

Marketing Scholarship 2.0

The system for the design, production, and dissemination of marketing scholarship aimed at contributing to marketing practice is under increasing strain due to pressures exerted by globalization, digitization, and environmentalism. Scholarly research in marketing adheres largely to a twentieth-century manufacturing model. Change is needed now. Marketing scholarship can benefit from embracing a twenty-first-century, collaborative approach to the conception, design, and dissemination of research. “Crowdsourcing” is becoming a frequently employed strategy in industry. Marketing academe should adopt some of the same techniques and technologies to make stronger research contributions that will benefit marketing practice. In particular, more collaboration is needed, both among academic researchers and between academe and industry, to be sure important problems are being investigated using sound theories and methods. An open, collaborative model will allow the field to evolve from Marketing Scholarship 1.0 to Marketing Scholarship 2.0.

Keywords: scholarship, open source, Web 2.0, academics, practitioners

What if the marketing discipline collectively decided to sit down and devise an effective system for advancing marketing knowledge and practice? The focus of this system would be the identification of important marketing issues, the production and dissemination of research that addresses those problems, and the effective utilization of this research knowledge by marketing practitioners. What are the chances that this “designed-from-scratch” system would look anything like our current system? In many respects, our knowledge production and dissemination, though time-tested, is analogous to a twentieth-century manufacturing process: closed (think double-blind reviewing), linear, and slow.

In contrast, marketing practice worldwide has embraced the concept of a more collaborative model and is moving rapidly to deploy it. “Crowdsourcing,” generally understood as outsourcing previously internal processes to the public and encouraging participation (Howe 2008), is cropping up in dozens of marketing organizations. From product designs to ad campaigns, companies and brands such as Dell, Starbucks, Frito-Lay, Nike, Netflix, Unilever, Threadless, Honda, Trek Light, NASA, IBM, and Procter & Gamble have turned to crowdsourcing.

The purpose of this article is to explore the implications of the changing environment and newer collaborative models for marketing knowledge production and dissemination, with particular emphasis on our academic journals. I begin with a brief review of environmental impacts on the publication process, followed by a discussion of digitally inspired trends in other scholarly domains. I conclude by

offering some proposals for what “Marketing Scholarship 2.0” might look like. Some of these proposals may seem a bit radical; others are almost certainly not radical enough. It is difficult to overestimate the rate at which change is occurring. It is clear that change is needed now, not years from now. We don’t really want to be at the helm of the next Kodak or General Motors.

Environmental Impact on Marketing Scholarship

The first decade of the “New Millennium” has brought with it a dazzling array of changes to the marketing landscape. We have witnessed the emergence of a truly global economy, with China and the other BRIC countries (i.e., Brazil, Russia, and India) nipping at the heels of the United States for global economic leadership. The impact of the Internet is being felt in virtually every aspect of our global society, from where we shop, to where we get our news and entertainment, to where we find our friends and even our spouses. Climate change has accelerated and has energized some of our largest firms to take steps toward becoming more sustainable enterprises.

While these trends are well-known as critical developments in the general marketing environment that affects firms both large and small and across all industries, it is also clear that these trends have been manifesting their effects in the domain of marketing scholarship. Not just *what* we research, but *how* we conduct research, disseminate it, and access it are changing. The current twentieth-century system of knowledge production, dissemination, and utilization is under unprecedented strain. An overhaul is needed that will move the model for marketing scholarship into the twentieth century.

Over the past decade, *Journal of Marketing* has experienced an explosion of growth in terms of manuscript submissions. From January 1, 2000, through June 30, 2009, the journal received 4205 new submissions. Most of this growth has been fueled by the joint effects of the globaliza-

Richard J. Lutz is the JCPenney Professor of Marketing in the Warrington College of Business at the University of Florida; Gainesville (e-mail: Richard.lutz@warrington.ufl.edu). At the time of the preparation of this article, he served as the Vice President of Publications for the American Marketing Association. He gratefully acknowledges helpful comments on a previous version of this article by Ajay Kohli, Debbie MacInnis, Leigh McAlister, C.W. Park, and Bart Weitz.

tion of business education and the digitization of the journal submission and review process. As business schools worldwide mature and embrace the importance of scholarly publication by their faculties in the field's most prestigious journals, marketing scholarship has become more globalized, with the participation of hundreds of new scholars.

Without access to the Internet, many of these international scholars would face substantial barriers to publishing in U.S. journals, but the technological barriers are down, and marketing scholarship is more broadly participative as a consequence. Submissions to *Journal of Marketing* have doubled in the past decade.

Although perhaps driven more by economic constraints than a mandate for becoming "greener" per se, libraries, the traditional customers and repositories of print journals, are nonetheless evolving toward a more electronic future. Many university libraries are severely budget- and space-constrained and regard the print form of professional journals to be more of a (costly) nuisance than a benefit (McKay 2009). Their real need is for online access for their constituents. On a per-use basis, electronic access is far more cost efficient for the library and more environmentally friendly. The online, "open access" (OA) journal movement, which I discuss in greater detail subsequently, is being embraced by scientific and professional journals across virtually all disciplines. As marketing scholarship continues to globalize and become more sophisticated, it is inevitable that the demand for journal pages will accelerate. *Journal of Marketing* published 512 pages and 27 articles in 2000; by 2009, those figures were 864 pages and 61 articles (including a special section funded by the Marketing Science Institute [MSI]). Similar growth has occurred at other leading journals in the marketing discipline, as well as other related disciplines (McKay 2009).

Impact of Marketing Scholarship on Marketing Practice

"You people don't do real research. You *think* you do research, but you don't."

