

**BUS 741  
MARKETING STRATEGY  
FALL 2016**

**Sandy Jap** (sjap@emory.edu)  
**GBS 519      404.727.6386**

**Weds 9a-noon  
W523**

**PERSPECTIVE**

This is the marketing strategy seminar in the PhD course sequence at Emory. It is intended to be an introduction to the substantive literature in marketing. You will find that marketing strategy is inherently interdisciplinary and as such, you will be exposed to readings from economics, sociology, psychology, and the organizational sciences in addition to the marketing literature.

Marketing strategy research occurs at many interesting levels of analysis, including the individual, dyad, group, firm, interorganizational, and industry level. While you may gravitate to a level of preference, you should remain open to varying levels of analyses. You will be exposed to a variety of research designs and techniques, including laboratory and field surveys, experiments, quasi-experiments, qualitative and secondary data.

The course will also emphasize the “how to” of generating ideas, evaluating their research potential, crafting an approach to operationalize the ideas, executing a research plan, writing up and presenting the research for maximal impact, and pursuing the research through the review process and into publication form.

There is an enormous amount of work that has been done on each topic we will cover. The readings for each session have been selected to provide you a historic overview of the evolution and scope of topics, assumptions and methods of investigation as well as the cutting edge.

Additionally, the seminar is intended to help you develop an ability to professionally critique scholarly articles that appear in the field’s leading journals and independently generate a detailed proposal for an original research project. Our goal will be to go beyond the detection of strengths and weaknesses to consider how each work could have been improved and, in some cases, approached in a different but more insightful manner.

**REQUIRED MATERIALS**

The readings for each will be available at the Library Course Reserves  
<https://ereserves.library.emory.edu>

The required text for the semester is *Assessing Marketing Strategy Performance*, eds. Christine Moorman and Donald R. Lehmann, Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute and will be distributed to you prior to the first session.

## FORMAT

The class will meet for a three hour period, with a 15 minute break at the halfway point.

### BEFORE CLASS

For every class, I will ask you to develop an idea for one study that would be an interesting addition to the literature. With this in mind, come to class with an “idea page” in which you sketch your idea (rationale and implication), its positioning, and a very rough sense of at least one way you might go about testing it. Be sure to define your constructs and present the explanatory mechanism(s). Think of an idea page as a “pitch sheet,” an abstract of the critical elements necessary to launch a new project. Hence, the idea page should contain 5 elements:

1. Problem statement -- what is the context and problem being addressed?
2. Research questions -- what is the specific research question that is being asked / investigated?
3. What is the theory -- potential hypotheses and their causal mechanisms (what is the theoretical explanation for the effects you anticipate).
4. Potential contribution - how does answering these questions create incremental value and what would the research be cited for?
5. How to test your ideas - what are the possible methods and what are the strengths and weaknesses of your suggestion?

The idea page is due at the beginning of each class, although we will not discuss them in class. Their purpose is to get you into the habit of generating testable research ideas whenever you read articles. These pages serve as low-cost ways to practice positioning an idea, framing the causal mechanism, casting implications in testable form, and devising a test. I encourage you to take risks here. In these exercises, you are certain to come up with what will turn out to be some poor ideas at least once. This is not critical. What matters is to give it a try in order to gain some feedback and practice. You are welcome to speak to past students about their experiences with the idea pages and to look at examples of those they have successfully written in the past. By the end of the semester, you should have several testable research ideas related to our readings. If you would like more guidance on how to construct these idea pages, see the end of this syllabus.

Finally, preparation for our discussion is key. Do not just read, but read and think. The former is easier than the latter, although more time-consuming. As you read, ask yourself the following: What grabbed my attention? What else might also explain these results? What don't I believe and why? What do I disagree with and why? What is missing? If you recommend a change in the analysis, then what would it change and why is it necessary? How might changes in the level of analysis further inform research?

Question assumptions. It is ok to not “like” a paper – published research is not perfect and it is sometimes incorrect! The purpose of our class time is to discover and evaluate the work and at the same time, learn something about the literature and potential directions for future research.

