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These books will not be directly discussed in class. However, pertinent Chapters from Dall’Olmo Riley, Singh, and Blankson (eds) will be required reading in class. As for Hooley, Piercy, and Nicoulaud, given that we all should be on the same page regarding general strategic issues, concepts, principles and nomenclature, the book is a recommended reading as well.

“The beginning of knowledge is the discovery of something that we do not understand.” – Frank Herbert

“The function of education is to teach one to think intensively and to think critically….intelligence plus character – that is the goal of true education” – Martin Luther King Jr.

SEMINAR INTRODUCTION
The basic purpose of the Ph.D. seminar in marketing strategy is to help doctoral students understand the role of marketing within the organization, its business strategy, and its success or failure. The seminar will expose students to the main issues in marketing strategy and marketing strategy research. The seminar is designed to help students critically evaluate both fundamental (i.e., seminal) ideas and more recent developments on the subject matter.
SEMINARY OVERVIEW AND PEDAGOGY

MKTG 6030 is designed to present current and historical insights into several (i.e., selected) streams of marketing research that each relate to various broad aspects of marketing strategy. Moreover, like all Ph.D. seminars, this provides the types of insights, knowledge sets and skills that will enable students to grow into their presumed roles as successful marketing scholars.

MKTG 6030 will be delivered as a seminar. The course will feature a strong emphasis on discussion and critical deliberation of assigned reading materials in class. Students’ preparation for each class should entail considerable reading and serious thought about the various topics and readings assigned for each week’s discussion. All students should have read each of the assigned materials prior to each seminar session. Moreover, all students should have thought about what they have read. So, be prepared to discuss each article in-depth and to present ideas about gaps in the literature, contributions, limitations, and extensions of each paper. Extensions can include straight-forward/line extensions and replications or more innovative linkages with other papers or literatures.

In the midst of in-class discussions, collegial disagreement amongst students or amongst students and the presiding Professor are welcomed and encouraged. Because many of the topics discussed in this course are subjective in nature, group consensus regarding these topics is neither expected nor desired.

MKTG 6030 features one weekly tutorial session per student. These brief (10-minute or less) sessions will occur each week and will involve one student and the Professor. Meeting times for your individual tutorial session will be scheduled in class during the first class session. The initial purpose of these tutorials is to inculcate deeper insights into what is required to become a more successful academic. A related purpose is for the Professor to learn more about each student’s specific academic and professional aspirations. Such understanding should enable the Professor to adjust the course in real time such that its deliverables more effectively address specific individuals’ professional aspirations, needs and goals. Then, after a few semester weeks (and meetings) have passed, our conversations should turn more directly to issues related to your specific research interests and the research project you pursue in this seminar.

LEARNING GOAL

The overarching goal of this seminar is to deliver a platform that will permit students to identify and to discuss seminal questions that underlie knowledge development in marketing strategy.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

By the end of the semester, students should acquire the skills in appreciating the thinking engaged in and methodologies employed by marketing researchers engaged in the development or execution of marketing strategies.
Students should have an in-depth, multidimensional understanding of the role that various critical strategic marketing issues plays in the development and execution of marketing theory or practice.

Students should have an opportunity to develop a research project (i.e., a paper) that, by turns (a) identifies a materially significant literature gap; (b) discusses how research efforts will contribute to closing the identified gap; (c) features a literature review and appropriate theoretical framework; (d) develops testable hypotheses (or identifies research aim(s) and objectives); (e) discusses appropriate methodology and data collection procedures; and eventually (i.e., after the course is complete), (f) discusses the results, theoretical and practical implications and limitations associated with the study.

The purpose in writing this paper is to target at least a “B” or better still, an “A” marketing journal publication. At the beginning of this project, you will be guided and then asked to identify the journal targeted for submission. A list of “A” and “B” marketing journals will be discussed during the semester. Thereafter, you should follow the targeted Journal’s specific submission guidelines in preparing the paper.

SEMINAR PERSPECTIVE

The content following in the next two sections is adapted in large part from Dr. Pelton’s 2008 MKTG 6030 Syllabus and that of Dr. Strutton’s 2012 MKTG 6030.

The word strategy is derived from the Greek word meaning “strategos” – “art of the general.” That many of the early teachings on strategy were couched in military contexts should not surprise us. From von Clausewitz to Sun-Tzu to General Paton, military leaders have espoused differing perspectives of strategy. For example, WW II Andre Beufre described strategy simply “as a method of thought.” The best accepted English definition is “the art of generalship”. It is therefore not surprising that the term is used to describe decisions that companies make when they are engaged in competition.

One of the most widely read business primers is Bing Fa or Art of War. Chinese military strategist Sun-Tzu admonished, “Strategy without tactics is the slowest route to victory. Tactics without strategy is the noise before defeat.” The lack of accord between the tactical and the strategic is a compelling issue that may be frequently addressed throughout the semester. Publius Virgilius Maro Vergil questioned: “Who asks whether the enemy was defeated by strategy or valor?” So is strategy truly a “means to political ends,” as Prussian General von Moltke [the Elder] suggested? The adaptation of military strategy to business introduces a different set of challenges. Is the marketplace the same as a battlefield?

