



ELSEVIER

Intern. J. of Research in Marketing 24 (2007) 1–2

International Journal of

**Research in
Marketing**

www.elsevier.com/locate/ijresmar

Editorial

This issue is the first under our tenure as co-editors of the International Journal of Research in Marketing (IJRM). As is customary, we wish to outline the editorial policy of the journal and some new initiatives that we are undertaking.

IJRM builds upon a great tradition of global marketing scholarship. It is the most international among the top journals in our field (Stremersch & Verhoef, 2005). The journal has consistently improved throughout its history, as has its visibility. The credit for this goes to visionary former editors, such as Berend Wierenga (founding editor), Gilles Laurent, Piet Vanden Abeele, John Saunders, Jan-Benedict Steenkamp and Hubert Gatignon. We are especially grateful to Hubert Gatignon, who immediately preceded us, for transferring the journal to us in such good health. We also thank the members of the IJRM editor search committee (Jan-Benedict Steenkamp, EMAC Vice-President of Publications, Marnik Dekimpe and Gilles Laurent, advised by Hubert Gatignon) for the trust they have shown in our capability to bring the journal to new heights. The main challenges are to strengthen content and to improve the visibility of IJRM.

IJRM is, and will remain, a broad journal covering multiple aspects of marketing (i.e., strategy, customer and organization behavior and modeling). While IJRM will welcome a broad array of methods, the journal will show a bias towards the empirical. Thus, purely conceptual or analytical papers will be held to a higher standard than empirical papers. Also the journal will not be very receptive to work that merely replicates well established findings across countries and cultures. The papers need to have relevance (to marketing), sufficient rigor, and something interesting to say.

The content that IJRM publishes should be exciting, even if possibly at the expense of conclusiveness. This means we aim for IJRM to be at the forefront of the field, resulting in the publication of several truly “visionary” papers a year. While we expect rigor, we actively solicit pathbreaking work. This may occasionally result in special issues or special sections. More importantly, we will favor truly new ideas and methods, even if inconclusive, over the mere application of older, more highly conclusive, ideas and methods. The journal will therefore not be receptive to exact replications or mere applications.

We also hope to further increase the global visibility and availability of the journal and continue the recent efforts of Hubert Gatignon to increase the number of subscriptions. We

have made additions to the editorial board to help achieve that goal. The scholars we have added will bring both high quality and ties to different communities around the globe. As the journal already has a strong and loyal following on the European continent, we have invited scholars from both the East (Asia and the Pacific) and the West (US and Canada), in addition to European scholars, to join the editorial review board (ERB), significantly expanding it in the process.

We also seek to increase the journal’s visibility at conferences. This may result in forthcoming IJRM papers or papers in advanced stages of review being featured at conferences, as well as inviting submission of papers from special conferences or sessions that delineate new trends in an area. In a yearly editorial, we plan to feature some of the papers we feel are the most exciting.

To increase the visibility of papers via the popular press, we will be reorienting the abstract of papers into an “executive program” (“managerial”) abstract. Abstracts should be short, clearly state the question the paper addresses, the answer it provides and the implications it has for scholars, companies and/or society at large. If such an abstract cannot be written, the chances are the paper will not be accepted. On a related issue, Tables and Figures should be able to stand on their own, i.e., in one glance both convey the message and be self-explanatory in nature. We also plan to allow authors to develop a brief “afterthought” section which can be a bit more speculative than the standard discussion. What would they have done differently after the fact? What should others do? And how could one stretch the findings or implications of the paper? These discussions are meant to be thought provoking, trigger debate, and may go beyond the bounds of actual findings.

We are making some changes to the review process to achieve the objectives outlined above. This is the first time that the journal will have two editors. One benefit is efficiency — two editors can create more visibility for the journal especially if they are bi-continental (in our case, Europe and the US) and have complementary networks to solicit manuscripts from (e.g., organization behavior/strategy, modeling and consumer behavior). We have also decided to introduce Area Editors (AE’s) to IJRM. The AE’s cover diverse subject areas, methods and geographical areas. When the need arises, we may also ask members of the ERB to serve as guest AE’s.

The review process will start with electronic submission of a paper to the editorial office, located at Erasmus University Rotterdam, where the paper will be assigned to one of the co-editors. Each editor will handle about half of all papers and requests by the authors to be assigned to a particular editor will generally not be taken into account. In addition to an AE, we will typically appoint two reviewers: one a scholar amongst the three expert scholars on our editorial board that the authors are required to suggest when submitting their manuscript (we will deviate from this list when there are clear conflicts of interest or the reviewer is unavailable); and the other a scholar who we will assign ourselves without input from the authors. Reviewers will be asked to write *at most* 3 page reviews, while the AE report is expected to be only 1 page long.

Upon receiving the AE and reviewer recommendations, we plan to either reject the paper or commit to publishing the paper if the issues the review team raises are resolved. Our aim is to make a final acceptance decision in two rounds or less and make a preliminary publication commitment in the first round. The total turnaround time for a round should be around two months, with a maximum of three months. To maintain fast turnaround time, we will proceed even if we do not receive reviewer and/or

AE reports in time. More generally, although we will take into account the recommendations of the review team, our own opinions will weigh in on the decision outcome as well. We will also continue with an active desk reject policy for papers that clearly do not fit the objectives of the journal. This is beneficial to authors as it makes no sense to delay the manuscript when IJRM is very unlikely to publish it in the end. Such a desk reject may be handled by both editors, sometimes after receiving an AE report to that effect.

We are convinced that the delineated policy above will further strengthen IJRM. A fast and efficient review process, which actively involves AE's and editors, together with our objective to publish exciting manuscripts and the additional effort invested in providing more visibility to the journal, should make IJRM an attractive outlet for your very best work!!

Stefan Stremersch
Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherlands
Emory University, United States

Don Lehmann
Columbia University, United States