

**AS EXPECTATIVAS E OS NÍVEIS DE SATISFAÇÃO DOS EDITORES DE  
PERIÓDICOS ACADÊMICOS EM SUAS RELAÇÕES COM UNIVERSIDADES**

**THE EXPECTATIONS AND SATISFACTION LEVELS OF ACADEMIC  
JOURNALS EDITORS IN THEIR RELATIONSHIPS WITH UNIVERSITIES**

**LAS EXPECTATIVAS Y LOS NIVELES DE SATISFACCIÓN DE EDITORES DE  
REVISTAS ACADÉMICAS EN SUS RELACIONES CON LAS UNIVERSIDADES**

---

**Emerson Wagner Mainardes**

Ph.D. in Management from University  
of Beira Interior (UBI), Covilhã/Portugal;  
Associate Professor at FUCAPE Business  
School, Vitória/ES  
emerson@fucape.br

**Contextus**

ISSNe 2178-9258

Organização: Comitê Científico Interinstitucional

Editor Científico: Marcelle Colares Oliveira

Avaliação : Double Blind Review pelo SEER/OJS

Revisão: Gramatical, normativa e de formatação

Recebido em 19/12/2014

Aceito em 17/01/2014

2ª versão aceita em 30/01/2015

**Helena Alves**

Ph.D. in Management from UBI;  
Assistant Professor in the UBI  
halves@ubi.pt

**Mario Raposo**

PhD in Management from UBI;  
Full Professor at Management and  
Economic Department at UBI  
mraposo@ubi.pt

**RESUMO**

Sob a ótica da Teoria dos Stakeholders, o objetivo deste estudo foi, inicialmente, identificar e classificar por importância as expectativas de editores de periódicos científicos indexados no ISI quanto ao seu relacionamento com as universidades. Na sequência, o objetivo foi medir os níveis de satisfação dos mesmos editores quanto ao seu relacionamento com as universidades em geral. Foram obtidas 276 respostas e os resultados demonstraram que a satisfação dos editores com as universidades provém da oferta, pelas universidades, de estruturas adequadas para pesquisa, inclusão de pesquisa científica nos currículos de graduação, encorajamento para realização e financiamento de eventos científicos na universidade, e da universidade estimular seus alunos a participarem de projetos de pesquisa.

**Palavras-chave:** Stakeholders. Teoria dos stakeholders. Universidade. Gestão universitária. Satisfação. Necessidades. Expectativas. Editores de revista acadêmica. ISI.

## ABSTRACT

From the perspective of the Stakeholder Theory, the objective of this paper was to, initially, identify and classify by importance the expectations of editors from scientific journal that are indexed in ISI about its relationship with the universities. After that, the objective was to measure the satisfaction levels of the same editors as to its relationship with universities in general. 276 answers were obtained and the results showed that the satisfaction of the editors with the universities comes from the offer, by the universities, of the adequate facilities for research, including scientific research in the degree programs, encouragement for having and funding scientific events at the university, and of the encourage by the university for their students to participate in research projects.

**Keywords:** Stakeholders. Stakeholder Theory. University. University Management. Satisfaction. Needs. Expectations. Academic Journal Editors. ISI.

## RESUMEN

Sob la perspectiva de la “Teoría de los Stakeholders”, el objetivo de este estudio fue, inicialmente, identificar y classificar por la importancia las expectativas de editores de revistas científicas indexadas en ISI sobre su relación con las universidades. Después, el objetivo fue medir los niveles de satisfacción de los mismos editores en cuanto a su relación con las universidades en general. Fueran obtenidas 276 respuestas y los resultados mostraron que la satisfacción de los editores con las universidades proviene de la oferta, por las universidades, de las instalaciones adecuadas para la investigación, incluso de la investigación científica en los programas de grado, estímulo para la entrega y financiación de eventos científicos en la universidad, y de la universidad animar a sus estudiantes a participar en proyectos de investigación.

**Palabras clave:** Stakeholders. Stakeholder Theory. Universidad. Gestión Universitaria. Satisfacción. Necesidades. Expectativas. Editores de Revistas Académicas. ISI.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The competitive context characterising the advance of the 21st century demands and expects evolution from organisations, especially those as fundamental to the destinies of states as universities (NEAVE, 2000). This organisation, one of the longest standing and most resistant organisations in society, plays an increasingly prominent role in the modern sectors of the majority of countries. Correspondingly, universities are subject to heightened pressures as they set about effectively complying with their

mission: teaching, research and rendering services to society (MEEK, 2006).

Thus, new proposals need putting forward for the running of universities (BRYDE; LEIGHTON, 2009). One of the management fields most active in mobilising research designed to overcome this shortcoming looks at relationships between stakeholders and universities, based upon Stakeholder Theory (JONGBLOED; ENDERS; SALERNO, 2008). Various authors from this theoretical field have maintained that analysing stakeholders may prove to be a key for identifying problems that could and

should be resolved (for example, FREEMAN, 1984; FROOMAN, 1999; BRYSON, 2004; FRIEDMAN; MILES, 2006), especially in situations where no individual holds total responsibility, with many participants, who either experience impacts or are partially responsible for actions undertaken (BEACH, 2008).

According to Polonsky (1995), stakeholder management involves: (1) identifying the groups relevant for organisational management, (2) ascertaining the participation and importance of each stakeholder group, (3) determining how effectively the needs and expectations of each group are being met, (4) modifying corporate policies and priorities to appropriately take into consideration stakeholder interests. For example, one applied example of Stakeholder Theory is the measurement of performance (FREEMAN; REED, 1983; MITROFF, 1983; FREEMAN, 1984; EVAN; FREEMAN, 1988; DONALDSON; PRESTON, 1995; PLENDER, 1997; WHEELER; SILLANPÄÄ, 1997; SIRGY, 2002; LAI, 2003). The corporate performance measurement approach involves verifying the extent to which all the actors influencing and influenced by the organisation have their needs and expectations met (LIMA; COSTA; FARIA, 2009).

Therefore, one key aspect to stakeholder management is ascertaining just what are the expectations and needs of an organisation (FROOMAN, 1999). For example, in the case of universities, scientific and academic communities are deemed to be important stakeholders and are often actually formally represented by their academic publication structures. Such journals and similar are fundamental to universities in as much as the research taking place is primarily communicated with a broader audience through these specific publications. However, few universities actively seek out, identify and understand the needs of this representative of the academic community stakeholder. Furthermore, modernising university management practices may indeed involve awareness as to the perceptions of this important stakeholder.

Nevertheless, the identification of stakeholder expectations and measuring their satisfaction with the relationship ongoing has not been a common research objective across the literature (LEBAS, 1995; WITTE; VAN DER WENDE; HUISMAN, 2008; VRIES, 2009). There are only rare studies dealing with such questions. In addition, such studies normally incorporate the perceptions of stakeholders in general from the perspective of university managers and not based upon the stakeholders themselves

(SAN ANTONIO; GAMAGE, 2007; JONGBLOED; ENDERS; SALERNO, 2008).

Hence, the expectations and satisfaction levels from the editor perspective (as leaders of scientific publication teams), and within the scope of Stakeholder Theory, are a factor worthy of research. Correspondingly, the objective of this study is to identify expectations and classify them by level of importance in addition to measuring the current extent of satisfaction of editors of ISI – *Institute for Scientific Information* (ISI, 2010) listed academic journals in relation to universities in general from the perspective of the editors themselves.

To undertake this study, we first provide a brief review of Stakeholder Theory and the management of university stakeholders. Subsequently, we present the research methodology applied and our analysis of the data collected. We close the article with the conclusions, recommendations and limitations of the study.

## 2 STAKEHOLDER THEORY AND UNIVERSITIES

The ideas of Freeman (1984), which together culminated in Stakeholder Theory, emerged out of an organisational context in which the company perceived that it was not self-sufficient and actually

dependent on internal and external environments made up of groups internal and external to the organisation as observed by Pfeffer and Salancik (1978). These were the groups influencing or influenced by the company that Freeman (1984) entitled stakeholders.

According to Jones and Wicks (1999) and Savage, Dunkin and Ford (2004), the core assumptions of Stakeholder Theory are:

- The organisation interacts and engages with many groups that influence or are influenced by the company, stakeholders in accordance with the Freeman (1984) terminology,
- The theory is interested in the nature of these relationships in terms of processes and results for both the company and for stakeholders,
- The interests of all legitimate stakeholders hold intrinsic value and it is assumed that no set of interests dominates all others, as pointed out by Clarkson (1995) and Donaldson and Preston (1995),
- The theory focuses upon managerial decision making,
- The theory explains how stakeholders seek to influence the organisational decision making process and align it with their own needs and priorities,

- As regards the organisations, they should aim to understand and balance the interests of interested parties.

