

Editorial: Fifty Years of *Marketing Science*

Steven M. Shugan*

University of Florida, Warrington College of Business, 201B Bryan Hall, P.O. Box 117155,
Gainesville, Florida 32611, steven.shugan@cba.ufl.edu

We have observed conspicuous changes in the 25 years after Frank M. Bass, John D. C. Little, and Donald G. Morrison begot *Marketing Science*. *Marketing Science* benefited from five subsequent editors and fifty different area editors. New submissions grew from 40 to over 320. Published articles grew from 16 to over 45 per year. We discuss six possible developments for the next 25 years. (1) The Internet's extraordinary search capabilities will diminish the distinctiveness of each journal. (2) The Internet will allow any researcher to publish research without journals. (3) Faster dissemination is inevitable. (4) Many economical electronic journals will enter the market. (5) The business model of print journals must change. (6) We will publish new forms of content (e.g., videos, blogs, running reviews, and subsequent comments by the authors).

Key words: *Marketing Science*; electronic journals; print journals; citations; impact of the Internet

The Last Twenty-Five Years

In the early 1980s, Frank M. Bass and John D. C. Little ambitiously founded the INFORMS journal *Marketing Science* to provide a premiere outlet for rigorous research that applied management science methods to marketing problems (Morrison and Raju 2004).

At that time, there was a conspicuous need for another journal. Outlets for the application of management science to marketing problems were scarce. *Management Science* furnished inadequate space, and the *Journal of Marketing Research* focused more on statistical methodologies (Morrison 2001). Donald G. Morrison, who became the first editor of *Marketing Science*, chaired the committee that started the journal (Steckel and Brody 2001). Today, of course, *Marketing Science* publishes a wide-range of high-quality marketing articles (often reviewed by three or more experts), including articles providing applications of management science methods, new methodologies, quantitative analysis of marketing problems, advances in behavioral decision theory, econometrics, and new empirical findings.

In the brief twenty years since conception, *Marketing Science* became one of the leading marketing journals (Baumgartner and Pieters 2003, Mort et al. 2004, Bauerly and Johnson 2005, Polonsky et al. 2005, Polonsky and Mittelstaedt 2006). By 2004, *Marketing*

Science was not only the most highly cited journal in marketing but also one of the three most cited journals in business, according to the 2004 Social Science Citation Index (SSCI). In 2006, *Marketing Science* was included on the list of journals used by the *Financial Times* for the ranking of research productivity at business schools.

From a modest circulation in the early 1980s, we have seen our subscriptions grow to include the libraries of every leading university. Of course, library subscriptions have diminished in importance with the remarkable growth of the Internet. Web-based aggregators and scientific portals now provide unprecedented electronic access to full-text, peer-reviewed articles (e.g., see Cohen 2006, Tenopir 2004). *Marketing Science*, focusing on broad circulation, has permitted nonexclusive access for most leading aggregators and integrated library service vendors, including Elto B. Stephens Company (EBSCO), Proquest (Bell and Howell), the nonprofit Journal Storage Project (JSTOR), and InfoTrac (Thomson-Gale). These aggregators not only offer full-text versions of our articles, but also they offer extraordinary (truly remarkable) search capabilities allowing users to execute complex searches for information in seconds that would have taken hours, days, or weeks using traditional print copies (e.g., Oldenkamp 2003). In an effort to gain additional visibility for our articles, INFORMS offers online access to current content from INFORMS' own website and sister institutional websites. Finally, to enhance the circulation and the utility of *Marketing Science*, INFORMS encourages free use of copyrighted *Marketing Science* articles for exclusively educational uses.

In 1982, annual new manuscript submissions to *Marketing Science* were less than 40 articles, and acceptances barely filled the first few issues (Morrison 2001).

Editorial pages are not part of the regular *Marketing Science* page budget. We thank the INFORMS Society of Marketing Science for paying for all editorial pages. We also thank the Society for granting every page supplement requested by the current editor.

We welcome and often post responses to editorials. Please see mktsci.pubs.informs.org.

*Steven M. Shugan is the Russell Berrie Foundation Eminent Scholar in Marketing.

