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ABSTRACT. *Health Marketing Quarterly* (*HMQ*) is one of the leading journals in its field and has been published since 1983. This article reports the findings of a content analysis of *HMQ* over a period of more than a decade. The study identifies most frequent authors and institutional affiliation of contributors, the primary subject of articles, methodology utilized, and implications offered readers. Conclusions from the findings are discussed and suggestions are offered for the benefit of readers, authors, editorial review board members, and editors. [Article copies available for a fee from The Haworth Document Delivery Service: 1-800-HAWORTH. E-mail address: <docdelivery@haworthpress.com> Website: <http://www.HaworthPress.com> © 2004 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.]
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INTRODUCTION

The health care marketplace has changed significantly over the past decade. With the adoption of managed care (Donelan, 1996), HMOs...
(Sturman, Bourdeau, and Corcoran, 1996), technology improvements (Green, 1998; McStravic, 2001), and escalating costs (Barringer and Milkovich, 1996), health care leaders are faced with dynamic market situations that must be competently managed. As a leading purveyor of academic and practitioner thought in the specialty area of health care marketing, Health Marketing Quarterly (HMQ) offers both academic and practitioner knowledge and management guidance related to the health care marketing industry. Yet, given the growing importance of the journal, no overview of the contributions made by HMQ has been conducted. The purpose of this article is to conduct a content analysis of HMQ to learn more about the authors, affiliations, subject content, methodologies, and implications offered to readers over the past decade.

Content analysis of specific journals has been accomplished in the advertising (Barry, 1990; Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas, 1998) and B2B marketing (Ford, Latour, and Henthorne, 2001) disciplines. Health Marketing Quarterly is one of a handful of journals that publish research relevant to the health care marketing field. Other leading health care marketing journals include Journal of Hospital Marketing and Public Relations (JHM & PR) and International Journal of Medical Marketing (IJMM). The JHM & PR concentrates on hospital marketing and IJMM is dedicated to the pharmaceutical, medical devices, and diagnostic markets.

The Study

This study employs content analysis methodology that was utilized by Barry (1990), Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998), and Ford, LaTour, and Henthorne (2001). That is, all articles appearing in HMQ for an eleven-and-a-half year period are examined to determine: the contributing author(s), their academic or firm affiliation, principal subject investigated, whether the article was theoretical or empirical, and implications offered the readership. Although several sources rank marketing journals (Hult, Neese, and Bashaw, 1997; Cabell and English, 1997), this study seeks to gain a deeper understanding of who is publishing in HMQ, their affiliation, what they are writing about, the sophistication of the articles, and the type of recommendations offered academic and practitioner readers.
RESULTS

Beginning with Volume 9, Number 1 (1991), through Volume 20, Number 2 (2002), an average of 25 articles reached press annually. Average annual output produced was 28 articles through Volume 17 (1999), decreasing to 18 articles per volume (four issues at 4.5 articles) for the two and a half years beginning with Volume 18. During the time period investigated, a total of 296 articles were published by 460 authors, resulting in an average of 1.55 authors per article. Single authored articles totaled 94 (32%), two-authored pieces accounted for 115 articles (39%), and three or more authored manuscripts totaled 87 (29%). Thus the mode is 2 authors per article.

Authors and Affiliations

Of the 460 authors who contributed to HMQ during the selected time period, 82% were affiliated with academic institutions and 18% identified themselves as health care managers, marketers, or consultants. This confirms that HMQ primarily publishes academic manuscripts; however, a significant number (80) of articles authored by practitioners are in evidence. This means that HMQ is an outlet that offers a vehicle for “cross fertilization” of ideas between academe and service industries (LaPlaca, 1997).

Likewise, our analysis shows that a small number of authors were frequent publishers during this time frame in HMQ. That is, Stephen Moore (University of Missouri-Columbia) and David Strutton (University of SW Louisiana/North Texas State) were the leading HMQ contributors, with seven total published articles each during the period analyzed. However, Moore was the first-author of seven articles and Strutton first-authored six articles and was second-author on another HMQ publication. Table 1 offers a comprehensive list of the 31 most frequent HMQ authors during the eleven-plus year time frame analyzed. The 31 most prolific authors—who published three or more articles in HMQ—contributed at least 105 separate articles. That is, approximately 35 percent of the total articles published in HMQ during this period were contributed by a small cadre of authors.