Taking these premises into consideration, according to Clarkson (1995), Donaldson and Preston (1995), Rowley (1997), Scott and Lane (2000) and Baldwin (2002), the stakeholder management concept enables organisations to recognise, analyse and examine the characteristics of individuals and groups influencing or influenced by organisational behaviour. This management takes place across three levels: the identification of stakeholders, the development of processes recognising their needs and interests, and the building and fostering of relationships with them and all from a perspectives of best attaining the organisation's own objectives. On the other hand, stakeholders define their expectations, experience the effects of their relationship with the organisation, evaluate the results obtained and act in accordance with the outcomes of these evaluations, strengthening or otherwise their links and bonds with the company (POLONSKY, 1995; POST; PRESTON; SACHS, 2002; TOLLEY; FLECKNOE, 2003; NEVILLE; BELL; MENGÜÇ, 2005; REID, 2010).

Correspondingly, the strategic positioning of the organisation should take into consideration the internal and external environments (HALLINGER;

SNIDVONGS, 2008; MELLAT-PARAST; DIGMAN, 2008; PATHAK; PATHAK, 2010), their internal resources and competences as well as stakeholder expectations and their scope of influence (MITCHELL; AGLE; WOOD, 1997). Therefore, one of the core contributions of Stakeholder Theory is its input into the management and strategic development of organisations: changing both the nature of management decisions and the type of objectives in addition to the architecture. The results of activities focused upon stakeholders and their consequences may be approached as additional obstacles or as a potential means of boosting the level of competitiveness (TURNER *et al.*, 2002; ZIRGUTIS, 2008; JONES; RANSON, 2010).

Clarkson (1995) had already affirmed that the survival and the success of an organisation depends on the capacity and ability of its managers to generate stakeholder wealth, value and satisfaction. According to Cummings and Doh (2000), the very competitiveness of a company is based upon its ability to interact and relate with its stakeholders. They, and in their multiple roles, represent an important factor in analysis of the company's chain of value in supplying information on how organisations should allocate resources and competences when facing uncertain and turbulent environments. Preston and

Donaldson (1999) argue that stakeholder management may boost the revenue streams of an organisation and that economic gains may be generated out of positive relationships between an organisation and its stakeholders.

Conway, Mackay and Yorke (1994) highlight how higher education has multiple and simultaneously complementary and contradictory stakeholders. Hence, sometimes the different wishes and needs of these distinct stakeholders may come into conflict and render difficult strategies designed to meet their needs. Bertrand and Busugutsala (1998) maintain that universities should move beyond the identification of their stakeholders to recognise the demands and needs of each entity.

Even while a complex task, the managing university stakeholders proves to be a necessary undertaking (LAŽETIĆ, 2010; MORRISON, 2010; VIDOVIČ, CURRIE, 2011). In order to secure their role in modern, knowledge based economies, universities everywhere are under pressure to carefully reconsider and rethink their roles and their relationships with diverse actors and communities (BLACKMORE; BLACKWELL, 2006). This involves the identification of participants, classifying them in accordance with their relative importance and establishing relationships with

stakeholders, again according to their importance and respective demands. In a university (or even at the level of its constituent components), the capacity for identifying, prioritising and getting involved in communities reflects the level of organisational evolution. It may be argued that the results of this process of engagement bear important implications for the probability of the university surviving over the course of time. The careful study of these processes, the strengths driving them and their impacts on the internal workings of the university seems more than opportune and justified (JONGBLOED; ENDERS; SALERNO, 2008; CUMMINGS, 2010; DOYLE, 2010).

### **3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Population and Sample Definition**

Given the stakeholder selected for this research project was academic communities and their publications, the target sample was made up of the editors of academic journals and other such publications. Editors were chosen as they represent one of the links facilitating interaction within and beyond their respective community. They play a fundamental role in deciding (based upon the evaluations submitted by reviewers)

what is and what is not accepted for publication (PINSKI; NARIN, 1976).

Many of the more recent academic discoveries are first submitted to these editors and it is only in accordance with their decisions that the scientific world gains access to these breakthroughs. Correspondingly, we may comfortably assume that many of the needs of these academic communities are known to editors. Given the scale of difficulties in directly accessing these communities, editors serve the role of collating and conveying the broader needs and expectations.

Aware of the diversity of contemporary academic output, in practically all languages, we deployed the following guidelines so as to narrow our target sample down: (a) the journal had to be an English language publication given these generate the greatest impact on scientific communities (b) be a journal indexed by the ISI (Institute for Scientific Information) in light of the broad consensus that this entity brings together the main publications from every field of knowledge.

Consulting the Journal Citation Reports (ISI, 2010), we found a total of 6,620 ISI indexed publications covering 232 different academic fields with the last update carried out in 2008 and hence not containing publications registered in either

2009 or 2010. We then opted to contact, by e-mail, a total of one thousand publications identified as having the highest level of impact given the research objective did not involve the study of any specific scientific field. Thus, we were dealing with a disproportionately stratified sample with the strata being the academic areas displaying non-proportional publication quantities (HAIR JR. *et al.*, 2003).

Following confirmation of the responses received, 26 were excluded (due to errors in completion or incomplete) and 276 were accepted as valid for analysis. This quantity of questionnaires enabled statistical validation of the data collected with a 5.89% margin of error.

### 3.2 Data Collection Techniques

Taking into account that no previous research project had directly approached the perceptions of editors regarding the variables under analysis here (editor expectations and satisfaction levels), setting out the questionnaire required prior research of an exploratory nature so as to generate the response options to each question. Hence, we ran a set of eight interviews (via email) with ISI indexed academic publications. Following the content analysis of interview results, we reached the twenty expectations that enabled the data collection instrument to be set out.

The results obtained by the exploratory research process enabled the drafting of the questionnaire utilised in this project. This instrument is characterised by being self-applied, structured and non-disguised (HAIR JR. *et al.*, 2003). The questionnaire language was English.

At the beginning of the questionnaire, a brief description and explanation of the research objectives was provided as well as some instructions for respondents. Subsequently, we set out questions looking at each variable: academic journal editor expectations regarding universities and their satisfaction as regards these expectations. At the end, some respondent classification questions were asked.

For editor expectations, a total of twenty expectations were identified in the exploratory research results with the adoption of a Likert 5 point scale type (HAIR JR. *et al.*, 2003), according to which respondents may choose from totally disagree, partially disagree, neither disagree nor agree, partially agree, totally agree, and don't know / no answer (for when respondents either do not want to or do not know how to answer). Each expectation could be answered with only one response. However, two of the twenty expectations incorporated two facets into the same issue (expectation 2 referring to own financial resources and/or third party

financial resources, and 18, referring to launching new publications and improving those in circulation). Hence, we took the option to separate these two expectations and hence ended up with a total of twenty-two expectations. Following the respondent attributing the respective degree of agreement with each of the twenty-two expectations, there came a question on the editor's general current expectations as regards universities with six alternative answers – very low, low, average, high, very high, don't know / no answer).

Having responded to issues relating to expectations, the following question captured the editor's level of satisfaction in relation to those expectations being met. The means of measurement was the same as that in relation to the expectations and hence the respondent was questioned as to his/her level of satisfaction on each one of the twenty-two expectations. Respondents were able to choose between the following options: very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied, don't know / no answer. After evaluating the individual satisfaction level for each expectation, the respondent was asked to provide his/her overall level of general satisfaction with universities currently and provided with the same range of answers as those for measuring general editor expectations.



The final seven questions in the questionnaire sought to characterise the respondent: the editor's country of residence, the host country of the academic journal, the academic field of publication, age, gender, amount of experience in the field, and length of service as academic journal editor. The objective here was to survey responses and to detect any bias in the research respondents, for example, responses overwhelmingly from one particular academic field.

The questionnaire was finalised by pre-testing and content validation with two professor-research specialists both in university management and in research methods for this specific field. In this stage, the specialists raised doubts and indicated errors in the questionnaire content. These issues were first resolved and then validated by the specialists. Subsequently, the questionnaire was transferred into software specific to online inquiries.

