

Editorial

The Mission of *Marketing Science*

Steven M. Shugan

Warrington College of Business Administration, University of Florida, 201 Bryan Hall,
Campus Box 117155, Gainesville, FL 32611-7155
<http://mktsci.pubs.informs.org>

Introductory Comments

As the new Editor-in-Chief for *Marketing Science*, it is a great pleasure to provide my first editorial. The objective of this editorial is to outline the strategy for *Marketing Science* and how it will be implemented. In particular, this editorial announces several new types of papers the journal will accept and why. Before doing so, however, we must all emphatically compliment my friend, Dr. Brian Ratchford, for the excellent job that he has done over the past four years as Editor-in-Chief of *Marketing Science*. Brian has left me in an enviable position. The next few issues of the journal are set with excellent articles; the journal's prestige remains at an all-time high; the journal features prominent, dedicated area editors; and Brian has recruited remarkably well-qualified and strikingly motivated researchers for the editorial board. Brian has adroitly built on the previous fine work of Dr. Donald Morrison, Dr. Subrata Sen, Dr. John R. Hauser, and Dr. Richard Staelin, each of whom left his own valuable legacies for *Marketing Science*. The devotion of these researchers, numerous reviewers, and College on Marketing members have been important resources for the journal. My own experience suggests that *Marketing Science* reviews involve the most reflection of any journal.

A New World for Journals

Trends

To understand the proposed strategy for *Marketing Science*, we must first recognize at least two important technological changes that impact *Marketing Science* as well as other journals.

First, electronic information retrieval services are rapidly replacing print media as the source of information. Indeed, an INFORMS member can now access all articles in all INFORMS journals for a single fee. Second, journal evaluations are moving from subjective and unreliable (Hawkins et al. 1973) measures of prestige to more objective quantitative metrics of performance. Now available are services offering detailed journal evaluations on complex metrics, including the average number of citations per article in a journal over a specified period. Despite the obvious limitations of citation analyses, they are becoming popular in many disciplines (Garfield 1999).

Electronic Dissemination

There are several implications for *Marketing Science* as well as many other journals. Given electronic information retrieval services, journal subscribers no longer need to limit their subscriptions to a small number of journals. They can easily find relevant articles in a vast number of journals. Consequently, the importance of bundling many relevant articles together to encourage subscriptions is becoming less important. Researchers and other audiences who seek information will still subscribe to journals customized to their specific needs. However, journals will be less able to differentiate based on the bundling of content and must focus on other dimensions. Hence, *Marketing Science* should not restrict the type of articles published only to differentiate itself from other journals. Moreover, trying to strategically fine-tune a journal's image is a Herculean task. Despite the extraordinary powers of persuasion of many editors, few researchers read editorials and dramatically change their research paths to accommodate an editor's tastes. A

better strategy is to focus on variables the editor can control. These include the openness of the journal to new ideas, the types of articles the journal is willing to publish, the mechanics of the review process, the presentation of information in the journal, and access to the journal. This component of the journal's strategy involves a number of initiatives. They include an openness to innovative research, a movement toward an efficient paperless review process, a smaller number of efficient revisions, improved handling of revisions, and a very fast time to print. The objective is to make the *Marketing Science* review process less costly for both authors and reviewers. Authors should submit to *Marketing Science*, not only because it is a prestigious place to publish with an enviable certification of quality, but also because they can quickly disseminate their findings to a wide audience. Beyond turnaround time, a useful goal is decreasing the total time-to-print for submitted manuscripts.

Evaluating Journals on Impact

Now, consider the implications of the increasingly popular quantitative metrics of performance. It is now becoming common to evaluate journals on metrics, such as citations, rather than merely to rely on surveys of prestige. Of course, we should consider more than numbers. Articles may not be cited for many reasons. For example, the article may adopt a different paradigm. The topic may be unpopular. The article may be ahead of its time. The content of the article may become generic, or the author may be at a less-than-prestigious institutional affiliation.

Keeping in mind the many limitations of citation analyses, we are still doing well on this metric. *Marketing Science* is far from broken. *Marketing Science's* impact rating, based on estimated citations per article reported by the SSCI Journal Citation Reports (www.jcr.com), in the year 2000 was 1.364. That rating exceeds that of *Management Science* (1.011), the *Rand Journal of Economics* (1.107), the *Journal of Econometrics* (0.977), and the *Journal of Accounting Research* (1.071). However, it has not grown from prior years (1.478 in 1995). In the year 2000, it was also slightly less than that of some other leading marketing journals (for ex-

ample, 2.039 for the *Journal of Marketing* and 1.679 for the *Journal of Marketing Research*).

Analyses that are far more complete provide similar conclusions. Harzing (2001) finds that *Marketing Science* is an A-journal of international status and gives it the highest possible rating (an A-5). Bill Starbuck (1996), as reported by Staelin (1996), verifies this status. Although not all published marketing productivity rankings use *Marketing Science* (e.g., Trieschmann et al. 2000), rankings based on a larger set of journals do use it (Bakir et al. 2000).

It is important to note that citation analyses are a metric for a journal's impact on published research. This perspective emphasizes the important network externality aspect of research, in which the value of research often depends on other research. Journals are unlike products that only compete for market shares. An isolated journal often has little impact. Journals that overlap build on each other's research, creating synergies and producing mutual impact. It is not a market share game! It is a network externality game.

