

# SURVEY RESEARCH IN FINANCE: VIEWS FROM JOURNAL EDITORS

H. Kent Baker, American University  
Tarun K. Mukherjee, University of New Orleans

## Abstract

*We survey editors from 15 “core” and 35 “non-core” finance journals to learn their views about specific issues involving survey research. Based on responses from 25 editors, none of their journals has an established policy involving the publication of survey research. The evidence shows that survey-based manuscripts typically go through the same review process as other manuscripts. However, editors of “core” versus “non-core” journals have mixed views about the role that survey research should play in the finance literature. The editors provide their views about the strengths and weaknesses of survey research as well as topic areas that would benefit from using this approach. A review of finance journals shows that the publication of survey-based papers is an infrequent event for most journals.*

## INTRODUCTION

In an imaginative allegory, Percival (1993) relates a story about a frog pond having several inhabitants – turtles, tadpoles, and frogs. Those who ruled the frog pond believed that tadpoles should receive training in frog pond school to become successful frogs. Traditionally, turtles did most of the teaching, except for a few “frogs in residence” who gave special lectures. All the turtles in different frog pond schools taught the same frog pond theory that assumed “rational” behavior. The turtles told the tadpoles that they needed to learn what frogs should do, not what frogs do because this “normative” approach would teach tadpoles how to think.

The tadpoles repeatedly pointed out to the turtles that frogs often did not behave the way the theory said they should. Although this was a source of puzzlement, the turtles said that they knew best. They pointed out that over the years many eminent turtles had developed and empirically tested this theory. When the tadpoles asked why the turtles did not ask the frogs why they did what they did, the turtles simply scoffed at this naïve question. Such an approach would be unscientific. Furthermore, frogs would not be able to rationally explain their behavior. Thus, if the turtles could not fully understand frog behavior, how could frogs possibly understand it? According to the turtles, the moral of the story is that we should not let what appear to be facts cause us to deviate from our commitment to sound theory.

As Weaver (1993) points out, this story calls attention to some of the broad gaps between practitioners (frogs) and academics (turtles). As a way of bridging the gap between financial theory and practice, Weaver recommends that academics “ask them” using practitioner surveys, that practitioners participate in such surveys, and that journal editors publish the survey results. Following this recommendation offers several potential benefits. For example, the evidence from properly designed surveys could be useful in

empirically validating conceptual hypotheses and the relative usefulness of various theories. In addition, the continuing dialogue between academics and practitioners could be helpful in designing research agendas, courses, and programs. In short, finance practice can contribute to finance theory and vice versa.

Although Aggarwal (1993) notes that much value exists in assessing the state of practice in finance by surveying or asking practicing executives, he argues that over-reliance on wisdom received from financial practice has limitations. He presents five reasons why survey researchers interested in understanding forces underlying financial practice should remain skeptical. First, financial executives may be unable to divulge their reasons and other details about their strategies and actions. Second, they may not be fully aware of or agree on all the reasons for their firm's strategies and actions. Third, researchers may be unable to gain access to a representative number of executives to obtain reliable and representative information on financial practices. Fourth, continually changing financial practices requires frequent updating of surveys of practice. Finally, suitable interpretation of empirical evidence requires using an appropriate theory or conceptual framework.

Since finance is a multi-faceted discipline, there is no single way to address various questions and to test hypotheses that confront researchers. Instead, finance academics may take two broad paths – theoretical and empirical -- to help provide a clear understanding of research issues. Yet, as Ramirez, Waldman, and Lasser (1991, p. 17) state, “a major aim of both theoretical and empirical financial research should be to aid the financial decision-maker.” Unfortunately, some turtles appear to be more concerned with the elegance and sophistication of their theories, models, and statistical techniques than with actually helping decision makers.

Some do “cutting edge” theoretical research such as the eminent turtles in the allegory. Financial theories and conceptual frameworks can produce knowledge that helps the profession develop. For example, advances in finance theory such as portfolio, agency, and asset pricing theories have been adopted into practice. Thus, by learning these “normative” theories tadpoles can supposedly morph into becoming successful frogs, despite the fact that frogs do not always behave the way these theories say they should.

Others conduct empirical research. As Aggarwal (1993) notes, all theory should be subject to empirical tests. If theory is inconsistent with empirical evidence, researchers should revise the theory. Gathering information needed to conduct empirical research involves several alternative paths. The most common means of data collection in finance is secondary research. This consists of compiling and analyzing data that already has been collected and that exists in usable form. For example, financial researchers often rely on publicly available data to understand the world and test finance theories.