In 1995, new submissions had increased to 110, with 153 total submissions and 13 accepted articles (Staelin 1997). New submissions remained between 105 and 120 through 2001 (Ratchford 2001). Since 2002, growth has been explosive. In 2004, there were 233 new submissions, and we published 43 articles indexed by the Journal Citation Reports (ISI Web of Knowledge). That number exceeded the number of articles published in 2004 by each of the other leading general marketing journals (i.e., the *Journal of Marketing* and the *Journal of Marketing Research*). By 2005, we had 290 new submissions, and we published 45 articles indexed by SSCI. We project 323 new submissions for 2006, a growth rate of 169% during the current editor's term. Our average turnaround time also decreased during that period.

The People

Marketing Science has an editorial structure consisting of an editor-in-chief, several area editors, an editorial board, and many ad hoc reviewers. Each year *Marketing Science* publishes journal statistics covering new submissions, number of articles published, average processing times, and number of editorial decisions (e.g., Shugan 2004c, 2005c). We also publish the names of all of the people who graciously and magnanimously donated their valuable time and often-unique expertise to the creation of *Marketing Science*. These people include guest editors, regular area editors, guest area editors, regular editorial board members, ad hoc reviewers, and the administrative help (particularly, Business Manager Margaret Jones). On this 25th anniversary, Table 1 recognizes the past and present editors and area editors who generously and diligently served both *Marketing Science* and the field of marketing.

The Research

As noted earlier, *Marketing Science* began as an outlet for creative research applying advanced management science methods to marketing problems (Morrison and Raju 2004). As the field of management science expanded to encompass both new methods beyond traditional optimization and new problem domains, *Marketing Science* needed to expand in scope. Unfortunately, the tendency exists (without strong and often contentious interventions by the editor) for research that survives the review process to become more narrow, more specialized, less accessible and, perhaps, more dogmatic. Peer reviewers of articles sometimes, regrettably and improperly, require authors to explain why their empirical results differ from conventional wisdom; reject manuscripts that offer alternative explanations for observed phenomena; and question prescriptive theory not already in use

Table 1 Some Key People in the First 25 Years

Editors	Regular area editors	Regular area editors
Donald G. Morrison (1982)	Greg M. Allenby Eugene W. Anderson	Gary L. Lilien K. Sridhar Moorthy
Subrata K. Sen (1983–1988)	William F. Boulding Eric T. Bradlow	Eitan Muller Chakravarthi Narasimhan
John R. Hauser (1989–1994)	Pradeep K. Chintagunta Marcel Corstjens	Scott A. Neslin Arvind Rangaswamy
Richard Staelin (1994–1997)	Anne T. Coughlan Imran Currim	Ram C. Rao Brian T. Ratchford
Brian T. Ratchford (1998–2001)	Wayne S. DeSarbo Ravi Dhar	Roland T. Rust David C. Schmittlein
Steven M. Shugan (2002–present)	Tülin Erdem Peter S. Fader John U. Farley Dominique (Mike) Hanssens James D. Hess Joel Huber John Wesley Hutchinson Dipak C. Jain Abel P. Jeuland Barbara E. Kahn Wagner A. Kamakura Rajiv Lal James M. Lattin Donald R. Lehmann	Subrata K. Sen Greg Shaffer Duncan I. Simester Kannan Srinivasan V. (Seenu) Srinivasan Richard Staelin J. Miguel Villas-Boas Michel Wedel Charles B. Weinberg Birger Wernerfelt Yoram (Jerry) Wind Russell S. Winer Dick R. Wittink Jinhong Xie Z. John Zhang

by practitioners. While it is perfectly reasonable to encourage authors to provide compelling evidence for their conclusions (which might certainly necessitate comparisons with extant research), we must judiciously restrain the incumbency effect. The past research on a topic should be the benchmark for evaluating new research *not* because past research preceded new research, but because of the cumulative evidence accrued during the tenure of that past research. Incumbency barriers to publication inhibit scientific advancement and the growth of knowledge. If manuscripts, for example, provide compelling evidence for empirical results that are inconsistent with conventional wisdom, those manuscripts are publishable, with or without theoretical reasons for those inconsistencies. Moreover, the use of state-of-the-art methods, while admirable and aesthetically pleasing, should never become an absolute criterion for publication. Fancy, sophisticated, and technologically advanced tools can certainly be a great aid for making scientific discoveries and improving practice. However, we must ultimately judge that research based on the research findings (substantive or methodological), rather than on the awe-inspiring mathematics, the elegance of the theory, or the wondrous quality of the coveted data. We can make new discoveries with the benefit of new, fantastic, humbling technology or with simple undistorted observation. A purportedly improved method that potentially encompasses more

factors or more elegantly combines those factors may not necessarily improve practice.