—Anonymous university president addressing business school faculty

Why would a major research university president say such a thing to the faculty of a highly ranked public business school? Among the various possible answers to this question, the most charitable interpretation is that the president in question judges something as being "real" research only when it generates indirect expense (i.e., overhead), a large part of which is captured by the central administration.

However cynical the president's assessment may have been, it does raise an important issue—perhaps *the* important issue—facing scholarly research in marketing: Who, exactly, are the constituents for our research? Extramural (funded) research of the type favored by the president has no difficulty answering that question. The most obvious, and immediate, constituent is the funding entity, whether it is a private foundation, a corporation, or a government agency. The funding is granted because the funding entity is

interested in the outcome of the research; research relevance is guaranteed, or the researcher's funding will evaporate.

Academic marketing researchers seldom face this sort of built-in constituency. Very little of our research is funded by outside parties. (MSI is a notable exception.) Thus, many researchers pursue their projects without as clear a "market definition" of the eventual "potential customers" of their research as is desirable, especially when the intended audience is marketing practitioners. As Daniel (2009, p. 3) notes, "it's commonplace to hear businesspeople scoff that academic research never has any influence on what they actually do in their companies. Legal, medical, and engineering journals are written and read by lawyers, doctors, and engineers, but business journals consist almost wholly of articles written by professors for other professors." Judging by the typical 85%–90% rejection rate at the field's leading journals, it might be tempting to conclude that academic marketing researchers do not even understand the needs and preferences of other academics! Armstrong (2003, p. 71), one of the most persistent critics of academic marketing research, puts a sharp point on the issue: "Few papers in marketing journals would fall into the category of having findings that are useful, ... especially in the more prestigious journals." He further poses (p. 71) the question, "Do researchers in marketing consider usefulness when they decide on research topics?" His conclusion is that they do not.

It is my contention that marketing academe needs to improve the relevance of its research to *some* constituency (whether practitioners or other academics) without sacrificing rigor. I further contend that this improvement can be accomplished by adoption of a more collaborative, "Web 2.0" research model at the conception, design, review, and dissemination stages of the process. Although the production of knowledge obviously precedes its dissemination, for expositional purposes, it is easier to discuss them in reverse order here. Thus, I begin by turning my attention to the dissemination stage of the scholarly research enterprise. This is followed by a consideration of a more collaborative approach to the conception, design, and review of marketing scholarship.

Dissemination of Marketing Scholarship

Although the content of marketing scholarship—most notably the choice of the problems to investigate (to be discussed in the following sections)—is of paramount concern to a vital research enterprise, opportunities exist for improving the dissemination of scholarly research. Adopting a "four Ps" analogy, knowledge content is the product, while dissemination encompasses the place and promotion elements. Assuming that useful content has been developed, dissemination becomes equally important.

Unfortunately, the track record for effective dissemination of marketing scholarship intended to contribute to marketing practice has not been strong, at least not from the perspective of the intended recipients. Arguably, the two primary routes through which academic marketing research is disseminated are professional journals and professional

(academic) conferences. Neither of these media is favored in the practitioner community. In a recent study conducted in New Zealand by Gray, Ottesen, and Matar (2005), academic conferences and academic journals ranked seventh and eighth, respectively, out of eight business media. (Printed reports, CD-ROMs, and seminars were the top three media.) At the risk of extrapolating beyond the sample of New Zealand managers, it seems safe to conclude that journals and academic conferences would not fare much better in the United States. Clearly, a better “distribution” method is needed.

From the academic scholar’s perspective, publication in one of the field’s top journals (preferably an “A-level” one) is the “coin of the realm.” Although the field’s journals currently adhere to the “printed issue” model, it is evident that the real utilization of journal content is increasingly electronic. Opening the door to electronic dissemination of marketing scholarship creates a wide range of collaboration and communication possibilities.

Common Online Knowledge Dissemination Vehicles

In a recent survey commissioned by the Association of Research Libraries, Maron and Smith (2009) employed a team of 301 librarians at 46 institutions to interview faculty about their use of online scholarly resources for research purposes. They identified 206 sources, which they then clustered judgmentally into eight categories.

Electronic-only journals. The most common online resource mentioned—across an eclectic group of scholars representing the humanities; social sciences; and science, technology, and medicine—was e-journals. These e-journals are essentially the online analog to traditional print journals. They have clear editorial missions and guidelines and, importantly, are peer reviewed (Harnad 1996). A hallmark of e-journals is their OA character, which permits unlimited public access to the work. I devote more attention to OA publication subsequently, but for now, suffice it to say that its primary perceived advantages by scholars are more immediate access to current scholarship for the readers and increased citations for the authors. In the early days of OA publishing, many scholars had concerns about the credibility and prestige of OA journals; however, as long as a journal adheres to a rigorous peer-review process, those early concerns are mitigated. For example, *PLoS* (Public Library of Science) *Pathogens*, an OA journal founded in 2004, has an impact factor of 9 and is widely regarded as publishing the best work in the field (McFadden 2009). Open access e-journals are an important trend across a wide range of disciplines and appear to have great potential significance for the marketing discipline.

Reviews. Particularly in fields in which scholarly monographs are an important vehicle, online reviews have emerged as a very current source of information about new scholarly works. The journals in the field of marketing traditionally have featured book review sections, but most of the featured books are either trade-oriented or textbooks. Thus, although online reviews are not as important to marketing scholarship as they are in other disciplines, the much

faster access relative to reviews appearing in a print publication is a clear advantage. Adopting a somewhat broader view of scholarship to embrace trade and textbooks, it would be useful for the American Marketing Association (AMA) to host a book and monograph review website. Currently the AMA Foundation awards an annual prize (the Berry-AMA Book Prize) to the best trade-oriented marketing book. Rather than just this annual award, candidate trade books and monographs could be reviewed as they are released. True to the collaborative model being espoused here, the review website would permit and encourage commentary on both the books and the reviews.