Others collect primary data directly from those under study. Survey research involves soliciting self-reported verbal information from people about themselves. The main goal of survey research is to allow researchers to generalize about a large population by studying a small portion of that population. Returning to our allegory, survey research would involve the turtles asking the frogs about their behavior.

According to Rea and Parker (1997), survey research has become a widely used and acknowledged technique in many disciplines. Although survey research has derived considerable credibility from its widespread acceptance, such acceptance appears greater

in some business disciplines than in others. For example, casual observation suggests that those in management and marketing appear to embrace the use of surveys to a greater extent than in finance. If this observation is correct, those using this research technique in finance follow a less-well trodden path than that used by most researchers.

A lingering doubt exists, especially among some eminent turtles, about the reliability of information derived from a relatively few respondents purporting to represent the whole. In fact, turtles who teach at frog pond schools often do not train tadpoles in survey research as part of their programs. After all, other turtles may view teaching this research technique as inconsistent with current practice.

In conducting empirical research, Bruner (2002, p. 50) notes, “The task must be to look for patterns of confirmation across approaches and studies much like one sees an image in a mosaic of stones.” What Bruner suggests in reference to mergers and acquisitions equally applies to other research issues in finance. Although various approaches can be useful in gathering information and understanding research issues, Graham (2004, p. 40) makes the following observation about the survey method:

Survey research is by no means the standard academic approach these days; in fact it’s sometimes looked down on in academic circles as “unscientific”. The common attitude is that managers and investors can do very different things than what they say they do – and even if they do what they say, their real reasons for doing things can be different from the ones they cite.

By survey research, we mean surveys that are conducted to advance scientific knowledge. According to Pinsonneault and Kraemer (1993), survey research has three distinct characteristics. First, the purpose of the survey is to produce quantitative descriptions of some aspects of the studied population. Second, the main approach used to collect data is to ask people structured and predefined questions. Third, researchers typically collect data about a fraction of the study population in such a way as to be able to generalize the findings to the population. Thus, survey research is the most appropriate method if the researcher needs information that is unavailable elsewhere and wants to generalize the findings to a larger population.

The key focus of this study is to gain information, comments, and opinions for finance journal editors about various issues involving survey research. Using an email survey, we inquire about whether journals have an established policy about publishing survey research. In addition, we ask them about the role that survey research should play in finance, its strengths and weaknesses, and areas where the application of such a methodology would be of most benefit. This portion of the paper is largely exploratory in nature. However, we expect that editors of “core” finance journals generally hold a less favorable view about the role of survey research relative to other types of original research compared with editors of “non-core” finance journals. In addition to surveying finance editors, we review a sample of finance journals over the period 1985-2005 to identify and classify published survey research. Most of the journals started publishing after 1985.

This study contributes to the metafinance literature, which Cooley (1994) defines as the critical analysis of the nature, structure, and behavior of finance. To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine the use of survey research in finance by asking journal editors and inspecting finance journals. The paper should be especially relevant to those using or contemplating using survey research because it presents

insights about how editors view this approach as well as data on the record of journals publishing survey-based articles. In addition, observations made by finance editors on finance issues that would benefit most from survey research may provide avenues for future research.

The remainder of the paper has the following organization. In the next section, we review our sample followed by our methodology. Next, we present our findings of our email survey of journal editors and examination of finance journals. In the final section, we give a summary and conclusions.

## **SAMPLE**

To determine which journals to examine and editors to contact, we started with a list of 72 finance journals identified by Cooley and Heck (2005). This list excluded journals in real estate, insurance, economics, and accounting because of the subjectivity involved in attempting to distinguish finance articles from non-finance articles. From the list of 72 finance journals, we excluded 23 journals based on the following criteria: (1) book-type journals that publish annually, (2) defunct journals, (3) journals ceasing publication, specifically, the *Journal of Business*, and (4) journals with no current editor. We added the *International Journal of Managerial Finance*, which started publication in 2005. Our aim is to focus on finance journals currently accepting manuscripts and publishing more than once a year.

Based on these criteria, our final sample consists of 50 journals. As Appendix 1 shows, 26 of the 50 journals started publication in the 1990s. Seven started in the 1980s and nine in the 1970s. Before 1970, only six of the journals were publishing finance articles, and two started in 2000 or later. We identified the editor of each journal by reviewing either the most recent issue of each journal or the journal's website.

