

A Citation Analysis of Articles Dealing with Marketing History, Thought, and Theory, 1970s–1990s: The Full Impact

Raymond Hubbard, Drake University, USA
 Andrew T. Norman, Drake University, USA
 Chip E. Miller, Drake University, USA

This paper examines the citation histories of articles dealing with marketing history, thought, and theory on a decade-by-decade basis from the 1970s through the 1990s. Two citation measures are used: (1) papers subsequently cited only in the Journal of Marketing (JM), and (2) papers cited in any of the journals listed in the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) database. Many papers show excellent citation records, while some others that we might have anticipated doing better failed to do so. The lengthy and ongoing debate over the discipline's status as a science suggests that papers involving marketing history, thought, and theory will continue to find an audience in future publications.

In an article scheduled for publication in a special issue of *Marketing Theory* on "New Perspectives on the History of Marketing Thought," Hubbard, Norman, and Miller (2005) presented the results of a citation analysis of articles dealing with marketing history, thought, and theory from the 1950s–1990s. Their citation analysis, however, was limited to articles cited in the *Journal of Marketing (JM)* only. This paper, in contrast, examines the citation histories of these same articles based on *all journals* listed in the *Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI)* database for the 1970s–1990s—the full impact.¹ And we compare the citation histories from the two data sources—*JM* only versus *SSCI*—on a decade-by-decade basis. The reason for beginning with the 1970s, rather than with the 1950s as in the Hubbard et al. (2005) study, is that the *SSCI* database does not include any articles published prior to the 1970s.²

We chose articles based on a manual search of all issues of *JM* from 1970–1999. Because it is aimed at a more general audience than specialized periodicals such as the *Journal of Consumer Research (JCR)* and the *Journal of Marketing Research (JMR)*, we felt that *JM* would publish more articles dealing with marketing history, thought, and theory than would *JCR* and *JMR*, a sentiment corroborated by Hubbard et al. (2005).

We classified articles into four groups. The first we called the "domain of marketing," and this group covered works concerned with marketing's sphere of influence, including those addressing such topics as the marketing concept/marketing orientation/social marketing, etc. A second classification category was for papers dealing with "marketing thought." In this group were papers discussing philosophical issues, theory development, and progress in marketing and its scientific status. The third ("historical papers") and fourth ("marketing strategy/management") groups are fairly self-descriptive. Of course, subjective evaluation is always involved when classifying items, and in some cases an argument could be made that an article belonged to more than one category. Nonetheless, as Hubbard et al. (2005) make clear, there was reasonable agreement among the three authors over the assignment of the *JM* papers in their study.

1970s

Table 1 shows the citations garnered by a number of articles dealing with marketing history, thought, and theory published during the 1970s based on *JM*-only and *SSCI* sources. Comparisons of citations across the two databases are made in terms of *Total Annualized Average Citations*, or TAAC scores. These scores are calculated by dividing the total number of citations an article receives by the number of years since its publication. Thus, if a paper is cited 40 times during the course of its 10-year existence, the TAAC score is 4.00.

With this in mind, the most cited paper of the 1970s, based on *JM* data, was Kotler's (1972) "A Generic Concept of Marketing," with a TAAC score of 1.00. This seminal work was ranked third (TAAC = 3.52), however, when calculated from the *SSCI* database. Bagozzi's (1975) "Marketing as Exchange" was ranked second when TAAC scores were computed on both *JM* (0.86) and *SSCI* (4.32) databases. In third place, based on *JM* data (0.52) was Kotler and Zaltman's (1971) classic paper "Social Marketing: An Approach to Planned Social Change." This paper rose to the first rank when based on *SSCI* citations

THE FUTURE OF MARKETING'S PAST

(4.47). The only other papers achieving a TAAC score greater than one for the 1970s were Hunt's (1976) "The Nature and Scope of Marketing," ($JM = 0.39$; $SSCI = 1.32$),

and Lacznia et al.'s (1979) "Social Marketing: Its Ethical Dimensions," ($JM = 0.12$; $SSCI = 1.13$).