Recommendation 1: The AMA should establish an online book review forum. Reviews of new marketing-related books should be posted on a timely basis, and interactive discussion should be promoted.

Preprints and working papers. In this electronic age, numerous mechanisms exist for scholars to share their pre-publication work, most notably through e-mail and personal websites and increasingly, academic institutions’ repositories. However, as Maron and Smith (2009) note, some public servers exist that offer even broader access. For example, the Social Science Research Network (SSRN) houses nearly 250,000 downloadable working papers. It is also common for OA journals to post preprints of work that has been accepted but not finalized for publication.

Recommendation 2: Marketing scholars should post their pre-publication working papers in their institutional repositories, if available, and on SSRN.

The marketing discipline has been slow to embrace this vehicle. For example, at the time of writing, only 2866 marketing papers were on SSRN, compared with more than 84,500 finance papers (<http://www.ssrn.com>).

Encyclopedias and dictionaries. The basic idea of this resource is analogous to Wikipedia.org, except that entries are reviewed by scholars before they are posted. The resultant resource is an authoritative compendium of knowledge in the field. Such an online resource could be hosted by the AMA and would have the distinct advantage over printed encyclopedic collections of being dynamic and easily updated. In addition, because no space constraints exist, unlike a print format, entries could be lengthier and could afford space for alternative viewpoints.

Recommendation 3: The AMA should host an online, authoritative dictionary/encyclopedia of marketing, using a wiki approach.

Data resources. In several disciplines, scholars are engaged in large-scale data projects designed to create an online repository of data that other scholars can access for their own research. A particularly creative database effort cited in Maron and Smith (2009) is eBird, which aggregates bird watchers worldwide. This “community data project” receives more than a million observations monthly. The key to an online database, according to Maron and Smith, is functionality; the data need to be readily usable by scholars accessing the site. The field of marketing could greatly benefit from a large-scale database that is open to all schol-

ars. Many of the most highly cited articles in marketing have used data that firms have supplied to the researchers (MarketingPower.com 2010a, b).

Although many of these data sets are proprietary and the companies have been reluctant to share them widely, others have been shared a bit more broadly (e.g., Information Resources Inc., panel data used by numerous researchers). However, by and large, access to marketing data is rather restricted. Perhaps it will always be so, due to competitive forces, but as more scholars have the tools and skills to analyze large databases, having an online data archive that permits younger, less-connected scholars ready access would appear to be advantageous to advancing knowledge in the field.

In a sense, this online resource deals more directly with the production of knowledge than with the dissemination of knowledge, but it clearly illustrates the value of collaboration by parties with differing resources (i.e., databases and analytical tools). Institutions such as the AMA could “host” the data archives and manage a proposal review process to ensure that the access being granted was for scholarly purposes.

Recommendation 4: The AMA should host an archive of marketing-related databases that are available to academic researchers for scholarly research. The data should be disguised as necessary to avoid revealing proprietary information.

Blogs. Web logs devoted to scholarly research are common in many disciplines and are regarded as effective for informal communication among scholars. Most blogs are OA, and entries undergo no screening or formal peer review. The primary benefit is the opportunity for a scholarly community to interact freely on topics of mutual interest. Currently, the AMA hosts a moderated *Journal of Marketing* blog on its website, but to date it has not attracted a lot of activity. It is not clear what the incentives are for an individual to post comments on a blog unless it is a high-profile site with a large or important audience.

Discussion forums. According to Maron and Smith (2009), discussion forums are one of the oldest forms of online scholarly communication. Like blogs, discussion forums are informal and used more for informational purposes than for scholarly publication. The ELMAR listserv maintained by the AMA is a good example. However, similar to the *Journal of Marketing* blog, there is little or no real “discussion” taking place on ELMAR; its role is more informational. If the discussion was more fully integrated into the journal itself (postpublication review and commentary), it may become more prominent and valuable to the community of researchers and users.

Recommendation 5: Encourage open commentary and debate.

Marketing scholarship can benefit by becoming more interactive. The 1988 report of the AMA Task Force called for more commentaries on journal publications to encourage scholarly debate and interchange. When journal space is scarce, it is difficult to justify allocating several pages to commentary and rebuttal. However, online journal space is essentially “free,” which creates an excellent opportunity to

encourage such interaction. Although it may be desirable to have some sort of editorial “filter” on such exchanges, in the spirit of wikis and in the service of immediacy, an “open forum” approach would seem to be better approach. This would operate similarly to the current model at the *Journal of Marketing* blog.

Academic hubs. A hub is a digital portal, most often hosted by a scholarly society, that provides “one-stop shopping” for scholars in a field. At such a hub, an individual can find access to e-journals, reviews, preprints, blogs, databases, and other resources. The AMA’s Academic Resource Center (ARC) is an excellent example of an academic hub. In addition to tabs for Conferences, Journals, SIGs (Special Interest Groups), and Awards, links are provided for Teaching, Research, Service, Career, and Connections. Drilling down on the Research link, one finds links to an array of helpful resources, ranging from bibliographies of selected topics to useful software for conducting research. According to former ARC administrator Charles Hofacker, utilization of the ARC research links is sporadic at best. The ARC appears to be an opportunity that the AMA can capitalize on more fully in the future.

Another important idea not considered explicitly by Maron and Smith (2009) is a more proactive mechanism for disseminating research results to interested parties, rather than a more passive approach of waiting for the audience to access the research.

