

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Library Faculty & Staff Publications

Libraries

January 2008

Vital Business Educators Perceptions about the Usefulness of Business Education Periodicals

James C. Scott
Utah State University

Carol Blaszczynski
California State University Los Angeles

Diana J. Green
Weber State University

Britt A. Fagerheim
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/lib_pubs

 Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Scott, James C.; Blaszczynski, Carol; Green, Diana J.; and Fagerheim, Britt A., "Vital Business Educators Perceptions about the Usefulness of Business Education Periodicals" (2008). *Library Faculty & Staff Publications*. Paper 81.

https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/lib_pubs/81

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Libraries at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Faculty & Staff Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



Vital Business Educators' Perceptions about the Usefulness of Business Education Periodicals: Making the Relevant Literature More Accessible

James Calvert Scott, Carol Blaszczynski, Diana J. Green and Britt Anna Fegerheim

Abstract

Problem: The business education literature isn't accessible. **Research Questions:** Which business education periodicals do vital business educators perceive to be more useful? In which databases and/or indices are they found? How much literature is fugitive? What strategies might increase literature accessibility? **Research Method:** Depth technique. **Data Collection Procedures:** A survey was distributed to 25 vital business educators. **Results:** The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal and the NABTE Review were rated as essential to the profession; nine periodicals were rated as very useful; and six periodicals were rated as useful. Eleven databases and indices were identified as potentially useful. **Conclusions:** Approximately 37% of the studied periodicals are fugitive, confirming literature inaccessibility. **Recommendations:** Strategies to increase the accessibility of the business education literature include libraries carefully selecting complementary databases, getting periodicals indexed, placing periodical tables of contents on the web, improving fugitive-literature retrieval skills, and developing an electronic business education database.

Introduction

THE BUSINESS EDUCATION LITERATURE, the lifeblood of the profession, is no longer readily accessible. As Blaszczynski and Scott (2003a) observed, With the demise of *The Business Education Index*, a serious problem in accessing the business education literature has been created (p. 23). Even using a series of electronic databases will not retrieve many pieces of relevant business education literature, suggesting that a significant portion of business education literature is fugitive literature, literature that exists although most business educators do not know that it exists or how to go about retrieving it (J. C. Scott, personal communication, August 16, 2005). The challenge facing business educators is to make more of their literature known and accessible than it is currently.

Literature Review

Blaszczynski (2001) found that prolific business education researchers use the literature extensively. Often they turn to online electronic sources to replace print-based sources and indices. However, Miller (1997) pointed out a widespread myth in both academe and society at large: All

DR. JAMES CALVERT SCOTT is a professor emeritus at Utah State University.

DR. CAROL BLASZCZYNSKI is a professor in the Department of Information Systems at California State University, Los Angeles, CA 90032.

DR. DIANA J. GREEN is a professor in the Department of Telecommunications & Business Education at Weber State University, Ogden, UT, 84408.

MS. BRITT ANNA FAGERHEIM is a Business Reference Librarian, Utah State University, 3000 Old Main Hill, Logan, UT 84322-3000.

Acknowledgment

The authors gratefully acknowledge the funding of the reported research by The Delta Pi Epsilon Research Foundation, Inc.

information is now available electronically (p. A44).

The business education literature is not comprehensively covered in major electronic databases (Blaszczynski & Scott, 2003a; Blaszczynski & Scott, 2003b), creating a major problem for business educators who are relying on databases without fully understanding their shortcomings, including limited coverage of business education periodicals. According to Anderson and Perez-Carballo (2005),

Ever since humankind learned how to record messages on portable long-lasting media clay tablets, papyrus, much later paper and more recently various electronic media we have devised ways to describe and organize these messages so that they could be found, used and enjoyed later on. (p. 7).

However, for some disciplines, including business education (Blaszczynski & Scott, 2003a; Blaszczynski & Scott 2003b), technical and professional communication (Smith, 1996), and others, the coverage of the discipline in electronic databases is woefully incomplete and inadequate. Mann (1993) observed.

If a system makes only some sources easily available especially if those sources are very superficial or of poor quality then it can do real damage to the quality of research, for it will encourage users simply to make do with whatever resources are readily retrievable within it, regardless of their quality or completeness. (p. 92)

Blaszczynski and Scott (2003a) found, among other things, that "no database or index provides anything approximating full coverage of the 18 business education-related periodicals in which the studied authors had disseminated their business education-related research and writing between 1999 and 2001" (p. 23). About one third of the business education periodicals in their study were not accessible in any of the representative databases that were searched. Blaszczynski and Scott recommended that the coverage of business education literature in online databases be monitored because the future of the discipline is in jeopardy when its relevant literature is not widely accessible.