### **3.3 Data Analysis Techniques**

With the data collection phase completed, work began on quantitative analysis. As regards the characterisation of respondents, descriptive analysis (scope and averages) was carried out on countries (addresses of the editor and journal head office), publication academic field, age, gender and years of either professional

academic experience or as editor. This analysis sought to find any trends in responses that might compromise the general data set.

As regards analysis of expectations and satisfaction levels, descriptive results were first obtained: the average, standard deviation, variances, among others. These results enabled the first conclusions on these two themes to be reached. Subsequently, so as to deepen the analysis, multiple linear regression was deployed.

In this research project, the dependent variables were the expectations and general satisfaction of the editors towards the university. As regards the independent variables, these were the twenty-two expectations tested and evaluated individually in terms of both expectations and satisfaction. The analytical approach adopted enabled the identification of those needs that most influence the expectations and satisfaction of editors in relation to universities.

Finally, the classification of expectation importance was completed in accordance with the Garver (2003) methodology that generated the identification of core expectations (high declared and statistically significant ranking), basic (high declared and non-statistically significant ranking), amplifiers (low declared and statistically significant

ranking) and secondary (low declared and non-statistically significant ranking).

## 4 ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

### 4.1 Sample Characterisation

The characterisation of the sample sought to identify any possible errors or bias in the responses obtained. Table 1 summarises the sample profile.

**Table 1** – Summary of respondent characteristics

| <b>Respondent Characteristics</b>                |                                    |             |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------|
| <b>Editor Country of Origin</b>                  | United States of America (USA)     | 62.32%      |
|                                                  | United Kingdom                     | 17.39%      |
|                                                  | Canada                             | 5.07%       |
|                                                  | Australia                          | 2.90%       |
|                                                  | Germany                            | 1.45%       |
|                                                  | The Netherlands                    | 1.45%       |
|                                                  | Other countries                    | 9.42%       |
| <b>Country of Publication</b>                    | United States of America (USA)     | 55.79%      |
|                                                  | United Kingdom                     | 25.36%      |
|                                                  | The Netherlands                    | 8.70%       |
|                                                  | Denmark                            | 1.45%       |
|                                                  | Other countries                    | 8.70%       |
| <b>Academic Field</b>                            | Exact Sciences                     | 14.49%      |
|                                                  | Biological and Healthcare Sciences | 39.13%      |
|                                                  | Social and Human Sciences          | 42.75%      |
|                                                  | Did Not Answer                     | 3.63%       |
| <b>Age</b>                                       | Average                            | 55.73 years |
|                                                  | Minimum                            | 28 years    |
|                                                  | Maximum                            | 85 years    |
| <b>Gender</b>                                    | Male                               | 79.71%      |
|                                                  | Female                             | 20.29%      |
| <b>Years of Experience in the Academic Field</b> | Average                            | 30.58 years |
|                                                  | Minimum                            | 3 years     |
|                                                  | Maximum                            | 65 years    |
| <b>Years of Experience as Editor</b>             | Average                            | 11.54 years |
|                                                  | Minimum                            | 1 year      |
|                                                  | Maximum                            | 50 years    |

Source: Research data

In accordance with Table 1, we find that both the editors and the academic journals themselves are in the main concentrated in the USA and the United Kingdom. Given how the English language prevails in academic journals, it comes as no surprise that so many of these publications and their respective editors are, in the majority, located in English language countries. Thus, the result comes

as no surprise particularly as a brief consultation of ISI (2010) finds the predominance of editors and academic publications from the USA, the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia. Regarding the academic field of publication, the majority of respondents are editors from fields falling within the scope of the Social and Human Sciences, especially psychology, sociology,

economics and management. Given the number of journals in this field (making up one-third of the ISI database) and, in accordance with the characteristics of this field, there was a tendency for a greater proportion of editor respondents from this area. There was also a good response rate from editors of Biological and Healthcare Sciences, with a particular emphasis on medicine related publications. Meanwhile, Exact Science editors proved to be least cooperative with only some editors responding to the questionnaire. Despite these differences between fields, there was no significant trend in the responses and hence the data collected was deemed valid.

Another finding from the respondent data was that to become editor, in the majority of cases, the individual had already advanced significantly in their careers (given the final average age of over 55), as well as vast experience as a specialist (with an average of over 30 years of service). This demonstrates that to become editor, a broad reaching mastery of a particular field is required and this needs many years spent on research (PÖSCHL, 2004). After having attained editor status, the position comes with very significant

stability given that the average number of years served as editor was greater than eleven and it would seem that academic journals would tend to keep the same editors throughout many years.

Finally, the results also drew attention to the lack of female editors as Wennerås and Wold (2001) and Zuckerman (2001) had already observed. In summary, following analysis of respondent data, the sample obtained was deemed representative of the broader universe of academic journals under study.

#### **4.2 Editor Expectations in Relation to the University**

Taking into consideration the expectations identified in the initial exploratory research, this stage aimed at confirming the editor expectations (hopes, needs, desires). To obtain this, a Likert type (HAIR JR. *et al.*, 2003) semantic differential scale was deployed with expectations returning averages of over three susceptible to confirmation as effective editor demands over which there is greater agreement than disagreement. Table 2 presents the descriptive results of analysis of expectations.

**Table 2** – Descriptive results of the twenty-two editor expectations

| Descriptive Statistics                                                 |     |             |                           |          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-------------|---------------------------|----------|
|                                                                        | No. | Average     | Standardised<br>Deviation | Variance |
| Expec_Infrastructures_for_research                                     | 276 | <b>4.48</b> | 0.928                     | 0.861    |
| Expec_Financing_own_research                                           | 276 | 3.57        | 1.199                     | 1.438    |
| Expec_Attracting_resources_for_research                                | 276 | 3.96        | 1.187                     | 1.409    |
| Expec_Building_researcher_careers                                      | 276 | <b>4.61</b> | 0.831                     | 0.690    |
| Expec_Involving_students_in_research                                   | 276 | 4.30        | 0.999                     | 0.998    |
| Expec_Curricula_include_research                                       | 276 | 4.18        | 1.032                     | 1.065    |
| Expec_Aid_in_bringing_researchers_and_financiers_together              | 276 | 3.00        | 1.092                     | 1.193    |
| Expec_Enabling_access_to_publications                                  | 276 | <b>4.55</b> | 1.066                     | 1.136    |
| Expec_Incentives_for_researcher_cooperation                            | 276 | 3.74        | 1.047                     | 1.095    |
| Expec_Suggest_research_projects_according_to_university_strategy       | 276 | 2.93        | 1.266                     | 1.603    |
| Expec_Dissemination_research_results                                   | 276 | 3.90        | 1.101                     | 1.211    |
| Expec_Incentives_for_basic_research                                    | 276 | 4.33        | 0.996                     | 0.991    |
| Expec_Recognising_research_merit                                       | 276 | 4.31        | 0.971                     | 0.943    |
| Expec_Publication_host_structure                                       | 276 | 3.55        | 1.176                     | 1.383    |
| Expec_Providing_financing_for_internal_publications                    | 276 | 2.80        | 1.162                     | 1.351    |
| Expec_Providing_time_for_profs.&researchers_contribute_to_publications | 276 | 3.30        | 1.296                     | 1.679    |
| Expec_Provide_staff_for_publication_management                         | 276 | 2.54        | 1.213                     | 1.471    |
| Expec_Non_interference_in_publications                                 | 276 | 4.17        | 1.298                     | 1.686    |
| Expec_Encourage_launch_new_publications                                | 276 | 3.07        | 1.225                     | 1.501    |
| Expec_Encourage_improvements_current_publications                      | 276 | 2.93        | 1.100                     | 1.210    |
| Expec_Encourage&finance_scientific_events                              | 276 | 4.16        | 0.996                     | 0.993    |
| Expec_Encourage&finance_participation_scientific_events                | 276 | 4.20        | 1.053                     | 1.108    |
| Expectations_General                                                   | 276 | 3.69        | 0.816                     | 0.666    |
| Valid N (listwise)                                                     | 276 |             |                           |          |

Source: Research data

Analysis of Table 2 initially finds the non-confirmation of four expectations: editors did not expect research lines to be related to the university strategy (2.93), editors did not hold expectations regarding university financing internal academic publications (2.80), they did not expect the university to supply members of staff to work exclusively on their academic publication (2.54) while editors also did not expect the university to improve the publications it currently housed (2.93). All these expectations returned averages below three meaning that the editors on average disagree with the affirmation that this is

what those undertaking their roles expect of a university.