About three decades ago the noted management professor George Steiner authored a seminal text
that addressed the conceptualization of organizational strategy.\textsuperscript{3} While he does not define strategy \textit{per se}, he does reinforce the lack of a reconcilable definition of strategy. Mintzberg introduced the “four Ps” of strategy: plan, pattern, position and perspective. This typology has been widely adapted to several disciplines across the social sciences. Tom Peters has cited this book as one of the most important books written in the last quarter-century. Today, a prevailing definition of strategy is encapsulated in Michael Porter’s (1996) \textit{Harvard Business Review} article, “What is Strategy?”

\begin{quote}
[\textit{Strategy}] “\textit{means deliberately choosing a different set of activities to deliver a unique mix of value.”}

“What’s the use of running if you are not on the right road?”

– German proverb
\end{quote}

James Thurber once counseled “It is better to know some of the questions than all of the answers.” Thurber’s advice functions as an appropriate introduction to any doctoral seminar. Successful completion of this doctoral seminar – like most others – will not provide you with an accumulation of answers. Instead, it will introduce you to many questions. The doctoral seminar is designed to motivate critical thinking. Each student will be required to engage in critical thinking. Beyond question however, the majority of our thinking is impacted by distortions or partialities that present - and likely have presented for a long time - within our living or working environments.

“Critical thinking is, in short, self-directed, self-disciplined, self-monitored, and self-corrective thinking. It presupposes assent to rigorous standards of excellence and mindful command of their use. It entails effective communication and problem solving abilities and a commitment to overcome our native egocentrism and sociocentrism.”\textsuperscript{1}

This definition characterizes one of the primary challenges that will confront you as a doctoral student and emerging scholar.

\textbf{POLICIES AND PROCEDURES}

The UNT COB complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Reasonable accommodations are made for qualified students with disability. If you have an established disability as defined in the Americans with Disabilities Act and would like to request accommodation, please see me as soon as possible.

\textit{The Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE) is a requirement for all organized classes at UNT. This short survey will be made available to you at the end of the semester,}

\textsuperscript{3}Steiner, George (1979), \textit{Strategic Planning}, Boston, MA: Free Press.

\textsuperscript{1}http://www.criticalthinking.org/aboutCT/
providing you a chance to comment on how this class is taught. I am very interested in the feedback I get from students, as I work to continually improve my teaching. I consider the SETE to be an important part of your participation in this class.

Acceptable Student Behavior

The university's expectations for student conduct apply to all instructional forums, including university and electronic classroom, labs, discussion groups, field trips, etc. The Code of Student Conduct can be found at www.unt.edu/csrr

Academic Integrity:

Each student should be fully aware of the policies and guidelines for academic honesty in the University of North Texas Student Guidebook and on UNT’s web page (www.unt.edu). The Student Code of Conduct and an abbreviated list of other rules, regulations and policies are available from the Dean of Students. Plagiarism is a serious compromise of academic integrity. Please be certain to cite any reference. Materials copied verbatim must be in quotation marks with a correct citation documented within the text. This applies to any and all materials taken from Internet sites.

Timeliness Policy: Class sessions will begin precisely at 2:00 p.m. on each scheduled Thursday. That means students are required to be seated and ready to begin work before 2:00 p.m. If you are not present and ready to start by 2:00 p.m., you are late.

Cellular Telephones, I-Phones etc.: No electronic devices are permitted in the seminar without written consent from the Professor.

In-Class Communication Comportment: Every student is expected to contribute substantial value to each session’s discussion. Yet no student is expected, nor is any student permitted, to dominate seminar discussions. In fact, no one will be permitted to dominate in-class communications - not even the Professor. This seminar is structured to facilitate a shared and collaborative learning experience. Should your questions, responses or observational commentary be anything other than crisp (succinct), clear and hopefully compelling, the Professor will advise you – in the moment – to do better.

SEMINAR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

Performance assessment in this seminar will be based on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles Review &amp; Critique</th>
<th>Review/Research Paper for Journal</th>
<th>Comprehensive Final Exam</th>
<th>Total Possible Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participation:

Every student should be well-prepared for each seminar. You should read each assigned reading.
But you should go beyond a cursory reading of assigned materials. Before each seminar session, you are expected to critically evaluate the “body of knowledge” clustered together for each seminar session.

Articles Review and Critique:
The sessions will involve a discussion of the readings assigned for the day. For each session, you will have two assignments: (1) prepare a detailed summary and critique of all reading assigned for the day (“discussion moderator” will be assigned and will present in power-point to the class); (2) come prepared to critically discuss all the readings for the day. Do not come up short on assignment #2; 50% of your grades hinges on your preparation, participation and performance on this dimension. When asked to moderate a particular reading, you should distribute any pertinent hand-out for your assignment and then use power-point to present to the class. This summary should adhere closely to the format shown in Appendix 1.

As well, for all students, and for each of the sessions 2 through 14, you must submit a two-page notes/memos (double space) focusing on one research idea that emanates from the week’s readings. The purpose of these assignments as noted by Professors George S. Day and Christophe Van den Bulte of Wharton Business School is to encourage you to think generatively while reading. These memos or write-ups will be due at the end of each class.

