



Executive Committee Meeting

Glasgow - 25 & 26 October 2002

MINUTES

AGENDA

1. Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting May 2002 - Braga
2. EMAC Conference 2003
3. Improving the quality of the conference
4. EMAC Doctoral Colloquium 2003
5. Future conferences
6. Membership and recruitment
7. Intermediate financial situation 2002
8. IJRM + New E-Journal
9. EMAC website
10. EMAC statutes
11. EMAC awards/fellowships
12. EMAC/ANZMAC + Relationship with other organizations
13. Miscellaneous

ATTENDANCE (names of attendants in **BOLD**)

OFFICERS

President	Lutz HILDEBRANDT
Past-President	Suzanne C. BECKMANN
President-Elect	--
Vice Presidents:	
Conferences	Graham HOOLEY
Development	Suzanne C. BECKMANN
External Relations	G�rard HERMET
Publications	Gilles LAURENT

NATIONAL COORDINATORS

AUSTRALIA	Mark UNCLES
AUSTRIA	Hans M�HLBACHER
BELGIUM	Kristof DE WULF
CANADA	Ulrike DE BRENTANI
DENMARK	Mogens BJERRE
FINLAND	Kristian M�LLER
FRANCE	Delphine MANCEAU
GERMANY	S�nke ALBERS
GREECE	Nikolaos PAPA VASSILIOU
HUNGARY	Jozsef BERACS
IRELAND	Frank BRADLEY
ITALY	Michele COSTABILE
NEW ZEALAND	Rod BRODIE
NORWAY	Einar BREIVIK
PORTUGAL	Minoo FARHANGMEHR
SLOVENIA	Boris SNOJ
SPAIN	Jose Luis MUNUERA
SWEDEN	Claes Robert JULANDER
THE NETHERLANDS	Hans KASPER
U.K.	Veronica WONG
U.S.A.	Gary LILIEN

EX-OFFICIO

IJRM Editor	Hubert GATIGNON
EIASM Director	Gerry VAN DYCK
Executive Secretary	Nicole COOPMAN

MINUTES

The President, Lutz Hildebrandt, welcomed the attendees and opened the meeting. He mentioned that one point had to be added in the agenda, i.e. the new electronic journal.

Although the various points of the agenda were not discussed in the pre-established order because of time restrictions, the minutes do follow the order of the agenda.

1. Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting May 2002 - Braga

Two errors in names were found on page 5 - point 6:

- It should read Graham Hooley instead of Gary Hooley
- It should read Elin Sørensen instead of Elin Brandi Sørensen

The minutes were approved.

2. EMAC Conference 2003

Michael Saren welcomed all Executive Committee Members to the University of Strathclyde, Glasgow and introduced two members of the Organizing Committee: Jan Whiteford and John Webb.

The conference will be held at the Thistle Hotel. For the Executive Committee Members a tour of the hotel facilities had been organized for the next morning. Michael outlined the tentative structure of the conference. The conference will start with a welcome reception in the Town Hall presided by the Lord Mayor. There will be a gala dinner in a Scottish castle located 30 miles away from Glasgow. They have identified 200 reviewers to review the expected 450 to 500 submitted papers. The conference budget has been planned on the basis of 400 delegates.

A number of ideas to improve the conference structure have been discussed e.g. to integrate a virtual conference for researchers from Australia or ANZMAC. Gilles Laurent reported on the **Special Sessions** at the conference in Braga 2002 (see ANNEX I).

Based on the results of the 2002 experiment, i.e. good quality and good attendance of special sessions, he proposed for 2003:

- to slightly extend the system to 2 or 3 special sessions;
- to organize sessions on focused topics;
- to ask session chairs to invite the presenters.

It was also discussed to organise a special session around the IJRM special issue in order to get more integration of the journal into the association, to motivate excellent researchers to be and remain EMAC Members.

The committee decided to see the integration of special sessions an experiment, which – if it is successful – should be implemented and extended in future conferences.

To chair special sessions a number of names were mentioned, e.g. Gerald Hastings (Strathclyde University), Bodo Schlegelmilch of University of Vienna.

As a special problem the combination of the conference and the EMAC membership fee was debated. There were doubts regarding the efficiency of the existing system.

First there is an ongoing problem to control the membership payment before the registration at the conference starts. The system has to be improved. Nicole pointed out that there are a couple of accounting problems.