Analysis of the first non-confirmed expectation shows how editors defend researchers enjoying freedom in the choice of their object of study (BALDRIDGE, 1983), placing the university in the position of having to adjust to the decisions of researchers, bordering on the concept of organised anarchy (WEICK, 1976).

Another non-confirmed expectation is related to university financing of academic journals. As many such publications are located in other places (publishers or professional associations), it is natural that editors are not expecting

university financing. From their perspective, the relationship with this organisation seems to be more heavily dependent on the payment universities make to gain access to academic publications. Therefore, universities actually financing their publications would come as a surprise to editors. The third expectation is interrelated given that, just as editors are not awaiting financial resources from universities, then they also do not expect the university to supply human resources for managing the journal. The editors perceive that the staff necessary to run a top level academic journal should be provided by the publication itself, by editors and/or the professional associations providing sponsorship for these publications. Hence, just as editors expect neither financing nor human resources from universities, then it makes corresponding sense that the fourth non-confirmed expectation depicts editors as also not expecting the university to contribute towards improving academic publications. Therefore, these last three non-confirmed expectations point to the distance between editors (and their academic journals) and the universities themselves, as Pöschl (2004) commented upon.

Furthermore, some of the expectations obtained high rankings from editors. Considering the averages

attributed, what editors most desire from a university is that it provides exclusive research careers (4.61), that it provides access for its researchers to academic journals in their field (4.55) and that universities supply the structures necessary for undertaking research (4.48). Given the level of the averages, these three expectations may be deemed fundamental to editors. Additionally, we should take into consideration that having exclusively dedicated researchers, providing them with opportunities for accessing the results of their peers and providing and enhancing the infrastructures attributed to engaging in research represent the foundations for a university attaining its mission as a producer of knowledge (BOK, 2003).

At a lesser level of editor attributed importance, there come: university incentives for basic research (4.33), the university recognising the merit of its researchers (4.31), the involvement of university students in internal research (4.30), enabling and facilitating researcher participation in scientific events (4.20), including research on the university's course curricula (4.18), not interfering in university hosted publications (4.17), holding scientific events at the university (4.16), the university capturing resources for research (3.96), and disseminating/raising the profile of university research outputs (3.90). These

expectations may be seen as the secondary expectations of editors and hence when the first three expectations are duly met, this latter nine are highly valued by editors. The remaining six expectations tend towards the neutral.

In general terms, editor expectations towards the university on average stood at 3.69, that is almost 74% of the maximum expectation, and thus at a relatively high level. Nevertheless, the expectations are indeed extensive with at least eighteen of the twenty two questions confirmed by editors as expectations held. Correspondingly, managing eighteen (or more) types of different expectations represents a highly challenging task and therefore requiring a management team

concentrating on the most important expectations. According to Stakeholder Theory, the organisation should focus both its efforts and resources on the truly important expectations (CLARKSON, 1995).

There is thus the need to discriminate editor expectations by the level of importance attributed. To this end, the Garver (2003) model proved appropriate given its application requires undertaking multiple linear regression. In this analysis, the general editor expectations were taken as the dependent variable and the twenty-two expectations as independent variables. The results of this regression are set out in Tables 3 and 4.

**Table 3** – Model obtained following the multiple linear regression of general editor expectations

| Model Summary <sup>b</sup> |                    |                |                         |                            |                       |          |     |     |               |
|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model                      | R                  | R <sup>2</sup> | Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics     |          |     |     |               |
|                            |                    |                |                         |                            | R <sup>2</sup> Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| Dimension 1                | 0.563 <sup>a</sup> | 0.317          | 0.297                   | 0.684                      | 0.018                 | 7.134    | 1   | 267 | 0.008         |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Expec\_Provide\_financing\_for\_internal\_publications, Expec\_Curricula\_include\_research, Expec\_Encourage\_improvements\_current\_publications, Expec\_Encourage&finance\_scientific\_events, Expec\_Finance\_own\_research, Expec\_Infrastructures\_for\_research, Expec\_Aid\_in\_bringing\_researchers\_and\_financiers\_together, Expec\_Suggest\_research\_projects\_according\_to\_university\_strategy

b. Dependent Variable: Expectations\_General\_Editors

Estimation method: stepwise

Validation Tests:

- ANOVA: significant
- Randomness Test: Randomness hypothesis accepted
- Kolmogorov-Smirnov Adherence Test: Normal distribution adherence hypothesis accepted
- Homoscedasticity Test: Homoscedasticity hypothesis accepted

Source: Research data

**Table 4** – Coefficients obtained by multiple linear regression of the general expectation

| Model                                                            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t     | Sig. | Collinearity Statistics |       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|-------------------------|-------|
|                                                                  | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |      | Tolerance               | VIF   |
| (Constant)                                                       | 2.494                       | 0.250      |                           | 9.977 | .000 |                         |       |
| Expec_Provide_financing_for_internal_publications                | 0.147                       | 0.041      | 0.210                     | 3.555 | .000 | 0.734                   | 1.361 |
| Expec_Curricula_include_research                                 | 0.203                       | 0.047      | 0.257                     | 4.355 | .000 | 0.735                   | 1.361 |
| Expec_Encourage_improvements_current_publications                | 0.173                       | 0.044      | 0.233                     | 3.923 | .000 | 0.723                   | 1.383 |
| Expec_Encourage&finance_scientific_events                        | 0.137                       | 0.049      | 0.167                     | 2.819 | .005 | 0.725                   | 1.380 |
| Expec_Finance_own_research                                       | 0.105                       | 0.039      | 0.154                     | 2.672 | .008 | 0.766                   | 1.306 |
| Expec_Infrastructures_for_research                               | 0.110                       | 0.051      | 0.125                     | 2.148 | .033 | 0.753                   | 1.327 |
| Expec_Aid_in_bringing_researchers_and_financiers_together        | 0.134                       | 0.045      | 0.179                     | 2.990 | .003 | 0.711                   | 1.406 |
| Expec_Suggest_research_projects_according_to_university_strategy | 0.099                       | 0.037      | 0.153                     | 2.671 | .008 | 0.778                   | 1.285 |

Source: Research data

Analysing Tables 3 and 4, from the outset we find that the general model is reasonable as the adjusted  $R^2$  came in at 0.297, which means that 29.7% of the dependent variable is explained by the linear combination between eight of the twenty-two variables (expectations relating to financing internal university publications, including research on university degree curricula, encouragement by the university for the continuous improvement of its publications, encouraging and financing scientific events at the university, self-financing of internal research, supplying infrastructures for carrying out research, university incentives and assistance for bringing researchers and financiers together, suggesting lines of research in keeping with university

strategies). Even while the model reasonably explained the dependent variable, this was not the objective of this analysis which instead incorporated the identification of the statistically significant variables. In this way, it proved possible to discriminate between the variables in accordance with the Garver model (2003):

- Core expectations (high declared and statistically significant ranking):
  - Supplying infrastructures suitable to carrying out research,
  - Including research on university course curricula,
  - Encouraging and financing scientific events held at the university.

- Basic expectations (high declared and non-statistically significant ranking):
    - Providing exclusive research career structures,
    - Providing researcher access to academic publications on their respective specialist areas,
    - Providing incentives for basic research,
    - Recognising researcher merit,
    - Involving students in internal research,
    - Enabling and financing researcher participation in scientific events,
    - Fostering cooperation between researchers,
    - The university attracting resources for research,
    - Disseminating/raising the profile of research,
    - Supplying structures to host scientific publications,
    - Not interfering in publications hosted.
  - Amplifier expectations (low declared ranking and statistically significant in multiple linear regression):
    - The university's own financing for internal research projects,
    - Aiding and assisting in bringing researchers and financiers together,
    - Suggesting research lines in keeping with university strategies,
    - Own financing for internal university publications,
    - The university encouraging the continuous improvement of its publications,
  - Secondary expectations (low declared ranking and non-statistically significant in multiple linear regression):
    - Providing time for researchers and/or professors to engage in academic publication management tasks,
    - Providing staff for scientific publication management,
    - Encouraging the launch of new scientific publications.
- Taking into consideration the results obtained from the Garver (2003) method, we find that the three expectations are key and unidimensional. The institutional performance in relation to these expectations, deriving from university infrastructure related issues fostering research, the incorporation of research onto course curricula, and holding



scientific events at the university, potential directly impacts on the level of editor satisfaction with a specific university. In principle, the better the institutional performance regarding the attributes, the greater the satisfaction and vice versa. These expectations correspondingly require greater attention from university managers whenever the objective is to strengthen and deepen relationships with the stakeholder represented by academic communities and their publications.