Hence, journals publishing similar articles work synergistically to enhance each other's reputations. An excellent example is the *Journal of Consumer Research* (JCR) with a 2.460 impact rating. In the year 2000, it received more citations from the *Advances in Consumer Research* conference proceeding (i.e., 439 cites) than from JCR citing itself (i.e., 251 self-cites). The conference proceeding substantially improves the impact scores for the *Journal of Consumer Research*. Like the *Journal of Consumer Research*, and unlike most other journals, self-citation is also not the primary source of citations for *Marketing Science* (94 self-cites in year 2000).

However, as Table 1 shows, unlike the *Journal of Consumer Research*, *Marketing Science* enjoys citations from a similar high-impact journal. The *Journal of Marketing Research* is the largest source of citations (107 in the year 2000) for *Marketing Science* citations. Table 1 also shows trends in the journals citing *Marketing Science* over time. Of course, recent articles usually get fewer cites because they are earlier in their citable life span.

Therefore, differentiating *Marketing Science* is only a minor goal. A major goal is to find and publish

Table 1 Journals Citing Marketing Science

Citing Journal	Impact of Citing Journal Year 2000	Total Cites in All Years	Cites from 1996 to 2000	Cites from 1991 to 1995
<i>Journal of Marketing Research</i>	1.679	107	32	37
<i>Marketing Science (Self-Cites)</i>	1.364	94	26	34
<i>International Journal of Research in Marketing</i>	1.133	85	43	23
<i>Journal of Retailing</i>	0.600	48	14	24
<i>Journal of Marketing</i>	2.039	41	11	14
<i>Management Science</i>	1.011	37	8	15
<i>OR Spektrum</i>	0.000	35	4	6
<i>Journal of the Academy of Market- ing Science</i>	0.980	29	9	15
<i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>	2.460	21	4	10
<i>European Journal of Operations Re- search</i>	0.000	20	2	7
All other journals		414	83	131
Total		931	236	316

high-impact articles. Prestige journals, like *Marketing Science*, must follow a conservative review process. However, the errors are asymmetric. The loss from publishing a low-impact article is far less than the loss from failing to publish a high-impact article.

Evaluation of journals on impact is only one reason for this goal. A second reason for publishing high-impact articles is that they provide enormous benefits to the field of marketing. They provide opportunities for future research, as well as opportunities for applying research in marketing. Finally, high-impact articles can increase the audience for *Marketing Science* and, perhaps, help other articles published by the journal.

To accomplish this goal, we must be willing to consider a wide range of articles. Expanding the number of publishable topics increases opportunities for attracting potentially high-impact modeling articles in areas outside of traditional research. We must also recognize the need to overlap with other journals.

Overlapping journals have more impact than differentiated ones because they build on each other's research. The easiest way to have an impact is to have research in other journals extend the research done in *Marketing Science*. We should also build on the research published in other marketing journals.

Issues Facing *Marketing Science*

Current Situation

Several authors have done extensive analyses of marketing journals. Hans Baumgartner and Rik Pieters (2000) report several interesting anomalies regarding *Marketing Science*.

First, *Marketing Science* was ranked fourth among doctorate-granting institutions but only tenth among non-doctorate-granting institutions.

Second, "... very specialized and focused marketing journals tend not to be influential in marketing." However, *Marketing Science* was one of the "most notable exceptions to this general pattern" (Hans Baumgartner and Rik Pieters 2000).

This finding is consistent with other analyses. For example, Tellis, Chandy, and Ackerman (1999) report that *Marketing Science* is the "least diverse" of four leading marketing journals. They also find that *Marketing Science* "shows some strong fluctuations, as authors and editors sought to develop a clear niche for the journal."

Ratchford (2001) stated: "We [at *Marketing Science*] seem to concentrate a disproportionate amount of effort on packaged goods and to do relatively little work in some areas important to practitioners."

Table 2 Most Cited Articles in Marketing Science

Rank	All Time (Rank on Current Cites)	Current & Projected Cites	After 1990 (Rank on Projected Cites)	Current & Projected Cites
1	Thaler (1985)	338,356	Griffin-Hauser (1993)	77, 123
2	Guadagni-Little (1983)	278,278	Anderson-Sullivan (1993)	74, 118
3	Anderson-Weitz (1989)	132,162	Lynch-Ariely (2000)	12, 116
4	Hauser-Shugan (1983)	123,123	Hardie-Johnson-Fader (1993)	53, 85
5	Jeuland-Shugan (1983)	109,109	Gonul-Srinivasan (1993)	51, 81

The third anomaly is that *Marketing Science* gained prominence in a very short period of time. Perhaps the reason is that *Marketing Science* had strong early support from established researchers at established institutions offering leading doctoral programs. That support overcame its "focus" disadvantage. For example, early issues of the journal featured well-known researchers. Also recall that the Editor-in-Chief was Donald Morrison (then at Columbia) and the Area Editors were V. Srinivasan (Stanford), Subrata Sen (then at Rochester), and Jerry Wind (Wharton). See Hauser (1989) for more supporting evidence for this point. The first articles in *Marketing Science* were from researchers who were well known, at leading universities, or both. The implication is that to maintain a focused strategy requires perpetual participation by well-known researchers from universities who produce future faculty (i.e., doctoral programs).