In another study Blaszczynski and Scott (2003b) concluded that building a credible literature review using electronic databases has become problematic. The inability to consult *The Business Education Index* as a research launching point combined with the lack of accuracy and scope of electronic databases serve to diminish the reliability of electronic-based literature reviews. (p. 1)

Researchers in many disciplines examine the perceptions of the quality of their periodicals. For example, Lowensohn and Samelson (2006) surveyed accounting faculty about their perceptions of the quality of accounting journals. They found, among other things, that the researching and publishing efforts of accounting scholars have become more specialized in recent years.

Over the last 20 years, several studies have been conducted that involved periodicals and their relative position in the business education literature. For example, Wayne, Clark, and Betley (1987) ranked schools with business education programs based on the number of faculty publications

appearing in four prominent business education periodicals: the *Business Education Forum*, *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, the *Journal of Education for Business*, and the *NABTE Review*.

Dufrene, Shane-Joyce, and Zimmer (1990) explored the perceptions of 171 business education/office systems department heads/chairs from AACSB-accredited institutions regarding 72 periodicals from the office administration/systems, business communication, and business education fields. The four journals with the highest recognition and rating factors in descending order were *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, the *NABTE Review*, the *Business Education Forum*, and the *Journal of Business Communication*. The *Journal of Education for Business* was in fifth position. About half of the investigated journals had low recognition and rating factors because the respondents were unfamiliar with those periodicals. In contrast, Blair and Balachandran (2002) found that when 51 NABTE representatives evaluated 43 business education periodicals, the journals with the highest ratings in descending order were *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal* and the *NABTE Review* (tie), the *Journal of Business Communication*, the *Journal of Vocational Education Research*, and the *NBEA Yearbooks* and the *Journal of Computer Information Systems* (tie). About half of the investigated periodicals were either not rated or marked as Unsure, suggesting respondents unfamiliarity with those periodicals.

Thus, the related literature suggests that although business educators are increasingly using electronic databases for retrieving business education literature, those databases are in fact incomplete and inadequate for accessing business education literature and that perceptions of business education periodicals vary considerably depending on who is evaluating those periodicals.

Research Purpose, Need, and Questions

The purpose of the research study was to determine the relative usefulness of business education periodicals so that strategies can be developed for making at least the more useful business education periodicals widely accessible to business educators. The reported study was conducted in direct response to an urgent need expressed by the Delta Pi Epsilon Publications Committee in its Request for Proposals, (n.d.) to diminish the proportion of the business education literature that is fugitive and not accessible by most business educators. The following research questions guided the investigation:

1. Which business education periodicals do vital business educators perceive to be the more useful ones as evidenced by their ratings and resulting rankings?
2. In which databases and/or indices are the more useful business education periodicals found?
3. How much business education literature is fugitive literature that is not included in databases and/or indices and, consequently, is difficult or impossible for most business educators to retrieve?
4. What strategies might be employed to make the business education literature more accessible to business educators?

Procedures

Before the study started, human subjects approval was granted by the Institutional Review Board. Twenty-six business educators from across the United States and Canada who were identified as vital business educators in an unpublished study conducted by one of the researchers were randomly selected as potential Delphi panel members. The vital business educators are subject matter experts who regularly publish in well respected periodicals and are well known in business education circles in the United States and Canada. They were drawn from all National Business Education Association regions. These prominent business educators with verifiable research-related professional accomplishments were asked if they would be willing to participate in a three-round Delphi study about the relative usefulness of business education periodicals to be conducted between February and April of 2006 at about three-week intervals with one-week response time for each Delphi round since the study was to be conducted electronically. Twenty-five of the 26 business educators who were asked agreed to participate in the study under the described conditions.