## **DURING CLASS**

It is expected that everyone will read the required four to five papers for each session. Additionally, one or two students will be expected to be the relative “expert” on the first four papers, providing insights, commentaries, and analyses that push the boundaries of our discussion. We will set up this schedule after the first session. It is your job to lead the discussion on that article, which should include the key contributions (and why these are important), strengths, weaknesses and opportunities for improvement of their article. The fifth article will typically be a background article to give you a broader understanding of the methods or theoretical assumptions that you underlie the core readings. In each class session, you will find a listing of supplemental readings, related to the topic of the day. They are there for your reference.

A large portion of how you are evaluated is the quality of discussion that you contribute to class. I caution against mere extensions of others’ points made in class. Instead, grasp the opportunity to initiate your own ideas and stimulate thoughtful discourse. The former is a safe strategy, but not particularly interesting. It is not a habit that you should fall into; instead, take a risk and put your ideas out there.

## **AFTER CLASS**

After each session, you will be asked to create a concept map – a one page, visual tool that brings together a set of key concepts, insights, and interrelationships to reflect your core learning from that session. The concept map is designed to help you better store and categorize your knowledge and identify relationships between concepts. I encourage you to be creative and memorable here. This is an organizing exercise that should help to give you a deeper understanding of the material and readily see interrelationships, gaps, and implications. These are made after each session discussion and due by the start of the next class. I’ve attached sample concept maps at the end of this document.

## **END OF SEMESTER PROJECT**

At the end of the semester, you will be asked to submit a 3-5 page outline of a novel, researchable idea based on your readings, individual interests, and learnings from the course. This statement should address the same 5 questions used to structure your idea pages, but (obviously) reflect more careful thought and rigor.

The purpose and intent of this exercise is to provide you an opportunity to develop a researchable idea that could be added to your portfolio of research projects. In other words, try to identify an idea that you would / could actually execute, not just something to fill a 5-page requirement.

Additionally, the purpose of this exercise is to aid you in constructing a game plan and strategy for a high quality paper/manuscript worthy of publication.

## **EVALUATION**

Concept maps are graded as a plus, minus, or a check mark. A check mark means that the work is up to expectations and fulfills all the requirements. This is where the average is. A plus means that the idea was particularly insightful, interesting, and well defined. It shows a lot of thought. A minus suggests that the work is below expectations.

Idea pages are graded on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being great and 1 suggesting that you should rethink whether this is the best class for you at this stage in your coursework. More details on this scoring system are provided at the end of this syllabus.

### **Course Grade point allocation scheme**

5 page project	20%
Idea pages	20
Concept maps	20
Group discussion	40

## SESSION SCHEDULE

“Related” readings are provided in the event that you might want to pursue a particular topic further.

“Toolkit” readings are intended to familiarize you with the purpose and nature of the empirical approaches used in that day’s readings.

Both of the above designated readings are optional.

Please note that readings are subject to change at least 1 week prior to the session.

Before our first session, it is required that you read: Baron, Reuben M. and David A. Kenny (1986), “The Moderator–Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173.

### #1: MARKETING STRATEGY

8/24

Day, George S. and Robin Wensley (1983), “Marketing Theory with a Strategic Orientation,” *Journal of Marketing*, 47(4), 79-89.

Kirca, Ahmet H., Satish Jayachandran, and William O. Bearden (2005), “Market Orientation: A Meta-Analytic Review and Assessment of its Antecedents and Impact on Performance,” *Journal of Marketing*, 69(2), 24-41.

Vargo, Stephen L. and Robert F. Lusch (2004), “Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing,” *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1), 1-17.

Day, George S. and Robin Wensley (2002), “Market Strategies and Theories of the Firm,” in *Handbook of Marketing*, Barton Weitz and Robin Wensley, eds., p. 85-105.

### #2: MARKETING MIX AND ITS IMPACT

8/31

Walter van Waterschoot and Christophe van den Bulte (1992), “The 4P Classification of the Marketing Mix Revisited,” *Journal of Marketing*, 56(4), 83-93.

Bowman, Douglas and Hubert Gatignon (2009), “Market Response and Marketing Mix Models: Trends and Research Opportunities, *Foundations and Trends in Marketing*, 4(3), 129-207.

Srinivasan, Shuba and Dominique M. Hanssens (2009), “Marketing and Firm Value: Metrics, Methods, Findings and Future Directions,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 46(3), 293-312.

