed as a priority and may not receive the same levels of support or rewards as other types of research ([Schmidt-Wilk, 2007](#); [Arbaugh et al., 2013, 2017](#)). This further questions the value business schools place on academics pursuing education research.

In its current state, marketing education research does not have the power of discipline-based research and is not as valued as highly as it could be at both system and institutional levels. This offers an opportunity to re-imagine marketing education research as a valued part of a business school's research agenda and reposition its relevance at both system and institutional levels. From a system point of view, we should note that rankings themselves can drive quality, as good quality research is directed to journals of appropriate status. By way of example, the *European Journal of Marketing* (EJM) is ranked A* by ABDC in Australia, but only 3 by CNRS, 2 by ESSEC, C by VHB, 3 by ABS and C by CEFAGE. The number of papers with at least one author with an Australian university affiliation has increased markedly over the last decade: Volume 40 (2006) had 11 such papers, Volume 41 (2007): 10 papers, and a decade later Volume 50 (2016) and Volume 51 (2017) had 25 papers each. One interpretation of this substantial increase is that a greater proportion of excellent quality work from Australia is being submitted to EJM, although other interpretations are also possible.

3. Part B: futurescaping the scholarship of marketing education

The potential future of SoME is bright. Disrupting the perception of value and relevance of SoME by lifting its credibility presents a rich opportunity to marketing scholars. The challenges presented in the current context could be overcome with adjustments to the structure and narratives currently in place at both

the system and institution levels. It is important to think creatively. For example, a colleague suggested to us that if teaching were conceptualised as a (transformative) service many marketing journals might consider SoME submissions, but there have been very few to date and in any case the analytical approach taken might not be immediately helpful to the practice of teaching. Accreditation bodies such as AACSB, AMBA and EFMD are taking more notice of education related research in business schools, including SoME, as it informs teaching practice and as a means of professional development and knowledge dissemination ([AACSB, 2018](#); [EFMD, 2018](#)). Further to this, there has been greater interest in all types of multi-disciplinary research including higher education-based research. To contribute to this, it is important to have a strong education research paradigm in our discipline as a foundation to build upon.

When exploring possibilities for futurescapes, there is always the option to maintain the status quo. This would likely limit the growth and development of SoME so it would remain an underdeveloped and undervalued area of research. Failing to offer marketing academics similar opportunities to conduct education-related research as academics in other fields, such as management and accounting, would make it more difficult for the marketing academy to contribute to and learn from high quality marketing education research as a means to support evidence-based decision making in their own teaching. If the aim is to encourage an increase in both quality and quantity of SoME, then maintaining the status quo is not acceptable.

Therefore, we propose three potential futurescapes that we believe could increase SoME's value and relevance. We do not recommend any single option. Rather, we offer this as a means to explore options and broaden the conversation. The futurescapes presented are based on their ability to equitise and rebalance power in relation to SoME and/or increase the value and relevance of SoME at both system and institutional levels. There is no one fixed way to achieve a positive outcome in this instance and we encourage these futurescapes to be used as a starting point; studied, questioned, adapted, and/or combined to support momentum in reconceptualising SoME for a relevant future. These can be summarised in [Table 3](#):

3.1. Futurescape one: addressing the void in highly ranked journals for SoME

Currently, the option to publish in high ranking journals for SoME is limited because within the marketing FoR code there are

Table 3
A brief summary of the futurescapes.

Futurescape	Potential outcomes
1. Addressing the void in highly ranked journals for SoME	Three options (or combination of): -The opportunity to publish in education journals regardless of discipline. - Improve the perceived quality and ranking of an existing journal. - Create a new high-ranking journal specifically for marketing education.
2. Looking beyond journals to disseminate SoME	- Set up a multi-discipline business education conference similar to FIE, the computing-engineering education conference. - Streamline the submission and review process, for instance preliminary review of abstracts to decide which authors are invited to write full papers.
3. Restructuring support mechanisms for SoME within business schools	- Increase institutional support positively for SoME through changing resourcing, narratives and culture (formal and informal). - Draw on the broader marketing community, such as ANZMAC, to support and reinforce the importance of conducting research in this area.