During Round One, the panel members were asked to click on a box to rate the relative usefulness of each listed business education publication using a five-point Likert-type scale with 5 being essential, 4 being very useful, 3 being useful, 2 being marginal, and 1 being of unknown value. The Delphi panel members were also asked to add any additional business education periodicals that were missing from the presented business education publication list, which was developed from the Dufrene, Shane-Joyce, and Zimmer (1990) and Blair and Balachandran (2002) studies, the last issue of *The Business Education Index* (Noll & Graves, 2001), input from United States and Canadian business reference librarians, and the researchers personal knowledge about the business education literature. To be added by a panel member, a periodical should meet these criteria: (a) be published at least once a calendar year; (b) be at least ten pages long; (c) have at least three substantive articles in each issue, preferably with a strong research base; and (d) have content of primary interest to business educators at one or more of the following levels: elementary schools, middle schools/junior high schools, high schools, one- and two-year career and technical education schools and community colleges/junior colleges, four-year colleges and universities, and supervisors and administrators. Panel members could also write comments about any of the listed and/or added periodicals about which they had strong feelings as well as the business education literature in general.

When the Round One deadline occurred, an extension was granted since a number of those who had agreed to participate in the study had not yet done so. A total of 25 vital business educators, 100% of the Delphi panel members, responded by the end of the extended deadline. Three of the participants in Round One either did not provide the requested identification information so that their individual rating scores could be provided to them along with the group's ratings, mean, standard deviation,

and comments about specific journals or their identifying information disappeared during electronic transmission. As a result, a follow-up message was sent to those who could not be confirmed as having responded asking if they participated in Round One and, if so, to provide their IP address so that their individual response information could be provided in Round Two. This process resulted in identifying the responses of each individual and in a decision to switch from a web-based instrument to an attached instrument in succeeding rounds to ensure that there were fewer technological glitches in the remaining rounds and a paper trail of responses.

During Round Two, the Delphi panel members reviewed their individual and the other Delphi panel members responses and related statistics from Round One including the means, standard deviations, and comments; again clicked on boxes to reflect their current perceptions regarding the relative usefulness of the original and added business education periodicals; and indicated whether each publication should be retained or deleted in Round Three. Again, Delphi panel members could write comments about individual periodicals and/or the business education literature in general. A total of 25 vital business educators, 100% of the Delphi panel members, responded by the end of the deadline that was extended because of conflicts arising from a variety of dates for institutional spring breaks.

Since periodicals that some vital business educators preferred to have dropped from future rounds were rated highly by other vital business educators, a decision was made to retain all periodicals during Round Three. During Round Three, the Delphi panel members strove for consensus in their ratings by clicking on boxes to reflect their current perceptions regarding the relative usefulness of the business education periodicals, justifying their individual ratings that deviated two or more categories from the Delphi panel members mean response in Round Two. Additionally, Delphi panel members could write comments about the business education literature in general. A total of 25 vital business educators, 100% of the Delphi panel members, responded by the end of the deadline that was extended because of scheduling conflicts arising from travel to and from the National Business Education Association annual convention and the wind down of the Delphi panel members academic years.

Findings and Discussion

Research Question 1 asked which business education periodicals do vital business educators perceive to be the more useful ones as evidenced by their ratings and resulting rankings. Table 1 shows that vital business educators ranked two business education periodicals as essential: *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal* and the *NABTE Review*. *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal* and the *NABTE Review* were also the two highest ranked periodicals in the Dufrene, Shane-Joyce, and Zimmer (1990) and the Blair and Balachandran (2002) studies, suggesting that these two publications continue to be highly regarded by business education professionals over a decade and a half.

Table 1.
Ranking and Means for the Essential Business Education Periodicals

Rank	Publication	Mean	Standard deviation
1	The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*	4.88	0.34
2	NABTE Review* 4.63	4.63	0.65

Note. Means were derived using a five-point Likert-type scale with 5 = essential, 4 = very useful, 3 = useful, 2 = marginal, and 1 = unknown value.

Note. A periodical title followed by an asterisk means that the periodical is peer reviewed.