TABLE 1
TOTAL AND ANNUALIZED AVERAGE CITATION RATES FOR ARTICLES PUBLISHED IN THE 1970s

Articles	Journal of Marketing		SSCI Database	
	Total Number of Citations	Total Annualized Average Citations (TAACs)	Total Number of Citations	Total Annualized Average Citations (TAACs)
Lavidge (1970) ^a	5	0.15	13	0.39
Bell/Emory (1971) ^a	5	0.15	18	0.56
Hunt (1971) ^b	3	0.09	8	0.25
Kotler/Zaltman (1971) ^a	17	0.52 ³	143	4.47 ¹
Kotler (1972) ^a	32	1.00 ¹	109	3.52 ³
McNamara (1972) ^a	8	0.25	30	0.97
Pinson et al. (1972) ^b	2	0.06	3	0.10
Stidsen/Schulte (1972) ^a	2	0.06	11	0.35
Enis (1973) ^a	2	0.06	14	0.47
Hunt (1973) ^b	—	—	—	—
Kernan (1973) ^b	—	—	—	—
Kotler (1973) ^d	1	0.03	9	0.30
Bagozzi (1974) ^a	8	0.27	27	0.93
Bartels (1974) ^a	3	0.10	16	0.55
Luck (1974) ^a	5	0.17	20	0.69
Tucker (1974) ^b	6	0.20	17	0.59
Bagozzi (1975) ^a	25	0.86 ²	121	4.32 ²
Shuptrine/Osmanski (1975) ^a	—	—	5	0.18
Hunt (1976) ^a	11	0.39	37	1.32
Bartels/Jenkins (1977) ^a	2	0.07	6	0.23
Arndt (1978) ^a	3	0.12	11	0.44
Carson (1978) ^a	1	0.04	1	0.04
Lacznia et al. (1979) ^a	3	0.12	27	1.13

NOTE: Articles are listed by date of publication. ^a denotes articles dealing with the domain of marketing; ^b marketing thought; ^c marketing history; and ^d marketing management and strategy. The three highest cited articles are superscripted.

Faring poorly was Hunt's (1971) "The Morphology of Theory and the General Theory of Marketing" ($JM = 0.09$; $SSCI = 0.25$), along with Pinson et al.'s (1972) critique of it ($JM = 0.06$; $SSCI = 0.10$). Worse yet, and rather surprisingly, were the zero citations in both the JM and

$SSCI$ categories for Hunt's (1973) short paper "Lawlike Generalizations and Marketing Theory," and Kernan's (1973) "Marketing's Coming of Age."

1980s

Editorial policy at the *JM* was changed in 1979 in an effort to promote marketing as a science. This meant that papers had to be more "scholarly" (Kerin 1996), and articles written by practitioners almost disappeared (Wilkie and Moore 2003). Table 2 reveals that the papers earning the most citations for this decade were those with a marketing thought/strategy focus. For example, Anderson's (1982) "Marketing, Strategic Planning, and the Theory of

the Firm" was ranked number one in terms of both the *JM* (1.77) and *SSCI* (4.23) TAACs. Wind and Robertson's (1983) "Marketing Strategy: New Directions for Theory and Research," was ranked second based on *JM* citations (0.90), but fell to rank 9 (2.29) based on the *SSCI* database. Similarly, Day and Wensley's (1983) "Marketing Theory with a Strategic Orientation," while ranked number 3 in terms of *JM* citations (0.81), was ranked in seventh place when based on *SSCI* data (2.52).