Reaching a Larger Audience

It appears that *Marketing Science* has done well. However, the focused strategy of the journal creates a potential vulnerability. As Ratchford (2001) states, "If our interests become too narrowly focused, ultimately we could lose our franchise with practitioners in some areas we have neglected." Were *Marketing Science* less focused, it would be less dependent on publications of researchers who have established reputations publishing elsewhere (probably other marketing journals). Being less focused would also present more of an opportunity to publish research from promising young researchers. Of course, a new strategy will keep our many existing strengths. We will continue to publish the same types of articles. Rather than

publishing different types of articles, we should publish more types of manuscripts. We should add more topics and keep the representation of current topics.

Another argument for moving away from a focused strategy is the changing technology used to evaluate journals. As previously mentioned, journal rankings are moving from prestige metrics (e.g., surveys of top researchers) to citation impact ratings. The latter ratings are very dependent on having a few high-impact (i.e., highly cited) articles. This is evident from the high variation in impact ratings from year to year.

Moreover, some researchers (Polonsky et al. 1999) have suggested using accessibility as a criterion for evaluating journals. Here, *Marketing Science's* focused strategy creates a distinct disadvantage. Focused and elitist strategies work poorly in the new environment, where journals are evaluated on broader and more complex measures.

One goal must be to publish high-impact research. Another goal must be to overlap with research in other journals. Given the limited number of available high-impact manuscripts, we must expand the set of acceptable topics for publishable manuscripts. Given the limited number of articles any journal can publish, we need to be synergistic with research published in other marketing journals.

Replicating Success: Our Most-Cited Papers

An impact analysis also supports a nonfocused strategy. Early papers in *Marketing Science* had an enormous impact on many dimensions. Citations are just one measure of that impact, albeit a commonly used one.

Table 2 provides the five most cited articles (to

date) in *Marketing Science*. Current cumulative citations for these articles are 338, 278, 132, 123, and 109, respectively. However, older papers have more time to accumulate citations. Therefore, using a half-life of 8.3 years, as reported by the Social Science Citation Index Journal Citation Report, we project citations for all papers after 18 years from publication. These numbers are to the right of current citations in the table. We see that Griffin-Hauser (1993) replaces Jeuland-Shugan (1983) in the top five.

Table 2 also provides the five most-cited articles for articles appearing after 1990, adjusting for each article's age. Again, the table reports both current and projected cites for 18 years after publication. Obviously, the half-life assumption is important for the projections.

The one thing these papers have in common is that they have little in common, except, perhaps, for their interest to an audience beyond *Marketing Science*. Diversity helps to achieve success. Expanding the domain of the journal provides more opportunities to find high-impact papers. It also creates more opportunities for synergy.

We should not reject papers only because they contradict existing beliefs, use different methods, or focus their attention on nontraditional variables. We need to move away from complexity as a goal. The goal of modeling is simplicity (we already have the complexity of the real world). We model to remove complex distractions that are not central to the phenomena under study.

Producing mathematics, per se, is not a goal of *Marketing Science*. Mathematics is a language, i.e., the language of science. It provides the ability to communicate precisely a contribution. It is NOT the contribution. The primary goal is to answer research questions in marketing by exploiting the capabilities of quantitative methods.

Our goal must be to reach a wide audience. We should broaden our net to capture more high-impact research. We should be synergistic with research published in other marketing journals.

Publishing High-Impact Articles

One problem associated with publishing high-impact articles is that the often-noisy review process makes

it particularly difficult to publish highly cited articles. Staelin (1998b) notes this point and emphasizes the Lynch (1998) study that shows an extraordinary variance in reviewer recommendations for the same submission. There exists substantial evidence that journals do face biases against innovative articles (Crane 1967, Mahoney 1977) with the potential for more impact.

Although the early suggestions by Morrison (1982) to authors of *Marketing Science* are invaluable, a frustrated Armstrong (1982) suggests (hopefully facetiously) that authors (1) not pick an important problem, (2) not challenge existing beliefs, (3) not obtain surprising results, (4) not use simple methods, (5) not provide full disclosure, and (6) not write clearly.

Of course, challenges of publishing seminal research are not limited to the field of marketing. Staelin (1998b) cites the Gans and Shepherd study (1994), which reveals that many extremely influential economics articles were repeatedly rejected by economics journals. Numerous other studies (e.g., Armstrong 1979, Peters and Ceci 1982, Azbel 1993, Daniel 1993) come to similar conclusions. Sharpe states that when his famous capital asset pricing model (now with more than 2000 citations) was rejected by the *Journal of Finance*, the editor told Sharpe that his "assumption that all investors made the same predictions was so preposterous that it makes his conclusions uninteresting (Shepherd 1995)." Nobel Laureate Akerlof's seminal paper on the market for lemons was rejected by the *American Economic Review*, which replied that AER did not publish such trivial stuff." The *Journal of Political Economy* rejected the paper because "the paper was too general to be true." The *Review of Economic Studies* rejected it because, again, "it was too trivial." Finally, the paper was published in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. Someone in marketing, unlike Akerlof, might have fewer A-journals as options.

Examples outside of the business literature are also numerous. Physicist Julius von Mayer could not publish the First Law of Thermodynamics in any leading physics journal—it appeared in an obscure chemistry journal. Mathematician Jean Baptiste Fourier's revolutionary article on heat propagation took 13 years in the review process (Merton 1968). Albert Einstein be-

came so angry at reviews from *Physical Review* that he stopped submitting papers to that journal (Azbel 1993).

Staelin (2000) has his own story about his own very high-cited channels paper that was rejected by several journals. He had given up on that paper. However, he found that *Marketing Science* was receptive to a channels paper that he was reviewing. Based on that observation, he submitted his paper to *Marketing Science*. It was published shortly afterwards. *Marketing Science* needs to keep that receptivity to new ideas.