One effort to widen the scope of the topics in *Marketing Science* has been to add a larger number of more diverse regular area editors and make liberal use of guest area editors in more diverse areas. In the last reporting period, we used 133 different scholars as area editors and 904 different scholars as manuscript reviewers (Shugan 2006c). We hope that every manuscript can mate with an area editor who finds the manuscript's topic interesting and is able to judge the competency and contribution of the research in the manuscript's specific area.

Another effort to widen the scope of the topics in *Marketing Science* has been to increase the number of types of submissions (Shugan 2002). New submission types have included fast-track, findings articles, and practice-prize reports. The practice-prize reports are part of the effort originated by Gary L. Lilien, and continued by John H. Roberts, to encourage the publication of research involving the application of marketing models in specific companies. We routinely publish the winner of the practice prize in *Marketing Science*. Finalists have the option of submitting their manuscript for peer review or writing a chronicle that provides interesting insights associated with model applications. Although practice prize reports are also peer reviewed, reviewers focus on contributions associated with implementation, rather than on the newness or contribution relative to extant theory.

Another effort to widen the scope of topics was the use of compartmentalized reviewers (Shugan 2003). Given the often highly technical content of our articles, we often need reviewers who are well trained in the methods (e.g., optimization, algorithms, game theory, estimation) employed in the research, rather than in the substantive domain of the research (e.g., new product development, advertising, brand strategy, salesforce management, pricing). Consequently, articles often focus on the novelty and strengths of their methods, rather than on fully developing the implications of their substantive findings. By having different reviewers evaluate the adequacy of the methods and the contribution of the substantive findings, we can increase the impact of our articles in the substantive domain. Unfortunately, substantive reviewers sometimes decline to review highly technical manuscripts that couch their substantive findings in overwhelming specialized jargon.

Still another effort has been the extensive use of editorials. Although *Marketing Science* has always provided informative editorials containing current journal statistics and editorial policy, the current editor has published 22 editorials in an attempt to promote additional research extending recent and more novel articles published in *Marketing Science*. The goal of

Table 2 Most-Cited Articles in *Marketing Science* from Social Science Citation Index

Rank	All time (rank on current cites)	Cites as of Winter 2002
1	Thaler (1985)	338
2	Guadagni and Little (1983)	278
3	Anderson and Weitz (1989)	132
4	Hauser and Shugan (1983)	123
5	Jeuland and Shugan (1983)	109

some editorials was to create controversy and encourage researchers to question, better understand, and go beyond conventional wisdom related to very fundamental marketing issues. For example, recent editorials have:

- advocated scientific testing over statistical fit (Shugan 2006b);
- stressed integration of our research and teaching (Shugan 2006a);
- proposed reasons on why traders engage in transactions (Shugan 2005d);
- questioned whether brand loyalty programs create loyalty (Shugan 2005b);
- noted that competitive response varies over time as markets develop (Shugan 2005a);
- suggested technological advances as a source of new research ideas (Shugan 2004d);
- emphasized the difference between consulting and research (Shugan 2004b);
- argued against endogeneity in marketing decision models (Shugan 2004a)

Finally, to recognize a few of our highly cited articles, we republish Table 2 (from Shugan 2002). Unfortunately, it is no longer possible to obtain accurate citation data from SSCI on articles appearing before *Marketing Science* entered the SSCI index. Table 3, therefore, provides our most cited articles, based on the less-accurate Google Scholar. Google Scholar more heavily weights recent published and unpublished research over past publications in SSCI journals. Please see Shugan (2006c) for the most-cited article by year and the interesting revelation that the

Table 3 Most-Cited Articles in *Marketing Science* from Google Scholar (Recent Cites)

Rank	All time (rank on current cites)	Cites as of 9/23/06
1	Thaler (1985)	676
2	Anderson and Sullivan (1993)	431
3	Guadagni and Little (1983)	394
4	Anderson and Weitz (1989)	388
5	Griffin and Hauser (1993)	289
6	Jeuland and Shugan (1983)	251
7	Novak et al. (2000)	250
8	Bolton (1998)	244
9	Lynch and Ariely (2000)	216
10	Pasternack (1985)	216

most cited *Marketing Science* articles in the past 10 years received almost all of their cites from journals other than *Marketing Science*.