TABLE 2
TOTAL AND ANNUALIZED AVERAGE CITATION RATES FOR ARTICLES PUBLISHED IN THE 1980s

Articles	Journal of Marketing		SSCI Database	
	Total Number of Citations	Total Annualized Average Citations (TAACs)	Total Number of Citations	Total Annualized Average Citations (TAACs)
Leone/Schultz (1980) ^b	9	0.38	54	2.25
Savitt (1980) ^c	12	0.50	25	1.04
Webster (1981) ^d	18	0.78	39	1.70
Wensley (1981) ^d	9	0.39	29	1.26
Anderson (1982) ^d	39	1.77 ¹	93	4.23 ¹
Hunt/Burnett (1982) ^a	1	0.05	2	0.09
Wind/Robertson (1983) ^d	19	0.90 ²	48	2.29
Hunt (1983) ^b	13	0.62	34	1.62
Anderson (1983) ^b	15	0.71	78	3.71 ³
Bartels (1983) ^a	—	—	4	0.19
Grether (1983) ^a	—	—	3	0.14
Arndt (1983) ^b	12	0.57	49	2.33
Day/Wensley (1983) ^d	17	0.81 ³	53	2.52
Howard (1983) ^b	2	0.10	13	0.62
Deshpande (1983) ^b	9	0.43	68	3.24
Peter/Olson (1983) ^b	11	0.52	79	3.78 ²
Bagozzi (1984) ^b	11	0.55	52	2.60
Charnes et al. (1985) ^d	2	0.11	9	0.47
Arndt (1985) ^b	6	0.32	29	1.53
Leong (1985) ^b	2	0.11	11	0.58
Houston (1986) ^a	8	0.44	55	3.06
Muncy/Fisk (1987) ^b	2	0.12	6	0.35
Houston/Gassenheimer (1987) ^a	6	0.35	33	1.94
Fullerton (1988) ^c	3	0.19	17	1.06

NOTE: Articles are listed by date of publication. ^a denotes articles dealing with the domain of marketing; ^b marketing thought; ^c marketing history; and ^d marketing management and strategy. The three highest cited articles are superscripted.

1990s

When calculated from *SSCI* data, the second place ranking goes to Peter and Olson's (1983) "Is Science Marketing?" (3.78), up from rank 9 (0.52) using *JM* citations only. Anderson's (1983) "Marketing, Scientific Progress, and Scientific Method" is ranked third (3.71) based on *SSCI* information, and fifth (0.71) based on *JM* citations. Other papers faring well when ranked on *SSCI* data are Deshpande's (1983) "Paradigms Lost: On Theory and Method in Research in Marketing," in fourth place (3.24), and fifth-placed (3.06) Houston's (1986) "The Marketing Concept: What It Is and What It Is Not." When counting only *JM* citations, these papers fall to ranks 12 and 11, respectively.

Two papers, Bartels' (1983) "Is Marketing Defaulting Its Responsibilities?" and Grether's (1983) "Regional-Spatial Analysis in Marketing," earned zero *JM* citations; they received poor TAAC scores from *SSCI* information, 0.19 and 0.14, also. Another disappointing performer was Hunt and Burnett's (1982) "The Macromarketing/Micromarketing Dichotomy: A Taxonomic Model," with TAAC scores of 0.05 (*JM*) and 0.09 (*SSCI*).

Typical citation rates were shattered in this decade with the emergence of two papers: Kohli and Jaworski's (1990) "Market Orientation: The Construct, Research Propositions, and Management Implications"; and Jaworski and Kohli's (1993) "Market Orientation: Antecedents and Consequences." Table 3 shows the former article is ranked number 2 for the 1990s, with a TAAC score of 2.71 based on *JM* data, and a number substantially higher than any citation rates by earlier authors (the highest of which was Anderson's [1982] 1.77). For *SSCI* data, Kohli and Jaworski (1990) has an astonishing TAAC of 22.69, which dwarfs the previous high of 4.47 for Kotler and Zatlman's paper. And the Jaworski and Kohli (1993) manuscript edged out the Kohli and Jaworski (1990) piece: *JM* = 3.18; *SSCI* = 26.20. The explanation for this extraordinary state of affairs is that these two articles were, unbelievably, the first serious efforts in some forty years to operationalize the "marketing concept," a generally accepted cornerstone of marketing thought.