Table 2 shows that vital business educators ranked nine business education periodicals as very useful. The *NBEA Yearbooks* ranked fifth in the Blair and Balachandran (2002) study, and the *Business Education Forum* and the *Journal of Education for Business* ranked third and fifth respectively in the Dufrene, Shane-Joyce, and Zimmer (1990) study and ninth and tenth respectively in the Blair and Balachandran (2002) study. The relatively recent publications of *Delta Pi Epsilon*, *The Delta Pi Epsilon Fall Conference Book of Readings* and the *Journal of Applied Research for Business Instruction*, are surprisingly influential among vital business educators given the longevity of the publications. *The Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal*, formerly the *Office Systems Research Journal*, was ranked seventh in the Blair and Balachandran (2002) study and fourteenth in the Dufrene, Shane-Joyce, and Zimmer (1990) study, suggesting the increasing value that business educators attach to technology periodicals. The ranking of the *Journal for Global Business Education* suggests that new publications that fill specialized niches are capable of rising to prominence in a few years. Although the *Phi Delta Kappan* technically did not meet the provided selection criteria for inclusion in the study, a number of vital business educators, primarily affiliated with colleges of education, advocated strongly for its inclusion. Interestingly, the *Business Communication Quarterly*, formerly the *ABC Bulletin*, ranked eighth in the Blair and Balachandran (2002) study and twelfth in the Dufrene, Shane-Joyce, and Zimmer (1990) study while the *Journal of Business Communication* was ranked third in the Blair and Balachandran (2002) study and fourth in the Dufrene, Shane-Joyce, and Zimmer (1990) study. The upward shift in the ranking of the *Business Communication Quarterly* and the downward shift in the ranking of the *Journal of Business Communication* may reflect the increasing need of business education professionals for less theoretical and more practical business communication literature.

Table 2.
Ranking and Means for the Very Useful Business Education Periodicals

Rank	Publication	Mean	Standard deviation
3	NBEA Yearbooks*	4.29	1.08
4	Business Education Forum	4.25	0.85
5	The Delta Pi Epsilon Fall Conference Book of Readings	3.63	1.17
6	Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal*	3.54	1.22
7	Journal of Applied Research for Business Instruction*	3.54	1.47
8	Journal of Education for Business	3.54	1.07
9	Journal of Global Business Education*	3.21	0.98
10	Phi Delta Kappan	3.17	1.11
11	Business Communication Quarterly*	3.08	1.32

Note. Means were derived using a five-point Likert type scale with 5 = essential, 4 = very useful, 3 = useful, 2 = marginal, and 1 = unknown value.

Note. A periodical title followed by an asterisk means that the publication is peer reviewed.

Table 3 shows that vital business educators ranked six business education periodicals as useful. Among these useful periodicals are ones that address specialized aspects of the broad discipline of business education such as the *Journal of Business and Training Education* and *Career and Technical Education Research*, paralleling the findings of Lowensohn and Samelsson (2006). Several of these periodicals such as *The Review: The Journal of the International Society for Business Education* and *The Balance Sheet* are not peer reviewed.

Table 3.
Ranking and Means for the Useful Business Education Periodicals

Rank	Publication	Mean	Standard deviation
12	Journal of Business Communication*	3.00	0.93
13	Journal of Business and Training Education*	3.00	1.14
14	Career and Technical Education Research*	2.96	1.68
15	The Review: The Journal of the International Society for Business Education	2.67	0.96
16	Business Education Digest*	2.67	1.27
17	Balance Sheet	2.50	0.72

Note. Means were derived using a five-point Likert type scale with 5 = essential, 4 = very useful, 3 = useful, 2 = marginal, and 1 = unknown value.

Note. A periodical title followed by an asterisk means that the publication is peer reviewed.

Table 4 shows that vital business educators ranked 18 business education periodicals as marginal. Since these periodicals are specialized

and narrower in scope, they are perceived by many vital business educators as less mainstream and of diminished value in some cases because of lack of familiarity. While conference proceedings such as the *Association for Business Communication Conference Proceedings* and the *AERA Sig* (Business Education Computer Information Systems Research) *Proceedings* and state journals such as the *Arizona Business Education Association Journal* and the *Ohio Business Technology Educator* are valued by some business educators, those periodicals appear to the majority of vital business educators to be of lesser value.

Table 4.
Ranking and Means for the Marginal Business Education Periodicals

Rank	Publication	Mean	Standard deviation
18	Association for Business Communication Conference Proceedings	2.42	0.97
19	Training and Development	2.42	1.21
20	Journal of Career and Technical Education*	2.38	1.38
21	Techniques	2.33	0.70
22	Training	2.33	1.13
23	AERA Sig (Business Education Computer Information Systems Research) Proceedings	2.17	0.94
24	Journal of Economic Education*	2.17	1.13
25	Journal of Marketing Education†	1.96	1.08
26	THE Journal (Technological Horizons in Education Journal)	1.88	0.85
27	Information Resources Management Journal*	1.88	2.09
28	Human Resource Development Quarterly*	1.78	1.24
29	Educational Leadership	1.67	0.76
30	Arizona Business Education Association Journal*	1.63	0.77
31	Journal of Organizational and End User Computing*	1.63	0.88
32	Management Communication Quarterly *	1.58	0.93
33	Information Systems Management*	1.54	0.88
34	Ohio Business Technology Educator*	1.54	0.88
35	Journal of Computer Information Systems*	1.50	0.93

Note. Means were derived using a five-point Likert type scale with 5 = essential, 4 = very useful, 3 = useful, 2 = marginal, and 1 = unknown value.