Recommendation 6: “Push” knowledge contributions out to constituents.

To achieve maximum impact of marketing scholarship, it is not sufficient to wait for the world to “beat a path to our door.” Instead, proactive steps must be taken to “push” knowledge out to the marketplace of ideas. For example, *Journal of Consumer Research* prepares a publicity release for every article it publishes. Another useful approach is exemplified by the “Knowledge @ Wharton” e-mail newsletter, which features professionally written synopses of published articles by Wharton faculty as well as original commentary on important business issues of the day. Knowledge @ Wharton currently boasts about 1.2 million subscribers, comprising a mix of academics and practitioners.

The benefits of a more proactive promotional campaign on behalf of marketing scholarship will be apparent to anyone working in the field. Ultimately, scholars engage in research to influence thought and gain recognition for their contributions. It is in their best interest to have their work disseminated widely, through a variety of media. It is also in the best interests of their employing institutions, whose rankings depend in part on the scholarly renown of their faculty.

Online OA Journals

The OA movement began around the turn of the twenty-first century and has been accelerating the past few years. Essentially, an OA journal provides free, immediate, and unrestricted access to journal content. Content is created once, stored once in an online archive, and used a limitless number of times. As with any published work, the author

retains the rights to attribution. In the OA domain, a distinction is made between the “gold path” and the “green path.”

The green path. The OA green path works in conjunction with existing print journals. When a manuscript is accepted for publication, the author submits a copy of the article to an online open repository. More than 500 universities worldwide are providing such repositories for research published by their faculty and PhD students, among others (Harnad et al. 2008). Because the journal typically holds the copyright to the article, authors need to take care to preserve their right to post their research in a public forum. Most journals cooperate with this process, but the SPARC Author Addendum (<http://www.arl.org/sparc/author/>) is available for authors to append to the standard copyright agreement if necessary. The majority of OA journals currently follow the green path. In a recent survey of more than 10,000 traditional journals (cited by Harnad et al. 2008), over 90% reported that they were “green.”

The gold path. The gold path refers to exclusively electronic journals with no print counterpart. Gold journals do not have subscription fees; they are freely available to anyone. To support themselves, gold journals rely on a variety of mechanisms, including (most commonly) author publication fees of \$2,000–\$3,000 per article, sponsorships, and grants. In September 2009, the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) contained 4344 journals, 93 of which were in the Business and Management category. By September 2010, the DOAJ database boasted 5381 online journals (144 in Business and Management). There are an estimated 25,000 journals worldwide, which suggests that approximately 20% are “gold,” and DOAJ reports that 10% of all peer-reviewed articles across all disciplines are OA (see <http://www.doaj.org>).

The OA imperative. Although still in its infancy, the OA movement is rapidly gathering momentum as institutions throw their weight behind it. Originally a grassroots movement, OA gained legitimacy in 2007 when the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the world’s largest funder of nonclassified research, mandated that all NIH-funded research be OA (Suber 2009). Currently under debate, the Federal Research Public Access Act would require any institution receiving more than \$100 million annually in federal research funds to provide its research in an OA format. Sweden already mandates that all published research be OA (McFadden 2009). In 2009, the arts and sciences and law faculties at Harvard adopted OA, as did the Stanford School of Education. Furthermore, in 2009, more than 30 established print journals “converted” to OA (Suber 2009). The Public Library of Science PLoS, funded by an initial grant of \$9 million, is moving toward self-sufficiency.

OA business models. Given the nature of scientific publication, gold OA journals rely very little on advertising to replace subscription revenues. Instead, the most common model is a publication fee charged to the authors. These fees may be paid by the authors themselves, but more commonly they are paid out of the grants supporting the research or by the authors’ institutions. For example, University of California, Berkeley, devotes funds to paying

publication fees (Suber 2009), and the University of Florida announced a similar OA funding initiative in 2010.

The vast majority of OA journals are “green” and continue to charge for subscriptions, most often through a “big deal” offered by a commercial publisher or aggregator (Bjork and Hedlund 2009). Springer, which publishes more than 2000 academic journals, is the leading OA journal publisher (<http://www.springer.com/aboutspringer>). Under the green route, access to the final print version of a manuscript is restricted to subscribers, but immediate access is provided by author self-archiving or, increasingly, institutional archives. More than 500 universities now provide institutional repositories to support self-archiving. The Budapest Open Access Initiative (OAI) sets a standard for archiving through metatags that tag critical information such as author, title, and date in a uniform manner. This permits OAI-compliant archives to be “harvested” by a web search engine (Harnad et al. 2008). Some journals have experimented with a “hybrid” model, whereby an author submitting to a “green” journal can pay a publication fee to afford immediate access to his or her work in its final form. The rationale for an author taking this action follows.

Advantages of OA. When considering the advantages of OA journals, at least three groups are relevant: authors, readers, and libraries. First, from the authors’ perspective, OA ensures the maximum exposure and impact of their research. Because OA articles are freely available to anyone with web access, the potential audience is much greater. Studies reported by Harnad et al. (2008) show that, for articles published in traditional business and management journals, self-archiving (i.e., OA) increased citations by 75%–90%. In physics, the difference was 250%. Lawrence (2001) analyzed 120,000 computer science articles published between 1989 and 1998 and found that 85% of the most highly cited articles were OA. Thus, OA benefits authors by providing a larger audience, by increasing their impact, and by shortening the lag time between acceptance and publication. In addition, OA offers more flexibility with regard to mode of data presentation (e.g., color, video), language format, and interactivity (Weiner 2001).

