

EDITORIAL

UVODNIK

CONTRIBUTION TO MARKETING SCIENCE

At first, I had completely different ideas about what preface to the latest issue of the Slovenian scientific marketing journal I would write. When the unexpectedly drawn-out editorial process was finished, my feelings and thoughts changed and required a different story. This preface is, hence, about how quality and consequently the development of science and profession depend on the culture of three key players, the creators of every journal issue: authors, reviewers and editors.

Each individually and all together add their own pieces to the mosaic of marketing knowledge that belongs to all mankind. Therefore, we must constantly seek answers to the question, which is crucial for 20-year-old Slovenia and its marketing field: how to increase, reach and maintain the quality and credibility of the marketing scientific and professional publishing.

AUTHOR(S)

Authors must be well familiar with the field of ideas where the journal is published; in particular, when dealing with theories, they should be capable to sort out the wheat from the chaff. In Slovenia, however, there are only very few such authors; thus, every single one of them is even more precious. Young researchers, at the beginning of their career, too often approach

PRISPEVEK K MARKETINŠKI ZNANOSTI

Ko sem se pripravljaj na urednikovanje nove številke Akademije MM, sem imel povsem drugačne ideje o tem, kaj naj bi napisal v uvodnik kot popotnico novi številki slovenske znanstvene revije za marketing. Po zaključku nepredvideno daljšega uredniškega procesa so občutki in misli povsem drugačni in zahtevajo drugačno zgodbo. Zato bom v tem uvodniku zapisal nekatere ključne poudarke o odvisnosti kakovosti in posledično tudi razvoja znanosti in stroke od kulture treh ključnih akterjev, ustvarjalcev vsake številke: avtorjev, recenzentov in urednika.

Vsak zase in vsi skupaj namreč dodajajo svoj delček v mozaik, iz katerega nastaja velika skupna slika, marketinško znanje, ki je last vsega človeštva. Zato moramo, še posebno za mlado Slovenijo in njen marketing, stalno iskati odgovor na izredno pomembno vprašanje, kako povečati, doseči in ohraniti kakovost in kredibilnost marketinškega znanstvenega in strokovnega publiciranja.

AVTOR/JI

Avtorji morajo poznati trg idej, na katerem deluje revija, predvsem pa kaj teorija je in kaj teorija ni! V Sloveniji je izredno malo takšnih avtorjev, zato je prav vsak še toliko bolj dragocen. Mladi se na začetku kariere prepogosto lotevajo pisanja znanstvenih prispevkov brez sodelovanja

scientific assignments without the assistance by their mentors. Such independence is not only contrary to the academic culture, it is also an abuse of the institution of mentors as coauthors – a big mistake. It is a case of a prematurely cut umbilical cord, an incomplete process of socialization during the development of an emerging scholar or expert. I have no intention to dwell on the reasons for such situation in Slovenia, although I could happily toy with the idea of an ideal mentor profile; but that's another story. I would like to point out that formal collaboration with your mentor does not and cannot guarantee that your paper will be published; the result is a high proportion of nonpublished, albeit often very interesting papers.

REVIEWER(S)

Academic journals should provide a well-established peer review system, which is true for all disciplines, although the system is not perfect. Nonetheless, excellent blind review is of great value to progress in science in general and of every discipline. What drives reviewers to sacrifice a lot of their time and energy for the work they will not be paid for? The only real answer to this question is: such an assignment is an excellent opportunity to learn and improve their personal research skills. Additionally, it allows them to compare their reviews with those of other reviewers, which is definitely a unique experience. This does not mean that personal preferences and views are not involved. We can, however, expect professional, competent and fair reviews. An excellent reviewer is primarily a colleague who makes a major contribution to the quality of science by being involved in the peer review.

When looking for and education good reviewers, we must ask and answer the following question: "Who is an ideal reviewer?" Let me list the following four characteristics of an ideal reviewer:

1. He is competent and an expert in her field and methodology of research.
2. He takes a respectful, free of conflicts, direct, and uncompromising approach to papers under review.
3. He is ready to recognize strong and weak parts in papers under review.
4. He can write a clear and logical review that authors find useful for their further research.

Alas, the reality on the Slovenian marketing scene is rather far away from such an idealized image. The Slovenian Marketing Association has a fairly comprehensive list of potential reviewers;

njihovih mentorjev, s katerimi so do včeraj ustvarjali ali še vedno ustvarjajo svoje diplomske, magistrske naloge ali doktorske disertacije. Takšna neodvisnost ni samo v nasprotju z akademsko kulturo, je tudi zloraba mentorjevega soavtrstva, torej gre za veliko napako. To je prehitro presekana popkovina, ker predstavlja nedokončan proces socializacije v razvoju nastajajočega znanstvenika ali strokovnjaka. V razloge za takšno stanje v Sloveniji se na tem mestu ne želim spuščati, čeprav bi se lahko z veseljem poigral z idejo o profilu idealnega mentorja. Toda to je že druga tema. Ugotavljam, da formalno sodelovanje z mentorjem, žal, ni in ne more biti zagotovilo za objavo prispevka. Posledica je visok delež neobjavljivih, čeprav pogosto zelo zanimivih prispevkov.

RECENZENT/I

Znanstvena revija mora zagotoviti dobro utečen sistem recenziranja – dvojno slepo ocenjevanje poslanih prispevkov. Ta sistem uporabljajo vse znanstvene discipline, čeprav je nepopoln. Navkljub temu ima namreč odličen proces ocenjevanja veliko vrednost za napredek znanosti nasploh in vsake posamezne discipline. Vprašati se moramo, kakšen je motiv recenzentov, da brezlačno, skorajda samaritansko opravljajo delo, za katerega je potrebno žrtvovati veliko časa in energije. Edini pravi odgovor je, da to delo predstavlja odlično priložnost za učenje in samoizobraževanje, izpopolnjevanje osebnih spretnosti raziskovalca. Omogoči jim primerjati njihove ocene z ocenami drugih recenzentov, kar je vsekakor edinstvena izkušnja. To seveda ne pomeni popolne odsotnosti osebnih preferenc in pogledov. Posledično je torej možno pričakovati profesionalno, kompetentno in pošteno ocenjevanje. Odličen ocenjevalec je v prvi vrsti kolega, ki naredi velik prispevek h kakovosti znanosti s svojo vpletenostjo v procese ocenjevanja prispevkov različnih avtorjev.

Pri iskanju in vzgoji dobrih recenzentov si moramo zastaviti in odgovoriti na vprašanje: »Kakšen je idealni recenzent?« Izmed številnih možnih, ki jih navajajo različni avtorji, bi izpostavil zgolj naslednje štiri:

1. Demonstrira kompetence in strokovnost na svojem vsebinskem področju ter metodologije raziskovanja.
2. Do dela, ki ga ocenjuje, izkazuje spoštljiv, nekonflikten, direkten, hkrati pa nepopustljiv pristop.
3. Pripravljen je poiskati tako močne kot šibke točke ocenjevanega prispevka.
4. Zna napisati jasno in logično oceno, ki je avtorju/em v pomoč pri njegovem delu.