There were a total of eleven basic expectations. In general terms, a university is endowed with exclusively dedicated researchers, fosters basic research, provides researcher access to academic publications, recognises the merit of researchers, and involves students in internal research. Among other basic needs, these represent the minimum that an editor expects from a university. The expectations may thus be understood as mostly referring to incentives for research at the university. Only two of the expectations related to academic publications were deemed basic by editors: willingness to host publications and the non interference of the university in publications. We should highlight that these basic needs, when performance levels are low, cause dissatisfaction even

while excellent performance does not bring about additional satisfaction. Therefore, they represent the minimum requirements of editors.

The amplifier, or attractive, expectations totalled five of which three were not even confirmed as expectations. Such expectations do not cause dissatisfaction when the performance level is low or non-existent even while they may drive a rise in satisfaction when a good performance is encountered. Hence, editors do not expect universities themselves to finance their projects and publications, to provide incentives and assistance for researchers to reach out to potential financiers, to connect their strategies to line of research ongoing at the university or to encourage and enable their own publications to bring about continuous improvements. Where the editors do not expect any of this, universities that do perform these attributes effectively cause surprise to editors and may amplify their satisfaction with the university organisation and one means of enhancing the bond between the university and the academic scientific community and its respective publications.

Finally, there are three secondary and thereby non-important expectations. According to the editors making up this

sample, it makes little difference whether the university provides staff for running academic publications or providing time for professors and/or researchers to manage academic publications or even support for the launch of new academic publications. These attributes all proved irrelevant to responding editors.

In view of the above, we may conclude that editors nurture many expectations and pay far more attention to carrying out research within the scope of the university, which results in articles serving to maintain and build the standing of academic publications. Furthermore, the founding and maintenance of academic publications within universities is not an expectation held by editors. They consider publishers and professional associations to be better placed for this purpose and that

the most appropriate setting for academic journals is not within the university. In summary, the most important expectations to the academic and scientific publication community stakeholder revolve around the research engaged in at universities.

#### **4.3 Editor Levels of Satisfaction towards Universities**

Completing our analysis of the data collected from editors, we arrive at their measurements of their satisfaction levels on each of the twenty-two expectations generated by the qualitative research and thereby also identifying those expectations bearing the greatest influence on general editor satisfaction. The descriptive results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 – Descriptive statistics of editor satisfaction

| Descriptive Statistics                                               |     |             |                    |          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-------------|--------------------|----------|
|                                                                      | N   | Average     | Standard Deviation | Variance |
| Satis_Current_research_infrastructures                               | 276 | 3.59        | 0.875              | 0.766    |
| Satis_Finance_university_research                                    | 276 | 3.06        | 0.901              | 0.811    |
| Satis_Attract_research_resources                                     | 276 | 3.40        | 0.874              | 0.764    |
| Satis_Build_researcher_careers                                       | 276 | 3.43        | 0.918              | 0.842    |
| Satis_Involve_students_in_research                                   | 276 | <b>3.91</b> | 0.840              | 0.705    |
| Satis_Curricula_include_research                                     | 276 | 3.59        | 0.876              | 0.767    |
| Satis_Aid_in_bringing_researchers_and_financiers_together            | 276 | 3.21        | 0.848              | 0.719    |
| Satis_Enable_access_to_publications                                  | 276 | <b>4.37</b> | 0.862              | 0.743    |
| Satis_Incentive_for_researcher_cooperation                           | 276 | 3.67        | 0.830              | 0.688    |
| Satis_Suggest_research_projects_according_to_university_strategy     | 276 | 3.28        | 0.779              | 0.608    |
| Satis_Dissemination_research_results                                 | 276 | 3.37        | 0.903              | 0.816    |
| Satis_Incentives_for_basic_research                                  | 276 | 3.83        | 0.918              | 0.842    |
| Satis_Recognise_research_merit                                       | 276 | 3.84        | 0.888              | 0.789    |
| Satis_Publication_host_structure                                     | 276 | 3.39        | 0.983              | 0.966    |
| Satis_Provide_financing_for_internal_publications                    | 276 | 2.86        | 0.863              | 0.745    |
| Satis_Provide_time_for_profs.&researchers_contribute_to_publications | 276 | 3.06        | 0.909              | 0.826    |
| Satis_Provide_staff_for_publication_management                       | 276 | 2.77        | 0.936              | 0.877    |
| Satis_Non_interference_in_publications                               | 276 | <b>4.48</b> | 0.755              | 0.570    |
| Satis_Encourage_launch_new_publications                              | 276 | 3.00        | 0.578              | 0.335    |
| Satis_Encourage_improvements_current_publications                    | 276 | 3.11        | 0.690              | 0.475    |
| Satis_Encourage&finance_scientific_events                            | 276 | <b>3.92</b> | 0.810              | 0.655    |
| Satis_Encourage&finance_participation_scientific_events              | 276 | 3.74        | 0.913              | 0.834    |
| Satisfaction_General                                                 | 276 | 3.64        | 0.751              | 0.564    |
| Valid N (listwise)                                                   | 276 |             |                    |          |

Source: Research data

Analysis of Table 5 reveals that there is significant variation in satisfaction levels with some items gaining strong levels and others meeting outright dissatisfaction. In general, editor satisfaction with universities stood at 3.64, which represents a reasonable level of satisfaction even if below the general level of expectation (3.69). Thus, universities are meeting a part of editor expectations even though others go unattended with this causing the dissatisfaction.

Among the expectations awarded high levels of satisfaction, the highest single ranking was awarded to the non-interference of universities in publications

run inside the institution (average of 4.48).

We may thus conclude that autonomy, highly relevant from the point of view of editors (MARGINSON; CONSIDINE, 2000), has been a strong point in universities. This autonomy ensures editors do not experience pressure to align with university interests. Another expectation that was broadly met was universities providing access to academic publications for researchers (average of 4.37). As such access incurs costs, and very often high costs, there clearly is a risk of universities not investing in researcher access to academic publications available worldwide (PÖSCHL, 2004). However, from the

perspective of editors, this has not happened and, on the contrary, universities, very often in partnership with governments (PÖSCHL, 2004), seem to have prioritised making available the latest in academic and scientific output. It should be noted that much of the financing behind academic publications derives from the payments made by universities so as to access their published content. Correspondingly, given this high level of editor satisfaction, it would seem as though universities have been investing in payment for such access.

In addition to these two cases, a further two stand out given their closeness to full satisfaction: the involvement of students in university research, and holding academic events at the university. As regards student involvement, this may be perceived as an important indicator. To editors, getting students involved in research has proven another step forward in university progress. As editors considered universities in general, it is feasible that they looked at their own localised reality or those circumstances known to them. In this way, one means of analysing student participation in university academic research is evaluating the reality prevailing in the respective editor's country of residence (see Table 1), after all, editors came out almost fully satisfied with the current involvement of

university students in research projects. Such involvement is particularly to the fore in universities almost entirely focused upon research, as Altbach (2009) pointed out.

Another expectation achieving a good level of satisfaction was holding academic and scientific events at universities. The editors found that universities had paid attention to staging such types of events as a means of training their researchers to interact with others in their respective fields and, simultaneously, as a means of promoting the university within academic environments. These improvements to the institutional image may be reflected in its results, whether in terms of attracting and retaining students or in an ability to attract greater resource levels into the university (ROWLEY, 2003).

As regards the expectations generating levels of dissatisfaction, two were particularly emphatic: university financing of academic publications and the supply of university staff for managing and running internal academic journals. Despite the dissatisfaction of editors, this finding was foreseeable (the absence or lack of financing) in keeping with how the shortage of resources has represented a characteristic of universities throughout recent years (ROSA; AMARAL, 2007). Thus, it would be expected that universities

would limit and cut back on financial resources allocated to academic journals and naturally to the dissatisfaction of their editors. This attribute is related with another factor driving feelings of dissatisfaction, the supply of university staff for managing internal academic publications. It is all but obvious that should a university pull back on the financial resources supplied to academic publications, such restrictions would also be extended to the staff available at the aforementioned publication. This leads to more work for the editor (and normally non-remunerated) and greater effort on behalf of all involved. Correspondingly, a reduction in the resources available to the management of academic journals hosted at universities generates the open and declared dissatisfaction of editors and perhaps goes some way to explaining the reasoning behind editors concluding that academic journals should remain beyond the scope of universities.