no A or A* education-focused journals. Perhaps the teaching of marketing is not seen as sufficiently differentiated from other disciplines to warrant a specialist journal, but be that as it may, SoME researchers are currently required to look beyond their home discipline to publish in a highly ranked journal (Snuggs and Jevons 2017). Three options could address this. First, opening the possibility to publish in any education-based journal regardless of which discipline it resides in. The ERA process already allows for this if there is good justification, but this is relatively unusual in practice. Second, to improve the perceived quality and consequently the ranking of an existing marketing education journal. Third, to create a high-ranking journal specifically for marketing education. By combining these strategies, marketing education as a stream of inquiry gains power as there is a greater opportunity in which to publish marketing education research in high quality journals. This will offer SoME researchers the ability to develop a strong profile not only in marketing education research but also more broadly within business and wider disciplinary education research.

The first part of this futurescape would be to broaden the opportunity for SoME researchers to publish outside their home field of research. This would need to be addressed at the system level, requiring structural change within the ABDC journal quality list. One potential way to undertake this is by identifying all journals that have an education focus, then grouping them together and giving them a unique additional FoR code. This FoR should have identical outcomes when compared to publishing within a discipline-based FoR. For instance, research published in either the business education FoR or the marketing FoR when evaluated by the ERA framework could be then be combined to determine the overall research quality of a marketing department.

The second part of this futurescape is to improve the perceived quality and therefore ranking of an existing journal. While citation counts and other quality measures of the better marketing education journals are increasing, this is a necessarily slow process; copious research shows that it is difficult to rapidly improve brand perceptions.

Third, we could broaden the journal pool through the creation of a new high-ranking journal specifically for SoME. The structural difficulty with this is that if it has no or a low initial ranking, this could influence the research it attracts (the reverse of the EJM example offered earlier) and/or not achieve the purpose of providing a high-quality vehicle for publishing top quality marketing education research. One way to address this difficulty is to set it up as an online-only journal, no hard copies printed, with one issue of no predefined size open for twelve months; only papers of appropriately high standard would be accepted for publication. Attracting top-quality authors and reviewers is a problem for any respectable academic journal but these measures should reduce the pressure somewhat. The intention in this instance is quality over quantity and having no hard copies reduces any perceived pressure to accept articles to “fill” a printed journal. It may be that the early issues would have few articles but over time this could encourage growth by following the logic that ‘if you build it, they will come’—having a high-quality vehicle for SoME will attract high quality research, as has been suggested by the quantity and quality of Australian work in EJM. There is an opportunity for the ANZMAC community here. Since good scholarship and good teaching often go together the new journal could draw on the collective expertise of top ANZMAC and global researchers as a core guiding principle. The creation of an online journal specifically for SoME could be seen as a modern interpretation of the slogan that first appeared on the masthead of the New York Times newspaper in the late 19th century—“All the News That’s Fit to Print”—that committed the brand of this newspaper to top quality work. This futurescape is directed to rebalancing the power by expanding prospects for journal publication. This in turn would lead to greater opportuni-

ties to publish in high-quality journals, attracting more academics to pursue this line of inquiry with high-quality work.

3.2. *Futurescape two: looking beyond journals to disseminate SoME*

Our best research in the marketing discipline is primarily published in journals, and other forms of distribution are not as widely utilised. Marketing academics (for all areas of research) can choose to present at conferences but in general conferences do not have the same reputation as journals and as such, are often used to share initial findings or seek feedback prior to publication in journals. This can cause considerable delays in communicating valuable findings. In contrast, other branches of learning such as education, engineering, health and science, place greater value on conferences as a means to effectively disseminate quality research. By studying, borrowing and/or adapting how other disciplines communicate their education research could lead to new practices for SoME as well as reducing the time spent on preparing research for publication and potentially broaden the audience. For instance, in engineering and computing, the IEEE—“the world’s largest technical professional organisation for the advancement of technology” (IEEE, 2018)—hosts the annual Frontiers in Education (FIE) conference where education-based research in computing and engineering disciplines is disseminated via workshops, presentations and posters at a standalone event. This four-day conference is open to multiple disciplines with the common theme across the disciplines being education-based research. The conference attracts 576 attendees on average (FIE, 2018) and uses a two-stage process for conference paper submission. In the first instance, an abstract is submitted and reviewed by a committee and then if accepted, authors are invited to submit a finished paper or a work-in-progress (short paper) for full, blind peer-review. This makes for a more effective use of time for academics as only an abstract is needed initially, with a full paper only required if the abstract is accepted. In a field like ours, where both student behaviour and the technology used to deliver education are changing rapidly it may be that the speed of dissemination of results allowed by conferences would be an advantage. Indeed, as Harrigan and Hulbert (2011) point out, these same factors are changing our graduates’ professional working environment, so perhaps research dissemination practice should follow educational practice which itself follows professional marketing practice! (Incidentally, this rapidly-changing environment also provides more opportunity for interesting and useful SoME research.)