Ataman, M. Berk, Harald J. van Heerde, and Carl F. Mela (2010), “The Long-Term Effect of Marketing Strategy on Brand Sales,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47(5), 866-82.

Related: Mizik, Natalie and Robert Jacobson (2003), "Trading Off Between Value Creation and Value Appropriation: the Financial Implications of Shifts in Strategic Emphasis," *Journal of Marketing*, 67(1), 63-76.

### #3: COMPETITION

9/7

Hunt, Shelby D. and Robert M. Morgan (1995), "The Comparative Advantage Theory of Competition," *Journal of Marketing*, 59 (April), 1-15.

Related: Armstrong, J. Scott and Fred Collopy, "Competitor Orientation: Effects of Objectives and Information on Managerial Decisions and Profitability," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 33(2), 188-99.

Montgomery, David B., Marian Chapman Moore, and Joel E. Urbany (2005), "Reasoning About Competitive Reactions: Evidence from Executives," *Marketing Science*, 24 (Winter), 138-149.

Debruyne, Marion and David J. Reibstein (2005), "Competitor See, Competitor Do: Incumbent Entry in New Market Niches," *Marketing Science*, 24 (1), 55-66.

#### **Toolkit reading**

Gatignon, Hubert, Erin Anderson, and Kristiaan Helsen (1989), "Competitive Reactions to Market Entry: Explaining Interfirm Differences," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 26 (February), 44-55.

Related: Lewis, Michael (2008), "Individual Team Incentives and Managing Competitive Balance in Sports Leagues: An Empirical Analysis of Major League Baseball," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45(5), 535-49.

Mizik, Natalie and Robert Jacobson (2004) "Stock Return Response Modeling," in *Assessing Marketing Strategy Performance*, Christine Moorman and Donald R. Lehmann, eds. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute, 29-46.

Chintagunta, Pradeep K., Vrinda Kadiyali, and Naufel J. Vilcassim, "Structural Models of Competition: A Marketing Strategy Perspective," in *Assessing Marketing Strategy Performance*, Christine Moorman and Donald R. Lehmann, eds. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute, 95-114.

### #4: PIONEERING ADVANTAGE AND MARKET ENTRY

9/14

Carpenter, Gregory S. and Kent Nakamoto (1989), "Consumer Preference Formation and Pioneering Advantage," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 26 (3), 285-298.

Related: Kardes, Frank R., Gurumurthy Kalyanaram, Murali Chandrashekar, and Ronald J. Dornoff (1993), "Brand Retrieval, Consideration Set Composition, Consumer Choice, and the Pioneering Advantage," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20 (1), 62-75.

Boulding, William and Markus Christen (2003), "Sustainable Pioneering Advantage? Profit Implications of Market Entry Order," *Marketing Science*, 22 (3), 371-392.

Related: Urban, Glen L., Theresa Carter, Steven Gaskin, and Zofia Mucha (1986), "Market Share Rewards to Pioneering Brands: An Empirical Analysis and Strategic Implications," *Management Science*, 32 (6), 645-359.

Golder, Peter N. and Gerard J. Tellis (1993), "Pioneer Advantage: Marketing Logic or Marketing Legend?" *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30 (2), 158-170.

Shankar, Venkatesh, Gregory S. Carpenter, and Lakshman Krishnamurthi (1998), "Late Mover Advantage: How Innovative Late Entrants Outsell Pioneers," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 35(1), 54-70.

Srinivasan, Raji, Gary L. Lilien, Arvind Rangaswamy (2006), "The Emergence of Dominant Designs," *Journal of Marketing*, 70(2), 1-17.

### **Toolkit reading**

Chandy, Rajesh K., Peter N. Golder, and Gerard J. Tellis (2004), "Historical Research in Marketing Strategy: Method, Myths, and Promise," in *Assessing Marketing Strategy Performance*, Christine Moorman and Donald R. Lehmann, eds. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute, 165-184.

---

## **#5: NEW PRODUCT MANAGEMENT AND INNOVATION**

9/21

Hauser, John, Gerard Tellis, and Abbie Griffin (2006), "Research on Innovation: A Review and Agenda for *Marketing Science*," *Marketing Science*, 25 (November-December), 687-717.