We divided the finance journals into two groups: 15 "core" journals, excluding the *Journal of Business*, and 35 "non-core" journals, based on the classification of Cooley and Heck (2005). Although the classification of a finance journal as a "core" or "non-core" is debatable, some support exists for this dichotomy (Borokhovich et al., 1995; Chan et al., 2000; Zivney and Reichenstein, 1994). One distinguishing characteristic of a "core" journal is its perceived quality. Another is that "core" journals have been publishing longer, on average, than have the "non-core" journals. As Appendix 1 shows, the inaugural year of the "core" journals ranges from 1945 to 1988 compared with 1962 to 2005 for the "non-core" journals. Almost three-quarters (26 of 35) of the "non-core" journals started publication in the 1990s.

[Insert Appendix 1 at the end of the paper]

## **METHODOLOGY**

During November 2005, we surveyed the editors of 50 finance journals to gain their views about various issues involving survey research using an email questionnaire. As Appendix 2 shows, the questionnaire consists of nine questions (hereafter referred to as Q#). Although most questions are closed-ended, we asked several open-ended questions. For example, one open-ended question asked the editors to indicate what

finance issues would benefit most from survey research (Q7). The questionnaire also contained a venting question (Q8) that asked them to add any additional comments about survey research, but that had not been addressed throughout the main body of the questionnaire. The small sample size precludes conducting tests of statistical significance to determine whether genuine differences exist between the responses of the “core” versus “non-core” journals.

[Insert Appendix 2 after Appendix 1 at the end of the paper]

Table 1 shows the response rate from editors of “core” and “non-core” finance journals. Overall, 25 of 50 editors (50.0%) responded to the survey with a marginally greater proportion of editors responding from “core” journals (53.3%) versus “non-core” (48.6%) journals. Despite the high response rate, a potential of non-response bias exists. An analysis of the inaugural year of the journals reveals no distinctive difference between journals with responding versus non-responding editors. Therefore, we believe that our findings are representative, or at a minimum suggestive, of the beliefs of the finance journal editors that we surveyed.

To gain a sense of the number and types of survey-based articles in finance, we reviewed virtually all of the finance journals from 1985 or their inaugural year, whichever was later, through 2005. Only 17 of the 70 journals published during the full 1985-2005 period. In a few instances, we could not gain access to the journals over the full period. Where electronic databases such as JSTOR are available, we conducted a keyword search of the title, abstract, and full-text (where possible) using terms such as “survey,” “survey research,” “survey method”, and “questionnaire” to identify articles. We reviewed each article to determine whether it met our criteria for inclusion in this study. In addition, we examined the journal websites and reviewed abstracts and/or articles on an issue-by-issue basis. In a few instances in which electronic copies are unavailable, we examined hard copies of the journals.

We included only articles by researchers who collected data firsthand, directly from the subjects under study. These researchers use methods such as mail-out, telephone, and in-person surveys to collect primary data. We excluded studies based on secondary research even though the data was initially gathered through surveys. These sources of secondary information included government agencies (e.g., Federal Reserve, Census Bureau, and Small Business Administration), organizations (e.g., Value Line, American Association of Individuals Investor, and National Federation of Independent Businesses) among others.

After having identified articles based on survey research, we classified them into several broad subject areas. Although the task of identifying the subject area of each article involved subjectivity, we believe that the results are at least suggestive of the topics represented by survey-based research.

## **EMPIRICAL FINDINGS**

The findings consist of two parts: (1) views of finance journal editors based on survey responses and (2) articles in finance journals based on survey research.

## VIEWS OF FINANCE JOURNAL EDITORS

In this section, we examine the responses of finance journal editors to seven questions (Q2 through Q8) contained in the questionnaire. One question asked whether finance journals have an established policy involving the publication of survey-based research (Q2). Of the 25 responses, none of the editors indicated such a policy. One editor of a core journal said “As in other papers, the survey-based article must pass the quality threshold. It must contribute to the literature and advance our knowledge.”

