


**Please cite the Published Version**

Khan, MA, Pattnaik, D, Ashraf, R , Ali, I, Kumar, S and Donthu, N (2021) Value of special issues in the journal of business research: a bibliometric analysis. Journal of Business Research, 125. pp. 295-313. ISSN 0148-2963

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.12.015>

**Publisher:** Elsevier

**Version:** Accepted Version

**Downloaded from:** <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/629353/>

**Usage rights:**  In Copyright

**Additional Information:** This is an Author Accepted Manuscript of an article published in Journal of Business Research.

**Enquiries:**

If you have questions about this document, contact [openresearch@mmu.ac.uk](mailto:openresearch@mmu.ac.uk). Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

# *Value of special issues in the Journal of Business Research:*

## *A bibliometric analysis*

### **Abstract**

*Journal of Business Research (JBR)* is a leading peer-reviewed scientific outlet that publishes theories highly relevant to practical business applications. Our study aims to explicate the knowledge creation dynamics (structure and networks) of *JBR* special issues (SIs) and regular issues (RIs) between 1973 and 2020. Applying bibliometrics, we examine the knowledge structure of *JBR* SIs by identifying their highly cited publications, prolific authors, and affiliations. In addition, using co-authorship, co-citation, and bibliographic coupling analyses, we investigate the knowledge structures prevailing among the sources citing *JBR*, its contributing authors, and their affiliations. Our findings indicate that the most prolific authors have US affiliations and that *JBR* has stronger ties with other leading marketing and management journals, such as the *Journal of Marketing*, the *Journal of Consumer Research*, the *Journal of Marketing Research*, *Strategic Management Journal*, and *Industrial Marketing Management*. Bibliographic coupling groups the *JBR* SI publications into seven clusters identified as consumer behavior of emerging technologies, organizational resources and networks, dynamics of consumer power in marketing, measurement issues, globalization of marketing, future-oriented strategies and tools, and market relationships. Finally, a comparison of *JBR* SIs with RIs highlights scholarship from more countries with a focus on evolving and current topics.

**Keywords:** Bibliometrics, knowledge structures, knowledge networks, bibliographic coupling, Web of Science, special issues

# 1. Introduction

“If you don't know where you've come from, you don't know where you're going”. ~ Maya Angelou (Poet, Author, Civil Rights Activist)

*Journal of Business Research (JBR)* is a leading peer-reviewed scientific hub that publishes theoretical studies with high practical relevance. Starting as a biannual journal, *JBR* has progressively expanded into 12 volumes per annum outlet. The journal enjoys an irrefutable position in international listings such as Scimago (2019) where it features among the first quartile of the enlisted sources in “Marketing” (top 30) and “Business, Management and Accounting” (top 120) categories. Similarly, Google Scholar (2019) ranks *JBR* first in both “Marketing” and “Strategic Management” categories with an h5-index of 108. Naveen Donthu and Anders Gustafsson, from Georgia State University and the BI Norwegian Business School, respectively, serve as *JBR*'s current editors-in-chief.

It is a common practice in academia to conduct systematic reviews of journals with established academic history as a critical assessment of the past legitimizes the future trajectory (Barley, 2015; Rialp et al., 2019; Van Fleet et al., 2006). For instance, Hoffman and Holbrook (1993) reviewed the first 15 years of the *Journal of Consumer Research*, and Zinkhan and Leigh (1999) evaluated the *Journal of Advertising* between 1980 and 1997. Similarly, Malhotra et al. (2005, 2013) reviewed publications in *International Marketing Review* from 1983 till 2011. More recently, Martínez-López et al. (2018) reviewed the 50-year performance of the *European Journal of Marketing* using bibliometric analysis, and Donthu et al. (2020) analyzed the 45-year performance of the *JBR*. However, as a common limitation, these endeavors lack an investigation on the intricacies and differences between the regular issue (RI) and special issue (SI)

manuscripts. Broadly, the question “why do journals publish special issues?” remains unaddressed. The only exception is Khan et al. (2020) who applying bibliometrics demonstrated the differences between the SIs and RIs of *Psychology & Marketing*.