Related: Rubera, Gaia and Ahmet Kirca (2012), "Firm Innovativeness and its Performance Outcomes: A Meta-Analytic Review and Theoretical Integration," *Journal of Marketing*, 76(3), 130-47.

Van den Bulte, Christophe (2000), "New Product Diffusion Acceleration: Measurement and Analysis," *Marketing Science*, 19(4), 366-80.

Chandy, Rajesh, Brigitte Hopstaken, Om Narasimhan and Jaideep Prabhu (2006), "From Invention to Innovation: Conversion Ability in Product Development," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 43(3), 494-508.

Related: Slotegraaf, Rebecca J. and Kwaku Atuahene-Gima (2011), "Product Development Team Stability and New Product Advantage: The Role of Decision-Making Processes," *Journal of Marketing*, 75(1), 96-108.

Griffin, Abbie and John R. Hauser (1993), "The Voice of the Customer," *Marketing Science*, 12(1) 1-27.

Related: Urban, Glen L. and John R. Hauser (2004), “‘Listening In’ to Find and Explore New Combinations of Customer Needs,” *Journal of Marketing*, 68(2), 72-87.

**Toolkit Reading** Srinivasan, Raji and Sundar Bharadwaj (2004), “Event Studies in Marketing Strategy Research,” in *Assessing Marketing Strategy Performance*, Christine Moorman and Donald R. Lehmann, eds. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute, 9-28.

---

#6: BRANDS AND BRAND EQUITY

9/28

Keller, Kevin Lane and Donald Lehmann (2006), “Brands and Branding: Research Findings and Future Priorities,” *Marketing Science*, 25(6), 740-59.

Broniarczyk, Susan M. and Joseph W. Alba (1994), “The Importance of the Brand in Brand Extension,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(2), 214-28.

Brown, Stephen, Robert V. Kozinets, and John F. Sherry, Jr. (2003), “Teaching Old Brands New Tricks: Retro Branding and the Revival of Brand Meaning,” *Journal of Marketing*, 67(3), 19-33.

Mizik, Natalie and Robert Jacobson (2008), “The Financial Value Impact of Perceptual Brand Attributes,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45 (1), 15-32.

Related: Srinivasan, V., Chan Su Park and Dae Ryun Chang (2005), “An Approach to the Measurement, Analysis, and Prediction of Brand Equity and Its Sources,” *Management Science*, 51 (9), 1433-1448.

Mizik, Natalie and Robert Jacobson (2009), “Valuing Branded Business,” *Journal of Marketing*, 73(Nov), 137-53.

Ailawadi, Kusum L., Scott A. Neslin, and Donald R. Lehmann (2003), “Revenue Premium as an Outcome Measure of Brand Equity,” *Journal of Marketing*, 67(4), 1-17.

Goldfarb Avi, Qiang Lu, Sridhar Moorthy (2009), “Measuring Brand Value in an Equilibrium Framework,” *Marketing Science*, 28(1), 69-86.

---

#7: CHANNEL MANAGEMENT

TBD

Kumar, Alok, Jan B. Heide and Kenneth H. Wathne (2011), “Performance Implications of Mismatched Governance Regimes Across External and Internal Relationships,” *Journal of Marketing*, 75(March), 1-17.

Related: Palmatier, Dant and Grewal (2007), “A Comparative Longitudinal Analysis of Theoretical Perspectives of Interorganizational Relationship Performance,” *Journal of Marketing*, 71(Oct), 172-94.



Jap, Sandy D. and Shankar Ganesan (2000), "Control Mechanisms and the Relationship Lifecycle: Implications for Safeguarding Specific Investments and Developing Commitment," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 37(2), 227-45.

Heide, Jan B. (1994), "Interorganizational Governance in Marketing Channels," *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (January), 71-85.

Seggie, Steven, David Griffith, and Sandy Jap (2012), "'Passive and Active Opportunism in Interorganizational Exchange,'" working paper under second review at *Journal of Marketing*.

Kashyap, Vishal, Kersi D. Antia, and Gary L. Frazier (2012), "Contracts, Extracontractual Incentives, and *Ex Post* Behavior in Franchise Channel Relationships," 49(2), 260-76.

Avery, Jill, Thomas J. Steenburgh, John Deighton and Mary Caravella (2012), "Adding Bricks to Clicks: Predicting the Patterns of Cross-Channel Elasticities Over Time," *Journal of Marketing*, 76(May), 96-111.