Note. A periodical title followed by an asterisk means that the publication is peer reviewed.

Table 5 shows that vital business educators ranked 18 business education periodicals as having unknown value. While a modest number of vital business educators ranked most of these periodicals highly, the vast majority did not, in many cases because of lack of familiarity with these periodicals. For example, most vital business educators were unfamiliar with the Canadian-based business education periodicals and with the state and provincial business education periodicals. As is reflected in both Tables 4 and 5, lack of familiarity with business education

periodicals leads to lower rankings for approximately two thirds of the periodicals. Both the DuFrene, Shane-Joyce, and Zimmer (1990) study and the Blair and Balachandran (2002) study found that about half of the investigated periodicals had low recognition and rating factors because the respondents were unfamiliar with those periodicals. As the field of business education becomes increasingly more diverse and fragmented, its practitioners appear to be more specialized and less interested in the broad spectrum of business education as traditionally defined.

Table 5.
Ranking and Means for the Unknown Value Business Education Periodicals

Rank	Publication	Mean	Standard deviation
36	Educational Technology Research and Development*	1.43	0.90
37	Journal of Consumer Affairs*	1.42	0.88
38	Canadian Business and Current Affairs Education	1.42	1.06
39	The Information Management Journal	1.38	0.71
40	Kentucky Business Education Association Journal*	1.33	0.64
41	Wisconsin Business Education Journal*	1.33	0.76
42	ABC Blue Book: U. S. and Canadian Business Publications	1.33	0.87
43	Georgia Business Education Association Journal*	1.29	0.55
44	Human Resource Development Review**	1.29	0.91
45	Performance Improvement Quarterly*	1.29	0.91
46	Canadian Business and Current Affairs Business	1.25	0.90
47	EBIT: Educators of Business and Information Technology	1.25	0.90
48	Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*	1.22	0.52
49	Journal of Database Management*	1.21	0.51
50	International Journal of Information Management*	1.13	0.45
51	Journal of Global Marketing*	1.08	0.28
52	Journal of Global Information Management*	1.04	0.20
53	Ontario Business Educators Association Newsletter	1.00	0.00

Note: Means were derived using a five-point Likert type scale with 5 = essential, 4 = very useful, 3 = useful, 2 = marginal, and 1 = unknown value.

Note: A periodical title followed by an asterisk means that the publication is peer reviewed.

Research Question 2 asked in which databases and/or indices are the more useful business education periodicals found. Table 6 shows the 12 widely available databases and indices that contain six or more of the studied business education periodicals along with the number of indexed periodicals and the content categories for which those databases and indices are most useful for researching.

Since a number of the studied periodicals appear in multiple databases or indices, business education practitioners should understand that in order to access more of the relevant available literature, they must use a wide variety of databases and indices, realizing that each additional

database or index may only add a modest number of new periodicals. Shrinking library budgets often restrict the access that business education practitioners have to a wide variety of databases and indices (B. A. Fagerheim, personal communication, March 1, 2007).

Table 6.
The More Useful Databases and Indices for Finding Business Education Periodicals

Rank	Database	Number of included business education-related periodicals	More useful for researching
1	ABI/INFORM Global	18	Business communication; computer technology/information systems; human resources/training and development; marketing/marketing education
2	Business Source Premier	17	Business communication; basic business and economics; computer technology/information systems; human resources/training and development; marketing/marketing education
3	Wilson Select	13	Computer technology/information systems; general business education; teacher education
4	Inspec	11	Computer technology/information systems
5	Factiva Select	9	Business communication; human resources/training and development
6	Education Full-Text	9	General business education; teacher education
7	ERIC	9	Human resources/training and development; teacher education
8	Computer Science Index	7	Computer technology/information systems
9	Academic Search Premier	7	Teacher Education
10	ISI Web of Science	7	Computer technology/information systems; teacher education
11	Business Periodicals Index	6	Business communication; human resources/training and development
12	Current Contents	6	Teacher education