Review or Research Paper for Journal Submission by the end of the Semester:
Students must develop and then submit a manuscript (i.e., an article) bound for a marketing journal – “A,” “B” journal or AMA/AMS full paper conference. The article can be a critical review or general overview of a body of literature or a meta-analysis or an empirical analysis – it must focus on any one of the topics listed in the syllabus that addresses a marketing strategy issue underlying a relevant and timely marketing issue/conundrum. The topic will need to be approved on/before September 29. A typical review paper or critical review paper/article will be provided (see also, Appendix 2).

The paper will be due on December 8, 2016 and you will be expected to make a 10-15 minute presentation (followed by Q&A) of your manuscript. Please develop the paper with a designated journal target in mind. I will provide on-going guidance and feed-back.

Comprehensive Final Exam:
A comprehensive final take home exam will be given in week 13 of the semester. The final exam will be due the last day of class, December 15, between 1:30pm-3:30pm. To do well on this exam, you must acquire a critical, integrative ability to address marketing strategy issues and resolve marketing strategy problems during this seminar. Success will also require a thorough understanding of the assigned readings and diligence.
ASSIGNED READINGS

Week 1: Introduction and Overview (September 1, 2016):

*Students should download and then read materials before class and arrive ready to discuss them during the class session. Students do not critique the first week’s articles.*


Further Reading


Week 2: Marketing Planning and Market Domain (September 8, 2016)


Further Reading


**Week 3**: The Role of Marketing within the Organization and Market Orientation (September 15, 2016)


Further Reading


**Week 4**: Market Definition, Segmentation, Positioning and Product Differentiation (September 22, 2016)


Further Reading


**Week 5: Competition (September 29, 2016)**


**Further Reading**


**Week 6: Making Decisions (October 6, 2016)**


Further Reading


**Week 7**: Product/Service and Industry Life Cycle Dynamics (October 13, 2016)


Further Reading


**Week 8**: Marketing Mix and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) (October 20, 2016)


Further Reading


**Week 9**: Channel Design, Coordination and Transaction Cost Theory (October 27, 2016)


Further Reading


**Week 10:** Alliances and Acquisitions (November 3, 2016)


Further Reading


**Week 11:** Market Entry and Evolution, Institutionalization and Network Effects (November 10, 2016)


Further Reading


**Week 12: New Product Development and Innovation (November 17, 2016)**


Further Reading


**Week 13:** Strategic Transformations, SD Logic and Resource-based View of the Firm (November 24, 2016)


Further Reading


**Week 14:** Branding and Relationship Marketing (December 1, 2016)


Papadopoulos, Nicolas, Leila Hamzaoui-Essoussi, and Jose I. Rojas-Mendez (2016), “From

Further Reading

**Week 15**: Final Presentations of Manuscript Bound for a Journal (December 8, 2016).

**Week 16**: Final Comprehensive Examination (December 15, 2015).
Appendix 1

GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING THE RESEARCH PROJECT

Manuscript Form:
Introduction and Justification of Importance of Topic/Problem (that is going to the addressed in the manuscript below)
Additional background discussion (as needed) to frame the broad domain of the research topic/problem in greater detail
Background to Hypothesis
Conceptual/Theoretical Justification of the Hypotheses
Justification prepared separately for each hypothesis
Discussion of “Methodology”
Sampling Domain
Description/Justification of Analytical Methods Used
Description of scale and construct development
Description of reliability and validity
Discussion of results of hypothesis testing
Theoretical Discussion
Explication of results and implications
Managerial (Practical) Discussion
Explication of managerial results implications
Discussion of “Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research.”

Process (independent of the manuscript):
Identify an existing unresolved marketing problem or gap in the marketing literature that is sufficiently worthy to be deemed worthy of publication by cynical reviewers who, as a primary task in their role set, will seek out ways and reasons to reject your manuscript.
Identify a topic that interests you, at the least, or impassions you, ideally.
Develop your research questions and identify the types of data and analysis that would be necessary to address and answer those research questions (research hypothesis)
Develop instruments (measures) that will capture the data necessary to answer the research questions you will be asking
Take necessary measures to ensure the reliability and validity of the data you collect
Collect the data, conduct analyses, and report the results
Prior to this you will have executed, at least in your mind, each of the five preceding steps in the “Broadly Accepted Sections in an Empirical Manuscript” discussion shown just above.
Embrace the challenge of doing things right.

Appendix 2
GUIDELINES FOR CRITIQUING AN ARTICLE
Using either regular text or outline form, you should:

Write your name and broad topic area studied that week (i.e., “Competition, Branding)
Provide full citation for article.
Summarize the “Broad Topic” studied in article.
Summarize the theoretical framework(s) used to ground the study’s research objectives and/or hypotheses.
Summarize the seminal constructs or concepts present in the article.
Summarize the article’s broad research objectives and its hypotheses, propositions or postulates.
Summarize Research Methodology (i.e., Sampling Frame and Method, Analytics Used).
Summarize Research Findings, Implications, Conclusions.
Summarize Prescriptive (Predictive) and Description Contributions.
Constructively Criticize the Article.
Explicate Relevant Gaps and Future Research Opportunities that remain within the critique.