The next question asked editors to indicate the path that their journals followed when considering survey-based manuscripts for publication (Q3). As Table 2 shows, 22 of the 25 editors answer this question. Most of the responding editors (81.8%) report that the review process of survey-based manuscripts is the same as others. A few editors report screening such manuscripts more rigorously than others, but none discouraged the submission of survey-based manuscripts. One editor of a “non-core” journal describes the journal’s review process as follows: “I pre-scrutinize survey-based submissions carefully to determine whether I feel they are sufficiently rigorously executed to merit referring.” Another editor relegates the review process to a guest editor for a special survey issue.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

We asked editors to indicate their view on the role that survey-based research should play in the finance literature (Q4). Table 3 shows the results for the 23 respondents. Although the small sample sizes do not permit statistical testing, the results suggest differences between the views of editors from “core” versus “non-core” finance journals. Editors of “core” journals state that survey-based research should play either a complementary or a limited (or no) role, 66.7% and 33.3% respectively, relative to other types of original research. None indicate that survey-based research should be considered equal to other types of original research. By contrast, the majority of editors from “non-core” finance journals (58.8%) indicate that survey-based research should be considered equal to other types of original research.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

Another issue concerns the potential strengths and weaknesses of survey-based research (Q5 and Q6). We asked the editors to indicate their views about whether any of five strengths or weaknesses apply to survey-based research. Because they could select more than one of these responses plus indicate an “other” category, the number of responses exceeds the number of responding editors. Of the 25 editors, 22 answered the question on strengths while 20 gave their views on weaknesses. Table 4 shows the distribution of responses for these two questions.

Panel A of Table 4 presents the results for the strengths of survey research. All of the editors indicate that survey-based research adds value. Overall, the most highly ranked strength is that surveys produce data unavailable from other sources (30.4%) followed by survey responses can suggest new avenues for future research (26.8%). Almost a quarter of the editors (23.2%) indicate that sometimes there is no way to answer

a research question except to use survey-based research. In fact, one editor wrote “Having done a major survey-based research project, I know first hand that they can potentially, if carefully crafted, provide genuine insights that are unachievable through other means.”

[Insert Table 4 about here]

Like other research methodologies, survey research has weaknesses. As Panel B of Table 4 shows, each of three weaknesses received about 25% of the responses. These weaknesses are the difficulty of generalizing results (27.6%), non-response bias (25.5%), and adverse selection problems (22.4%). Another weakness, which 17.2% of the editors selected, is that respondents may not be fully knowledgeable to answer a question. Fortunately, methods are available for handling all of these weaknesses. Thus, survey research is not innately flawed but sometimes results in poor quality research because of poor execution by researchers. As one editor noted, “. . . many authors fail to apply rigorous survey design techniques, and therefore fail to elicit meaningful data.” Another editor wrote “many of the survey based papers that I have seen undermine themselves with poor analysis of results.”

Another question asked the editors to indicate up to three finance issues that would benefit most from survey-based research (Q7). Only 18 of 25 editors gave their views on this question. Because each editor could list more than one issue, the number of responses exceeds 18. Table 5 presents a summary of the finance issues potentially benefiting from survey research. The most frequently cited issue involves investment decisions and practices (25.0%) such as capital budgeting from a corporate perspective and portfolio choice from an individual perspective.

The next most popular issue concerns behavioral finance (21.4%). For example, one editor suggested using survey research to learn what people actually do and why they do it and then compare the results with theoretical conclusions. Such an approach could help bridge the gap between theory and practice. Another editor suggested using surveys to investigate the psychology of investing involving such issues as overconfidence. The third most popular issue is risk management (14.3%) including risk management practices and attitudes toward risk, especially among high net worth individuals.

[Insert Table 5 about here]

The remaining editors suggest an array of finance issues that would benefit from survey research. These issues include financing decisions such as those involving capital structure and raising funds as well as managerial decision making. The “other” category includes a variety of issues ranging from corporate governance to estimating earnings.

The final question asked editors to make additional comments about survey research (Q8). Only a few editors responded to this question. For example, one editor offered the following observation.

To ensure that a survey produces results which lead to reliable inferences requires that the review process includes the opportunity to see the questionnaires and, possibly, raw data/information. In this context, “reliable” means based on a sound method which is appropriate for the data in question.

Another editor cited two recent survey-based articles (Graham and Campbell 2001; Brav, Graham, Michaely, and Harvey 2005) as examples of those making important contributions to the finance literature.

## **ARTICLES IN FINANCE JOURNALS BASED ON SURVEY RESEARCH**

We identify articles published in the 50 finance journals over the period 1985 or the inaugural date, whichever is later, through 2005. We had access to all but one of the 50 journals, namely, the *Review of Futures Markets*. The results shown in Appendix 1 under “Survey Articles” approximate the number of survey-based articles published in each journal. The data represent only those articles in which their authors collected primary data, not those based on surveys conducted by others. Given the potential limitations of our search methodology, we believe that this list is representative, but not necessarily exhaustive.