TABLE 3
TOTAL AND ANNUALIZED AVERAGE CITATION RATES FOR ARTICLES PUBLISHED IN THE 1990s

Articles	Journal of Marketing		SSCI Database	
	Total Number of Citations	Total Annualized Average Citations (TAACs)	Total Number of Citations	Total Annualized Average Citations (TAACs)
Jones/Monieson (1990) ^c	1	0.07	8	0.62
Kohli/Jaworski (1990) ^a	38	2.71 ²	295	22.69 ²
Hunt (1990) ^b	5	0.36	22	1.68
Nevett (1991) ^c	—	—	9	0.75
Dickson (1992) ^b	27	2.25	88	8.00
Webster (1992) ^d	31	2.58 ³	213	19.36 ³
Waterschoot/Bulte (1992) ^a	—	—	6	0.55
Peter (1992) ^b	3	0.25	10	0.91
Zinkhan/Hirscheim (1992) ^b	2	0.17	13	1.18
Hunt (1992) ^b	2	0.17	10	0.91
Hunt (1993) ^b	2	0.18	5	0.50
Jaworski/Kohli (1993) ^a	35	3.18 ¹	262	26.20 ¹
Hunt/Morgan (1995) ^b	14	1.56	80	8.89
Kerin (1996) ^c	6	0.75	15	1.88
Day (1996) ^c	4	0.50	10	1.43
Dickson (1996) ^b	4	0.50	13	1.86
Teas/Palan (1997) ^b	—	—	3	0.50
Deligönül/Cavusgil (1997) ^b	1	0.14	5	0.83

Articles	Journal of Marketing		SSCI Database	
	Total Number of Citations	Total Annualized Average Citations (TAACs)	Total Number of Citations	Total Annualized Average Citations (TAACs)
Hunt/Morgan (1997) ^b	2	0.29	2	0.29

NOTE: Articles are listed by date of publication. ^a denotes articles dealing with the domain of marketing; ^b marketing thought; ^c marketing history; and ^d marketing management and strategy. The three highest cited articles are superscripted.

Webster's (1992) "The Changing Role of Marketing in the Corporation" is the third-highest-cited paper from the 1990s ($JM = 2.58$, $SSCI = 19.36$). Two other papers from this decade also did remarkably well. First, Hunt and Morgan's (1995) "The Comparative Advantage Theory of Marketing" had a JM TAAC of 1.56 and an $SSCI$ TAAC of 8.89. Second, Dickson's (1992) "Toward a General Theory of Competitive Rationality" had corresponding figures of 2.25 and 8.00.

Some articles that did not perform well include Waterschoot and Van den Bulte's (1992) "The 4P Classification of the Marketing Mix Revisited," ($JM = 0$; $SSCI = 0.55$), Teas and Palan's (1997) "The Realms of Scientific Meaning Framework for Constructing Theoretically Meaningful Nominal Definitions of Marketing Concepts" ($JM = 0$; $SSCI = 0.50$), and Hunt's (1993) "Objectivity in Marketing Theory and Research" ($JM = 0.18$; $SSCI = 0.50$).

MARKETING HISTORY PAPERS

Six of the articles included in this study dealt explicitly with marketing history. We address them chronologically. None of the papers from the 1970s was historical in nature. Savitt's (1980) seminal contribution, "Historical Research in Marketing," has respectable JM (0.50) and $SSCI$ (1.04) TAAC scores. Fullerton's (1988) "How Modern is Modern Marketing? Marketing's Evolution and the Myth of the 'Production Era,'" has a JM TAAC (0.19) substantially lower than Savitt's, but an $SSCI$ TAAC (1.06) just edging the latter's. Jones and Monieson's (1990) "Early Development of the Philosophy of Marketing Thought" has a JM TAAC of 0.07 and a $SSCI$ TAAC of 0.62. Nevett's (1991) "Historical Investigation and the Practice of Marketing" was not cited at all in the JM , but earned an $SSCI$ TAAC of 0.75.