There is an extensive body of literature on how to improve the peer review system (e.g., Cole 1998), the role of the editor (e.g., Laband and Piette 1994), and potential biases in the review process (Blank 1991). Obviously, revealing an author's name can sway reviewers. However, reputation and background are also important. For example, statements about product development at IBM would be more credible when made in a paper coauthored by IBM's VP for new product development. Nevertheless, in deference to lesser-known authors, INFORMS policy is double blind.

More Efficient Revisions

One obvious implication of the noise in the review process is that revisions are extremely risky. The review process usually improves most articles (Laband 1990) but not all articles—it often depends on the ability of the editor to select the proper reviewers. For articles in Chemistry, 87% of rejected papers were published elsewhere in their original form (Peters and Ceci 1982). Worse, authors who are likely to write revolutionary articles are likely to get reviewers with lesser qualifications. Finally, evidence exists that requests for revisions are the primary cause for the slowdown in the publishing process (Ellison 2000, Hamermesh 1994).

Hence, when an author makes specific revisions for a specific reviewer, there is no guarantee that those revisions will substantially improve the odds of acceptance at another journal. In particular, the authors of a manuscript rejected after the first revision bear an enormous cost in terms of both the time spent on the revision and the opportunity cost associated with

not sending the manuscript to another journal. Although this problem may be unsolvable, there are opportunities to improve the efficiency of the process by limiting the number of revisions or more carefully examining the nature of the requested revisions. Moreover, editors can provide clear direction to reduce the number of revisions.

It is important to focus on time-to-print as an objective. It is also important to clearly classify types of revisions. A future editorial may elaborate on this point.

Fragmentation of the Field

In the 1970s, it seemed that marketing was more of a "melting pot," where researchers with very different training and viewpoints coalesced to work on shared marketing problems. These problems, for example, included how to help marketing managers make better decisions and the proper role of marketing in an organization. Unlike finance and management science, which are coalescing around problems such as trading in financial markets and building management information systems, to some extent, our field is fragmenting. There is often more emphasis on the approach taken over the contribution to marketing knowledge. Of course, some of this trend is inevitable as knowledge advances. My own research argues that advances in knowledge require a more specialized economy (Shugan 1994). Nevertheless, combined efforts often lead to synergistic impact.

We need to focus on common marketing problems while using different approaches, methods, data, viewpoints, and ideas. As long as we share the problems, we can combine forces to create spectacular advancements in our knowledge of markets and marketing. *Marketing Science* should provide a vehicle to do that. Many of the following objectives and initiatives center on enhancing shared relevance and communication to create accessible and transferable knowledge.

Objectives and Initiatives

We will maintain the quality reputation of the journal by using expert reviewers to certify manuscripts as

errorless. There are other objectives beyond maintaining quality. Given the previous reasoning, the situation analysis implies the following three objectives:

1. Broaden the audience for *Marketing Science*;
2. Increase the impact of the journal;
3. Make the process more efficient.

There are some major problems involved in accomplishing these objectives. For example, participation by a broader audience with less training in quantitative methods is difficult because they are unable to publish or even read *Marketing Science*. This audience may have many good ideas and a genuine desire to use research published in *Marketing Science*, but their background creates barriers. Another problem is participation by practitioners as either contributors or readers. As contributors, practitioners lack incentives to publish. Practitioner readers often learn more from solid applications of existing theory than from articles proposing new state-of-the-art theory.

Marketing Science will never be everything for everyone, but there are ways of moving toward achieving these three objectives. This section proposes several initiatives.

Objective 1: Broaden the Audience for *Marketing Science*

Future editorials may expand on these initiatives. However, the journal will take a slightly different attitude toward different articles. The primary focus will remain on articles that answer important research questions in marketing, using mathematical modeling. However, other scholarly articles may encourage broader participation and diversity.

In particular, we want to encourage submission of four new types of contributions, as follows:

- (1) "Findings papers" that, with the use of empirical quantitative methods, produce important general substantive findings (but without any specific contribution to modeling methods). The objective is to allow faster publication of empirical discoveries without the need for elaborate theoretical underpinnings.
- (2) Short "chronicle papers" that document normative applications of models and methods. Chron-

icle papers should briefly discuss a specific application and provide some general contributions that may relate only to implementation issues. The objective is to allow some research to focus on implementation as a research objective. We should recognize that many organizations are resistant to adopting new marketing methods and processes. We should consider the reasons.

- (3) Short one-page "scoop papers" that provide a scholarly report of events occurring in either fundamental disciplines or industry that might have important marketing implications. These events may be new initiatives taken by firms (e.g., crisis management teams, knowledge management, sustainable technology initiatives, business games for training), changes in the environment (e.g., new regulations, changes in technology) or breakthroughs in fundamental disciplines (e.g., economics of intellectual property, psychology of fairness, call center management, nonparametric multivariate analysis, restructuring). Although scoop papers will be checked for accuracy and relevance, unless they provide an original contribution, they will be published in a new nonreferred articles section that will include letters and comments. The objective is to provide a constant source of fresh ideas for relevant research.
- (4) We may occasionally consider nonreferred letters or short articles. For example, rejoinder letters on negative comments may be published in a nonreferred section. As Staelin (1998a) reminds us, science suffers when debate is inhibited. Letters should be polite and scholarly with clear reasoning for all statements made. Letters should be accurate and not confuse opinions with facts. However, opinions may be provocative and contradictory to current beliefs.