For marketing academy, adapting cultural and systemic practices from other disciplines could enable the growth of SoME in an efficient yet valuable manner. In particular the example of the FIE conference highlights two aspects that could be adapted to suit the particular needs of marketing education. The first is combining with other (business) disciplines to create a multi-discipline business education conference and the second is to study the process for submitting and accepting papers. A multidisciplinary conference similar to FIE would enable a sharing of research and ideas that is difficult to replicate through other means. The gathering of individuals from multiple disciplines in one place could also encourage multidisciplinary research and collectively strengthen individual fields while promoting the adoption and adaptation of best practice more broadly. The second aspect that could be of interest is how papers are reviewed and accepted. The process used at FIE is not onerous or risky for authors and could encourage speculative work as full papers are only written after acceptance of an abstract. This futurescape reconceptualises publication of SoME beyond journals where an alternative, more efficient means of disseminating quality education-research is introduced without reducing rigor or relevance, while increasing the speed of publication

Table 4
Summary of futurescapes with potential benefits and challenges.

Futurescape	Potential outcomes	Potential benefits and challenges
1. Addressing the void in highly ranked journals for SoME	Three options (or combination of): - The opportunity to publish in education journals regardless of discipline. - Improve the perceived quality and ranking of an existing journal. - Create a new high ranking journal specifically for marketing education.	<i>Benefits:</i> - Greater opportunity for research to be disseminated. - A recognised and relevant place for research to be showcased. <i>Challenges:</i> - Determining the most appropriate option(s) as a community. - Building the awareness and support required for change to occur.
2. Looking beyond journals to disseminate SoME	- Set up a multi-discipline business education conference similar to FIE, the computing-engineering education conference. - Streamline the submission and review process, for instance preliminary review of abstracts to decide which authors are invited to write full papers.	<i>Benefits:</i> - Enable a physical space for like-minded researchers to share, present and connect, across all business disciplines. - A paper submission and review process that is less onerous for both authors and reviewers and encouraging of speculative work. <i>Challenges:</i> - Building resources and support for the conference across all business disciplines. - The logistics and operational aspects.
3. Restructuring support mechanisms for SoME within business schools	- Increase institutional support positively for SoME through changing resourcing, narratives and culture (formal and informal). - Draw on the broader marketing community, such as ANZMAC to support and reinforce the importance of conducting research in this area.	<i>Benefits:</i> - Opportunities for individual universities to be an establish a 'stake' in this space (as a positioning strategy) - Ability to act as a ripple across the sector. <i>Challenges:</i> - Will require a strong champion to drive change internally. - Possibility for misalignment of communication between formal and informal channels within the university.

which is increasingly becoming an advantage in a rapidly-changing environment.

3.3. *Futurescape three: restructuring support mechanisms for SoME within business schools*

At an institutional level, the levels of support from business schools for SoME and other education-based research is varied, as demonstrated by the pockets of institutional dominance evidenced by [Arbaugh et al \(2017\)](#). However as also noted previously, institutional support is prioritised toward activities on which measurements of the performativity are based, notably discipline-focused research ([Ball, 2012](#)). This limits the power and value of activities which currently have limited bearing on performativity measurements, such as SoME. To alter this situation, the relevance of SoME within the business school would need to be valued through an alternative construct. For instance, this could be through the lens of academics being subject matter experts in both discipline knowledge and the dissemination of discipline knowledge (pedagogy) and as such are expected to publish in both areas. To drive this notion, institutional resource allocations would need to be altered and narratives within the institution (formal and informal) would need to be adjusted. Both these aspects are able to influence power and value within the traditional business school research hierarchy. By allocating resources, whether they be funds for research, employment of academics to specifically undertake SoME (and other business education research), or the development of a research centre in marketing or business education, an institution taking a leadership position in this area would signal the relevance of this field internally and externally.