The Next Twenty-Five Years

Just as the Internet has changed the world as we know it, it has the potential to change scholarly journals as we know them. First, as noted earlier, the Internet allows extraordinary search capabilities. These search capabilities will have profound implications for all journals. For example, search capabilities will diminish the distinctiveness of each journal by allowing readers to search across journals for particular subject content rather than searching across the tables of contents of specific journals that publish research on the desired subject. Moreover, search capabilities could make obscure or highly specialized content as readily accessible as mainstream content from the most well-known and prestigious journals. Search capabilities could reverse the trend toward specialized or narrowly positioned journals.

Second, the Internet will allow any researcher (or anyone else for that matter) to disseminate freely their research findings without the need of a journal, book, or any other intermediary that evaluates or screens content. Free dissemination raises numerous issues, including citation etiquette and the time-date stamping of research findings. When considering citations, perhaps we should rely only on formally archived content, which is not subject to unilateral change or capricious withdrawal. Perhaps we should also rely only on invariable peer-reviewed content.

Third, the Internet will allow faster dissemination of content without the delays associated with the publication process and the dissemination of print copies. *Marketing Science* already allows limited distribution of content before actual publication. However, backlogs of accepted manuscripts are necessary to ensure on-time print publication. Hence, to be competitive with Internet dissemination, traditional print journals must provide some electronic access to accepted articles before those articles appear in print. Moreover, print journals might lose the battle on newsworthiness to the Internet.

Fourth, the Internet allows the rapid entry of economical electronic journals without the heavy overhead of print journals. Competition should help authors. However, the inevitable turbulence will result in issues regarding the quality of various certifications, the stability of new outlets, and the ability of libraries to cope.

Fifth, the Internet will change the entire business model of print journals as aggregators become the primary source of revenue. Many publishers reap monopolistic profits extracted from libraries while

authors see little, if any, revenues. Aggregators will battle for exclusive rights to content, which might further hurt authors and the dissemination of research findings and methods. It is critical that we support the journals of our professional organizations if we want to maintain control over the dissemination of our own research.

Sixth (but probably not last), the Internet will allow researchers to employ new forms of communication. *Marketing Science* already publishes technical appendices and proofs of published articles on our website. In the future, our website might contain videos, photographs, audio, links to other supplementary materials, blogs, running reviews, and subsequent comments by authors. Space on the Web, in contrast to a print page, has no limit on length. Future supplements to journal articles can take new forms and be of unprecedented length.

References

- Anderson, Erin, Barton A. Weitz. 1989. Determinants of continuity in conventional industrial channel dyads. *Marketing Sci.* 8(4) 310–323.
- Anderson, Eugene W., Mary W. Sullivan. 1993. The antecedents and consequences of customer satisfaction for firms. *Marketing Sci.* 12(2) 125–143.
- Bauerly, Ronald J., Don T. Johnson. 2005. An evaluation of journals used in doctoral marketing programs. *J. Acad. Marketing Sci.* 33(3) 313–329.
- Baumgartner, Hans, Rik Pieters. 2003. The structural influence of marketing journals: A citation analysis of the discipline and its subareas over time. *J. Marketing* 67(2) 123–139.
- Bolton, Ruth N. 1998. A dynamic model of the duration of the customer's relationship with a continuous service provider: The role of satisfaction. *Marketing Sci.* 17(1) 45–65.
- Cohen, Steven M. 2006. Web tools I can't live without. *Inform. Today* 23(7) 20–21.
- 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.
- Hauser, John, Steven M. Shugan. 1983. Defensive marketing strategy. *Marketing Sci.* 2(4) 319–360.
- Jeuland, Abel P., Steven M. Shugan. 1983. Managing channel profits. *Marketing Sci.* 2(3) 239–272.
- Lynch, Jr., John G., Dan Ariely. 2000. Wine online: Search costs affect competition on price, quality, and distribution. *Marketing Sci.* 19(1) 83–103.
- Morrison, Donald G. 2001. Founding *Marketing Science*. *Marketing Sci.* 20(4) 357–359.
- Morrison, Donald G., Jagmohan S. Raju. 2004. The marketing department in management science: Its history, contributions, and the future. *Management Sci.* 50(4) 425–428.
- Mort, Gillian Sullivan, Janet R. McColl-Kennedy, Geoffrey Kiel, Geoffrey N. Soutar. 2004. Perceptions of marketing journals by senior academics in Australia and New Zealand. *Australasian Marketing J.* 12(2) 51–61.
- Novak, Thomas P., Donna L. Hoffman, Yiu-Fai Yung. 2000. Measuring the customer experience in online environments: A structural modeling approach. *Marketing Sci.* 19(1) 22–42.
- Oldenkamp, David M. 2003. The new WilsonWeb. *Searcher* 11(3) 17–25.