[Insert Table 6 about here]

For the “core” finance journals, the most survey-based articles appear in *Financial Management* (23), *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting* (15), and *Financial Review* (10). For the “non-core” finance journals, those containing the most survey-based articles are the *Financial Services Review* (16), *Journal of Financial Education* (13), and *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* (10). Each of the remaining “core” and “non-core” finance journals has published only a few, if any, survey-based articles.

Table 6 presents a classification of the survey-based articles by broad topic areas. About a third of the published articles involve some aspect of financial management such as capital budgeting, financing, and dividend policy decisions. Other common topic areas include investments and portfolio management as well as financial markets and institutions. This table indicates that researchers have used the survey method to gather data on a broad array of topic areas.

## **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

Surveys have become a popular method of collecting information directly from people. Casual observation suggests that the attitudes toward and use of survey research in finance may differ from that of other business disciplines such as management and marketing. In this exploratory study, we survey 50 editors of finance journals about their views on various issues involving survey research. In addition, we identify the approximate number of survey-based articles published in a sample of finance journals and classify these articles by general topic area.

Responses from 25 finance editors reveal that none of their journals has an established policy involving the publication of survey-based research. Most responding editors report that survey-based manuscripts go through the same review process as other manuscripts. These editors appear to have mixed views about the role that survey research should play in the finance literature. Overall, they are evenly split in their views

about whether survey-based research should be considered equal to or should play a complementary role to other types of original research. However, none of the responding editors from “core” finance journals indicates that survey research should be equal to other types of original research.

The responding editors recognize that survey research has both strengths and weaknesses. The most often-cited strengths are that surveys produce data unavailable from other sources and survey responses can suggest new avenues for future research. Potential weaknesses include the difficulty of generalizing results from survey research and non-response bias. Researchers, however, can mitigate these drawbacks by using proper sampling methods and testing for non-response bias.

Despite these weaknesses, respondents indicate that survey research could be a useful approach for examining numerous issues. Some areas that editors believe could benefit include investment decisions and practices as well as behavioral finance. An examination of finance journals shows researchers have used this approach to cover a wide array of topics. Historically, finance journals having the most survey-based articles include *Financial Management*, *Financial Services Review*, *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting*, and the *Journal of Financial Education*.

What implications can we draw from these findings? First, while publication outlets in both “core” and “non-core” finance journals are available for survey-based research, many finance journals have published few, if any, articles based on this approach. Historically, finance journals that publish even one survey-based article, on average, a year are uncommon. The publication of survey research in finance is a relatively infrequent event. These data reinforce the belief that survey researchers travel a less well-trodden path than other types of researchers. Thus, survey researchers must be selective in choosing appropriate outlets for their work. Second, survey research is sometimes the only technique for gathering information and thus can offer unique insights about some research issue. Sample survey research enables researchers to generalize about an entire population by drawing inferences based on data derived from a small portion of that population.

Returning to the allegory, turtles, even eminent turtles, can learn something about frog behavior by asking them. In some cases, however, just asking frogs may be inadequate without having theories and conceptual frameworks. While differences between theory and practice often exist, both are important. Continual interactions between turtles and frogs can be mutually beneficial. For example, turtles can use information gathered by asking frogs to empirically validate conceptual hypotheses. This can help turtles revise and improve finance theories. By gaining a better understanding of what frogs do and why they do it, turtles can help tadpoles learn the difference between good practices and bad ones. In turn, learning more relevant and practical concepts, principles, and techniques can help tadpoles develop into successful frogs instead of becoming toads. In the frog pond, the inhabitants must co-exist, interact, and be tolerant of each other.