A consequence of this reallocation of resources would be an adjustment in the institutional narrative within the business school which would explicitly endorse SoME as an activity of value. This adjustment would need to be expressed through both formal and informal channels to provide confirmation and credibility. If the formal and informal channels are misaligned, then it could damage the authenticity of the underlying message that a top-performing academic should be a dual subject matter expert in both research

and teaching. The first institution to support this could produce a ripple effect to influence positively the perception of SoME at other institutions and the system overall. There is again potential here for ANZMAC to provide system-wide support to departments and business schools. Key agents of change could be the ANZMAC Distinguished Fellows, many of whom hold leadership roles for their employers, who are in a position to champion and promote SoME as a meaningful and valid stream of inquiry. This could be extended to HDR candidates and early career academics, who might be concerned that research in marketing education might not be coded 1505 and thus hurt their careers.

Table 4 now expands on **Table 3** and highlights the potential benefits and challenges of each futurescape.

The futurescapes presented here aim to reposition SoME as a relevant field of research by rebalancing power and building credibility. By posing these futurescapes, the case to support change in favour of SoME becomes easier as its potential, outcomes and benefits are articulated. We add to the conversation regarding the development of SoME to encourage systemic and institutional change.

4. Conclusions

The aim of this paper was to reconceptualise SoME in constructs that made it more relevant to the broader marketing academy. We briefly reviewed the current state of SoME in particular, drawing attention to the power imbalance away from SoME and the perception of SoME as a low value activity. This was then followed by the presentation of three futurescapes as a means of conceptualising some of SoME's potential futures. The first futurescape addressed the inequity of journal publications. The second futurescape explored opportunities to disseminate SoME beyond conventional journal publication and the third futurescape investigated the structure of support mechanisms within business schools for SoME. These futurescapes were offered as a means to add to the broader conversation regarding both marketing and business education in the hope that it may contribute positively to the development of SoME, becoming a more viable research area

for top marketing academics. There are limitations with all the futurescapes presented, in particular the requirement for champions who hold power within the academy to support change for SoME at systemic and institutional levels, as well as the time it will take for any change to disrupt the status quo. We build on the work of many others (Abernethy and Padgett, 2011; Arbaugh et al 2017; Boshier, 2009; Finch et al., 2012; Nagy 2011; Olssen and Peters, 2005) who view discipline-focused education research such as SoME as important within academia. We recognise the duality of an academic's role as both a researcher and a teacher and draw these aspects closer together.

Acknowledgements

This research did not receive any specific funding from funding agencies in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors. We acknowledge the helpful comments and suggestions made by attendees at the ANZMAC conference at RMIT in December 2017, the two anonymous reviewers, and from Professors Harmen Oppewal and Gary Magee of the Monash Business School.