Readers benefit from OA by having access to a broad and timely research literature, at no cost and with the convenience of surfing the web. A driving philosophy of the OA movement is that much scientific research is publicly funded and therefore “belongs” to the public at large. Although most average citizens may not want to read the scientific literature, it should nevertheless be available to them. Baldwin and Pullinger (2000) surveyed researchers in the United Kingdom regarding desirable characteristics of e-journals and found the following rank ordering: breadth of coverage, up-to-date, fast access, ease of use, and good archives. Open access offers clear-cut advantages over traditional journals in delivering those benefits.

Finally, librarians sensitive to cost and accessibility concerns are leading proponents of the OA model. Subscription costs are just the beginning for university libraries. They also have to cover the costs of storage, binding, shelving, handling, and providing access. All these costs are increasing (McKay 2009). Montgomery and King (2002)

conducted a comprehensive cost analysis of Drexel University's library holdings, using a "cost per use" metric to compare print-only and e-journals. They concluded that "full-text database e-journals" cost approximately \$1.00 per use, while current issues of print-only journals cost \$8.50 per use and bound journals cost \$30.00 per use. The largest cost factor for bound journals was storage costs. Clearly, cost considerations lead librarians to greatly favor the trend toward electronic publication in general.

Disadvantages of OA. The primary drawback to the OA publication model is that newer, "gold" OA journals have been perceived as less prestigious outlets for scholarly research. Even worse, some OA journals have not adhered to a rigorous peer-review process, though that is a dwindling minority. Economic forces are also at work, as commercial publishers have little interest in relinquishing their subscription revenue stream in the face of uncertainty about how those revenues will be replaced. As Solomon (2002, p. 6) notes, "Although the scientists and other scholars hold the ultimate trump card in determining who controls the serial publications system, the publishers are both far more motivated and far more savvy." Finally, sheer inertia and scholarly tradition act as barriers (Weiner 2001).

Overall assessment of OA. The emergence of OA publication has several important consequences for the scholarly research community. It moves the process to one that is more dynamic rather than static. Research is reviewed, accepted, and disseminated seamlessly and continuously rather than four or six times a year. Because of the focus on individual articles rather than issues or even journals, a truer gauge of the "value" of an article emerges as readers access it, cite it, and, in the case of some journals, comment on it online (Weller 2000). Similar to product ratings on Amazon.com, readers might even be encouraged to "rate" articles for their value (Johnson 2001). In a very real sense, the research community takes back ownership of its product in a global, collaborative format. Harnad (2002) envisions "an optimal and inevitable" system in which all journals are online, refereed, paper-free, and OA. As he notes, such journals are not cost-free; peer review still needs to be managed, and editing is essential. Publishers could capture a fair fee for those services through a publication fee, but authors would retain ownership of their scholarly work.

Recommendation 7: Adopt the OA green path.

The journals at the AMA should adopt the OA green path, which currently is the dominant model in the online journal domain. Print journals are bottlenecks in an increasingly digital scholarship system. Researchers typically use computer technology to gather or access data, analyze it, and prepare their findings for review. Manuscripts are submitted electronically through Scholar One, and reviewers are assigned to each manuscript by e-mail. Reviewers then access the manuscript through the website and submit their reviews there as well. The editor communicates decisions by e-mail to the authors. Some months later, a manuscript that has been accepted for publication is copyedited (electronically) and is converted to a "galley proof" (electronically) for author consideration, and finally is published

online as fully realized electronic manuscript. When permitted by the publishers, some authors post these published electronic manuscripts to their own websites, where they can be accessed freely by anyone who has Internet access. Eventually, depending on the lag time between acceptance and publication, the print version of the article appears. However, most researchers, especially younger scholars, access the official electronic version rather than the printed version of the paper.

Following the lead of other journals in the marketing discipline (e.g., *Journal of Consumer Research*) by posting the fully edited and laid out electronic version of the article as soon as possible after acceptance would greatly enhance the timeliness of disseminating marketing research findings to the scholarly community. Articles would no longer be subjected to a possible publication "backlog." Articles would be "officially" published when they were in final proof format, and knowledge would flow continuously rather than in two- or three-month intervals.

The Review Process

Despite the vagaries of the peer-review process, including lack of convergence, lack of effort, turf defending, and other forms of human error (Lynch 1998), there is currently no viable substitute for peer review for ensuring the professional integrity of published research.

Recommendation 8: Implement a more collaborative review model.

The hallmark of Web 2.0 is the collaboration that exists among a community of users. Wikipedia relies on the collaboration of literally hundreds of thousands of contributors to provide authoritative information. Netflix makes recommendations to its users on the basis of a collaborative filtering of millions of users' movie consumption. Facebook groups champion everything from *American Idol* contestants to presidential candidates. Marketing scholarship can benefit by adopting a more collaborative posture.

Collaboration is not new to marketing scholarship. The vast majority of published articles are coauthored; the singly authored article is becoming a rarity. Furthermore, many groups of coauthors are not at the same institution; e-mail and the Internet have greatly facilitated long-distance collaboration. Many journals aspire to a collaborative review process, whereby the insights from reviewers assist the authors in improving their manuscripts, resulting in a superior final product. However, this aspiration is often not met, at least not in the eyes of authors who experience rejection at the hands of less-than-diplomatic reviewers. Some authors even feel that their work has been "hijacked" by an overzealous reviewer or editor (Lynch 1998).