Research Question 3 asked how much business education literature is fugitive literature that is not included in databases and/or indices and, consequently, is difficult or impossible for most business educators to retrieve. More than one third of the studied business education periodicals identified by the Delphi panel members as potentially useful to business education professionals, 37% of the studied periodicals, are not found in widely available databases and indices, confirming that a noteworthy portion of the business education literature is fugitive literature that is difficult or impossible for most business educators to retrieve. The diminishing availability of a wide variety of both electronic and print media at many libraries makes it more difficult for business

education professionals to uncover fugitive literature. Some business education periodicals with smaller circulations, such as *NABTE Review*, are not indexed and are fugitive literature. So are some newer periodicals, such as the *Journal for Global Business Education*; some conference periodicals, such as the proceedings from the 2006 NABTE Research Conference; and some regional, state, and provincial periodicals, such as the *Arizona Business Education Association Journal* and the *Ontario [Canada] Business Educators Association Newsletter*.

Research Question 4 asked what strategies might be employed to make the business education literature more accessible to business educators. First, given the current state of the business education literature, libraries that support business education programs and their faculties should subscribe to as wide a variety of complementary databases and indices with business education periodicals as budgetary constraints will allow. Doing so would improve the access to more of the indexed business education literature.

Second, editors of business education periodicals and/or representatives of sponsoring organizations should obtain an ISSN (international standard serial number) for their periodicals since this number is a unique worldwide identifier of a periodical that is more reliable than the title. The ISSN is used in communication with representatives of databases and indices, publishers, and libraries. With this ISSN editors or representatives can interact with representatives of databases and indices about whether their periodicals meet the criteria for inclusion in the database or index.

Third, editors and/or representatives of periodicals that do not qualify for inclusion in existing databases and indices should place the table of contents of issues of their periodicals on the web so that the key bibliographic information could potentially be retrieved by search engines such as Google Scholar. This strategy would increase the likelihood that fugitive literature could be known to business education professionals and then be potentially retrievable. Such resources as WorldCat would help business education professionals determine which libraries subscribe to specific business education periodicals and the beginning and ending dates of their holdings. Business education professionals can also communicate with current and/or past editors of business education periodicals to find out where those periodicals might be housed and how copies of specific articles might be obtained.

Fourth, the business education profession should consider the desirability and practicality of developing a comprehensive database or index of business education periodicals. One possibility might be something like an electronic version of the defunct publication *The Business Education Index* that is sponsored by one or more business education professional organizations.

Comments from selected Delphi panel members contain additional relevant insights. For example, one Delphi panel member wrote, "An excellent byproduct of this study is the list of publications itself. There are some here I want to find! In a later Delphi round, he commented, "Review-

ing this list [of business education periodicals] reinforces some thoughts I have had for a while: (a) The spread of interest in business education has led us to be fragmented and in some ways unfocused, as witnessed by the journals, their contents, and their general lack of rigor. Not enough (academics and practitioners who publish) people are interested in the same business education topics to create a critical mass in any one area. Where that does happen, e.g., economic education or marketing education, they seem to spin off on their own. (b) There is a dire need for an online, quality, rigorous, theoretically based, selective journal for business education. Such a journal would demand thought, legitimate research approaches, and critique and self-examination of the profession. (c) Another contributing factor is the rotation of editors of these journals. Because of the nature of the organizations that produce the top journals in business education, the editors rarely become established. They rotate too often, reviewers aren't consistent, and thus the quality of the publications suffers. I will now get off my soapbox! Still another Delphi panel member noted, "While the comments within probably have said much of what I will say here, I firmly believe we as business educators need to (a) read more widely outside our field, (b) read publications that appear to be outside our field but really are extremely pertinent to our field, (c) pursue learning from broader sources and resources, (d) contribute more to [the] literature, and (e) be more proactive in supporting, reflecting, and teaching our profession. Our field is fast paced, but if we are dedicated to what we do, we must be committed to being a part of the rapid acceleration if we are to give value added to our profession. Finally, another Delphi panel member observed, "The business education literature as reflected in this study is not well known by most practitioners. There is more potentially relevant literature than I thought, but without convenient means to access much of it, we are only fooling ourselves if we think we really know what the business education literature says and means about many topics. Until we seize the moment, increase the quantity and quality of research, and make our research widely accessible, business education will continue to decline and eventually die.