The new submission form requests specific information that helps determine the paper's type and criteria for evaluation. The nonreferred section should allow publication of accurate, interesting, and relevant information that fails the "significant original contribution" test.

Finally, we are also undertaking an ambitious outreach initiative for the journal to get more involved with practitioners.

Objective 2: Increase the Impact of the Journal

- (1) We will adopt a very receptive philosophy toward innovation over consistency with prevailing beliefs. As noted earlier, some of the most cited articles in *Marketing Science* are from diverse areas, including behavioral decision theory, operations research, econometrics, managerial economics, R&D, and relationship management. Most high-impact articles also have audiences in multiple disciplines. We encourage submissions by adopting an open philosophy and assigning ad hoc reviewers to accommodate nontraditional subject areas for *Marketing Science*. As discussed earlier, we should not reject papers only because they contradict existing beliefs, use different methods, focus on different variables, or make different assumptions. Adding more variables is not always necessary to advance research. The goal of modeling is simplicity. (We already have the complexity of the real world.)
- (2) It is unnecessary for every article to reach a diverse audience. However, in evaluating individual manuscripts, we will consider the audience for the article (e.g., managers, public policy makers, consumers, consultants, market research professionals, etc.) and require evidence that the research can impact at least that audience. The new submission forms will help us achieve this objective.
- (3) We will also require that the body of every manuscript be clearly readable by its target audience.
- (4) We will start a doctoral student editorial board. Although doctoral students may be unable to evaluate the contribution of a manuscript, their reviews will expand journal participation and provide valuable feedback. Moreover, more doctoral students will be involved with the journal, further broadening the impact of *Marketing Science*.

The new submission form requests specific information. It ensures that every paper has at least one audience.

Objective 3: Make the Process More Efficient

- (1) For most manuscripts, our process will be “paperless” and communications will be instanta-

neous. Some significant changes in the review process (including a decrease in the number of revisions) should further expedite the time from initial submission to actual publication. Backlog is not a problem.

- (2) We now have an option of a “fast-track review” for their submitted research. Authors with a certain type of submission can request a fast-track review. *Marketing Science* will either completely reject or commit to accept subject to either deletions or minor changes (no additions). The fast-track review is appropriate, for example, for manuscripts on extremely timely subjects and manuscripts in very “hot” research areas.
- (3) Reviewers will have new forms that are designed to reduce the number of revisions. The new manuscript submission forms should expedite the review process.
- (4) On-time reviews will remain very important.
- (5) Manuscripts should not be rejected because they fail to consider the reviewer’s favorite factor. The number of factors is gargantuan, and we seek parsimony.
- (6) Manuscripts should not be rejected because they fail to adopt the reviewer’s paradigm. Authors need not justify a paradigm already accepted in the literature. It is inefficient to fight philosophical battles in the review process. We will develop better forums for philosophical discussion.
- (7) The submission forms request specific information to help ensure an efficient and productive review process.
- (8) The new reviewer evaluation forms request specific information to help determine exactly how to revise a manuscript to ensure an efficient revision.
- (9) Beginning this issue, Stephen Siegforth (our production editor) will monitor posting of page proofs so that authors can access them on the typesetter’s ftp site. These developments increase production efficiency and have the potential to decrease time-to-print.

These initiatives will be implemented while retaining a rigorous peer review process using highly qualified reviewers. Certification of quality must remain

a top priority of the journal. We want a tolerant but thorough review process. We will remain unable to publish most submitted manuscripts. However, we do offer a fast, constructive review process.

The Editor's Biases

This editorial provides reasons to encourage more articles that focus on marketing problems. There are many important marketing problems. Moreover, we should broaden our view of marketing problems to include substantive normative problems with only a marketing component.

Beyond considering important marketing problems, papers should and will undergo a rigorous review. Careful and rigorous screening occurs before certification and publication. Every error should be eliminated. However, we must remember that different papers use different paradigms. Although each of us thinks that particular factors are important (e.g., channels, pricing, advertising, service, competition, product lines, category growth, network externalities, and heterogeneity), no paper can or should include all factors. Although each of us thinks that different assumptions are appropriate (e.g., an equilibrium, linearity, optimal behavior, and distributional assumptions), different paradigms adopt different assumptions. It is our task to evaluate each paper within its own paradigm. Reviewers should avoid imposing their paradigm on others. The superiority of a paradigm should be evident from what it produces. If a manuscript solves an important marketing problem for a well-defined audience, then rejection should not come from ignoring the reviewer's favorite factors or not using the reviewer's favorite approach.

On a related topic, truly revolutionary papers may be orthogonal to existing thought. However, few articles will open completely new areas of research. If an article provides a significant contribution, but not a revolutionary one, it has more synergy with the marketing literature if it builds on the existing marketing literature. Sometimes, we have a reverse case of the NIH (Not Invented Here) Syndrome and focus on arbitraging ideas from elsewhere. Scoop papers are a better and more encouraged vehicle over full-length articles. This preference is only a preference and not a

requirement. However, the assessment of contribution must consider the interest to a marketing audience.

Traditionally, the economics literature has targeted public policy makers and regulators. The impact of that literature is monumental. One small example is the shift from regulating specific firm decisions to providing consumers with better information. The finance literature has targeted financial markets. The impact of that literature is monumental. One small example is the impact on the invention and pricing of options and futures instruments. Moreover, in both of these literatures, empirical and theoretical findings have had considerable synergy. Similar arguments are possible for many other literatures.