Kerin's (1996) interesting article on the history of JM , "In Pursuit of an Ideal: The Editorial and Literary History of the *Journal of Marketing*," averages 0.75 JM citations per year, and 1.88 $SSCI$ citations. Day's (1996) comment on Kerin (1996), "Using the Past as a Guide to the Future: Reflections on the History of the *Journal of Marketing*,"

despite being only three pages long, nevertheless has impressive citation rates ($JM = 0.50$; $SSCI = 1.43$).

The citation rates for articles devoted to historical research are the lowest among the four classification groups. For example, the average TAAC scores are as follows: marketing domain (1.08), marketing thought (2.01), marketing history (1.05), and marketing strategy/management (2.08). Corresponding figures for the 1990s are 16.48, 2.32, 1.17, and 19.36.³ Nevertheless, these TAAC scores suggest an ongoing interest in historical research in marketing.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has shown that papers published in the JM dealing with marketing history, thought, and theory are typically cited in subsequent publications in that journal (the JM TAAC scores). But it also shows that these works are often widely cited outside of the JM also (the $SSCI$ TAAC scores), to create what we call "The Full Impact." Indeed, many of these works have phenomenal citation histories.

We conclude with a couple of observations. First, some of our results are counterintuitive. Who would have guessed that the two papers by Jaworski and Kohli would have emerged stunningly as the highest cited works in the history of marketing thought and theory—ahead of such luminaries as Alderson, Bartels, Bagozzi, Hunt, Kotler, Leavitt, Levy, etc. Second, each decade brings some apparent headway in the development of marketing as a scientific discipline, but just as many claims that little real progress has been made. One thing seems sure in such a contentious atmosphere—there will always be room for papers dealing with marketing history, thought, and theory.

NOTES

¹ Strictly speaking, the $SSCI$ does not indicate the "full impact" of an article because it does not incorporate citations from books, theses, dissertations, and conference proceedings, as well as journals not included in its database.

² We have subsequently learned, however, that the

SSCI database now includes citations accruing to the *JM* from 1956 to the present. Any future citation analyses should reflect this fact.