EDITOR’S COMMENTS: PUBLISHING THEORY WHEN YOU ARE NEW TO THE GAME

The challenges with developing and publishing theory are well recognized, and some of the most accomplished theoreticians in management research have offered insights on the characteristics of good theory (Bacharach, 1989; Kilduff, 2006; Sutton & Staw, 1995; Weick, 1989; Whetten, 1989). The purpose of this piece is more humble. I reflect on the challenges that confront junior
scholars, such as Ph.D. students and junior faculty, who aspire to make a theoretical contribution early in their careers. As a junior scholar, I went through the review process at top-tier journals for nine theoretical papers. While I succeeded with five of them, I also lost four after three rounds of revisions—two as a doctoral student and two as an assistant professor. Reflecting on both the ups and the downs from the perspective of an editor has led me to some of the observations that I share below.

THINK BOLDLY BUT RESPECT THE “CRAFT” AND THE “GUILD”
Relative to the rest of the field, junior scholars as a group are less socialized in the paradigms of the field. They often explicitly endeavor to bring new ways of thinking to the field and are willing to go outside the paradigms the field relies on. Novelty, however, comes at a cost: novel things are harder to understand and, especially, to appreciate. The development of novel theoretical ideas, therefore, requires a considerable amount of skillful linking, bridging, and connecting to the current work in a given area. But junior scholars may not realize what it takes to connect their ideas effectively to current conversations in the field. In an effort to establish their expertise in a given area (especially if it is a relatively new paradigm), they tend to dedicate too much effort to reviewing the work in that area and not enough to developing their own original ideas. At the same time, guided by an explicit or implicit desire to assert the novelty of their contribution, they tend to underuse relevant management research. As a result, they tend to overstate the novelty of their contribution and to alienate the current experts in the area (selected as reviewers because of their expertise). What makes a contribution novel is not that no one in the field ever thought about a given idea but that the idea is articulated, organized, and connected in a way that suggests new directions for researchers who, hopefully, are already thinking about it.

At the other end of the spectrum are the problems that arise from sending for consideration the theoretical chapter from one’s dissertation as a theoretical contribution. While generalizations in this regard are difficult, it may be fruitful for junior colleagues to think of the theoretical part of their dissertation as the preparatory work for becoming an expert in a given field, rather than as a distinct theoretical contribution. Many theoretical chapters do not receive much attention once the empirical portion of the dissertation has commenced, and, thus, they do not reflect the development in the students’ thinking. Original theory development is an act best engaged in after completing the dissertation, because it can then benefit from investigating the problems empirically and reflecting on the findings, critiques, and defenses of the ideas. What emerges is a deeper, more synthetic, and more enriched understanding of the relationships of interest.

Both processes—connecting thoughtfully to the “guild” and reflecting deeply on the material—should help overcome what I have come to see as one of the fundamental problems scholars face in their first theoretical efforts: the need to recognize that ideas, no matter how original, are not theory. To become theory, ideas have to be crafted into a theoretical contribution—a well-
ordered whole, with a clear logic and explicated causal mechanisms (Kilduff, 2006; Whetten, 1989). My emphasis here is on craft-

Crafting and connecting are tools for developing an original contribution that will be comprehensible and acceptable to a community of scholars. These tools are honed in scholarly conversations—and especially through exposing one’s work to the scrutiny of the “guild.” If “scrutiny” sounds ominous, young scholars can think of the process as “doing your market research,” as one extremely successful colleague termed it. Discussing and presenting ideas is the process through which one can understand how one’s audience, rather than one’s mind, views the potential contribution. This process is not unlike the process through which the markets for really novel products form. In such markets, producers and potential users engage in repeated interactions and iterations to learn about each other’s needs and offerings (Dougherty, 1990).
Young scholars, however, may have several disadvantages in seeking to meet their target audience. They may have less developed professional networks from which to request qualified friendly reviews; they may worry about the reputational consequences of subjecting to scrutiny something that is still “in the works”; and, worst of all, they may be too worried that exposing their novel ideas may enable others with the superior theory development skills discussed above “to beat them to market.” While some of these concerns may have some validity, the costs of developing a paper in isolation, as discussed above, usually far outweigh such “risks.” Departmental or workgroup “brown bags,” lunches with friends, and formal presentations at conferences are all excellent vehicles for engaging actively in the scholarly conversation through which papers are polished and refined.

PUT YOUR BEST FOOT FORWARD
Published papers tend to look different from the papers originally submitted. The published versions have acquired additional elegance and polish from the additional crafting that has taken place during the review process. And while writing an “accept-as-is” draft may be an unrealistic dream for all but a few, one can aspire to send out a paper that entices editors and reviewers with its originality and craft. Yet it may be difficult for junior scholars, given their limited experience, to have a realistic assessment of when a draft is ready for submission. In addition, folk wisdom in our field seems to say that because reviewers’ reactions are unpredictable, it does not make sense to expend a lot of effort on polishing a set of ideas that is bound to change.