Related: Overby, Eric and Sandy Jap (2009), "Electronic and Physical Market Channels: A Multiyear Investigation in a Market for Products of Uncertain Quality," *Management Science*, 55(6), 940-57.

Sa Vinhas, Alberto and Erin Anderson (2005), "How Potential Conflict Drives Channel Structure: Concurrent (Direct and Indirect) Channels," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 62 (November), 507-15.

Inman, J. Jeffrey Venkatesh Shankar and Rosellina Ferraro (2004), "The Roles of Channel Category Associations and Geodemographics in Channel Patronage," *Journal of Marketing*, 68(2), 51-71.

**Toolkit Reading** Jap, Sandy D. and Erin Anderson (2004), "Challenges and Advances in Marketing Strategy Field Research," in *Assessing Marketing Strategy Performance*, Christine Moorman and Donald R. Lehmann, eds. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute, 269-92.

---

## #8: SALESFORCE MANAGEMENT

10/12

Mantrala, Murali K., Sönke Albers, Fabio Caldieraro, Ove Jensen, Kissan Joseph, Manfred Krafft, Chakravarthi Narasimhan, Srinath Gopalkrishna, Andris Zoltners, Rajiv Lal, Leonard Lodish (2010), "Sales Force Modeling: State of the Field and Research Agenda," *Marketing Letters*, 21:255-72.

Related: Albers, Sönke, Murali K. Mantrala, Shrihari Sridhar (2010), "Personal Selling Elasticities: A Meta-Analysis," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47(5), 840-53.

Godes, David (2003), "In the Eye of the Beholder: An Analysis of the Relative Value of a Top Sales Rep Across Firms and Products," *Marketing Science*, 22(2), 161-87.

Lim, Noah Michael J. Aharne, and Sung H. Ham (2009), "Designing Sales Contests: Does the Prize Structure Matter?" *Journal of Marketing Research*, 46(2), 356-71.

Aharne, Michael, Adam Rapp, Douglas E. Hughes, and Rupinder Jindal (2010), 47(August), "Managing Sales Force Product Perceptions and Control Systems in the Success of New Product Introductions," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 764-76.

Related: Anderson, Erin and Richard L. Oliver (1987), "Perspectives on Behavior-Based Versus Outcome-Based Sales Force Control Systems," *Journal of Marketing*, 51(October), 76-88.

Sujan, Harish, Barton Weitz and Nirmalya Kumar (1994), "Learning Orientation, Working Smart and Salesperson Performance," *Journal of Marketing*, 58(July), 39-56.

**Toolkit Reading** Farley, John U., Scott Hoenig, Donald R. Lehmann and David M. Szymanski (2004), "Challenges and Advances in Marketing Strategy Field Research," in *Assessing Marketing Strategy Performance*, Christine Moorman and Donald R. Lehmann, eds. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute, 145-64.

---

#### #9: RELATIONSHIPS IN MARKETING

10/26

Fournier, Susan (1998), "Consumers and Their Brands: Developing Relationship Theory in Consumer Research," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24(4), 343-53.

Related: Aaker, Jennifer, Susan Fournier, and S. Adam Brasel (2004), "When Good Brands Do Bad," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(1), 1-16.

Related: Batra, Rajeev, Aaron Ahuvia and Richard P. Bagozzi (2012), "Brand Love," *Journal of Marketing*, 76(March), 1-16.

Palmatier, Robert W., Rajiv P. Dant, Dhruv Grewal, and Kenneth R. Evans (2006), "Factors Influencing the Effectiveness of Relationship Marketing: A Meta-Analysis," *Journal of Marketing*, 70(Oct), 136-53.

Sandy D. Jap and Erin Anderson (2007), "Testing a Life-Cycle Theory of Cooperative Interorganizational Relationships: Movement Across Stages and Performance," *Management Science*, 53(2), 260-75.

Vosgerau, Joachim, Erin Anderson, and William T. Ross (2008), "Can Inaccurate Perceptions in B2B Relationships be Beneficial?" *Management Science*, 27(2), 205-224.