The marketing literature has also had considerable impact, for example, on how firm's do market research and develop new products. However, in many domains, we must wonder whether we have been as successful. We must also wonder how we can have more impact. A rigorous focus on important marketing problems and practical solutions would help.

We should do research not only to publish it, but also to have it read and, hopefully, used.

Submissions Guidelines and Related Issues

Future editorials will elaborate on the initiatives in this editorial and the detailed mechanics of how to make a submission. Some of these topics are still in the experimental phase.

For immediate detailed information on submissions and other topics, please visit the journal website at <http://mktsci.pubs.informs.org>. That website contains vital information, including submission mechanics, manuscript page limits, organization of manuscripts, and related issues. In particular, see the section on "how to get your manuscript accepted." The journal cover pages also contain important information.

Briefly, here are the mechanics of how to make a submission. To decrease total turnaround time, make reviewing more efficient, increase safety, and conserve trees, we are moving toward a completely paperless

system. However, although it is discouraged, you may submit the traditional five "laser-quality" paper copies. The mail is slow, and delays are common.

To submit a manuscript for review, you must include a *Marketing Science* submission form with the manuscript. **Send your manuscript and a copy of the submission form** by e-mail. A diskette or CD is an acceptable alternative (use appropriate packaging and identify the manuscript file name). We regret that storage media cannot be returned.

Please **also send** one hard (paper) copy of the manuscript including tables, figures, and appendices (exactly matching the electronic file) to:

Professor Steven M. Shugan
Editor, *Marketing Science*
University of Florida
201 Bryan Hall
Campus Box 117155
Gainesville, FL 32611-7155
E-mail: <http://mktsci.pubs.informs.org>
FAX: (413) 638-9318

We will not process a manuscript until we obtain an electronic copy of both the manuscript and the submission form. Identify authors and affiliations on only the first page and no other page of the manuscript. Submit the entire article as a single file and without links to other files. Embed artwork when possible.

Before submitting a manuscript, carefully check the manuscript for errors and check that the manuscript prints as intended. Be sure to include your submission form with the manuscript. Always embed all fonts. Use only Type 1 or TrueType fonts. When sending an electronic copy, you have two options.

The first option is to send your manuscript as an unprotected PDF (Portable Document Format) file or a PS (PostScript Image) file. Note that Adobe Reader cannot produce PDF files. In order to produce a PDF file, you must either use Adobe Acrobat or Adobe's online service (see <https://createpdf.adobe.com>). It is best to create the PDF file on the same computer you used to create the original document. Send the submission form in any common electronic format (e.g., DOC, TXT, PDF). Processing begins immediately.

The second option for submission is to send a DOC (Microsoft Word) file, and we will convert it to PDF format. Check Word files for corruption and include embedded fonts (see the save options menu in Word). We will ask you to review and approve the PDF file before processing the manuscript. Our website (<http://mktsci.pubs.informs.org>) provides additional information about other acceptable formats.

With either option, your PDF manuscript file is sent to reviewers.

You should receive an acknowledgment within three days of receipt of your manuscript.

At the time of publication, we require a paper copy of the manuscript, as well as an original word-processing file for the production folks. TeX and LaTeX files can be acceptable but must comply with the journal guidelines. Although PDF and PS submissions are useful for reviews, they are unusable during the final publication phase. We will send the authors complete details.

When electronic submission is impossible, processing begins only after we receive: (1) five double-spaced traditional hard copies of the manuscript with the submission form *and* (2) a FAX of the manuscript with the submission form.

Other than the movement to electronic submissions, the mechanics of the editorial process will remain the same. Authors should correspond with the Editor-in-Chief, who is responsible for the processing of manuscripts. Area editors and reviewers will remain anonymous while continuing to provide an important advisory role. Anonymity encourages more participation and objectivity. Anonymity is appropriate, provided that anonymous participants are purely advisory.

Finally, authors must inform the Editor-in-Chief of previous appearances of the submitted manuscripts (or parts of it) or submissions to another journal or conference.

The Transition

The Team: New Members

Although changes routinely occur with respect to the review board and the area editors, we deeply appre-

ciate everyone's contributions. *Marketing Science* depends on the valuable time and resources of many busy but committed people. It is both gratifying and exciting to see so many individuals willing to help *Marketing Science* continue its tradition of both impact and quality.

Now, it is a pleasure to welcome four new area editors to our superb existing area editors. They are the following:

1. **Dr. Joel Huber**, Professor, Fuqua School of Business, Duke University; Associate Editor for the *Journal of Consumer Research*; Editorial Review Boards: *Journal of Marketing Research*, *Marketing Letters*, *Marketing Science*; taught at Wharton, Columbia, Purdue, and Duke; Ph.D. University of Pennsylvania (1975, Dr. Paul Green, advisor). He believes that an important wave of research will combine the psychological insights with the market and equilibrium insights from analytical modeling and experimental economics. He says: "*Marketing Science* is particularly well-positioned to lead in this important endeavor."
2. **Dr. Eitan Muller**, Professor of Marketing, Leon Recanati Graduate School of Business Administration, Tel Aviv University. B.Sc. Mathematics (cum laude) from the Technion, Israel Institute of Technology (1973). Ph.D. and M.B.A. (cum laude), Kellogg Graduate School of Management, Northwestern University (1977). Associate Editor, *Management Science*. Editorial Review Boards: *Marketing Science*, the *Journal of Marketing Research*, and *Review of Marketing Science*. Current research interests include: innovation diffusion and new product marketing, evolution of markets for new products, the effects of marketing and promotion variables, market structure, and word-of-mouth on the diffusion of new products.
3. **Dr. Roland T. Rust**, David Bruce Smith Chair in Marketing, and Director, Center for E-Service, at the Robert H. Smith School of Business, University of Maryland; Ph.D. University of North Carolina (1979). Has published six books. Current and Past Editorial Positions include: Editor, the *Journal of Service Research*; Editorial Review Board, the *Journal of Marketing Research*, *Marketing Science*, the