³. We are indebted to an anonymous referee for suggesting the above comparisons, as well as for many other recommendations that have improved the quality of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Paul F. 1982. Marketing, strategic planning, and the theory of the firm. *Journal of Marketing* 46 (Spring): 15-26.
- _____. 1983. Marketing, scientific progress, and scientific method. *Journal of Marketing* 47 (Fall): 18-31.
- Arndt, Johan. 1978. How broad should the marketing concept be? *Journal of Marketing* 42 (January): 101-03.
- _____. 1983. The political economy paradigm: Foundation for theory building in marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 47 (Fall): 44-54.
- _____. 1985. On making marketing science more scientific: Role of orientations, paradigms, metaphors, and puzzle solving. *Journal of Marketing* 49 (Summer): 11-23.
- Bagozzi, Richard P. 1974. Marketing as an organized behavioral system of exchange. *Journal of Marketing* 38 (October): 77-81.
- _____. 1975. Marketing as exchange. *Journal of Marketing* 39 (October): 32-39.
- _____. 1984. A prospectus for theory construction in marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 48 (Winter): 11-29.
- Bartels, Robert. 1974. The identity crisis in marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 38 (October): 73-76.
- _____. 1983. Is marketing defaulting its responsibilities? *Journal of Marketing* 47 (Fall): 32-35.
- _____. and R. L. Jenkins. 1977. Macromarketing. *Journal of Marketing* 41 (October) 17-20.
- Bell, Martin L. and C. William Emory. 1971. The faltering marketing concept. *Journal of Marketing* 35 (October): 37-42.
- Carson, D. 1978. Götterdämmerung [sic] for marketing? *Journal of Marketing* 42 (July) 11-19.
- Charnes, A., W. W. Cooper, D. B. Learner, and F. Y. Phillips. 1985. Management science and marketing management. *Journal of Marketing* 49 (Spring): 93-105.
- Day, George S. 1996. Using the past as a guide to the future: Reflections on the history of the *Journal of Marketing*. *Journal of Marketing* 60 (January): 14-16.
- _____. and Robin Wensley. 1983. Marketing theory with a strategic orientation. *Journal of Marketing* 47 (Fall): 79-89.
- Deligönül, Z. Seyda, and S. Tamer Cavusgil. 1997. Does the comparative advantage theory of competition really replace the neoclassical theory of perfect competition? *Journal of Marketing* 61 (October): 65-73.
- Deshpande, Rohit. 1983. "Paradigms Lost": On theory and method in research in marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 47 (Fall): 101-10.
- Dickson, Peter R. 1992. Toward a general theory of competitive rationality. *Journal of Marketing* 56 (January): 69-83.
- _____. 1996. The Static and dynamic mechanics of competition: A comment on Hunt and Morgan's comparative advantage theory. *Journal of Marketing* 60 (October): 102-06.
- Enis, Ben M. 1973. Deepening the concept of marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 37 (October): 57-62.
- Fullerton, Ronald A. 1988. How modern is modern marketing? Marketing's evolution and the myth of the "Production Era". *Journal of Marketing* 52 (January): 108-25.
- Grether, E. T. 1983. Regional-spatial analysis in marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 47 (Fall): 36-43.
- Houston, Franklin S. 1986. The marketing concept: What it is and what it is not. *Journal of Marketing* 50 (April): 81-87.
- _____. and Jule B. Gassenheimer. 1987. Marketing and exchange. *Journal of Marketing* 51 (October): 3-18.
- Howard, John A. 1983. Marketing theory of the firm. *Journal of Marketing* 47 (Fall): 90-100.
- Hubbard, Raymond, Andrew T. Norman, and Chip E. Miller. 2005. Examining the influence of articles involving marketing history, thought and theory: A *Journal of Marketing* citation analysis. *Marketing Theory* (Forthcoming).
- Hunt, Shelby D. 1971. The morphology of theory and the general theory of marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 35 (April): 65-68.
- _____. 1973. Lawlike generalizations and marketing theory. *Journal of Marketing* 37 (July): 69-70.
- _____. 1976. The nature and scope of marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 40 (July): 17-28.
- _____. 1983. General theories and the fundamental explananda of marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 47 (Fall): 9-17.
- _____. 1990. Truth in marketing theory and research. *Journal of Marketing* 54 (July): 1-15.
- _____. 1992. For reason and realism in marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 56 (April): 89-99.
- _____. 1993. Objectivity in marketing theory and research. *Journal of Marketing* 57 (April): 76-91.
- _____. and John T. Burnett. 1982. The macromarketing/micromarketing dichotomy. *Journal of Marketing* 46 (Summer): 11-26.
- _____. and Robert M. Morgan. 1995. The comparative advantage theory of marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 59 (April): 1-15.
- _____. and _____. 1996. The resource-advantage theory of competition: Dynamics, path dependencies, and evolutionary dimensions. *Journal of Marketing* 60 (October): 107-14.