As regards the remaining expectations and needs, we find that they range from neutral through to satisfaction

and swing between these two points in accordance with the average obtained. Thus, should we consider the total of twenty-two expectations, and given that these return varying levels of satisfaction, simultaneously managing every facet represents a highly challenging task. Correspondingly, there is the need to discriminate between which really are important to the general satisfaction of editors.

In such situations, multiple linear regression, as already demonstrated, is the most highly recommended analytical approach given its ability to highlight those attributes most greatly influencing general editor satisfaction. Hence, the following analysis was carried out in order to identify the attributes that most strongly impact on editor levels of satisfaction. Therefore, the variable dependent was the general level of editor satisfaction and the satisfaction expressed towards each of the twenty-two expectations tested represented the independent variables. Tables 6 and 7 feature the results of this analysis.

**Table 6 – Multiple linear regression model for general editor satisfaction**

| <b>Model Summary<sup>b</sup></b> |                    |                |                         |                            |                   |          |     |     |               |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model                            | R                  | R <sup>2</sup> | Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics |          |     |     |               |
|                                  |                    |                |                         |                            | R Square Change   | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| Dimension 1                      | 0.788 <sup>a</sup> | 0.621          | 0.611                   | 0.468                      | 0.006             | 4.365    | 1   | 268 | 0.038         |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Satis\_Current\_research\_infrastructures, Satis\_Aid\_in\_bringing\_researchers\_and\_financiers\_together, Satis\_Encourage\_launch\_new\_publications, Satis\_Encourage&finance\_scientific\_events, Satis\_Provide\_time\_for\_profs.&researchers\_contribute\_to\_publications, Satis\_Involve\_students\_in\_research, Satis\_Suggest\_research\_projects\_according\_to\_university\_strategy

b. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction\_General\_Editors

Estimation Method: stepwise

Validation Tests:

- ANOVA: significant
- Randomness Test: Randomness hypothesis accepted
- Kolmogorov-Smirnov Adherence Test: Normal distribution adherence hypothesis accepted
- Homoscedasticity Test: Homoscedasticity hypothesis accepted

Source: Research data

**Table 7 – Coefficients obtained from multiple linear regression of general satisfaction**

| Model                                                                | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. | Collinearity Statistics |       |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|-------------------------|-------|
|                                                                      | B                           | Std. Error |                           |        |      | Tolerance               | VIF   |
| (Constant)                                                           | 0.753                       | 0.207      |                           | 3.630  | .000 |                         |       |
| Satis_Current_research_infrastructures                               | 0.448                       | 0.039      | 0.521                     | 11.354 | .000 | 0.670                   | 1.492 |
| Satis_Aid_in_bringing_researchers_and_financiers_together            | 0.145                       | 0.041      | 0.164                     | 3.508  | .001 | 0.646                   | 1.548 |
| Satis_Encourage_launch_new_publications                              | -0.234                      | 0.055      | -0.180                    | -4.266 | .000 | 0.790                   | 1.265 |
| Satis_Encourage&finance_scientific_events                            | 0.131                       | 0.042      | 0.141                     | 3.122  | .002 | 0.689                   | 1.451 |
| Satis_Provide_time_for_profs.&researchers_contribute_to_publications | 0.097                       | 0.033      | 0.118                     | 2.929  | .004 | 0.873                   | 1.146 |
| Satis_Involve_students_in_research                                   | 0.106                       | 0.039      | 0.118                     | 2.740  | .007 | 0.762                   | 1.312 |
| Satis_Suggest_research_projects_according_to_university_strategy     | 0.090                       | 0.043      | 0.093                     | 2.089  | .038 | 0.708                   | 1.413 |

Source: Research data

According to the results set out in Table 6 we find an appropriate level of model adjustment in accordance with the adjusted R<sup>2</sup> result of 0.611, meaning that 61.1% of general editor satisfaction may be explained by the linear combination of seven of the twenty-two expectations tested. Hence, these seven expectations

proved of especial importance to overall general editor satisfaction.

Analysing each item individually (Table 7), attention is drawn to the infrastructures that universities provide to researchers for their endeavors. This expectation attained the greatest factor of influence (greater than coefficient B) and

made the greatest single contribution towards general editor satisfaction. Taking into consideration the measurements collected, we find that current university research infrastructures returned reasonable levels of editor satisfaction (average 3.59). Hence, on average, universities still need to attain better standards in research structures so as to meet the academic and publication community stakeholder expectations from the perspective of editors at leading journals, a factor also detected by Altbach (2009). From the result obtained, we are able to confirm this is a key dimension to generating stakeholder satisfaction.

Another representative expectation was the encouragement provided by the university to its teaching and/or research staff to launch new publications. Nevertheless, in this case the result was negative. Therefore, however much the university advocates and backs the launching of new publications, editors will remain ever less satisfied. This result would seem to be justified by an excess of competition. Should there not be many academic journals focused upon a particular area, research results tend to be concentrated in existing publications and thereby boosting their prestige. Where there are many publications, mutual competition may impact on the worth of published content across an entire

academic field, a factor clearly not to the liking of editors. This would appear as the most logical explanation for the result obtained and also discussed by Pöschl (2004), whose research studied the impact of open access publications on the academic environment. It should be emphasised that the editor satisfaction level on this aspect is currently neutral (average 3.00) and therefore not impacting on current editor satisfaction levels. Furthermore, as originally this expectation appeared neutral, it needs to be repositioned as an amplifier operating in reverse. Hence, the lack of university encouragement for new journals and publications (enhancing the importance of those currently existing) might come to the surprise of editors.

At a secondary level of impact, we may point to the efforts the university makes to bring researchers and financiers together alongside the encouragement and financing of academic and scientific events at the university. The first attribute, with a general average of 3.21, deserves greater attention from universities as it represents a factor of amplification and may positively surprise editors, and consequently the entire academic community, as Morley (2003) affirmed. Meanwhile, the second attribute (general average of 3.92) serves to meet editor expectations. As this is a key attribute,

continuity in the means of implementation by universities in general (as regards this specific aspect) emerges as the most coherent approach.

The three final expectations relate to the involvement of students in university research (a basic attribute given its general average of 3.91), the university providing time to professors and/or researchers to run academic journals (a secondary attribute with a general average of 3.06, which might be re-qualified as an amplifier), and the university aligning internal research with university strategies (an amplifying attribute with a general average of 3.28). All these facets significantly influence the general satisfaction of editors and are worthy of attention from university managers. Mention should be made of current student involvement in university research projects that has practically complied with editor expectations and is an ongoing trend, especially at research focused higher education establishments (WOLFF, 1999; ALTBACH, 2009). The other two expectations are broadly neutral.

Finally, analysis of editor satisfaction levels also provided insight into which expectations influence those levels. It is important to recall that satisfaction is related to expectations. In order to confirm this, the Pearson test was applied to confirm the correlation between general expectations and general

satisfaction. This returns a correlation, significant at 0.01, with the correlation index established at 0.507. Therefore, where university managers acted within the scope of editor expectations, this impacted on the latter's satisfaction and who then communicated their positive impressions to the broader academic community, resulting in a better image for universities acting in this way (ROWLEY, 2003). Correspondingly, this once again confirms the needs for universities to strengthen their bonds with one of their most important stakeholders, academic and scientific communities and their respective journals and publications.

## **5 RESEARCH CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LIMITATIONS**

Taking into consideration that the objectives of this research project were the identification and qualification by level of importance of the expectations of ISI indexed academic journal editors in conjunction with measuring their satisfaction in relation to these expectations, the clearest conclusion at the end of this study is that universities in general terms remain distant from this important stakeholder.

Developing stakeholder relationships first involves understanding the expectations (wishes, needs and



desires) of each entity (CLEMENT, 2005). In this case, the objective centred on grasping the expectations of a specific stakeholder, the academic and publication community, with the editors of ISI indexed journals the actors selected to represent this important university stakeholder.

Firstly, we identified the expectations (through initial exploratory research) before then seeking to confirm these findings. The first stage in analytical processing found that four expectations were not confirmed (the connection between university research and its overall strategy, university financing for internal publications and supplying staff for running and managing internal publications, and university encouragement for the continuous improvement of publications). These four expectations, following regression analysis, were classified either as amplifiers (3 cases) or as secondary (1 case), results that proved coherent as amplifier expectations surprise (the stakeholder does not expect them to exist) and with secondary expectations not holding any importance in the stakeholder's perspective.

