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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 marketing and/or 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 doctoral students critically evaluate both fundamental (i.e., seminal) ideas and more recent developments on the subject matter.
SEMINAR 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.

The seminar will feature a strong emphasis on discussion and critical deliberation of assigned reading materials in class. Students’ preparation for each class should entail *close 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 to the marketing literature, limitations of the article, and extensions of each paper. Extensions can include straight-forward/line extensions and replications or more innovative linkages with other papers or literatures. Professor Christine Moorman of Fuqua School of Business cautions students against three tendencies.

1. Please *be very careful* about overly negative approach to dealing with other scholars’ research/studies. It is worthwhile to try to understand what the research is trying to accomplish and whether it is interesting and important as opposed to “tearing it apart;” whether it is perfect in every regard. No research is perfect; nobody is perfect.

2. Do not adhere only to extending others’ points made in class and not initiating your own ideas/perspectives. While the former is a safe strategy, it is not particularly interesting in the long-run. At times, you should take risk(s) – go ahead and put your ideas out there.

3. Make sure you *read* and *think*. Reading is the easy part – it takes time, but it is not very hard. Thinking is the critical part of the quest you are on – doctoral education. Think hard about the validity of the ideas and results in the paper as well as how you could improve the paper. Finally, think about what a paper might mean for your current research and/or dissertation topic.

The three tendencies are culled from Christine Moorman’s (2013) seminar in marketing strategy.

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.

What does strategy mean?

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. While he does not define strategy 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) Harvard Business Review article, “What is Strategy?”

[Strategy] “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

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 persist - and likely have persisted for a long time - within our living or working environments.

LEARNING GOAL

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

3Steiner, George (1979), Strategic Planning, Boston, MA: Free Press.
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 play in the development and execution of marketing theory or practice.

Research Ideas

The intention of this seminar is that you leave this course with several ideas that may form the foundation of your own research. As Professor Moorman notes, you should read as if on a scouting expedition. Pay attention to what you find interesting in case you find something is missing or inaccurate. Note/jot down alternative explanations for what the research suggests is happening. Question the researcher’s point of view and try and establish what the underlying assumptions are in the research and question them.

Use these activities for your own research idea assignments. To that end, you are required to write a two-page note (double spaced) focusing on one research idea that emanates from the entire week’s readings.

As well, each student will be requested to present their ideas (via power-point slides) to the class from week 2 through 14. You will be informed accordingly. 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. The two-page write-ups will be due at the end of each class.

“Critical thinking is 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.”

Research Paper

Each student will be expected to develop a research paper on a market(ing)-strategy related topic. If you decide to work on a paper that is more modeling in nature, you should present the model and solve it. On the other hand if you decide to work on a paper that is more behavioral, you could do one of two things.

1http://www.criticalthinking.org/aboutCT/
First, you could write an integrative conceptual paper that offers a new framework for marketing strategy. This paper would be in the tradition of conceptual papers published in journals like *Journal of Marketing* (see e.g., Rindfleisch and Heide 1997).

Second, your paper could offer predictions (i.e., propositions) and geared toward the design of a marketing strategy study. This could involve an experiment, quasi-experiment, a survey, a content analysis, a meta-analysis, a field study, or an empirical analysis of secondary brand and/or firm data.

In rare cases, a student who is already well ahead in working on a research project in any area of marketing that is geared for an “A” journal can be allowed to pursue/carry-on with that agenda. In other words, a study may not necessarily be within the domain of marketing strategy but with the agreement from the instructor, the paper may be targeted at any of the top marketing journals – *JM, JMR, JCR, MKSC, JAMS* etc.

The purpose in writing this paper is to target an “A” marketing journal publication. You will be guided by myself and where need-be, by other faculty colleagues. A list of “A” marketing journals will be discussed during the first week of the semester. Thereafter, you should follow the targeted journal’s specific submission guidelines in preparing the paper.

The paper will be due during the last seminar session on May 10, 2018. And you will be expected to make a 10 - 15 minute presentation (followed by Q&A) of your manuscript – bound for a named journal. Please develop the paper with a designated journal target in mind. I will provide on-going guidance and feedback.

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.

*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, 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](http://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.

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>Quality of articles reviewed and critiqued in class</th>
<th>Quality of your seminar paper for journal</th>
<th>Quality of your weekly two-page idea quests</th>
<th>Total Possible Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</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. Occasionally, I will offer “background readings” on key areas involving a topic treated or method to help the appreciation of the subject matter. As well, I will have three or more concepts and/or theory points that I will make at some point during the semester – either at the beginning, during, and...
getting to the end of the semester. I reserve the right to change topics and readings at will during the semester. This may never occur but I would like to have the option if I find a better paper in course of the semester.

ASSIGNED READINGS

**Week 1**: Introduction and overview (January 18, 2018):

*Students should download and then read materials before class and arrive ready to discuss them during the class session.*


Further Reading


**Week 2**: Marketing Planning and Market Domain (January 25, 2018)


Further Reading


**Week 3: The Role of Marketing within the Organization and Market Orientation (February 1, 2018)**


Further Reading


**Week 4**: Market Definition, Segmentation, Positioning and Product Differentiation (February 8, 2018)


Further Reading


**Week 5**: Competition (February 15, 2018)


Further Reading


Week 6: Making Decisions (February 22, 2018)


Further Reading


Hambrick, Donald C., Sydney Finkelstein, and Ann C. Mooney (2005), “Executive Job
Demands: New Insights For Explaining Strategic Decisions and Leader Behaviors,”  

**Week 7: Product/Service and Industry Life Cycle Dynamics (March 1, 2018)**


**Further Reading**


**Week 8: Marketing Mix and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) (March 8, 2018)**


Further Reading


**Week 9**: Channel Design, Coordination and Transaction Cost Theory (March 22, 2018)


Further Reading


**Week 10: Alliances and Acquisitions (March 29, 2018)**


Further Reading


**Week 11: Market Entry and Evolution, Institutionalization and Network Effects (April 5, 2018)**


Further Reading


**Week 12:** New Product Development and Innovation (April 12, 2018)


**Further Reading**


**Week 13:** Strategic Transformations, SD Logic and Resource-based View of the Firm (April 19, 2018)


Perspective: A Backward Step?” *European Journal of Marketing*, 43 (5-6), 784-793.

Further Reading

**Week 14**: Branding and Relationship Marketing (April 26, 2018)

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

Week 15: Come to class prepared to present your paper in Power-point slides. 10 minutes are allocated for each student (May 3 or May 10, 2018). May 10, 2018. Final course paper due.

Responding to editors and reviewers in a diligent and humble fashion

An assessment of national healthcare service delivery: A Ghanaian illustration

Manuscript Number: IJQRM-12-2014-0200

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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</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 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreover, one page 12, line no. 25; if among 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.</td>
<td>Thank you. We have revised our manuscript to include the justification for inquiring about cultural groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The researcher has not explained in detail all the demographic results and why respondents were inquired about cultural/tribal group is not justified either.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 it’s 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 analyzed 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 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

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.

Thank you.
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.

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 articles in the revised manuscript.

We thank you very, very much for your insight, constructive criticisms and all the suggestions and directions offered.

An assessment of national healthcare service delivery: A Ghanaian illustration

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</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>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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 analyzed 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 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.

We have taken into consideration your comments and have revised our manuscript to flow better. Thank you.

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.

**An assessment of national healthcare service delivery: A Ghanaian illustration**

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>
</table>
| This paper describes an empirical study conducted in Ghana, with the purpose of understanding the connections between 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. | 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. Thank you. |
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.

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 analyzed 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 re-phrase 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, 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).