Journal of Marketing, the *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, the *Journal of Advertising*, the *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, the *Journal of Advertising Research*, the *Journal of Retailing*, and the *International Journal of Service Industry*. Research interests: customer equity, service marketing, e-service, marketing strategy. Lifetime achievement awards in the fields of advertising, marketing research, and statistics. Henry Latané Distinguished Doctoral Alumnus Award from the University of North Carolina. Best article awards for articles in *Marketing Science*, the *Journal of Marketing Research*, the *Journal of Marketing*, the *Journal of Retailing*, and the *Journal of Advertising*.

4. **Dr. Duncan Simester**, Associate Professor of Management Science, Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Ph.D. in Management Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1993); law degree and B.S. from the University of Auckland, New Zealand. Editorial Review Board: *Marketing Science*; Associate Editor, *Management Science*. Current research interests: pricing, channel structure, adaptive experimentation, and the interface between marketing and operations research.

Our well-earned gratitude goes to the existing editorial board for their hard and careful work. It is also a pleasure to welcome the following new board members:

1. **Dr. Eugene Walter Anderson**, Professor of Marketing, University of Michigan–Ann Arbor;
2. **Dr. Douglas Bowman**, Associate Professor of Marketing, Goizueta Business School, Emory University;
3. **Dr. Fangruo Chen**, Associate Professor of Decision, Risk, and Operations, Columbia Business School, Columbia University;
4. **Dr. Ravi Dhar**, Professor of Marketing, Yale School of Management;
5. **Dr. Vrinda Kadiyali**, Associate Professor of Marketing and Economics, Johnson Graduate School of Management, Cornell University;
6. **Dr. Abbie Griffin**, Professor of Business Administration, University of Illinois;

7. **Dr. Praveen K. Kopalle**, Associate Professor of Business Administration, Tuck School of Business;
8. **Dr. Murali K. Mantrala**, Manager, ZS Associates;
9. **Dr. Christine Moorman**, Professor of Marketing, Fuqua School of Business, Duke University;
10. **Dr. Venkatesh (Venky) Shankar**, Assistant Professor of Marketing, University of Maryland;
11. **Dr. Joel Steckel**, Professor and Chairman, Leonard N. Stern School of Business, New York University;
12. **Dr. Mary W. Sullivan**, U.S. Department of Justice;
13. **Dr. Joffre Swait**, Technical Consultant, Advanis Incorporated;
14. **Dr. Russell S. Winer**, J. Gary Shansby Professor of Marketing Strategy and Chair, Marketing Group, Haas School of Business, University of California–Berkeley;
15. **Dr. Jinhong Xie**, Associate Professor, Warrington College of Business, University of Florida.

Of course, the new board members, as well as other board members, will maintain the *Marketing Science's* reputation for quality. The review process will remain rigorous and certify the quality of every published paper.

Existing Manuscripts

The same Area Editors and reviewers will handle, whenever possible, the manuscripts currently in process. For manuscripts with area editor reports before January 2002, Brian Ratchford will continue as the editor until the end of June; the new editor will process other manuscripts. Given a six-month lead-time to publication, Brian will probably accept most of the manuscripts that appear in 2002. The new editor will be completely responsible for the regular issues in 2003. We also plan a fifth special issue edited by Dr. Dick Wittink and Dr. David Reibstein in late 2002 or early 2003.