In regard to university/college affiliation, first authors are representatives of 155 academic institutions. Twenty-eight institutions appear three or more times among first authors. As expected, the two top contributors—Professors Moore and Strutton—greatly impact institutional rankings. As a result, the University of Missouri-Columbia received
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credit for the most first-authored articles (7), tied with East Tennessee State University (7 articles by four authors), and followed respectively by Cleveland State University (6 articles by five authors), and University of SW Louisiana (6 articles from Strutton). Authors from California State University-Sacramento and Idaho State University contributed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>First Author</th>
<th>Second Author</th>
<th>Third Author</th>
<th>Total Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Moore</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Strutton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Barnes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Tootelian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sujit Sansgiry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Yasin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Pelton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmoud Agrawal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Pinto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Sanchez</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Treise</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raj Goldman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Cady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raj Arora</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Coleman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Mundt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Paul III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Risker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Stevens</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Higgins</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Kaldenberg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Gotthoffer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Hampton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Ferguson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shubhada Sansgiry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Javalgi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Bopp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tanner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Warren</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Barber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Loudon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
five articles each to *HMQ*, attributable to two and three first-authors, respectively. Lastly, of the 28 institutions, eight can be classified as research institutions (University of Missouri, Florida, Penn State, Arkansas, Texas Tech, Massachusetts, Michigan State, and Colorado), while the remaining 20 fall into the categories of teaching schools or “mixed institutions”–those claiming to place equal emphasis on teaching and research. A complete list of the 28 institutions that contributed three or more articles and first author counts is provided in Table 2.

Finally, 27 international authors contributed 13 *HMQ* articles and hailed from nine countries: Australia (6-22%), Canada (9-33%), Great Britain (3-11%), New Zealand (3-11%), Hong Kong (2-7%), South Africa (1-4%), Singapore (1-4%), Nigeria (1-4%), and Turkey (1-4%). Thus, as evidenced by the countries listed in Table 3, international authors emanate primarily from current or former British Commonwealth nations.

**Article Subject Areas**

As expected, “marketing” wields a great presence in *HMQ*. While specific marketing topics, like advertising, market strategy, and market segmentation, are well represented, the broadest category of marketing–e.g. “creating a marketing program” or “marketing your services”–ranked first in subject frequency. A total of 36 articles concentrate on “marketing” and encompass the activities of conducting, planning, and evaluating the effectiveness of various health care marketing activities. Three of these articles directly analyze the application of the marketing concept to health care markets and five examine strategic market planning (See Table 4).

Advertising was the second most frequent subject area, with 28 articles focused on the salient practice of marketing communication. Specific themes included client and practitioner attitudes toward advertising, prescription drug advertising, experience with yellow page ads, advertising by veterinarians, and increasing the awareness of health behavior risks by utilizing Public Service Announcements (PSA). Five specific PSA studies investigated techniques to reach the general public, especially college students, with information and motivations that reduced risky behaviors associated with alcohol and drug abuse. Four articles explored the perceptions of public and health professionals about AIDS, including the fear associated with contacting persons or being exposed to fluids of that disease.

Traditional consumer behavior studies, applied more narrowly to clients/patients and their relations and activities with health care provid-
TABLE 2. Institutional Affiliation of Lead Author Health Marketing Quarterly 1992-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>1st Auth count</th>
<th># authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U Missouri-Col</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East TN St U</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland St U</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of SW Louisiana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal St Sacramento</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho St U</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Florida</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanova U</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle TN St U</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn St U</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Arkansas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Massachusetts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Louisiana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem State</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Missouri-KC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of the Pacific</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Michigan U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Missouri</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdosta St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carolina U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of SE Louisiana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Colorado</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ers, were the focal areas of 27 articles over the period investigated. Patient and client perceptions, attitudes, and choice making were explored in most of the 27 studies, with 12 of those targeting customer information search paradigms. There were an additional twenty papers that addressed various aspects of customer satisfaction and satisfaction-evaluation techniques.
One would expect a generous treatment of the service quality construct, and *HMQ* authors delivered ten papers that addressed this topic. Six of these specifically applied the SERVQUAL instrument and its theoretical concepts to health care marketing. However, as a reflection of the times, a single paper attempted to link the benefits of TQM and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number of articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Western Australia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland University of Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. So. Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. British Columbia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhouse University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Winnipeg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Great Britain</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Exeter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hong Kong</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Baptist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK Chinese University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Africa</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cape Town</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Zealand</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln University</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singapore</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nigeria</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers St. University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turkey</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazi University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
health care providers. The seniors, elder, and mature adult markets received substantial attention, either as the primary focus of the study (5 times) or, more often as study respondents, even when age was not the principal goal. In total, fifteen articles examined data derived from mature adult samples.

In the area of scant appearances, papers devoted to the Internet and web-based marketing of health care totaled only five articles and two papers addressed global health care policy. There were, however, comparative studies of various health care marketing experiences across six countries outside the United States. Only four studies specifically addressed Medicare or Medicaid in their titles/keywords, and mental health as a primary study topic, was addressed six times. Nearly as many (five) articles were devoted to understanding warning labels on medication packages. Finally, single papers explored subject matter that readers may find unique: animal facilitated therapy and “branding” physician services.