Currently, *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, under the leadership of editor C.W. Park, is implementing a more collaborative reviewing model. For manuscripts that are not clear rejections (either desk rejects or rejections based on reviewers' assessments), the editor, before making a final decision on the disposition of the manuscript, sends the reviews to the authors. The authors are given one week to prepare a succinct response to the reviews, indicating how they would handle the reviewers' concerns. This also pro-

vides the authors with an opportunity to disagree with reviewers' suggestions or to clarify points of misunderstanding. Then, with the reviewers' comments and authors' responses in hand, the editor makes his decision on the fate of the manuscript (either reject or revise and resubmit). Park (2010) reports a high degree of author satisfaction with this approach as well as a higher degree of his own confidence in his decisions. Obviously, this collaborative approach is more labor-intensive for the editor and requires a bit more time, but the early returns seem to suggest that the benefits outweigh the costs.

Conception and Production of Marketing Scholarship

Enhancing the Contribution of Academic Scholarship to Marketing Practice

Not all marketing scholarship has the goal of affecting marketing practice. Some research is legitimately aimed at advancing theory at a rather basic level. However, given the mission of *Journal of Marketing*, the premise adopted herein is that the typical researcher working in the marketing domain seeks to influence practitioners at some level. Criticisms of the content and value of academic marketing research are well-known and continuing (e.g., Reibstein, Day, and Wind 2009, as well as other articles in this issue), and I will not repeat them here.

Recommendation 9: Implement collaborative research design.

If a more collaborative approach to the peer-review process seems fruitful, the prospect arises of collaboration at other phases of the research process. How many times has a reviewer read a manuscript and had this reaction? "This is a fascinating topic, but the research design is completely and fatally flawed." It would be of systemic value to the discipline to head off fatally flawed research designs *before* they are executed. This can be accomplished via collaboration, using at least two possible mechanisms.

A proprietary research design collaboration model would largely mirror the existing peer-review process. Authors would submit a carefully prepared synopsis of their intended research. The synopsis would include the problem statement, the conceptual framework/literature review, hypotheses, and a detailed research design. Seasoned reviewers would be asked to assess the viability and validity of the research design and make suggestions for improvements. Authors could then proceed (or not) with their research with more confidence. It would be important that this "concept test" review not be viewed as a tentative publication decision; therefore, such a model would best be set up independent from any particular journal, with a separate review board and editor. Participation on such a review board should be attractive to the scholars in the field who enjoy playing a mentoring role.

A more public, "open-source" form of research design collaboration would mimic the crowdsourcing model that is gaining favor in applied settings such as new product design and promotional campaign planning (Howe 2008). Under this model, a website would be created on which

authors would be able to post their synopses. Anyone would be free to comment on the quality of the proposed research and post suggestions for improvement. Both authors and commenters would have the option of maintaining their anonymity, and a mechanism would exist to permit authors and commenters to contact one another directly for deeper conversations and for the purpose of forging possible research alliances. This could be especially helpful in serving a matching function for authors working in different countries who would otherwise be unaware of their shared interest. This model has more of the true "Web 2.0" character than the proprietary model in that it is more open and the participants' contributions are not moderated by an editorial structure.

To provide either of these collaborative research design models with some degree of authority and prestige, they need to be administered under the auspices of a respected professional association. To this end, the AMA's new "AMACConnect" site has much of the functionality required to accomplish this. Here, marketing academics could create and manage profiles or groups that are public or private, all-inclusive or invite-only, and broad in scope or segmented by interest. Public groups can interact and network with one another, which could bring a practitioner audience into conversation with academics, and private groups could engage in a more private conversation and share more potentially sensitive material (e.g., data, research ideas). Within these groups, blogging, discussion forums, wikis, the ability to create and maintain a repository of files, and many other 2.0-related functionalities are all possible (see www.marketingpower.com/Community).

Recommendation 10: Implement collaborative problem definition.

Logically preceding the research design decision is the selection of a topic to study. Perhaps an even more common reviewer/editor reaction to a manuscript is, "What a shame all this careful work went into such an unimportant and/or ill-defined problem." For an extensive treatment of this issue, see Armstrong (2003). Collaborative problem definition could be of tremendous value to the field in channeling research efforts away from trivial problems and toward those that can make a more substantial contribution to knowledge.

Currently, MSI publishes biannual research priorities that emanate from discussions among leading academic researchers and marketing practitioners at focused conferences hosted by MSI. Similarly, the Institute for the Study of Business Markets provides grants and supplies data to researchers working in the business-to-business arena. These approaches are useful but are, of necessity, not as comprehensive as the range of potential projects in the discipline. And although the guidelines are generated collaboratively among a relatively small number of interested parties, a more open collaborative process would permit much broader participation, especially by emerging scholars who are less likely to be involved in the MSI process. As with the research design collaboration I have discussed, two general models for problem definition collaboration exist.

Under the proprietary model, prospective authors would submit their problem definitions for review by experts in the field. The submissions would be in the form of two- to three-page prospectuses, stating the problem clearly, supporting its potential value through selected literature, and, importantly, specifying the intended target audience (e.g., academics working in the same area, public policy makers, marketing practitioners). Given my emphasis in this article on research that influences practice, I would suggest that the practitioner category should be segmented further. For example, contributions might be intended primarily for chief marketing officers, brand managers, sales managers, or market researchers. Note that the target audience designation places some responsibility on the researchers to familiarize themselves with the concerns of people who hold those types of positions. Is it asking too much of professional researchers and dedicated scholars to interact with those whom they are trying to influence? Promoting one's research is not fundamentally different from promoting a product: The process works immensely better when it is grounded in a deep understanding of the market, such that the "product" generated truly meets the needs of the market and can be promoted as such.

The review board for this collaborative problem definition model would comprise representatives from all the various possible audience groups. Prospectuses would be sent to members of the identified target audience for commentary. The basic question to be addressed would be, Assuming that a research study successfully addressed the problem identified herein, how important would the findings be? Suggestions would be solicited for revising or refining the problem definition. Assuming a prospectus "passed" this test to the authors' satisfaction, they could then turn to research design with greater confidence and enthusiasm, knowing that someone else cares about their topic. If they chose, they could then avail themselves of the opportunity to submit their research design to the collaborative research design process.