Conclusions

Before conclusions are drawn, it is worth remembering that the Delphi panel members are relatively well informed and well read business educators whose backgrounds exceed that of typical business educators. Consequently, the perceptions of Delphi panel members may not be the same as the perceptions of typical business educators. While the Delphi process strives to reach consensus among the panel members, panel members with outlying perceptions that are not strongly held may give in to group pressure and not report their actual perceptions in the latter rounds of the Delphi process.

Nevertheless, based on study findings, the researchers conclude that although the business education literature is larger and more diverse than

most vital business educators realize, they perceive only 17 of the 53 studied periodicals, 32%, to be essential, very useful, or useful to business education professionals, in part because of specialization within the broad discipline of business education and the lack of familiarity with many of the existing business education periodicals. Seven of these 17 publications, 41%, are fugitive literature. More than one third of all studied periodicals, 37%, are fugitive literature. The fact that even vital business educators are not fully aware of the gamut of their diverse literature gives pause for concern since the literature is the lifeblood of the profession. To address this concern, librarians and members of the business education profession can employ a variety of strategies to improve access to business education periodicals.

Recommendations

Based on study findings and conclusions, the researchers recommend that:

1. Business education professionals expand their knowledge about the diverse business education literature by reading studies such as the reported one that identify the names of potentially useful periodicals. Business educators should then strive to read on a regular basis a wide cross-section of that literature in all of its varied forms.
2. Libraries that support business education programs and business education professionals subscribe to as many complementary databases and indices as budgetary constraints allow.
3. Editors of business education periodicals and/or representatives of sponsoring organizations should obtain ISSNs and pursue getting their periodicals indexed in existing databases or indices.
4. Editors of business education periodicals that do not qualify for inclusion in existing databases or indices should list the tables of contents of their issues on the web to increase retrievability by search engines such as Google Scholar.
5. Business education professionals should employ a variety of retrieval strategies such as contacting periodical editors and using WorldCat in order to track down fugitive literature.
6. The business education profession should consider the development of a comprehensive business education database to increase relevant literature accessibility. A presentation exploring the creation of a potential business education database was given at the 2006 Delta Pi Epsilon National Conference. It is the responsibility of leaders of business education professional organizations to assess the need for and costs of a comprehensive business education database.
7. The Delphi portion of this study should be replicated within ten years to monitor the status of the business education literature and document diachronically the accessibility of business education periodicals.

References

- Anderson, J. A., & Perez-Carballo, J. (2005). *Information retrieval design: Principles and options for information design, organization, display, and access in information retrieval databases, digital libraries, catalogs, and indexes*. St. Petersburg, FL: Onetecca Institute.
- Blair, R. B., & Balachandran, M. E. (2002). Faculty perceptions of business education journals. *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, 44(3), 190-204.
- Blaszczynski, C. (2001). Insights from prolific business education researchers. *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, 43(3), 113-122.
- Blaszczynski, C., & Scott, J. C. (2003a). The business education literature: Going, going, gone? *NABTE Review*, 30, 23-28.
- Blaszczynski, C., & Scott, J. C. (2003b). The researcher's challenge: Building a credible literature review using electronic databases. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal*, 21(2), 1-8.
- Dufrene, D. D., Shane-joyce, M. P., & Zimmer, T. M. (1990). Quality perceptions of journals for business education professionals. *NABTE Review*, 17, 38-42.
- Lowensohn, S., & Samelsson, D. P. (2006). An examination of faculty perceptions of academic journal quality within five specified areas of accounting research. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 21(3), 219-239.
- Mann, T. (1993). *Library research models: A guide to classification, cataloging, and computers*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, W. (1997, August 1). Troubling myths about online information. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A44.
- Noll, C. L., & Graves, P. R. (2001). *The business education index 2000: Index of business education articles and research studies compiled from a selected list of periodicals published during the year 2000*. Little Rock, AR: Delta Pi Epsilon.
- Request for proposals. (n.d.). Available from Delta Pi Epsilon, P. O. Box 4340, Little Rock, AR 72214.
- Smith, E. O. (1996). Electronic databases for technical and professional communication research. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 5(5), 365-383.
- Wayne, F. S., Clark, G. L., & Betley, R. (1987). Productivity rankings of institutions based on number of publications in four business education journals. *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, 29(4), 133-143.