**Article Methodology and Managerial Implications**

Articles examined in *HMQ* were categorized as being theoretical, meaning that the author(s) did not collect, analyze, and interpret numerical data, or empirical, denoting that a sample of data were collected and analyzed. In this area, about two-thirds of the articles were empirical and one-third was theoretical. In addition, seven of the 296 articles (2%)
were experimental in nature. The great majority of articles (86%) are descriptive in nature. That is, the articles describe the data collected and their implications.

In regard to managerial implications, less than half (47%) of the articles examined included such a section, even though many manuscripts offered practical suggestions within the Discussion and/or Conclusion sections. Approximately 20% of the articles claimed to make identifiable contributions to health care marketing theory development.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Based upon the 296 articles reviewed between Volume 9 and the mid-point of Volume 20, a number of conclusions can be reached about *Health Marketing Quarterly*. First, *HMQ* offers an outlet for researchers and publishers of health marketing manuscripts that has produced nearly 300 papers or approximately 25 manuscripts per year. This suggests that *HMQ* provides a venue for anyone who wants to contribute valuable ideas or suggestions for understanding or improving the practice of health care marketing. There has been a decline in the number of articles published since Volume 18 (2000) when the editorship of the journal changed. The current editors set an initial objective of raising the quality of the journal. As a result, the acceptance rate was reduced from 50% (Cabell and English 1997) to 25-29% (Paul, 2004) and, as an outcome of this strategy change, articles published per volume decreased significantly.

Second, published authors in *HMQ* come from varied schools and geographical locations. Although 31 authors have published three or more articles, there remain a significant number of additional authors (429) who are employed at research, teaching, and mixed oriented colleges and universities located both in the U.S. and 27 colleges/universities located outside the U.S. Likewise, academicians account for approximately 80% of the contributed articles and practitioners publish about 20%.

Third, the principal focus of the 296 articles reviewed run the gamut of marketing topical areas and include theoretical think pieces, data driven descriptive articles, and controlled experiments. However, more than half of the articles do not offer specific managerial implications to the readership as a focus of their manuscript. Our findings lead to a number of suggestions the Editors and Editorial Review Board of *HMQ* may wish to consider:
1. Changing the quality of a journal is never easy or quick. The Co-Editors may want to communicate this accomplishment in writing to readers and potential authors in outlets such as *Cabell’s* and the Haworth® web-site. Given the repositioning that has taken place, such communication may result in additional high-quality manuscripts being submitted that will permit the annual number of articles to increase.

2. With the increase in quality, it may now be appropriate to recognize authors by instituting an award such as “Outstanding Article of the Year.”

3. Since the subject or topical areas have been so broad in this period, with few topics being treated in any depth, *HMQ* should commit to publishing a yearly special issue that highlights a single current health care marketing theme.

4. To improve greater cross-fertilization of ideas, *HMQ* may want to consider recruiting larger numbers of practitioners for their Editorial Review Board.

5. While a limited number of international authors are located in primarily English-speaking nations, *HMQ* should encourage overseas researchers to share their findings with a predominantly U.S. readership. Perhaps *HMQ* Editorial Review Board members from Europe, Asia, and Australia, could be asked to solicit greater numbers of international article submissions.

6. Finally, *HMQ* should consider requiring a “Managerial Implications” section in each article. Such a standard would require authors to answer: “So what?” The outcome is that readers, especially the practitioner audience, could more easily identify the main points and usefulness of academic *HMQ* articles.

---

**LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

As in all research, this study has limitations. First, the study only examined authors and articles published in *Health Marketing Quarterly*. Articles on health care marketing appear in other outlets and thus are not present in this study. As a result, this study does not purport to be fully comprehensive and future researchers are urged to conduct an investigation that incorporates other comparable health care marketing journals. Second, our study was not designed to gauge the impact of articles, through journal citation counting, that have appeared in *HMQ*. Hence, future researchers may want to consider the impact of *HMQ* articles on other journals. A third concern is
the numbers of potential authors that exist at specific business schools differ significantly. That is, large schools like Texas A & M may employ 20 marketing faculty, while smaller institutions exampled by Elon University contract only four marketing academicians. This infers that cited business school affiliation rankings could be a factor of size rather than productivity. While there are limitations to the current study, the authors believe the outcome provides a richer understanding of scholarship at HMQ. This research offers evidence of accomplishment for faculty members, schools, and firms and provides insight and offers suggestions that could potentially impact future editors, authors, researchers, and readers of Health Marketing Quarterly.

REFERENCES


Donelan, Karen (1996), “How Surveys Answer a Key Question: Are Consumers Satisfied with Managed Care?” Managed Care, February.


RECEIVED: 03/15/04
REVISED: 06/14/04
ACCEPTED: 06/21/04