Second there exists a difference between the **conference fee** for an EMAC Member (495,- €) and the conference fee for a non EMAC Member (545,- €) which is not covering the amount for the EMAC membership fee, i.e. 87,- € for European Members and 92,- € for non European Members. This is an error, which occurred the first time at the Bergen Conference.

The following decisions were taken:

- As of 2003 the membership fee would be set at 90,- € i.e. the same both for European and non European Members.
- At the Glasgow Conference, Michael Saren will ask the non Members an additional sum of 40,- €

Michael will reimburse 90,- € for those who paid the additional 40,- € to become a Member. For those who do not want to become a Member and thus do not want to pay the additional 40,- €, the 50,- € included in their registration fee will be split as follows: 50% for the EMAC Association and 50% for the Strathclyde University.

The President thanked Michael Saren and his colleagues for their work und wished them to have a great and successful conference.

At the end of the discussion of the Glasgow Conference, Suzanne Beckmann raised the problem of the **Joint ANZMAC/EMAC Symposium** in Kuala Lumpur. Due to political risks some governments will not support the visit of a conference in the area. In the case that the conference has to be cancelled, alternatives were discussed. Graham Hooley's preference goes to relocate it to Perth in order to respect the original concept and to minimise the loss of delegates. He explained that before the uncertainty, 70 persons were expected and 40 papers had been accepted. Graham said he would circulate a note to all persons whose papers have been accepted. It was decided to support the relocation to Perth.

3. Improving the quality of the conference

Lutz Hildebrandt skimmed through the document he had sent to all Members before the meeting entitled "**A proposal to improve the quality of the papers and the review process of future EMAC Conferences**" (see ANNEX II).

Most of the points were already debated during the discussion of the EMAC Conference 2003. To be seen as special points are the improvement of the paper review process, the quality improvement of the presented papers and the ability to attract top researchers.

There was also an agreement on two aspects. First the evaluation process and the organisation of the conference programme constitute the biggest workload for the conference organiser. He should get support from a conference model with area chairs. In addition there is a conflict between covering the financial cost of the conference and the size of the conference. It was decided again not to have more than six parallel presentations.

Second a long discussion followed around the necessity and usefulness of having a poster session. Some Members of the Committee were in favour of it because of the good feedback, good interaction, and as an ideal platform for "shy" speakers. Others thought it could be a place where conceptual papers could be discussed. Some said the name "poster session" has a bad connotation and is perceived as a rejection.

It was finally decided to organise some poster sessions at the Glasgow Conference. Michael Saren who accepted to do it, is invited to give them another name (e.g. Individual Feedback Sessions) and to announce them on the web mentioning clearly the objective of these sessions.

4. EMAC Doctoral Colloquium 2003

Veronica Wong, the Chair of the Doctoral Colloquium 2003, reported that this year's Organising Committee would consist of Susan Hart, Amanda Broderick, Henry Robben and herself.

She also mentioned that:

- the call for papers had been finalized;
- the list of reviewers was ready;
- the faculty list would be built up soon.

The EMAC President is invited to make a presentation at the end of the second day.

Some open problems (e.g. the use of facilities) have to be clarified with the conference organisers and the business school.

5. Future conferences

Graham Hooley reported that no official response had been received yet from Milan. It was requested that they send it before the end of this year.

José Luis Munuera, the Chair of the EMAC Conference 2004 to be held in Murcia, gave some information on the location, the University, the Business School and the Marketing Department. The conference will take place in the new Auditorium and Conference Center surrounded by a large number of hotels at walking distance and well served by public transportation.

José Luis pointed out the regular increase of the conference fee over the last years and committed himself to organise the conference for 500,- €. Therefore in Murcia, the registration fees for the 2004 Conference will be:

- 500,- € for EMAC Members
- 590,- € for non EMAC Members

José Luis would try to obey the rules described in the Guidelines to organise the EMAC Conference as much as possible but at the same time he asked for some flexibility. The proposal to organise the conference by integrating some special sessions was accepted. Also some sessions with invited practitioners are intended. The whole conference is planned to work with track chairs. The Executive Committee Members assured him of their full support and proposed to help him identifying potential track chairs. Graham will send him the job description of a track chair he had drafted for another conference.

Finally, José Luis suggested to think of an integrated process for the next conference organiser. He planned to invite someone from the next organiser (SDA Bocconi - Milan) to be a member of the Murcia Conference Organising Committee.

Graham proposed that the process should be formalised and a more formal debriefing should take place a few months after the event.

The Conference 2004 will be held in the 3rd week of May, i.e. from 18-21 May.