## REFERENCES

- Aggarwal, R. (1993) "Theory and practice in finance education: Or why we shouldn't just ask them," *Financial Practice and Education*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp.15-18.
- Borokhovich, K. A., R. J. Bricker, K. R. Brunarski, and B. J. Simkins (1995) "Finance research productivity and influence," *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 50, No. 5, pp. 1691-1717.
- Brav, A., J. Graham, R. Michaely, and C. R. Harvey (2005). "Payout policy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century," *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 77, No 3, pp. 483-527.
- Bruner, R. F. (2002) "Does M&A pay? A survey of evidence from the decision-maker," *Journal of Applied Finance*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 48-68.
- Chan, K. C., R. C. W. Fok, and M-S Pan (2000) "Citation-based finance department rankings: An update," *Financial Practice and Education*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 132-141.
- Cooley, P. L. (1994) "Survival strategies for the fledgling finance professor," *Financial Practice and Education*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 8-17.
- Graham, J. R. (2004), "Roundtable on corporate disclosure," *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 338-62.
- Graham, J. R. and Campbell R. Harvey (2001). *The theory and practice of corporate finance: Evidence from the field*," *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 60, No. 2-3, pp. 187-243.
- Heck, J. L. and P. L. Cooley (2005) "Prolific authors in the finance literature: A half century of contributions," *Journal of Financial Literature*, Vol.1, No. 1, pp. 46-69.
- Percival, J. (1993) "Why don't we just ask them?" *Financial Practice and Education*, Vol. 3, No. 3, p. 9.
- Pinsonneault, A. and K. L. Kraemer (1993) "Survey research methodology in management information systems: An assessment," *Journal of Management Information Systems*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 75-105.
- Ramirez, G. G., D. A. Waldman, and D. J. Lasser (1991), "Research needs in corporate finance: Perspectives from financial managers," *Financial Management*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 17-29.
- Rea, L. M. and R. A. Parker (1997), *Designing and Conducting Survey Research*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Josey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.
- Weaver, S. C. (1993) "Why don't we just ask them? *Financial Practice and Education*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 11-13.
- Zivney, T. L. and W. Reichenstein (1994), "The pecking order in finance journals," *Financial Practice and Education*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 77-87.

**Table 1. Number of Editors and Response Rate for Email Survey**

This table presents the number of editors of finance journals surveyed and the response rate partitioned by “core” and “non-core” finance journals.

	<b>Type of Finance Journal</b>		<b>Total</b>
	<b>Core</b>	<b>Non-Core</b>	
Editors	15	35	50
Responses	8	17	25
Response rate (%)	53.3	48.6	50.0

**Table 2. Review Process for Survey-Based Manuscripts**

This table presents responses from 22 editors of finance journals on the review process of survey-based manuscripts partitioned by “core” and “non-core” finance journals.

	<b>Type of Finance Journal</b>					
	<b>Core</b>		<b>Non-Core</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Although my journal does not have an established policy, it has followed the following path when considering survey-based manuscripts for publication.						
A. Survey-based manuscripts go through the <u>same</u> review process as other manuscripts.	4	80.0	14	82.4	18	81.8
B. Survey-based manuscripts are screened <u>more rigorously</u> than other manuscripts before they go through the review process.	1	20.0	1	5.9	2	9.1
C. Survey-based manuscripts are generally <u>discouraged</u> and only those with the greatest potential for making a contribution to the finance literature go through the review process.	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
D. My journal uses the following review process for survey-based manuscripts.	0	0.0	2	11.8	2	9.1
Total	5	100.0	17	100.1	22	100.0

**Table 3. Role that Survey-Based Research Should Play in the Finance Literature**

This table presents responses from 23 editors of finance journals on their views of the role survey-based research should play in the finance literature partitioned by “core” and “non-core” finance journals.

Which of the following statements best describes your view on the role that survey-based research should play in the finance literature.	<b>Type of Finance Journal</b>				<b>Total</b>	
	<b>Core</b>		<b>Non-Core</b>		<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>		
A. Survey-based research should be considered <u>equal</u> to other types of original research.	0	0.0	10	58.8	10	43.5
B. Survey-based research should play a <u>complementary</u> role to other types of original research.	4	66.7	6	35.3	10	43.5
C. There is a limited (or no) role for survey-based research relative to other types of original research.	2	33.3	1	5.9	3	13.0
D. The role of survey-based research should be as follows. ( <i>Please fill in.</i> )	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 4. Perceived Strengths and Weaknesses of Survey-Based Research**

This table presents responses from 20 editors of finance journals on their views about the strengths and weaknesses of survey-based research partitioned by “core” and “non-core” finance journals. Because most editors gave more than one response, the total exceeds 20 for both the strengths and weaknesses.

	<b>Type of Finance Journal</b>					
	<b>Core</b>		<b>Non-Core</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>Panel A. Strengths</i>						
A. None, because survey-based research does not add value.	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
B. Surveys produce data unavailable from other sources.	2	18.2	15	33.3	17	30.4
C. Survey responses can suggest new avenues for future research.	3	27.3	12	26.7	15	26.8
D. Direct responses from decision makers add value.	2	18.2	8	17.8	10	17.9
E. Sometimes there is no other way to answer a research question.	3	27.3	10	22.2	13	23.2
F. Other	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	1.8
Total	11	100.1	45	100.0	56	100.1
<i>Panel B. Weaknesses</i>						
A. Generalizing results from survey-based research is often difficult.	4	33.3	12	26.1	16	27.6
B. Survey-based research has major adverse selection problems because those who take the time to respond may not be the best respondents.	3	25.0	10	21.7	13	22.4
C. Survey research often suffers from non-response bias.	1	8.3	14	30.4	15	25.9
D. Noise reduces the statistical power of results.	1	8.3	3	6.5	4	6.8
E. A respondent may not have the full knowledge of how to respond to a question.	3	25.0	7	15.2	10	17.2
F. Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	12	99.0	46	99.9	58	99.9