Meanwhile, the highest rankings revealed only key (university research infrastructures) and basic (the university providing exclusive research careers and opening up access to scientific

publications) demands. The method of Garver (2003) found that declared expectations with high rankings result from key and basic expectations with the remainder returning high rankings deemed basic (seven in total) and key (two in total). The quantity of key and basic expectations reflects in the general rankings attributed by respondents and hence, general editor expectations towards universities are fairly high.

As descriptive analysis did not prove sufficient to discriminate between editor expectations by level of importance, we made recourse to multiple linear regression. Of the twenty-two expectations tested, three proved to be key, with eleven corresponding to the basic category. This means that fourteen expectations (a majority) are fundamental to editor satisfaction with the university. A closer look at these fourteen expectation found that editors place great value on the attention universities award researchers with a significant part of these fourteen expectations connected to the research taking place within the university, as also put forward by Altbach (2009). Meanwhile, the expectations classified as amplifiers may come as a surprise to editors and in such cases relate more to the existence of academic journals within the university environment and strongly supported by the organisation. Hence, the

editor expects research to take place but seeing universities actually dedicating themselves to academic journals would represent a rather surprising feature within the prevailing higher education context.

In addition to capturing editor expectations, we also sought to measure current levels of satisfaction, as charting the current reality might generate important contributions for future organisational actions (CLARKSON, 1995). In general terms, editor satisfaction levels with the university are fairly good even while lower than general expectations. This demonstrates that some expectations are causing either outright dissatisfaction or low levels of satisfaction, which impacts on the overall editor level of satisfaction.

Following descriptive analysis of the satisfaction measurements for each expectation, we found that editors value the scope of autonomy and independence currently enjoyed by journals hosted by universities as well as being satisfied by the level of access to academic outputs provided by the university to its researchers. It is important to recall that both of these expectations are basic and exactly what editors expect of universities. They also demonstrate the good level of satisfaction attained by these two core expectations: student involvement in internal research and holding scientific

events, which result in an improvement of the university's own image (ROWLEY, 2003). The factors raising dissatisfaction generally revolve around two expectations, one amplifier (university financing for academic journals) and another secondary (supplying staff to work on internal scientific publications). Nevertheless, in both cases, editors did not expect anything different, after all, they made clear their preference for hosting such journals and publications beyond the scope of universities as such organisations either cannot or do not supply the resources needed for publishing

The regression analysis served to identify that of the three key expectations, two were directly confirmed (university research infrastructures, and hosting scientific events) with the remainder indirectly confirmed (involving students in research may mean the inclusion of research on degree curricula). Furthermore, one originally secondary expectation (the university launching new academic publications) proved to be a negative amplifier and thus its existence actually drives dissatisfaction. This result suggests that editors are not receptive to competing publications (PÖSCHL, 2004).

Furthermore, of the two amplifiers (linkage between the university's strategies and research lines, and university efforts to bring researchers and financiers together)

would seem to come as a surprise to currently serving editors and significantly influence their satisfaction. Current efforts by university organisations may broadly be perceived as pleasing the editors. Finally, as a result of this analytical process, we reached a final classification of expectations, which contained only one secondary expectation and thus all other expectations do, one way or another, impact on editor satisfaction.

In summary, the classification proposed here, in accordance with the current state of editor perceptions, may guide the actions of university managers as applying the appropriate attention and resources to editor expectations might result in an improved relationship between the parties, influencing the overall output and results of universities. Undoubtedly, this represents the main contribution of this research project. In taking into account just what the editors of leading academic journals (ISI indexed) expect, these perceptions may be extended to the broader academic community as a whole. After all, this actor is highly significant to these communities. Correspondingly, one of the recommendations emerging out of this study is that the same research should be applied to other actors of relevance to academic communities such as, and for example, heads of research offices and coordinators of research centres, among

others. Only through comparing these actors shall we be in a position to make more definitive conclusions about what academic communities and their respective outputs expect of universities in general terms.

In addition to advancing the managerial performance of universities, there is another contribution in the academic field. As already mentioned, there are few studies seeking to qualify and quantify the perceptions of academic journal editors despite the importance of this stakeholder. This actor has not been subject to frequent study and many of the findings described here demonstrate originality and have never before been studied. Continuity in studies seeking to understand the expectations of the academic journal community stakeholder may contribute towards building this new model, of major relevance to contemporary university organisations.

Finally, as limitations to the study undertaken, the main case was undoubtedly the difficulty encountered in obtaining responses from editors. Hence, one recommendation for future researchers would be to test out innovative forms of data collection thereby avoiding obstacles in obtaining the level of detail necessary for the study.

Another limitation to be taken into consideration is the fact that editors seem

to be only one of the actors participating in academic journal communities. In order to expand our understanding of the reality subject to analysis, other actors should be surveyed with the results brought together so as to provide a more complete description.

A third limitation lies in discriminating between the expectations. As many are fairly similar in nature, with small details differentiating them in practice, knowing how to break them down proved difficult and this proximity required greater attention in analyses. In this case, we would recommend deepening the qualitative research (more interviews with greater response depth), so as to be able to better discriminate between editor responses.

In summary, this research project strove to deepen our knowledge on one university stakeholder in order to focus university actions with the purpose of meeting the expectations of this stakeholder and which may bring about an enhanced university performance.

## REFERENCES

ALTBACH, P. Peripheries and centers: research universities in developing countries. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, v. 10, n. 1, p.15-27, 2009.

BALDRIDGE, J. Organizational characteristics of colleges and universities. In J. Baldrige, T. Deal (Eds.). *The dynamics of organizational change in education*, 2. ed. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing, p. 43-66, 1983.

BALDWIN, L. *Total quality management in higher education: the implications of internal and external stakeholders perceptions*. PhD Thesis, Graduate School in Business Administration, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, USA, 2002.

BEACH, S. Sustainability of network governance: stakeholder influence. In: K. Brown, M. Mandell, C. Furneaux, S. Beach, S. (Eds.). *Proceedings Contemporary Issues in Public Management: The Twelfth Annual Conference of the International Research Society for Public Management (IRSPM XII)*, Brisbane, Australia, p. 1-23, 2008.

BERTRAND, D., BUSUGUTSALA, G. Organisation of first-cycle teaching at university: models and issues. *Higher Education Management*, v. 10, n. 3, p. 109-136, 1998.

BLACKMORE, P., BLACKWELL, R. Strategic leadership in academic development. *Studies in Higher Education*, v. 31, n. 3, p. 373-387, 2006.

BOK, D. *Universities in the marketplace: the commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2003.

BRYDE, D.; LEIGHTON, D. Improving HEI productivity and performance through project management, *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, v. 37, n. 5, p. 705-721, 2009.

BRYSON, J. What to do when stakeholders matter? *Public Management Review*, v. 6, n. 1, 21-53, 2004.