Under a more collaborative problem definition approach, an open-source, crowdsourcing model again applies. Researchers would post prospective problem definitions to an AMA-sponsored website, and interested parties could comment. Because the website would be open to anyone, it would be useful to have a mechanism whereby those commenting could indicate their job title or role. Thus, for example, a senior scholar who has engaged in considerable C-level consulting might comment on a project aimed at chief marketing officers and indicate that he or she has sufficient C-level experience to make a reasoned assessment of the importance of the problem (e.g., Reibstein, Day, and Wind 2009). Note that people could also post research problems they would like to be solved (similar to the MSI Research Priorities, but in a more "dynamic" forum). As discussed previously for the open-source research design site, this mechanism would rely on a website sponsored by the AMA.

Intellectual property issues. An obvious concern that many may have with the open-source models is that participants are essentially placing their ideas in the public

domain without complete protection. For those concerned about this issue, the proprietary forms of the process would make more sense than the open-source forms. And, of course, it is the individual researcher's choice to avail himself or herself of these new review processes at all. Researchers confident in their problem definitions and research designs can proceed as they always have.

Other scholars may embrace a more collaborative worldview and are not averse to putting their ideas in the public domain, either as a prospective author or as a commenter. For the open-source models I have described herein to work properly, "fair play" would have to govern the use of the websites. For example, it would be unfair of a commenter to literally "steal" someone's problem definition. Similarly, it would be unfair for an author to flood the site with scores of problem definitions to "stake a claim" to more ideas than he or she can possibly execute. Perhaps this is too utopian to expect, or even to wish for, but it is in this spirit that people submit their ideas for products and advertisements in open-source venues.

Incentive issues. One might raise the legitimate concern about the incentive an individual scholar would have for participating in such a collaborative process. Why would someone volunteer his or her time, effort, and creativity when no direct reward is entailed? First, it is worth noting that our current review process extracts enormous amounts of volunteer labor from the very best people in the discipline. Presumably, they donate their time freely and generously due to their commitment to scholarship and the intrinsic satisfaction received from mentoring aspiring scholars. As Belk (2010, p. 279) notes, the review process depends a great deal on participants' willingness to share their ideas and energy. In the marketplace for ideas, this becomes yet another mechanism whereby a talented individual can gain some recognition. Examples abound in commercial settings. Lee (2010) reports that BleacherReport.com, a sports website, has more than 3600 unpaid writers and *Huffington Post* has more than 6000 bloggers who work pro bono (and an audience of more than 23 million monthly). Consider the two amateurs, Joe and David Herbert of Batesville, Ind., who won the Doritos "Crash the Super Bowl" advertising competition in 2009. Not only did their ad win the Doritos contest and thus a 30-second spot during the Super Bowl, it also was ranked as the Number 1 Super Bowl ad overall by the *USA Today* ad meter, garnering a \$1 million prize. The Herberts are \$1 million richer today because they dared to share their idea with no guarantee of compensation (TheIndyChannel.com 2009). Although the risk-to-reward ratio may not be as favorable for academic scholarship, open-source research collaboration may nevertheless represent an opportunity for young scholars to gain some recognition in the field for their ideas (Chui, Miller, and Roberts 2009, p. 5; Gabor 2009, p. 7).

Tenure and promotion issues. An obvious concern that arises with the collaborative model proposed here is how participation and publication would be viewed by tenure and promotion committees (as well as by colleagues, deans, and department heads). Theoretically, contribution to knowledge should be the overriding criterion. In practice,

candidates are often evaluated on the quality of the journals in which they publish and perhaps on the number of citations their articles garner. Presumably, participation in this collaborative system by an author would (1) enhance the probability of making an A-level contribution and (2) make the publication process a bit more transparent. The current review process is touted as a “value-add” process that helps improve papers. Open collaboration would simply reveal more of that “behind-the-scenes” value-add process. If a researcher ultimately publishes a valuable article, presumably it should “count” the same regardless of the process it went through to get there. At the same time, emerging researchers should determine the views of their departments, just as they currently do for other aspects of the tenure and promotion process.

Conclusion

In this article, I have tried to provide a rationale for Marketing Scholarship 2.0, a more digital, collaborative approach to marketing knowledge production and dissemination. We often lament that academic research in marketing tends to follow rather than lead marketing practice. In this instance, industry is leading the way in collaborative approaches to conducting business. Leading business consulting firms (e.g., McKinsey, Booz & Co.) recently have published white papers on collaborative models, and it is clear that Web 2.0 is a game-changer for industry. Scholarship in marketing needs to embrace the same philosophy.

I have attended or appeared as a panelist at dozens of “Meet the Editors” sessions at conferences and doctoral consortia over the past three decades. At virtually every one of these sessions, aspiring authors were admonished to focus on generating useful contributions to knowledge and not just on the journal review and publication process. This is sound advice. Yet, institutionally, the marketing discipline is not organized to support that advice with the necessary infrastructure. The journal review process deals with completed research only. Enhancing scholarly contribution of our collective research effort requires us to devise mechanisms such as the collaborative problem definition and research design processes outlined here. This will enable marketing scholarship to migrate into the twenty-first century as Marketing Scholarship 2.0.