**Table 5. Finance Issues Benefiting from Survey-Based Research**

This table presents responses from 18 editors of finance journals on what finance issues would benefit most from survey-based research. The total exceeds 18 because some editors listed several issues.

<b>Issue</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Investment decisions and practices (corporate and individual)	7	25.0
Behavioral finance	6	21.4
Risk management (FX, hedging, and attitudes toward risk)	4	14.3
Financing decisions (capital structure and raising funds)	3	10.7
Managerial decision making and incentives	3	10.7
Other (corporate governance, market expectations, earnings estimates, mergers and divestitures, family-owned firms, issues with no or limited data)	5	17.9
Total	28	100.0

**Table 6. Classification of Articles in Finance Journals Based on Survey Research**

This table presents data that classifies survey-based articles that appeared between 1985 or the inaugural date, whichever is later, and 2005 for 49 finance journals partitioned into “core” and “non-core” journals.

<b>Topic Area</b>	<b>Type of Finance Journal</b>				<b>Total</b>	
	<b>Core</b>		<b>Non-Core</b>			
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Financial Management	32	37.2	27	28.7	59	32.8
Investments and Portfolio Management	11	12.8	12	12.8	23	12.8
Financial Markets and Institutions	15	17.4	6	6.4	21	11.7
Derivatives and Risk Management	8	9.3	9	9.6	17	9.4
International Finance	5	5.8	10	10.6	15	8.3
Technology and Innovation in Finance	5	5.8	7	7.4	12	6.7
Personal Finance	1	1.2	8	8.5	9	5.0
Educational Issues in Finance	0	0.0	8	8.5	8	4.4
Other	9	10.5	7	7.4	16	8.9
Total	86	100.0	94	99.9	180	100.0

## Appendix 1. Finance Journals Included in the Study

This appendix presents the 15 “core” and 35 “non-core” finance journals included in the study. Column 1 lists the journal title. Column 2 shows the number of survey-based articles published in the journal. Column 3 indicates whether the journal editor responded to the email survey. Column 4 lists the inaugural year of the journal.

	<b>Journal</b>	<b>Survey Articles</b>	<b>Survey Response</b>	<b>Inaugural Year</b>
<i>Panel A. Core Finance Journals</i>				
1.	Financial Analysts Journal	7	No	1945
2.	Financial Management	23	No	1972
3.	Financial Review	10	Yes	1966
4.	Journal of Banking and Finance	6	No	1977
5.	Journal of Business Finance and Accounting	15	No	1974
6.	Journal of Finance	5	Yes	1946
7.	Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis	0	No	1966
8.	Journal of Financial Economics	3	Yes	1974
9.	Journal of Financial Research	2	Yes	1978
10.	Journal of Financial Services Research	3	Yes	1987
11.	Journal of Futures Markets	0	No	1981
12.	Journal of International Money and Finance	4	No	1982
13.	Journal of Money, Credit and Banking	4	Yes	1969
14.	Journal of Portfolio Management	4	Yes	1974
15.	Review of Financial Studies	0	Yes	1988
<i>Panel B. Non-Core Finance Journals</i>				
1.	Applied Financial Economics	0	No	1991
2.	Applied Mathematical Finance	0	No	1994
3.	Asia-Pacific Financial Markets	0	No	1994
4.	European Financial Management	7	Yes	1997
5.	European Journal of Finance	4	Yes	1995
6.	Finance and Stochastics	0	No	1997
7.	Financial Markets, Institutions and Instruments	0	No	1992
8.	Financial Services Review	16	Yes	1991
9.	Global Finance Journal	2	No	1989
10.	International Finance	0	Yes	1998
11.	International Journal of Managerial Finance	1	Yes	2005
12.	International Review of Economics and Finance	0	No	1992
13.	International Review of Financial Analysis	0	Yes	1992