- CLARKSON, M. A stakeholder framework for analysing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review*, v. 20, n. 1, p. 92-117, 1995.
- CLEMENT, R. The lessons from stakeholder theory for U.S. business leaders. *Business Horizons*, v. 48, n.1, p. 255-264, 2005.
- CONWAY, T.; MACKAY, S.; YORKE, D. Strategic planning in higher education: who are the customers? *International Journal of Educational Management*, v. 8, n. 6, p. 29-36, 1994.
- CUMMINGS, J. Contextualised performance: reframing the skills debate in research education. *Studies in Higher Education*, v. 35, n. 4, p. 405-419, 2010.
- CUMMINGS, J.; DOH, J. Identifying who matter: mapping key players in multiple environments. *California Management Review*, v. 42, n. 2, p. 83-104, 2000.
- DONALDSON, T.; PRESTON, L. The stakeholder theory of the corporation: concepts, evidence and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, v. 20, n. 1, p. 65-91, 1995.
- DOYLE, L. The Role of Universities in the 'Cultural Health' of their Regions: universities' and regions' understandings of cultural engagement. *European Journal of Education*, v. 45, n. 3, p. 466-480, 2010.
- EVAN, W.; FREEMAN, R. A stakeholder theory of the modern corporation: Kantian capitalism. In T. Beauchamp, N. Bowie (Eds.). *Ethical theory and business*, 2 ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, p. 75-84, 1988.
- FREEMAN, R. *Strategic management: a stakeholders approach*. Boston: Pitman, 1984.
- FREEMAN, R.; REED, D. Stockholders and stakeholders: a new perspective on corporate governance. *California Management Review*, v. 25, n. 3, p. 93-104, 1983.
- FRIEDMAN, A.; MILES, S. *Stakeholders: theory and practice*. Oxford: Oxford University press, 2006.
- FROOMAN, J. Stakeholders influence strategies. *Academy of Management Review*, v. 24, n. 2, p. 191-205, 1999.
- GARVER, M. Best practices in identifying customer-driven improvement opportunities. *Industrial Marketing Management*, v. 32, n. 1, p. 455-466, 2003.
- HAIR JR., J.; BABIN, B.; MONEY, A.; SAMOUEL, P.. *Essentials of business research methods*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, 2003.
- HALLINGER, P.; SNIDVONGS, K. Educating leaders: Is there anything to learn from business management? *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, v. 36, n. 1, p.9-31, 2008.
- ISI - Institute for Scientific Information, Journal Citation Reports. Available at: <http://admin-apps.isiknowledge.com/JCR/JCR?SID=U19@gJlC5mgGCOCI5IG>. Accessed: 10 abr. 2010.
- JONES, J.; RANSON, S. Reconfiguring the governance of schools in England. *Management in Education*, v. 24, n.1, p. 7-13, 2010.
- JONES, T.; WICKS, A. Convergent stakeholder theory. *Academy of Management Review*, v. 24, n. 2, p. 206-221, 1999.
- JONGBLOED, B.; ENDERS, J.; SALERNO, C. Higher education and its communities: interconnections, interdependencies and research agenda.

*Higher Education*, v. 56, n. 1, p. 303-324, 2008.

LAI, K. Market orientation in quality-oriented organizations and its impact on their performance. *International Journal of Production Economics*, v. 84, n. 1, p. 17-34, 2003.

LAŽETIĆ, P. Managing the Bologna Process at the European Level: institution and actor dynamics. *European Journal of Education*, v. 45, n. 4, p. 549-562, 2010.

LEBAS, M. Performance measurement and performance management. *International Journal of Production Economics*, v. 41, n.1-3, p. 23-35, 1995.

LIMA, E.; COSTA, S.; FARIA, A. Taking operations strategy into practice: developing a process for defining priorities and performance measures. *International Journal of Production Economics*, v. 122, n. 1, p. 403-418, 2009.

MARGINSON, S.; CONSIDINE, M. *The enterprise university: power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

MEEK, L. The changing landscape of higher education research policy in Australia. In: L. Meek, C. Suwanwela (Eds.). *Higher education, research, and knowledge in the Asia-Pacific region*, p. 65-90. New York: Macmillan.

MELLAT-PARAST, M.; DIGMAN, L. Learning: the interface of quality management and strategic alliances. *International Journal of Production Economics*, v. 114, n. 2, p. 820-829, 2008.

MITCHELL, R.; AGLE, B.; WOOD, D. Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review*, v. 22, n. 4, p. 853-858, 1997.

MITROFF, I. *Stakeholders of the organization mind*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

MORLEY, L. *Quality and power in higher education*. Philadelphia: SRHE and Open University Press, 2003.

MORRISON, K. Complexity theory, school leadership and management: Questions for theory and practice, *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, v. 38, n. 3, p. 374-393, 2010.

NEAVE, G. *The universities' responsibilities to society*. Oxford: Pergamon, 2000.

NEVILLE, B.; BELL, S.; MENGÜÇ, B. Corporate reputation, stakeholders and the social performance-financial performance relationship. *European Journal of Marketing*, v. 39, n. 9-10, p. 1184-1198, 2005.

PATHAK, V.; PATHAK, K. Reconfiguring the higher education value chain. *Management in Education*, v. 24, n. 4, p. 166-171, 2010.

PFEFFER, J.; SALANCIK, G. *The external control of organizations: a resource dependence perspective*. New York: Harper and Row, 1978.

PINSKI, G.; NARIN, F. Citation influence for journal aggregates of scientific publications: theory, with application to the literature of physics. *Information Processing and Management*, v. 12, n. 5, p. 297-312, 1976.

PLENDER, J. *A stake in the future: the stakeholding solution*. London: Nicholas Brealey, 1997.

POLONSKY, M. A stakeholder theory approach to designing environmental marketing strategy. *The Journal of*

*Business & Industrial Marketing*, v. 10, n. 3, p. 29-37, 1995.

PÖSCHL, U. Interactive journal concept for improved scientific publishing and quality assurance. *Learned Publishing*, v. 17, n. 1, p. 105-113, 2004.

POST, J.; PRESTON, L.; SACHS, S. Managing the extended enterprise: the new stakeholder view. *California Management Review*, v. 45, n. 1, p. 6-28, 2002.

PRESTON, L.; DONALDSON, T. Stakeholder management and organizational wealth. *Academy of Management Review*, v. 24, n. 4, p. 619-620, 1999.

REID, K. Management of school attendance in the UK: A strategic analysis, *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, v. 38, n. 1, p. 88-106, 2010.

ROSA, M.; AMARAL, A. A self-assessment of higher education institutions from the perspective of the EFQM excellence model. In: D. Westerheijden, B. Stensaker, M. Rosa (Eds.). *Quality assurance in higher education: trends in regulation, translation and transformation*. Dordrecht: Springer, p. 181-207, 2007.

ROWLEY, J. Retention: rhetoric or realistic agendas for the future of higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, v. 17, n. 6, p. 248-253, 2003.

ROWLEY, T. Moving beyond dyadic ties: a network theory of stakeholder influences. *Academy of Management Review*, v. 22, n. 4, p. 887-910, 1997.

SAN ANTONIO, D.; GAMAGE, D. Building trust among educational stakeholders through Participatory School Administration, Leadership and Management. *Management in Education*, v. 21, n. 1, p. 15-22, 2007.

SAVAGE, G.; DUNKIN, J.; FORD, D. Responding to a crisis: a stakeholder analysis of community health organizations. *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration*, v. 6, n. 4, p. 383-414, 2004.

SCOTT, S.; LANE, V. A stakeholder approach to organizational identity. *Academy of Management Review*, v. 25, n. 1, p. 43-62, 2000.

SIRGY, M. Measuring corporate performance by building on the stakeholders model of business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, v. 35, n. 3, p. 143-162, 2002.

TOLLEY, J.; FLECKNOE, M. Evaluation of an 'Excellence Cluster' of schools. *Management in Education*, v. 17, n. 4, p. 10-13, 2003.

TURNER, T.; MENDIBIL, K.; BITITCI, U.; DAISLEY, P.; BREEN, T. Improving the reliability of the customer order fulfilment process in a product identification company. *International Journal of Production Economics*, v. 78, n. 1, p. 99-107, 2002.

VIDOVICH, L.; CURRIE, J. Governance and trust in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, v. 36, n. 1, p. 43-56, 2011.

VRIES, J. Assessing inventory projects from a stakeholder perspective: results of an empirical study. *International Journal of Production Economics*, v. 118, n. 1, p. 136-145, 2009.

WEICK, K. Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, v. 21, p. 1-19, 1976.

WENNERÁS, C.; WOLD, A. Nepotism and sexism in peer-review. In: M. Wyer, D. Giesman, M. Barbercheck, H. Ozturk, M. Wayne (Eds.). *Women, science and*

*technology: a reader in feminist science studies*, London: Routledge, p. 46-52, 2001.

WHEELER, D.; SILLANPÄÄ, M.  
Including the stakeholders: the business case. *Long Range Planning*, v. 31, n. 2, p. 201-210, 1998.

WITTE, J.; VAN DER WENDE, M.;  
HUISMAN, J. Blurring boundaries: how the Bologna process changes the relationship between university and non-university higher education in Germany, the Netherlands and France. *Studies in Higher Education*, v. 33, n. 3, p. 217-231, 2008.

WOLFF, R. *The ideal of the university*. 3 ed. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 1999.

ZIRGUTIS, V. Organization management assessing stakeholder influence. *Research Papers*, v. 15, n. 4, p. 1-7, 2008.

ZUCKERMAN, H. The careers of men and women scientists: gender differences in career attainments. In: M. Wyer, D. Giesman, M. Barbercheck, H. Ozturk, M. Wayne (Eds.). *Women, science and technology: a reader in feminist science studies*. London: Routledge, p. 69-78, 2001.