Related: Wang, Qiong, Ujwal Kayande, and Sandy D. Jap, (2010) "The Seeds of Dissolution: Discrepancy and Incoherence in Buyer-Supplier Exchange," *Marketing Science*, 29(6), 1109-24.

Inman, J. Jeffrey and Leigh McAlister (1993), "A Retailer Promotion Policy Model Considering Promotion Signal Sensitivity," *Marketing Science*, 12(4), 339-56.

Related: Jedidi, Kamel, Carl F. Mela, and Sunil Gupta (1999), "Managing Advertising and Promotion for Long-Run Profitability," *Marketing Science*, 18(1), 1-22.

Mela, Carl F., Sunil Gupta, and Donald R. Lehmann (1997), "The Long-Term Impact of Promotion and Advertising on Consumer Brand Choice," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34 (2), 248-261.

Kadiyali, Vrinda, Pradeep Chintagunta, and Naufel Vilcassim (2000), "Manufacturer-Retailer Channel Interactions and Implications for Channel Power" *Marketing Science*, 19(2) 127-48.

Srinivasan, Shuba, Koen Pauwels, Dominique M. Hanssens, Marnik G. Dekimpe (2004), "Do Promotions Benefit Manufacturers, Retailers or Both?" *Management Science*, 50(5), 617-29.

Related: Blattberg, Robert C., Richard Briesch, and Edward J. Fox (1995), "How Promotions Work," *Marketing Science*, 14(3,2), G122-132.

Mazumdar, Raj, and Sinha (2005), "Reference Price Research: Review and Propositions," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 69(October), 84-102.

---

## #11: INTEGRATED MARKETING COMMUNICATIONS AND ADVERTISING

Joshi, Amit and Dominique M. Hanssens (2010), "The Direct and Indirect Effects of Advertising Spending on Firm Value," *Journal of Marketing*, 74(1), 20-33.

Pieters, Rik, Michel Wedel and Rajeev Batra (2010), "The Stopping Power of Advertising: Measures and Effects of Visual Complexity," *Journal of Marketing*, 74(September), 48-60.

Wilbur, Kenneth C. (2008), "A Two-Sided Empirical Model of Television Advertising and Viewing Markets," *Marketing Science*, 356-78.

Lin, Chen, Sriram Venkatraman, and Sandy D. Jap (2013), "Media Multiplexing Behavior: Implications for Targeting and Media Planning," *Marketing Science*, 32(2), 310-24.

Related: Smith, Timothy M., Srinath Gopalakrishna, and Rabikar Chatterjee (2006), "A Three-Stage Model of Integrated Marketing Communications at the Marketing-Sales Interface," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 43(4), 564-579.

Related: Naik, Prasad A., and Raman, Kalyan (2003), "Understanding the Impact of Synergy in Multimedia Communications," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40(4), 375-388.

**Toolkit Reading** Dekimpe, Marnik and Dominique M. Hanssens (2004), “Persistence Modeling for Assessing Marketing Strategy Performance,” in *Assessing Marketing Strategy Performance*, Christine Moorman and Donald R. Lehmann, eds. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute, 69-94.

---

#12: SATISFACTION, QUALITY AND RETAILING

11/16

Slotegraaf, Rebecca J. and J. Jeffrey Inman (2004), “Longitudinal Shifts in the Drivers of Satisfaction with Product Quality: The Role of Attribute Resolvability,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 41(3), 269-80.

Related: Rust, Roland T., J. Jeffrey Inman, Jianmin Jia and Anthony Zahorik (1999), “What You Don’t Know About Customer-Perceived Quality: The Role of Customer Expectation Distributions,” *Marketing Science*, 18(1), 77-92.

Anderson, Eugene W. and Mary W. Sullivan, “The Antecedents and Consequences of Customer Satisfaction for Firms,” *Marketing Science*, 12(2) 125-43.

Dhar, Sanjay K. and Stephen J. Hoch (1997), “Why Store Brand Penetration Varies by Retailer,” *Marketing Science*, 16(3) 208-27.

Broniarczyk, Susan M., Wayne D. Hoyer, and Leigh McAlister (1998), “Consumers’ Perceptions of the Assortment Offered in a Grocery Category: The Impact of Item Reduction,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 35(May), 166-76.