**Appendix 1. Finance Journals Included in the Study – Continued**

	<b>Journal</b>	<b>Survey Articles</b>	<b>Survey Response</b>	<b>Inaugural Year</b>
14.	Journal of Applied Corporate Finance	4	No	1988
15.	Journal of Applied Finance	6	Yes	2001
16.	Journal of Corporate Finance	1	Yes	1994
17.	Journal of Derivatives	0	No	1994
18.	Journal of Empirical Finance	1	Yes	1993
19.	Journal of Financial Education	13	Yes	1972
20.	Journal of Financial Intermediation	0	No	1990
21.	Journal of Financial Markets	0	No	1998
22.	Journal of Fixed Income	2	No	1991
23.	Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money	0	No	1991
24.	Journal of Investing	3	Yes	1992
25.	Journal of Multinational Financial Management	7	Yes	1991
26.	Mathematical Finance	0	No	1975
27.	Multinational Finance Journal	0	No	1997
28.	Pacific Basin Finance Journal	6	Yes	1993
29.	Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance	10	No	1962
30.	Research in International Business and Finance	2	Yes	1979
31.	Review of Derivatives Research	0	No	1996
32.	Review of Finance (formerly European Finance Review)	1	Yes	1997
33.	Review of Financial Economics	5	Yes	1991
34.	Review of Futures Markets*	N/A	Yes	1982
35.	Review of Pacific Basin Financial Markets and Policies	3	No	1998

\*Journal unavailable for review.

## Appendix 2. Survey of Finance Journal Editors

This appendix presents a copy of the survey used to obtain responses from finance journal editors.

### SURVEY-BASED RESEARCH IN FINANCE: VIEWS FROM EDITORS OF FINANCE JOURNALS

**Instructions:** The purpose of this survey is to obtain views about survey-based research (**excluding literature surveys**) from editors of finance journals. Please email your response to Tarun Mukherjee at [tmukherj@uno.edu](mailto:tmukherj@uno.edu).

1. **The name of my journal is:** *(Please fill in.)*
  
2. **My journal has an established policy involving the publication of survey-based research.** *(Place an “x” to indicate your response.)*     \_\_\_ Yes                     \_\_\_ No  
  
*If “yes”, please describe your journal’s policy below (or add an attachment) and then skip to Question 4.*
  
3. **Although my journal does not have an established policy, it has followed the following path when considering survey-based manuscripts for publication.** *(Place an “x” to indicate your response.)*  
\_\_\_ A. Survey-based manuscripts go through the same review process as other manuscripts.  
\_\_\_ B. Survey-based manuscripts are screened more rigorously than other manuscripts before they go through the review process.  
\_\_\_ C. Survey-based manuscripts are generally discouraged and only those with the greatest potential for making a contribution to the finance literature go through the review process.  
\_\_\_ D. My journal uses the following review process for survey-based manuscripts. *(Please fill in.)*
  
4. **Which of the following statements best describes your view on the role that survey-based research should play in the finance literature?** *(Place an “x” to indicate your response.)*  
\_\_\_ A. Survey-based research should be considered equal to other types of original research.  
\_\_\_ B. Survey-based research should play a complementary role to other types of original research.  
\_\_\_ C. There is a limited (or no) role for survey-based research relative to other types of original research.  
\_\_\_ D. The role of survey-based research should be as follows. *(Please fill in.)*

**5. The strengths of survey-based research are as follows. (Place an x for all that apply.)**

- A. None, because survey-based research does not add value.
- B. Surveys produce data unavailable from other sources.
- C. Survey responses can suggest new avenues for future research.
- D. Direct responses from decision makers add value.
- E. Sometimes there is no other way to answer a research question.
- F. Other (Please fill in.)

**6. The weaknesses of survey-based research are as follows. (Place an x for all that apply.)**

- A. Generalizing results from survey-based research is often difficult.
- B. Survey-based research has major adverse selection problems because those who  
take the time to respond may not be the best respondents.
- C. Survey research often suffers from non-response bias.
- D. Noise reduces the statistical power of results.
- E. A respondent may not have the full knowledge of how to respond to a question.
- F. Other (Please fill in.)

**7. In your opinion, what finance issues would benefit most from survey-based research? (List up to 3 issues.)**

- A.
- B.
- C.

**8. If you want to make additional comments about survey-based research in finance, please do so below.**

**9. Do you want to receive a summary of the survey results? (Place an "x" to indicate your response.)**

Yes                       No

<p><i>Thank you for your time in completing this survey. Please return the survey to Tarun Mukherjee at <a href="mailto:tmukherj@uno.edu">tmukherj@uno.edu</a></i></p>
--