6. Membership and recruitment

The membership situation until October 2002 was presented (see ANNEX III) showing a general slight increase.

The numbers of following countries considerably dropped: Denmark, Norway and USA Whereas in five countries the number of memberships considerably increased.

7. Intermediate financial situation 2002

An intermediate financial situation until 15.10.2002 was presented by Nicole (see ANNEX IV).

Suzanne Beckmann pointed out that the fixed contribution from the Annual Conference 2002 should have been 5.000,- € as mentioned in the Guidelines.

The President reported that the EIASM was asking the EMAC to review its annual contribution to overhead which had not changed for over 10 years except for an increase of 500,- € in 1998 due to the increase of the total number of members. He made the following proposal which was accepted by the other Executive Committee Members: The contribution to overhead would be increased by 25% as of 2003 but should remain stable for the next 3 years.

8. IJRM + New E-Journal

Hubert Gatignon reported that the Journal was running smoothly. Hubert told the other Executive Committee Members present that he would appreciate receiving names of credible reviewers with some specialisation. He could however not promise that they would be taken on the Board.

He then listed the various *forthcoming issues* (see ANNEX V).

He also presented the number of new manuscripts (see ANNEX V - last page) and mentioned that the overall quality of submitted papers had decreased. A certain number was really unacceptable and not worth giving to reviewers.

Hubert then referred to an article entitled "Perceptual Differences of Marketing Journals: A Worldwide Perspective" (see ANNEX VI). This article looks at the perception of journals purely in terms of ranking. The IJRM is ranked 4th in Europe and 9th in North America. Hubert is conscious that the awareness is still very weak. He is working at it but it is a long-term process. He is of the opinion that other means should be used to make people look at the IJRM, i.e. improved on-line availability, flyers, etc.

Gilles Laurent reported on the *selection procedure of the IJRM Editor-in-Chief* (see ANNEX VII) addressing:

- Steps in the review process
- Criteria for choosing an editor
- Members of the Review and Nomination Committee

Gilles said that 140 requests had been sent out and 62 answers received.

As decided during the EMAC Executive Committee of 26th October 1996, the Review and Nomination Committee should consist of 3 persons: the Vice President Publications, i.e. Gilles Laurent, and 2 other Members with editorial experience who are selected by the Board. Last time, the 2 Members were Gary Lilien and Berend Wierenga. Gilles proposed to keep Gary Lilien and was thinking of asking Jan-Benedict Steenkamp to join him.

The reason for keeping the Review and Nomination Committee small is confidentiality. The EMAC President will however be kept informed and ensures that the procedure is followed according to the rules.

The Executive Committee Members present told Gilles to go for it and to follow the existing procedure.

Gilles Laurent reported subsequently on the *New Electronic Journal*. He presented Manfred Krafft's answers (see ANNEX VIII) to the numerous questions raised by the Executive Committee Members during their meeting in Braga, i.e.:

- Feedback from Executive Committee Meeting in Braga
- Positioning of the EMAC Teaching Portal
- Organisation of the Portal
- Benefits to non EMAC Members
- How to promote the portal
- Benefits for contributors/section editors
- Operational issues
- Collective subscriptions?
- How to identify teaching-oriented colleagues?
- Revised budget

A long discussion followed whereby all Executive Committee Members present expressed pros and cons for the project and the investment of 50 000 Euros into the project. Questions raised were

- Who will publish in the new journal?
- What quality will the papers have?
- What is the target audience?
- What is the market of the new journal?
- Do we have enough information about the chances of the new journal?

Finally the idea of going through a test phase with a limited offer was suggested.

Gilles Laurent asked the EMAC Executive Committee if it was possible to take a decision and suggested 3 options:

- Option 1: We go for it
- Option 2: We keep investigating and decide in 6 months' time
- Option 3: We feel after discussion that it is not worth going on

This led to another discussion where Hubert Gatignon pointed out that the big question is the availability of the material. According to him it will take 6 months to get material. He suggested to do some market research till May and to decide to go for it or not at the next Executive Committee Meeting. An amount between 5.000,- and 10.000,- € could be given to Manfred for the market research.

It was finally decided that Manfred Krafft would be offered 10.000,- € for doing some market research which would be the first step of the project. Gilles and Lutz have to contact Manfred to explain the decision of the Exec. Committee.

9. EMAC website

There was no time left over for discussing in depth the new structure of the EMAC website designed by Suzanne (see ANNEX IX).

Nevertheless the Executive Committee Members present gave their consent to proceed and asked Suzanne and Nicole to deal successfully with the project.