Nothing can be farther from the truth. First, the carefulness of the crafting affects the extent to which the reviewers and the editor will understand and appreciate the ideas. Second, the carefulness of the execution is also a signal to the reviewers and the editor that the author has the requisite attributes of being systematic, diligent, and persevering—all of which are prerequisites for seeing a paper through the review process and for justifying the time that the reviewers and editor are willing to spend to help the author succeed. Put differently, given the editor’s uncertainty about a young scholar’s ability or motivation to undertake the additional work required for a successful revision, along with the costs of an additional round of revisions in terms of the author’s, reviewers’, and the editor’s time, the likelihood of receiving a “revise-and-

REJOICE BUT REVISE
A carefully crafted and original submission more often than not will generate a revise-and-resubmit, which is the proverbial foot in the door. It is thrilling, reaffirming, and hope preserving. And if one has not been through the twists and turns of the review process more than a few times, the emotional reaction to the invitation to resubmit may override careful thinking about what is actually required to stay in the game. The most common errors with revisions that are
subsequently rejected appear to be (1) dismissing the issues raised as a failure on behalf of the editor and the reviewers to understand the author’s points; (2) responding to the comments with cosmetic changes—that is, editing the language and adding a few paragraphs here and there, which can then be pointed to in the responses to reviewers; (3) responding to the comments literally—that is, doing everything the reviewers asked for; and (4) responding to the reviewers’ comments rather than to the explicit guidelines in the editor’s letter.

Obviously, the different nature of these problems calls for different specific solutions, but two general guidelines may help with all four. First, the editor’s letter is the most important document that should guide an author’s thinking about the revision. At *AMR*, the editor’s letter summarizes and integrates the different viewpoints expressed by the reviewers and gives clear guidelines about what is required for a successful revision. The editor’s letter therefore is not only a very useful “read” on the reviewers’ comments but also a direct roadmap for revising. Second, a successful revision usually requires taking apart the paper one has so carefully crafted in order to integrate the review feedback into the logic of the theoretical arguments. Incremental, piecemeal changes made directly in response to reviewers dilute the clarity of the contribution and lead to what one reviewer has characterized as “a paper designed by a committee.” In other words, if you implement every reviewer’s suggestion literally, the arguments lose focus and coherence and your “horse” can easily become a “camel.” The reviewers and editor do not want to see a camel; they want to see a better horse. They want you to develop your ideas, so you should use the reviewers’ comments to rethink the problem and the solution, rather than as a checklist that, once completed, assures that the reviewers’ comments have been addressed.

**REVISE, DO NOT RESENT**

I would like to acknowledge that many of the points above are probably easier said than done; I personally have found some easier to do than others. Everyone knows how difficult it is to deal with criticism and rejection, especially early in one’s career, when so much hinges on the success of a single paper. What may not be as widely recognized is how these negative emotional reactions to aversive stimuli hinder our own success.

From my earlier experiences I learned several important lessons in this regard. First, I realized that harboring any negative feelings—of either fear or resentment—considerably impeded my ability to actually “hear” and act on the feedback received. In the review process of one of my earlier papers, a reviewer kept asking for something that “just did not make sense.” I was enormously relieved when the editor decided to accept the paper without my needing to make the change requested by the reviewer. When I sat down to edit the final accepted draft, I suddenly understood what the reviewer was asking for all along. I made the changes, and the paper acquired a new coherence. I was then suddenly so grateful to the reviewer, but back during the review process, in my state of fear, I simply could not hear his or her suggestion. Second, with experience I have gained a better understanding of the role of the editor as someone who seeks to
steward promising ideas and help authors develop them into high-quality contributions (and spends hours doing so!). As a result, I now can also better read the editor’s letter, where, behind the descriptions of everything I have “failed” at, I see lurking the roadmap for improving the paper. Third, I am now prepared to make more radical changes in my own thinking on a topic because I have seen, over time, that successful revisions often require the emergence of a new gestalt—literally a new picture of the system of relationships. Finally, I collaborate extensively because I have found collaborations with trusted colleagues to be the best antidote to the stress of the review process. Collaborations are a means of getting access to requisite skills. They also help increase the number of papers one develops at any given time, thereby decreasing the potential threat rigidity effects of a single high-stakes paper (see Ferris, Ketchen, & Buckley, in press, for a discussion of this issue). Most important, working with people we enjoy infuses the process with positive emotions, which, in contrast to negative ones, make us open-minded and creative.

REFERENCES
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Reviewer A - Reject

The authors present an interesting topic. I am sure they put a lot of effort into it. Overall, the study is important and attempts to put forward good suggestions for knowledge. However, as it stands, I find the paper not ready for publication. The conceptual framework is quite weak in that it does not forcefully justify the rationale for the paper. Specifically, Figure 2 does not actually explain or highlight the significance of the circles? And the criteria used to arrive at the sizes of the circles.

I also find the dependent variable somewhat weak and without strong justification. Why not examine the impact on firm performance such as sales, profits, ROI, consumer perceptions etc.? Still talking about Figure 2, I think you should have defined “administrative decree”. What is the meaning of decree?

At times the writing is jumpy and several places are not clear.

As well, while your hypotheses are worthwhile approaches, I do not see the pivotal role they will end up playing for the firm. I am wondering why you did not examine dependent variables such as sales, profits, new product performance and so forth.

Throughout your discussion, I see poor links between paragraphs making the reading quite tedious. You mentioned downstream sales channels? Do you mean retailers/distributors? Please clarify. I also see several repetitions (see page 16 for example). On page 19, you claim you recovered 342 completed/filled questionnaires. But I thought you obtained 236 (Table 1)? Please re-visit.