- Pasternack, Barry A. 1985. Optimal pricing and return policies for perishable commodities. *Marketing Sci.* 4(2) 166–176.
- Polonsky, Michael Jay, Paul Whitelaw. 2005. What are we measuring when we evaluate journals? *J. Marketing Ed.* 27(2) 189–201.
- Polonsky, Michael Jay, John D. Mittelstaedt. 2006. Publishing in socially oriented journals—The state of play in Asia. *Asia Pacific J. Marketing Logist.* 18(1) 61–71.
- Ratchford, Brian T. 2001. Editorial. *Marketing Sci.* 20(1) iii–v.
- Shugan, Steven M. 2002. Editorial: The mission of *Marketing Science*. *Marketing Sci.* 21(1) 1–13.
- Shugan, Steven M. 2003. Editorial: Compartmentalized reviews and other initiatives: Should marketing scientists review manuscripts in consumer behavior? *Marketing Sci.* 22(2) 151–160.
- Shugan, Steven M. 2004a. Endogeneity in marketing decision models. *Marketing Sci.* 23(1) 1–3.
- Shugan, Steven M. 2004b. Consulting, research, and consulting research. *Marketing Sci.* 23(2) 173–179.
- Shugan, Steven M. 2004c. A thanks to the many individuals who make publication of *Marketing Science* possible. *Marketing Sci.* 23(3) 275–279.
- Shugan, Steven M. 2004d. The impact of advancing technology on marketing and academic research. *Marketing Sci.* 23(4) 469–475.
- Shugan, Steven M. 2005a. Comments on competitive responsiveness. *Marketing Sci.* 24(1) 3–7.
- Shugan, Steven M. 2005b. Brand loyalty programs: Are they shams? *Marketing Sci.* 24(2) 185–193.
- Shugan, Steven M. 2005c. A thanks to the many individuals who make publication of *Marketing Science* possible. *Marketing Sci.* 24(3) 305–309.
- Shugan, Steven M. 2005d. Marketing and designing transaction games. *Marketing Sci.* 24(4) 525–530.
- Shugan, Steven M. 2006a. Editorial: Save research—Abandon the case method of teaching. *Marketing Sci.* 25(2) 109–115.
- Shugan, Steven M. 2006b. Editorial: Errors in the variables, unobserved heterogeneity, and other ways of hiding statistical error. *Marketing Sci.* 25(3) 203–216.
- Shugan, Steven M. 2006c. Editorial: Thanks to the many individuals who make publication of *Marketing Science* possible. *Marketing Sci.* 25(4) 293–300.
- Staelin, Richard. 1997. Update on status of journal. Unpublished letter to the Area Editors and Review Board Members, March 7, 1997.
- Steckel, Joel H., Ed Brody. 2001. 2001: A marketing odyssey. *Marketing Sci.* 20(4) 331–336.
- Tenopir, Carol, Gayle Baker, William Robinson. 2004. Database marketplace 2004: The information playground. *Library J.* 129(9) 38–47.
- Thaler, Richard. 1985. Mental accounting and consumer choice. *Marketing Sci.* 4(3) 199–214.