Nicole submitted the following budget for developing the new EMAC website:

- Members' Protected Area	1.250,- €
- Membership Directory	1.250,- €
- New Chronicle	2.000,- € / per annum
- Hosting of the website	2.000,- € / per annum

The budget was accepted.

10. EMAC statutes

It was decided that Nicole would send the proposal she had drafted on the basis of the EAA and EFA statutes to the Members of the EMAC Steering Committee. They would be requested to send back their comments and suggestions within 3 weeks.

Nicole would then send the new version to all Members of the Executive Committee who would be asked to send their comments and suggestions within 3 weeks too.

These comments and suggestions would give lead to a new version, which once approved by the Steering Committee would be sent to the Lawyer and next to the Belgian Ministry of Justice for acceptance.

The question as to whether there was a need for a Treasurer remained unanswered.

11. EMAC awards / fellowships

Suzanne Beckmann briefly presented the proposal entitled "Network of Fellows of the European Marketing Academy" (see ANNEX X).

She reminded that the basic idea was to create an intellectual resource for senior EMAC to draw upon and to provide a forum for dissemination of knowledge in the field.

Suzanne asked the Executive Committee Members present if they were in favour of the idea and if she could go ahead. The answer was yes.

12. Miscellaneous

Gilles Laurent raised a problem around sending through the EIASM *e-mails to EMAC Members* announcing and promoting other events.

He explained that he had asked Nicole to send early July an e-mail announcement of the Lalonde seminar, which she had done. He then asked her end of July to send a second e-mail about new international tools that should be very useful to disseminate recent research, while it is still unpublished. Nicole answered that the EIASM was not prepared to send out messages anymore as they feared that the Members would be upset due to the increasing number of promotion e-mails.

Gilles also mentioned that he was aware that a Member of the French Academy of Marketing had asked Nicole to send an e-mail around to promote a conference on "Branding".

Nicole explained that the request for promoting other events via e-mail to EMAC Members was growing and that they did not come only from France.

Some Executive Committee Members agreed that it would indeed not be wise to send out e-mails at random. Graham Hooley suggested that it might be time to appoint a webmaster. This person would decide which messages would be of interest to EMAC Members and could send them himself or have them sent to the EMAC Members.

It was reminded that this service could be provided by the Chronicle which would soon become electronic.

The ***EMAC membership fee issue*** was discussed at different moments during the meeting.

The issue is that the EMAC membership fee is valid per calendar year. This is mainly due to the journal. People tend to forget to renew their membership at the beginning of the year and some think that the conference fee includes the membership fee.

As a consequence, they do no longer appear in the EMAC membership lists and worse they do no longer receive neither the IJRM nor the Chronicle.

Nicole explained the *current procedure* for membership fee collection. Each year, the EMAC Secretariat (EIASM) sends a personalised invoice to all EMAC members inviting them to pay their membership for the year to come. This invoice is usually sent with a Chronicle. A reminder is sent with the next Chronicle. If after two years they have not renewed their annual membership, there are no longer contacted as they cannot be forced to be a Member.

As a consequence, if they do not officially complain that they no longer receive neither the Journal nor the Chronicle, they will not be told where the problem lies.

Nicole suggested on behalf of the EIASM a *new procedure* to collect the membership fee on the basis of the procedure adapted by all other associations. As from the Glasgow Conference 2003 on, EACH participant would be paying his membership fee along with the conference fee. This fee would thus entitle the registered person to all membership benefits during the year FOLLOWING the conference (in this case 2004).

At the Glasgow Conference participants would thus be obliged to pay their membership fee for 2004. At the Murcia Conference 2004 they would be paying their membership fee for 2005.

Persons not attending the Glasgow Conference could equally register for membership 2004 at the EMAC Secretariat.

The advantages of the new system are that membership lists would be up-to-date at the beginning of the year (so members can receive IJRM on time) and the collection of fees at the conference would be simplified.

However, in November/December 2002, we would send an invoice via e-mail to all EMAC Members (ex Members + others in EIASM Marketing network going back 3 years) asking them to join or renew their membership 2003.

This proposal was rejected as the EMAC does not want to lose any money and is frightened of losing members.

It was decided to stay with the old system. Members should be sent an invoice in December asking them to renew their membership for the year to come by the end of February. When they have paid, they should receive a Membership Card, which they should show when registering for the conference.

Hubert Gatignon was asked to send a copy of some membership cards to Nicole.

No further points were raised and the meeting was adjourned.