What does “the time lag should not make bias” mean? For your results, I think you should have shown the basic descriptive statistics from your Central Tendency prior to the SEM. In addition, you should have given a rationale for using just the SEM for your analysis. This is because I think your initial EFA should have been provided. The latter is important in that it reveals the strength of your items.

Thus, overall, I find your paper interesting and well-designed but it is not ready for publication. Try and amend the paper and strengthen the conceptual framework and the analysis as I have noted above.

Reviewer B - Reject

The paper presents an interesting research approach that connects the constructs of entrepreneurial and shared vision, integration, and product performance.

The authors have to be commended for a thorough empirical investigation.

However, most other parts of the paper contain a variety of shortcomings:

Orientation and focus of the paper:

The abstract does not stress why such a study is important. What effect does the paper have on research and practice?
The object of analysis is not clear. Apparently, the paper is about the early stages of a new venture. However, this does not mean that employees are present. In fact, it is very likely that a new venture has no employees at all! This is a major shortcoming since one of the research variables is “shared vision”. This then also concerns H1. H1, in fact, can only be true if a shared product vision exists, that is if a) the venture consists of more than one employee and b) those employees have the same vision. Otherwise, H1 is obsolete.

Until 3.1.1 it is not clear what kinds of companies are investigated. In 3.1.1 it suddenly reads “These countries were selected primarily because they are currently the leading manufacturers of consumer electronics and communications products globally.” This really comes as a surprise.

Furthermore, I cannot see why the paper contributes to marketing in general and B2B marketing in particular.

Citations and references:

The authors show a very sloppy usage of citations which is inadequate for a scholarly contribution. There is a myriad of statements (particularly in Intro and Theory) that lack citations. Here are some examples:

“The relationships among entrepreneurial vision, shared product vision, integration, and their impact on product development performance have long been of interest to entrepreneurship researchers.” NO CITES

“The success of entrepreneurial management depends on an entrepreneur’s leadership, team efforts, the engaged field, entrance timing, and the quantity of resources.” NO CITES

“Numerous studies point out the importance of integration to the effective application of internal resources, as well as its efficiency in new product development (Fain et al., 2011).” NUMEROUS? ONLY ONE CITE

“A pre-test analysis and case study demonstrate that the direct effect of entrepreneurial vision on effectiveness of product development performance is insignificant.” WHICH STUDY? NO INFO GIVEN

Low and MacMillan, 1988; Per and Johan, 2001 can hardly be termed “recent research”. Also the cite Per and Johan, 2001 should be Davidsson and Wiklund, 2001

Beginning of 2: “In theory and in practice, the definition of product development has been widely discussed among experts and scholars from different angles, including the viewpoint of producers, consumers, and product life cycle.” NO CITES

Flow of the paper:

Presenting research questions in the middle of the Introduction is unusual. They should ideally be presented at the end of the Introduction.

The reader stumbles into 2.2. This chapter is completely detached from 2.1. It starts with M&A, a concept that has not been discussed before and has nothing to do with the article.

Why does the paragraph directly at the beginning of chapter 3 explain what is going on in chapter 1 and 2?
Hypotheses development:

Chapter 2.3 is about internal and external integration. However, it does not address the interplay with shared product vision. Surprisingly, hypotheses are presented that do exactly that: combine product vision with integration. It is addressed somehow in the last paragraph but, again, without citations: “Although various empirical studies present evidence support the importance of shared product vision, such studies generally focus on already operating firms.”

What are the differences between H4a and H4c as well as H4b and H4d?

Empirical study:

The sample is inadequate. The paper aims to investigate new ventures and samples publicity trades companies. These are hardly new ventures!

Table 1 does not contain number of employees and firm age, as described in the text.

236 responses is a very low response rate for a mail questionnaire that was sent to 1,600 recipients.

Chapter 3.1.2: what does “of reliability and validity and were issued by e-mail, post mail, or delivery” mean? What is “or delivery”?

4.3.4 This sentence does not make sense in regards of the results: “During the process of establishing a new enterprise, external integration positively correlates with the efficiency of PDP. \( \beta = -0.21, \ t \text{ value} = -1.86 \); therefore, hypothesis H4a was unsupported.”

Misc:

The two-step sampling approach as described under 3.1 is not clear.

Given the shortcomings of the paper I cannot recommend its publication in IMM. I wish the authors good luck with the further development of the paper.

Thunderbird International Business Review
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Reviewer’s comments to the Author(s)

Customer satisfaction with retail banking services in Ghana

I congratulate the authors for choosing such research topic and for tackling the African (Ghanaian) context – a continent comparatively under-researched. Customer satisfaction with retail banking services in Ghana is an appropriate topic. In fact, due to the growing Ghanaian economy and government support
for banks and small businesses, customers are becoming choosy and demanding more than before. This research comes at an opportune time in Ghana’s burgeoning economy.

That said, in the main, I enjoyed reading the article and I believe the authors have presented the work well. The paper starts very well until it gets to the section on model development then several weaknesses are revealed. One of the weaknesses is the conceptual framework for this manuscript. The other (and which ties in with the framework) is the key aim of this paper. As it stands, it is not clear. Then another weakness is the methodology and analysis. I will talk about these next.