- _____ and _____. 1997. Resource-advantage theory: A snake swallowing its tail or a general theory of competition. *Journal of Marketing* 61 (October): 74-82.
- Jaworski, Bernard J., and Ajay K. Kohli. 1993. Market orientation: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Marketing* 57 (July): 53-70.
- Jones, D.G. Brian, and David D. Monieson. 1990. Early development of the philosophy of marketing thought. *Journal of Marketing* 54 (January): 102-13.
- Kerin, Roger A. 1996. In pursuit of the ideal: The editorial and literary history of the *Journal of Marketing*. *Journal of Marketing* 60 (January): 1-13.
- Kernan, Jerome B. 1973. Marketing's coming of age. *Journal of Marketing* 37 (October): 34-41.
- Kohli, Ajay K., and Bernard J. Jaworski. 1990. Market orientation: The construct, research propositions, and management implications. *Journal of Marketing* 54 (April): 1-18.
- Kotler, Philip. 1972. A generic concept of marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 36 (April): 46-54.
- _____. 1973. The major tasks of marketing management. *Journal of Marketing* 37 (October): 42-49.
- _____ and Gerald Zaltman. 1971. Social marketing: An approach to planned social change. *Journal of Marketing* 35 (July): 3-12.
- Laczniak, Gene R., Robert F. Lusch, and Patrick E. Murphy. 1979. Social marketing: Its ethical dimensions. *Journal of Marketing* 43 (Spring): 29-36.
- Lavidge, Robert J. 1970. The growing responsibilities of marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 34 (January): 25-28.
- Leone, Robert P., and Randall L. Schultz. 1980. A Study of marketing generalizations. *Journal of Marketing* 44 (Winter): 10-18.
- Leong, Siew M. 1985. Metatheory and metamethodology in marketing: A Lakatosian reconstruction. *Journal of Marketing* 49 (Fall): 23-40.
- Luck, David J. 1974. Social marketing: Confusion compounded. *Journal of Marketing* 38 (October): 2-7.
- McNamara, Carlton P. 1972. The present status of the marketing concept. *Journal of Marketing* 36 (January): 50-57.
- Nevett, Terence. 1991. Historical investigation and the practice of marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 55 (July): 13-23.
- Peter, J. Paul. 1992. Realism or relativism for marketing theory and research: A Comment on Hunt's "Scientific Realism". *Journal of Marketing* 56 (April): 72-79.
- _____ and Jerry C. Olson. 1983. Is science marketing? *Journal of Marketing* 47 (Fall): 111-25.
- Pinson, Christian R.A., Reinhard Engelmar, and Eduardo L. Roberto. 1972. An evaluation of the general theory of marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 36 (July): 66-69.
- Savitt, Ronald. 1980. Historical research in marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 44 (Fall): 52-58.
- Shuptrine, F. Kelley, and F. A. Osmanski. 1975. Marketing's changing role: Expanding or contracting. *Journal of Marketing* 39 (April): 58-66.
- Stidsen, Bent, and Thomas F. Schutte. 1972. Marketing as a communication system: The marketing concept revisited. *Journal of Marketing* 36 (October): 22-27.
- Teas, R. Kenneth, and Kay M. Palan. 1997. The realms of scientific meaning framework for constructing theoretically meaningful nominal definitions of marketing concepts. *Journal of Marketing* 61 (April): 52-67.
- Tucker, W. T. 1974. Future directions in marketing theory. *Journal of Marketing* 38 (April): 30-35.
- Vargo, Stephen L., and Robert F. Lusch. 2004. Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 68 (January): 1-17.
- Waterschoot, Walter van, and Christophe Van den Bulte. 1992. The 4P classification of the marketing mix revisited. *Journal of Marketing* 56 (October): 83-93.
- Webster, Jr., Frederick E. 1981. Top management's concerns about marketing: Issues for the 1980's. *Journal of Marketing* 45 (Summer): 9-16.
- _____. 1992. The changing role of marketing in the corporation. *Journal of Marketing* 56 (October) 1-17.
- Wensley, Robin. 1981. Strategic marketing: Betas, boxes, or basics. *Journal of Marketing* 45 (Summer): 173-82.
- Wilkie, William L., and Elizabeth S. Moore. 2003. Scholarly research in marketing: Exploring the "4 eras" of thought development. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* 22 (Fall): 116-46.
- Wind, Yoram, and Thomas S. Robertson. 1983. Marketing strategy: New directions for theory and research. *Journal of Marketing* 47 (Spring): 12-25.
- Zinkhan, George M., and Rudy Hirschheim. 1992. Truth in marketing theory and research: An alternative perspective. *Journal of Marketing* 56 (April): 80-88.