---

#13: GENERATING INTERESTING IDEAS AND SEMESTER PROJECTS

11/23

Davis, Murray S. (1971), “That’s Interesting! Towards a Phenomenology of Sociology and a Sociology of Phenomenology,” *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 1, 309-44.

Carpenter, Gregory S. and Kent Nakamoto (1994), “Reflections on ‘Consumer Preference Formation and Pioneering Advantage,’” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(4), 570-73.

Be prepared to make a brief (10 minute) presentation of your intended end of semester paper and receive feedback from the group.

**Note: Final Projects due Sun Dec 12 – no exceptions!**

---

#14: THE REVIEW PROCESS

11/30

Gans, Joshua S. and George B. Shepherd, “How Are the Mighty Fallen: Rejected Classic Articles by Leading Economists,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 8(1), 165-179.

Sawyer, Laran and Xu (2008), “The Readability of Marketing Journals: Are Award Winning Articles Better Written?” *Journal of Marketing*, 72(1), 108-17.

In this session, we will be learning about the review process and discussing strategies for management. I will make a dropbox folder available to you that contains electronic copies of the correspondence and manuscripts associated with the *JMR* review process for my dissertation, which spanned from 1997-99.

Please review the documents sequentially, paying close attention to the correspondence that is occurring between the author, reviewers and the editor. Be prepared to discuss the following questions:

1. What are the key aspects of the initial cover letter that should be included with a journal submission?
2. What are the key takeaways from the editor's response letter on Dec 9, 1997? Each reviewer?
3. What is the strategy in crafting the response to the reviewers and editor?
4. More generally, what does it take on the parts of the author and the review team to "close the deal"?

## TIPS ON WRITING A STRONG IDEA PAGE

For many students, it takes a while to get the hang of writing an idea page. But once it becomes habitual, you will find that it can become a resource of research ideas as you develop your career. Regularly generating interesting ideas in response to *any* paper you read is also a critical discipline as an academic.

1. The purpose of the idea page is to develop your ability to state a hypothesis (best if it contains an independent and dependent variable with a predicted directional effect) and **develop** it. This latter part includes articulating what I call the “explanatory mechanism,” or the logic for why the relationship between the independent and dependent variable of your hypothesis is as you say.

This will require a logical explanation of not only your proposed effect, but also a treatment of potential counter effects and why your proposal dominates. So for example, if you proposed that affect is positively related to sales, then you need to acknowledge that there is literature or the possibility that affect could be negatively related to sales. Yet for some reason (which you supply) you believe that the positive aspect dominates to the point that the net observed effect is positive, etc.

2. A related goal is to get used to minimizing jargon, and explaining/defining your terms. Most every major issue has been researched, so you will need to avoid relabeling commonly used terms and adding in new terms that are not necessary. It also means that your incremental contribution should typically be stated in relation to an extant literature. How does your hypothesis advance/change our understanding of this literature?
3. Also consider what makes a hypothesis or research idea “interesting.” Simply adding another X variable to the literature is not interesting. Nor is testing out a theory in a new context. **Unless** you can make the argument for how this approach necessarily enhances our present understanding of the relationship between X and Y. So if it is the case that the X variable or new context has been a serious omission to the literature that substantially changes/alters/reverses what we already know or is somehow superior to the state of the art literature.

Put differently, adding main effects and extending known findings is not an interesting research question. However, **moderators** or **mediators**, can be. This is because such variables can significantly change/alter how we think about a body of research or past findings.

4. Space is tight. You will have to be super-efficient to explain the above and still fit some thoughtfulness in how it will be tested. This means you will not want to belabor a point that everyone likely already accepts (e.g., social media usage is rampant today). And you may not want to test/describe/explain more than one hypothesis in a page. Make every sentence *matter*.

*Scoring.* Generally, the way idea pages are graded is that great papers get a 5. It takes practice to get to this level. This is a paper that is articulate, well-balanced in covering the various requirements AND creative. An average paper (4) is one that does pretty much everything, but may be less creative overall. Or it manages to get some aspects of the requirements done but not others (such as the explanatory mechanism). A 3 score is given to a paper that misses the mark on several important fronts in terms of covering the aspects that I asked. A 2 score suggests that you really need to rework what you are doing as there are many problems. A 1 score suggests that you should rethink whether you should be in the class!

## SAMPLE CONCEPT MAPS