REFERENCES

- AMA Task Force on the Development of Marketing Thought (1988), “Developing, Disseminating, and Utilizing Marketing Knowledge,” *Journal of Marketing*, 52 (October), 1–25.
- Armstrong, J. Scott (2003), “Discovery and Communication of Important Marketing Findings: Evidence and Proposals,” *Journal of Business Research*, 56 (1), 69–97.
- Baldwin, Christine and David Pullinger (2009), “What Readers Value in Academic Journals,” *Learned Publishing*, 13 (October), 229–39.
- Belk, Russell (2010), “Sharing,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36 (February), 715–34.
- Bjork, Bo-Christer and Turid Hedlund (2009), “Two Scenarios for How Scholarly Publishers Could Change Their Business Model to Open Access,” *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 12 (February), (accessed May 16, 2011), [available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0012.102>].
- Chui, Michael, Andy Miller, and Roger P. Roberts (2009), “Six Ways to Make Web 2.0 Work,” *The McKinsey Quarterly*, (February), (accessed May 16, 2011), [available at http://www.mckinseyquarterly.com/Six_ways_to_make_Web_20_work_2294].
- Daniel, Carter A. (2009), “How Two National Reports Ruined Business Schools,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, (November 8), (accessed May 16, 2011), [available at <http://chronicle.com/article/How-Two-National-Reports/49055/>].
- Gabor, Andrea (2009), “The Promise (and Perils) of Open Collaboration,” *Strategy & Business*, 56 (Autumn), 24–30.
- Gray, Brendan J., Geir Grundvag Otteson, and Sheelagh Matear (2005), “Disseminating Academic Research Information to Marketing Practitioners,” *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 23 (2), 124–35.
- Harnad, Stevan (1996), “Implementing Peer Review on the Net: Scientific Quality Control in Scholarly Electronic Journals,” in *Scholarly Publication: The Electronic Frontier*, R. Peek and G. Newby, eds. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 103–108.
- (2002), “The Invisible Hand of Peer Review,” *Exploit Interactive*, 5, (accessed May 16, 2011), [available <http://www.exploit-lib.org/issue5/peer-review/>].
- , Tim Brody, Francois Vallieres, Les Carr, Steve Hitchcock, Yves Gingras, et al. (2008), “The Access/Impact Problem and the Green and Gold Roads to Open Access: An Update,” *Serial Review*, 34 (1), 36–40.
- Howe, Jeff (2008), *Crowdsourcing: Why the Power of the Crowd Is Driving the Future of Business*. New York: Random House.
- Johnson, Eric J. (2001), “Digitizing Consumer Research,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (September), 331–36.
- Lawrence, Steve (2001), “Online or Invisible?” *Nature*, 411 (6837), 521.
- Lee, Edmund (2010), “The ‘Craigslis Effect’ Spreads to Content as Free Work Fills Supply,” *Advertising Age*, (June 28), (accessed May 16, 2011), [available at <http://adage.com/article/digital/craigslis-effect-spreads-content/144680/>].
- Lynch, John G., Jr. (1998), “Reviewing,” in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 25, J.W. Alba and J.W. Hutchinson, eds. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 1–6.
- MarketingPower.com (2010a), “Journal of Marketing Most-Cited Articles 2000–2009,” (accessed May 16, 2011), [available at <http://www.marketingpower.com/JM>].
- (2010b), “Journal of Marketing Research Most-Cited Articles 2000–2009,” (accessed May 16, 2011), [available at <http://www.marketingpower.com/JMR>].
- Maron, Nancy L. and K. Kirby Smith (2009), “Current Models of Digital Scholarly Communication: Results of an Investigation Conducted by Ithaka Strategic Services for the Association of Research Libraries,” *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 12 (1), (accessed May 16, 2011), [available at <http://dx.org/10.3998/3336451.0012.1057>].
- McFadden, Grant (2009), “Open Access: Is It the Future for All Scientific Publication?” paper presented at the University of Florida, Open Access Week, Gainesville, FL (October 19).
- McKay, Peter (2009), personal communication, Gainesville, FL (September).
- Montgomery, Carol Hansen and Donald W. King (2002), “Comparing Library and User Related Costs of Print and Electronic Journal Collections,” *D-Lib Magazine*, 8 (October), (accessed May 16, 2011), [available at <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/october02/montgomery/10montgomery.html>].
- Park, C.W. (2010), “A Two-Step Interactive Review Process,” *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 20 (2), 105–106.
- Reibstein, David J., George Day, and Jerry Wind (2009), “Guest Editorial: Is Marketing Academe Losing Its Way?” *Journal of Marketing*, 73 (July), 1–3.

Solomon, David J. (2002), "Talking Past Each Other: Making Sense of the Debate over Electronic Publication," *First Monday*, 7 (August), (accessed May 16, 2011), [available at <http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/rt/prINTERfriendly/978/899>].

Suber, Peter (2009), "Open Access in 2008," *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 12 (February), (accessed May 16, 2011), [available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0012.1047>].

TheIndyChannel.com (2009), "Indiana Brothers Win \$1 Million in Super Bowl Ad Contest," (accessed May 16, 2011), [available at <http://www.theindychannel.com/entertainment/18619613/detail.html>].

Weiner, Gaby (2001), "The Academic Journal: Has It a Future?" *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 9 (March), (accessed May 16, 2011), [available at <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v9n9.html>].

Weller, Ann C. (2000), "Editorial Peer Review for Electronic Journals: Current Issues and Emerging Models," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 51 (14), 1328–33.

A utilização deste artigo é exclusiva para fins educacionais

Copyright of Journal of Marketing is the property of American Marketing Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.

Fonte: Journal of Marketing, v. 75, n. 4, p. 225-234, July 2011. [Base de Dados]. Disponível em: <<http://web.ebscohost.com>>. Acesso em: 25 Aug. 2011.

A utilização deste artigo é exclusiva para fins educacionais