Steven M. Shugan
University of Florida
October 12, 2001

References

- Anderson, Erin, Barton A. Weitz. 1989. Determinants of continuity in conventional industrial channel dyads. *Marketing Sci.* 8 (Fall) 310–323.
- Anderson, Eugene W., Mary W. Sullivan. 1993. The antecedents and consequences of customer satisfaction for firms. *Marketing Sci.* 12 (2) 125–143.
- Armstrong, J. Scott. 1979. Advocacy and objectivity in science. *Management Sci.* 25 (5) 423–428.
- . 1982. Barriers to scientific contributions: The author's formula. *Behavioral Brain Sci.* 5 (June) 197–199.
- Azbel, Mark. 1993. Could Columbus have passed peer review? *Phys. Today* 46 (6) 13–15.
- Bakir, Aysen, Scott J. Vitell, Gregory M. Rose. 2000. Publications in major marketing journals: An analysis of scholars and marketing departments. *J. Marketing Education* 22 (2) 99–107.
- Baumgartner, Hans, Rik Pieters. 2000. The influence of marketing journals: A citation analysis of the discipline and its sub-areas. Center for Economic Research, No. 2000-123, Tilburg University (December). Tilburg, The Netherlands.
- Blank, Rebecca M. 1991. The effects of double-blind versus single-blind reviewing: Experimental evidence from the *American Economic Review*. *Amer. Econom. Rev.* 81 (5) 1041–1067.
- Cole, Stephen. 1998. Guardians of science: Fairness and reliability of peer review. *Minerva* 36 (2) 179–189.
- Crane, Diana. 1967. The gatekeepers of science: Some factors affecting the selection of articles for scientific journals. *Amer. Sociologist* 2 (November) 195–201.
- Daniel, Hans Dieter. 1993. *Guardians of Science: Fairness and Reliability of Peer Review*. New York, VCH Publishers.
- Ellison, Glenn. 2000. The slowdown of the economics publishing process. National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc, Paper #7804.
- Gans, Joshua S., George B. Shepherd. 1994. How are the mighty fallen: Rejected classic articles by leading economists. *J. Econom. Perspectives* 8 (1) 165–179.
- Garfield, Eugene. 1999. Journal impact factor: A brief review. *Canadian Med. Assoc. J.* 161 (8) 979–980.
- Gonul, Fusun, Kannan Srinivasan. (1993). Modeling multiple sources of heterogeneity in multinomial logit models: Methodological and managerial issues. *Marketing Sci.* 12 (3) 213–229.
- Griffin, Abbie, John R. Hauser. 1993. The voice of the customer. *Marketing Sci.* 12 (1) 1–27.
- Guadagni, Peter, John D. C. Little. 1983. A logit model of brand choice calibrated on scanner data. *Marketing Sci.* 2 (3) 203–238.
- Hameresh, Daniel S. 1994. Facts and myths about refereeing. *J. Econom. Perspectives* 8 (1) 153–163.
- Harzing, Anne-Wil. 2001. Bradford University School of Management: Journal Quality List. Unpublished web document, <http://www.harzing.com>.
- Hardie, Bruce, Eric J. Johnson, Peter Fader. 1993. Reference dependence, loss aversion, and brand choice. *Marketing Sci.* 12 (4) 378–394.

- Hauser, John. 1989. Editorial. *Marketing Sci.* 8 (1).
- . 1994. Editorial. *Marketing Sci.* 13 (1).
- , Steven M. Shugan. 1983. Defensive marketing strategy. *Marketing Sci.* 2 (4) 319–360.
- Hawkins, Robert G., Lawrence S. Ritter, Ingo Walter. 1973. What economists think of their journals. *J. Polit. Econom.* 81 (July–August) 1017–1032.
- Jeuland, Abel P., Steven M. Shugan. 1983. Managing channel profits. *Marketing Sci.* 2 (3) 239–272.
- Laband, David N., Michael J. Piette. 1994. Favoritism versus search for good papers: Empirical evidence regarding the behavior of journal editors. *J. Polit. Econom.* 102 (1) 194–203.
- Laband, David N. 1990. Is there value-added from the review process in economics? Preliminary evidence from authors. *Quart. J. Econom.* 105 (2) 341–352.
- Lynch, John G., Jr. 1998. Presidential Address: Reviewing. Joseph W. Alba, J. Wesley Hutchinson, eds. *Advances in Consumer Research*, Volume XXV. Provo, Utah: Association for Consumer Research, 11–16.
- , Dan Ariely. 2000. Wine online: Search costs and competition on price, quality, and distribution. *Marketing Sci.* 19 (1) 83–103.
- Mahoney, Michael J. 1977. Publication prejudices: An experimental study of confirmatory bias in the peer review system. *Cognitive Therapy Res.* 1 (2) 161–175.
- Merton, Robert K. 1968. The Matthew effect in science. *Science* 159 (3810) 56–63.
- Morrison, Donald. 1982. Editor's Farewell. *Marketing Sci.* 1 (4).
- Peters, Douglas P., Stephen J. Ceci. 1982. Peer-review practices of psychological journals: The fate of published articles, submitted again. *Behav. Brain Sci.* 5 (2) 187–195.
- Polonsky, Michael, Gary Jones, Megan J. Kearsley. 1999. Accessibility: An alternative method of ranking marketing journals. *J. Marketing Education* 21 (3) 181–193.
- Ratchford, Brian. 2001. Editorial. *Marketing Sci.* 20 (1).
- Shepherd, George B. 1995. *Rejected: Leading Economists Ponder the Publication Process*. Thomas Horton & Daughters, Sun Lakes, Arizona.
- Shugan, Steven M. 1994. Explanations for service growth. Richard Oliver, Roland Rust, eds. *Service Quality*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 223–240.
- Staelin, Richard. 1995. Editorial. *Marketing Sci.* 14 (1) U2–U5.
- . 1996. Editorial. *Marketing Sci.* 15 (1) U4–U6.
- . 1998a. Editorial: A discussion of bait and switch. *Marketing Sci.* 17 (3) 271–272.
- . 1998b. Last reflections of the editor. *Marketing Sci.* 17 (4) 297–300.
- . 2000. From courtroom to converse: My 30-year journey. Presented at the 15th Paul D. Converse Symposium. Abbie Griffin and James D. Hess, eds. American Marketing Association Publications, Chicago, IL.
- Starbuck, W. 1996. Estimates of the 1996 impact ratings. Unpublished web document.
- Tellis, Gerard J., Rajesh K. Chandy, David S. Ackerman. 1999. In search of diversity: The record of major marketing journals. *J. Marketing Res.* 36 (1) 120–131.
- Thaler, Richard. 1985. Mental accounting and consumer choice. *Marketing Sci.* 4 (3) 199–214.
- Trieschmann, James S., Alan R. Dennis, Gregory B. Northcraft, Albert W. Niemi. 2000. Serving multiple constituencies in the business school: MBA program versus research performance. *Acad. Management J.* 43 (6) 1130–1141.