

3-1-2009

Why did you cite...?

Research Trends Editorial Board

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.researchtrends.com/researchtrends>

Recommended Citation

Research Trends Editorial Board (2009) "Why did you cite...?," *Research Trends*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 10 , Article 12.
Available at: <https://www.researchtrends.com/researchtrends/vol1/iss10/12>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Research Trends. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Trends by an authorized editor of Research Trends. For more information, please contact r.herbert@elsevier.com.

Continued from page 6

frequency of publishing review papers,” says Fath.

He was also interested in de Solla Price’s discussion of non-cited papers. Around 35% of papers are never cited. Editors obviously want to publish the best research, but how can they recognize the outliers? “Our journal is quite avant-garde. We publish some novel papers, and naturally some don’t get cited. But on the other hand, if we could find a way to reduce the number of non-cited papers, our Impact Factor would go up,” he remarks.

Improving quality

Fath believes that bibliometrics can help editors improve the quality of their journals. “We can improve the field by knowing when to call for a review paper and by promoting timely special issues, and these actions are reflected in our bibliometrics,” he says. For instance, he recently discovered that special issues of his journal were actually less frequently cited than regular issues. “We’ve decided to try doing themed issues next year to see if that serves the community better than traditional conference-based special issues,” he says.

He is also paying more attention to keywords in papers, and

especially in abstracts. He believes that, “people are really starting to use search engines to find papers, and it seems logical to use keywords. Abstracts are also very important: well-written, clear English is very attractive.”

He does have one concern, however. “We are going through a period of rapid journal growth, which I don’t think is sustainable. It’s possible to get almost anything published somewhere these days – in fact, it can get quite hard to follow the literature. And all these papers are citing other papers, which means everyone’s Impact Factor is increasing. But I wonder if it’s sustainable; can all these new journals also expect their Impact Factors to rise?”

Yet overall, despite some resistance, Fath is convinced that citation analysis is very valuable: “Communities should be citing each other – this is what marks them out as a community; and if you’re not being cited by your own community, you should want to know this and do something about it.”

References

[1] de Solla Price, D.J. (1965) “Networks of scientific papers”, *Science*, Vol. 149, pp. 510–15.

Why did you cite...?



...a Top-Cited marketing paper?

In the subject area Economics, Econometrics and Finance, the paper “Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing”, published by Stephen Vargo and Robert Lusch in the *Journal of Marketing*, was the **TopCited** article between 2004 and 2008. This article has been cited 282 times.

Relevance and timing count

Professor Vargo from the Shidler College of Business at the University of Hawaii, US, explains: “While we did not fully anticipate the impact the article would have, I think there several reasons for it. First, it was intended to capture and extend a general evolution in thought about economic exchange, both within and outside of marketing. The most common comment we receive is something like ‘you said what I have been trying to say’ in part or in whole. Thus, although it was published in a marketing journal, it seems to have resonated with a much larger audience.

“We have also said from the outset that what has now become known as service-dominant (S-D) logic is a work in

process and have tried to make its development inclusive. As we have interacted with other scholars, we have modified our original views – and the original foundational premises – and expanded the scope of S-D logic. This approach seems to have been well received.”

Professor Vargo also acknowledges an element of “fortuitous timing” in the article’s success: “The role of service in the economy is becoming increasingly recognized and firms such as IBM and GE – and many others – are shifting from thinking about themselves as manufacturing firms to primarily service firms. Similar shifts are taking place in academic and governmental thinking. S-D logic provides a service-based, conceptual foundation for these changes.”

Busting paradigms

Professor Eric Arnould from the Department of Management and Marketing at the University of Wyoming, US, has cited this paper. He explains: “this article is a paradigm buster; it is as simple as that. The paper took under-systematized currents of thought that have been circulating in the marketing discipline

Continued on page 8

Continued from page 8

for a number of years and codified them. The paper proposes that marketing is about the exchange of services or resources, not things; and that value is always co-created in the exchange of resources both immaterial (operand) and material (operant) between parties. If widely adopted, their detailed proposals will change marketing theory and practice forever. The paper is widely cited because of the ongoing interest in their recommendations both in practice, such as for IBM, and in the

academic world. We cited the paper both for its content and its authority as a paradigm buster”.

References

- [1] Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004) "Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing". *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 68, issue 1, pp. 1–17.