I am not sure why you introduce the SERVQUAL framework but did not go on and test it. First, the link prior to the section on SERVQUAL can be strengthened. It appears you want to cover too many things in a paper in that the operationalization of SERVQUAL is an additional purpose of your work. In view of this, why not re-state your research question and the overall purpose clearly? Please devote sometime to clarify and elaborate on your model development (page 8). In Figure 1 for instance, while it is well intentioned, the model is quite confusing. Do re-visit and revise carefully. In fact, I repeat, why don’t you adopt the SERVQUAL framework for your study? You can then eliminate the demographic characteristics construct because this construct is not adding anything new to your work. In any case, this construct should serve as a control variable and not as an independent variable. The issues about core banking services and technology are confusing as well. What about “Reliability”, “Responsiveness”, “Assurance”, and “Empathy” as you indicated in SERVQUAL?

Thus your discussion under hypotheses is problematic to me. However, I am convinced that you will be able to restructure this paper, cut to the chase, clean the unnecessary constructs and just test the SERVQUAL as is. To the best of my knowledge, no one has tackled/applied the SERVQUAL in the Ghanaian services industry.

H4 for instance is problematic. I don’t think you can lump age, gender, education, income etc. as one construct. They have to be measured separately.

The introduction to the research context is too lengthy. Please cut down because it does not contribute much to your good effort. Just cut to the chase.

I see some weaknesses in the methodology as well. How long did the data collection last? Need to briefly state the rationale for using the mall intercept. Also, did you examine response bias? The section under survey instrument is also weak. Simply put, it is poorly put together. Please do take your time and clean it up. All these are doable/fixable but you have to grab the time to take care of them. You claim there is Appendix, but I did not see one. I think it will be useful to attach your questionnaire as you noted.

There are inconsistencies in your Table numbering – Roman numerals (X, IX and so forth) and 1, 2 etc. Also, several areas lack clarity. Do re-visit the entire paper and edit thoroughly. Need to inquire from the editor whether you may use the British English or the American English. I see you use the British English. On page 6, what does “thus, the five dimensions supplement each other to guide managers…” mean? I believe you meant “complement”?

Discussion of managerial implication is thin. Try and elaborate.
In Table IX, although you claim that the items “yr. of opening account” and “customer expertise” with Sig. F 0.13 & 0.12 are marginally significant, I don’t think so. If you say that they are significant, then you are saying that they are tantamount to a 50% or 60% confidence interval. This is unacceptable. Because of this, you cannot reject the null hypotheses.

Finally, I am very surprised that not a single TIBR article is cited – why? Surely you can find related articles in TIBR. I think for courtesy sake, it may be worth re-visiting your literature and find some TIBR articles relating to your work.
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Responses to the Reviewer 1

Please accept our sincere gratitude for the time spent in reviewing our paper and for the directions and the suggestions provided. We have revised the article thoroughly and have acted upon your concerns and the suggestions given. As a result, we believe that the manuscript has improved substantially.

Please find below our responses to the specific concerns raised. We deal with them point by point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer #1 Comments</th>
<th>Authors’ Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please go through your article once again to address and incorporate proposed changes. If feel convenient then kindly make sub sections of research methodology like questionnaire measures, study population and sample collection, questionnaire reliability and validity and data analysis method (software and technique used).</td>
<td>We thank you very much for this suggestion. We have revised our manuscript accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide latest info about Ghana Population and quote some recent report from Ministry of Health about coverage of NHIS in the country.</td>
<td>We have provided the latest info about Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes</td>
<td>Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored? Literature is explained very well. However from developing countries please quote some recent research like: Naseem, K., Malik, S.A., Iqbal, M.Z., and Malik, S.A. (2014), Assessing the quality of patient care: a normative decision view, International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management (Inderscience), 13(2): 125-141</td>
<td>Thank you for these remarks. We have duly addressed this concern as suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Methodology section is weak. Scales adopted are not clearly defined (i.e., total items in each construct) page 11.</td>
<td>We have improved the methodology section as suggested. We provide the total number of items used for each construct in our research model. Please see revised manuscript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why a single institute was selected and why MBA-part time students were approached is not properly justified.</td>
<td>The single institute was chosen purposely based on convenience. All students in this institution are part-time students since they work full time in various supervisory and management positions. Please see revised manuscript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreover, one page 12, line no. 25; if among</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respondents, 113 received medical treatment having health insurance and that only those having health insurance were selected, then why in demographic results, respondents are 100 instead of 113.

The researcher has not explained in detail all the demographic results and why respondents were inquired about cultural/tribal group is not justified either.

On what basis 500 questionnaires were floated is not explained. Furthermore, a final sample of 100 respondents somehow seems short/inadequate for analysis.

Which sampling technique was used is not mentioned either.

Though its too late, but why author didn't used some recent scales instead of old ones used in this study. All year 2001 and earlier.

Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper? Results are presented and interpreted well.

Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap managerial capacities in Corporate Ghana.

Thank you. We report in table 1 percentages and not actual frequency figures. As such, the total percentage for each demographic should be 100% and not 113.

Thank you. We have revised our manuscript to include the justification for inquiring about cultural groups. Please see revised manuscript.

Thank you. We have floated 500 questionnaires because of convenience. We have stated this in the revised manuscript. Further, though a final sample of 113 may seem short/small, the statistical technique used (PLS-SEM) is able to handle small sample size data.

