My Reflections on Publishing In Journal of Marketing

November 23, 2016
My Reflections on Publishing
In Journal of Marketing

V. Kumar
Journal of Marketing
Vol. 80, January 2016
2016, American Marketing Association

2014 InCites Journal Citation Reports rank JM as the top journal in marketing, with a total citation of 14,741 and a journal impact factor of 3.938.

Who contributes to JM’s success:
The authors,
The editors in chief, the EICs,
The area editors, AEs,
The editorial review board (ERB) members.
What Type of Articles Does JM Publish

- JM articles should have actionable managerial implications
- **Rigorous, meaningful, generalizable, managerially relevant** implications
  - The **domains** of knowledge
  - The **classification** of articles
  - The critical nature of **rigorous** and **relevant** research
Domain of Knowledge

- All articles published in JM:
  - Marketing management and strategy, MM&S
  - Consumer behavior, CB

- For the years 2013-2015, 132 articles published in JM
Domain-Specific Publications in JM Between 2013 and 2015

TABLE 1
Domain-Specific Publications in JM Between 2013 and 2015 (18 Issues)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MM&amp;S Domain</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Articles</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>CB Domain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Articles</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Total Articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–2015</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Classification of Articles

Between 2013 and 2015

- 1650 submissions
- 1075 went through review process, the remaining were desk rejected, 65%
- 132 articles were published, 8% of submissions, 12% of those through review process
Classification of Articles
Classification of Articles

FIGURE 2
Year-Wise Classification of Articles

2013 Study Statistics (48 Studies)

- Conceptual: 27 studies
- Review: 1 study
- Empirical: 45 studies

2014 Study Statistics (48 Studies)

- Conceptual: 36 studies
- Review: 5 studies
- Empirical: 38 studies

2015 Study Statistics (36 Studies)

- Conceptual: 16 studies
- Review: 1 study
- Empirical: 3 studies

Total Articles:

2013: 48 studies
2014: 48 studies
2015: 36 studies
Rigor and Relevance OR Rigor versus Relevance

- It is better to adopt a rigor and relevance approach as opposed to a rigor versus relevance approach.

- How can we achieve rigor and relevance in research?
  - Identify the sources of rigor: (1) review published articles, (2) introduce concepts from other disciplines, (3) interact with peers in academia.
  - Ensure relevance assists in the practitioner community.
Research and Relevance:
Implications of Pasteur’s Quadrant for Doctoral Programs and Faculty Development

Michael Tushman
Harvard University

Charles O’Reilly III
Harvard University

Academy of Management Journal
2007, Vol. 50, No. 4, 769-774
Rigor and Relevance OR Rigor versus Relevance
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Why Do Articles get Rejected from JM

- As illustrated in Figure 3, at the desk-reject stage, articles are rejected for foremost being the lack of generalizability.

*FIGURE 3*
Review Process at JM
Why Do Articles get Rejected from JM

- Reviews may make the recommendation of Reject and Resubmit
  - The generation of new theory
  - The generalization of new results
  - The ability to open new lines of research
Evaluation of Manuscripts

General message to the AEs, the ERB, and the Ad Hoc Reviewers

- Provide authors with an objective review
- Don’t spend more time in the review process than necessary
- Evaluated all submissions on their merit for possible publication in JM

Message to the AEs

- Synthesize the reviewer’s comments and provide guidance to improve the contribution
- Focus on what needs to be done to improve the contribution or what needs to be fixed/enhanced in the article
Evaluation of Manuscripts

- **Message to the Review Team, ERB – Editorial Review Board**
  
  - Direct authors to make a significant contribution while ensuring rigor and relevance
  - Recognize all feedback/input from the review team is advisory in nature
  - Assure the sanctity of the review team’s comments as the authors revise a manuscript
Evaluation of Manuscripts

■ Message to the authors

- Get an article published is not easy, especially in a premier journal such as JM
- There is no final “draft”, only a “penultimate draft”
- Research articles always have a scope for improvement, and the more they are read and reviewed, the better they can get.
Why Do Articles get Rejected from JM

- Lack of **theoretical** approach
- **Conceptual** issues arising from the study approach
- Insufficient coverage of the **literature**
- Methodological issues that diminish the study’s **rigor**
- **Contributions** are not significant enough
- Lack of **relevance** to real-life applications
What type of article does JM publish

• **Is the article interesting?**
  The novelty of the topic
  Nonobvious enough to generate interest

• **Is this study valid?**
  Rigorous in all applicable areas of investigation: conceptual, empirical and analytical

• **Does this article have broad appeal?**
  Of interest to scholars, managers, policy makers, and decision makers

• **Is this article practical?**
  Actionable implications are of use to practitioners and managers
Conclusion

- If all the questions raised are answered in the affirmative, the article will stand a good chance of getting published in JM.

- The review process is designed to cull out the best of the contributions in each submission and provide directions to authors to improve the article.
Thank You