References

- AACSB. (2018). Accreditation. Available from <http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation>.
- Abernethy, A.M., Padgett, D., 2011. A decade of scholarship in marketing education. *J. Market. Educ.* 33 (3), 326–336.
- Arbaugh, J.B., Asarta, A., Hwang, A., Fornaciari, C.J., Bento, R.F., Dean, K.L., 2017. Key authors in business and management education research: productivity, topics, and future directions. *Decis. Sci. J. Innov. Educ.* 15 (3), 268–302.
- Arbaugh, J.B., DeArmond, S., Rau, B.L., 2013. New uses for existing tools? A call to study online management and instructors. *Acad. Manag. Learn. Educ.* 12, 635–655.
- Academy of Management (2018). Academy of Management and Learning. Available from <http://aom.org/Publications/AMLE/Academy-of-Management-Learning-Education.aspx>.
- Australian Business Deans Council (2018). J. Q. List. Available from <http://www.abdc.edu.au/master-journal-list.php>.
- Australian Education Network 2018. Australian University Rankings. Available from <http://www.australianuniversities.com.au/rankings/>.
- Australian Research Council 2018. Excellence in Research for Australia. Available from <http://www.arc.gov.au/excellence-research-australia>.
- Ball, S.J., 2012. Performativity, commodification and commitment: an I-spy guide to the neoliberal university. *Br. J. Educ. Stud.* 60 (1), 17–28.
- Boshier, R., 2009. Why is the scholarship of teaching and learning such a hard sell? *Higher Educ. Res. Dev.* 22 (1), 1–15.
- Department of Education and Training (DET) 2017. Research Snapshot: Export Income to Australia from International Education Activity in 2016–17. <https://internationaleducation.gov.au/research/Research-Snapshots/Documents/Export%20Income%20FY2016%E2%80%9317.pdf>.
- EFMD 2018. About EFMD. Available from <https://www.efmd.org/what-is-efmd>.
- FIE 2018. Frontiers in Education—About FIE. Retrieved from <http://fie-conference.org/conferences>.
- Finch, D., Nadeau, J., O'Reilly, N., 2012. The future of marketing education: a practitioner's perspective. *J. Market. Educ.* 35 (1), 54–67.
- Foucault, M., 1991. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of a Prison*. Penguin, London.
- Gray, D.M., Peltier, J.W., Schibrowsky, J.A., 2012. The journal of marketing education: past, present and future. *J. Market. Educ.* 34 (3), 217–237.
- Group of Eight 2018. About Go8. Available from <https://go8.edu.au/page/about>.
- Harrigan, P., Hulbert, B., 2011. How can marketing academics serve marketing practice? The new marketing DNA as a model for marketing education. *J. Market. Educ.* 33 (3), 253–272.
- IEEE 2018. About IEEE. Available from <https://www.ieee.org/index.html>.
- Journal Guide 2018. Journal Guide Home <https://www.journalguide.com/>.
- Marketing Educators Association 2018. Advancing the Practice and Scholarship of Marketing Education. Available from <https://www.marketingeducators.org/>.
- Nagy, J., 2011. Scholarship in higher education: building research capabilities through core business. *Br. J. Educ. Stud.* 59 (3), 303–321.
- Organisations for Economic and Cooperative Development (OECD) 2017. Education at a Glance—Australia. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/education-at-a-glance-2017/australia_eag-2017-38-en.
- Olssen, M., 2016. Neoliberal competition in higher education today: research, accountability and impact. *Br. J. Sociol. Educ.* 37 (1), 129–148.
- Olssen, M., Peters, M.A., 2005. Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: from the free market to knowledge capitalism. *J. Educ. Policy* 20 (3), 313–345.
- Olsson, M., Heizmann, 2015. Power matters: Foucault's Pouvoir/Savoir as a conceptual lens in the information research and practice. *Inf. Res.* 20 (4) paper 695, URL: <http://www.informationr.net/ir/20-4/paper695.html#Wv6cfEiFPD4>.
- QS Top Universities 2018. World University Rankings. Available from <https://www.topuniversities.com/subject-rankings/2018>.
- Rabinow, P. (Ed.), 1991. *The Foucault Reader: An Introduction to Foucault's Thought*. Penguin, London.
- Scopus (2018). Journal Metrics. Available from <https://journalmetrics.scopus.com/>.
- Shore, C., Wright, S., 1999. Audit culture and anthropology: neo-liberalism in British higher education. *J. R. Anthropol. Inst.* 5 (4), 557–575.
- Shore, C., Wright, S., 2015. Governing by numbers: audit culture, rankings and the new world order. *Soc. Anthropol.* 23 (1), 22–28.
- Snuggs, E., Jevons, C., 2017. The (comparatively) quiet voice of marketing education. In: Proceedings of the ANZMAC 2017 Conference. Melbourne, Australia.
- Schmidt-Wilk, J., 2007. Why should my JME count? *J. Manag. Educ.* 32, 2–4.
- Tight, M., 2012. Higher education research 2000–2010: changing journal application patterns. *Higher Educ. Res. Dev.* 31 (5), 723–740.
- Universities Australia 2018. Global Engagement. Retrieved from <https://www.universitiesaustralia.edu.au/globalengagement>.
- Winter, R., 2014. Monash University Faculty of Education Journal List of Recommended Journals. Monash University, Victoria, Australia.