We use a nonprobability method of convenience sampling. We have included this sampling method in our revised manuscript. Thank you.

We used these scales because those were the ones available to us. We will take your suggestion into consideration in our follow up studies. Thank you.

Thank you.
between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper? All sections are fine.

Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: There are multiple mistakes of references and their citations within text. E.g., page 2, line 1, Taylor, 1994 whereas in references section the year is 1993. In the same manner page 3, line 19; Gilber et al., 1992, whereas in references section year is 2004 etc.

Page 14, line 36. Please check and rectify the results of variance.

Author needs to refer some recent research. Most recent articles referred are of 2014 (only 2) and majority of earlier year 2000. Please refer some recent articles i.e., 2013-2015.

Thank you.

We have rectified the errors pointed out to us. Thank you.

Thank you for the pointing this to us. The change has been made in the revised manuscript.

Thank you. We have included a few recent
We thank you very, very much for your insight, constructive criticisms and all the suggestions and directions offered.
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Manuscript Number: IJQRM-12-2014-0200

Responses to the Reviewer 2

Please accept our sincere gratitude for the time spent in reviewing our paper and for all the constructive criticisms, directions and the suggestions provided. We have revised the manuscript thoroughly, paying attention to your concerns, and have acted upon the suggestions given.

Please find below our responses to the specific points raised. We deal with them point by point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer #2 Comments</th>
<th>Authors’ Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The authors should be commended for their efforts in reviewing the literature, identifying gaps, focusing on patients and value concepts. The limitation section seems well written and transparent. The flow of the paper is sometimes hard to follow. I recommend adding further references to the statistical section.</td>
<td>We thank the reviewer for commending us on the relevance and structure of the manuscript. We have taken into consideration comments about the flow of the paper and addition of references to the statistical section in our revised manuscript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication? The paper addresses a population that is understudied and created a model or framework that was tested and validated. The importance of the findings is relatively acceptable. The authors should be commended for their efforts.</td>
<td>Thank you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?:

The review of the literature seems sound and outlined properly.

Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?:

Relatively acceptable with several limitations addressed in limitation section.

Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?:

Relatively basic information but important due to location and limited data.

Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper? The impact of the paper is significant mostly because of the

Thank you.

We appreciate your comments.

Thank you.

We have taken into consideration your comments and have revised our manuscript to flow better. Thank you.
relative paucity of the data in the studied field in the specific geographic location. The paper has several limitations addressed in the limitation section relatively well.

Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: The paper is reasonably well written, but the flow may be improved as the paper is not always easy to follow.

Please do accept our sincere gratitude for spending the time to review our paper and for all the suggestions you provided. The paper is now much stronger, thanks to your well thought-out input. We appreciate it.
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Manuscript Number: IJQRM-12-2014-0200

Responses to the Reviewer 3

Please accept our sincere gratitude for the time spent in reviewing our paper and for all the constructive criticisms, directions and the suggestions provided. We have revised the manuscript thoroughly, paying attention to your concerns, and have acted upon the suggestions given.

Please find below our responses to the specific points raised. We deal with them point by point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer #3 Comments</th>
<th>Authors’ Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This paper describes an empirical study conducted in Ghana, with the purpose of understanding the connections between</td>
<td>We thank the reviewer for commending us on the relevance and structure of the manuscript. We have taken into consideration comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
healthcare service quality and perceived value, with patient’s satisfaction and behavioral intentions. The literature review is extensive and adequate. The methodology is well designed and the data analysis is adequate. The conclusions and contributions of this research are also well described in the paper.

I suggest some minor revisions (see details in the score sheet) that, in my opinion, will improve the paper.

Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: In spite of not being an innovative issue, the fact that the study was conducted in a “fast growing and economically liberalized emerging country in sub-Saharan Africa” brings a relevant perspective on this subject.

Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Yes, the literature review is relevant, appropriate and updated. I would advise a careful revision of the connections between the citations and the list of references since I found some discrepancies – for example Thakur, Hsu and Fontenot (2012) is cited on page 1, but is not listed on the references.

We appreciate your comments. We have carefully rectified any disconnect between the citations and list of references.

Thank you. Data were collected in the month of January 2013. We have included the period during which the data was collected.
Is the paper’s argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Yes. However, in the description of the research methodology (pages 11 and 12) there is no reference to the date when the application of these questionnaires took place (2013? 2014?). This is an important information to understand the validity of the results obtained.

Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Yes. However:

- I don’t think that the purpose to “operationalize a customer-derived conceptual framework of service quality, perceived value and satisfaction in the context of a unique healthcare delivery system”, described in page 4, is really attained in this study. In my understanding, this research proposes a framework and tests its validity using questionnaires to patients. This is not an operationalization of the framework. I suggest the authors to rephrase this purpose, as well as the first sentence of the conclusions.

Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, We have taken into consideration your comments and have revised our manuscript accordingly. Thank you.

We appreciate your comments. Our revised manuscript now reads better. Thank you.
affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Yes, in section 5 the contributions of the research are clearly explained.

Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: The paper is reasonably well written. However, some phrases should be reviewed (for example, page 16, line 13, line 34, and line 53).

Please do accept our sincere gratitude for spending the time to review our paper and for all the suggestions you provided. The paper is now much stronger, thanks to your well thought-out input. We appreciate it.