A SI addresses an emerging topic of interest and usually attracts more attention than RIs. Publishing SI(s) once or twice a year is a common practice for academic outlets. *JBR* has progressed from publishing two SIs in 1988 to dedicated sections covering SI themes within each of its 12 annual volumes. According to the Web of Science Core Collection database, *JBR* SIs have published 3,102 documents (95,163 total citations; average 30.68 cites per paper) between 1973 and 2020. The 3,102 documents include 2,646 articles, 287 proceeding papers, 140 editorials, 26 reviews, two book reviews, and one correction. It is important to note that we excluded the editorials, book reviews, and corrections up until the current year (i.e., volume 116 of 2020) to calculate the total publications of *JBR* SIs in this study. However, in general, such a high volume of academic content instigates the need for an objective assessment of *JBR* SIs to better inform the readers about its academic legacy and values.

To achieve our broad objective, we employ bibliometrics to examine the knowledge structure and networks of the *JBR* SIs. Precisely, we evaluate the publication and citation trends of *JBR* SIs, identify their leading articles, authors, and affiliations, and trace their knowledge outflows (other journals citing *JBR* SIs) and inflows (other journals cited by *JBR* SIs). Furthermore, using VOSviewer (van Eck & Waltman, 2010) and Gephi application (Bastian et al., 2009), we demonstrate the knowledge networks of *JBR* SIs based on co-citation, co-authorship, and bibliographic coupling of articles, journals, authors, institutions, and countries. Finally, we compare SIs with RIs of the journal to highlight their differential thematic cover, representation of countries, authorship trend, and overall value addition to the journal.

The rest of the essay proceeds as follows: Section 2 briefly tracks the evolution of *JBR* during 1973 and 2020. Section 3 explains the methodology of this study. Section 4 discusses the results in terms of knowledge structure and graphical network maps of the SIs. Section 5 presents a comparison of *JBR*'s SIs and RIs. Finally, Section 6 summarizes the results and concludes the study.

## **2. Evolution of *JBR*: A brief history**

In 1973, *JBR* published its first RI. The founding editor-in-chief, Arch Woodside, explained the founding aim and scope of *JBR* in his editorial (1977) as “the goal for *JBR* is to provide important theoretical and empirical research contributions for scholars and practitioners in the business field. Editorial policy will favor manuscripts which offer pragmatic implications developed within a theoretical framework and tested with original research data in a business setting.” (p. 1). Building upon its foundation, *JBR* at present publishes 12 volumes of RIs or SIs sections annually. The progress of *JBR* in the last decade certainly recognizes it among the most prestigious journals. For instance, *JBR* holds the first and sixth places (see Table 1) among the top 20 business and management journals as per the cited publications and citations count, respectively. According to JCR (Journal Citation Report 2020), the two-year impact factor of *JBR* is 4.874 (five-year impact factor of 5.484) and it is ranked 29<sup>th</sup> out of 152 business journals. In the latest Chartered Association of Business Schools (CABS), Academic Journal Guide (AJG) 2018, and the Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) journal quality list of 2019, *JBR* ranks 3 and A, respectively.

\*\*\*\* Insert Table 1 about here \*\*\*\*

### 3. Methods

Bibliometrics is used across various disciplines, for example, economics (Bonilla et al., 2015), innovation (Fagerberg et al., 2012), entrepreneurship (Landström et al., 2012), management (Podsakoff et al., 2008), and marketing (Martínez-López et al., 2018), to examine the repository of literature using quantitative metric indicators such as citations, authorships, the institutional and geographic patterns of bibliographic materials (e.g., articles, books, review papers, and proceedings), often over a period of time (Ellegaard & Wallin, 2015). Nerur et al. (2008) suggest that bibliometrics has the advantage over qualitative studies as it objectively presents statistical results from a selected scientific database with lesser room for subjective bias. The bibliometric data for this study was accessed during August 2020 from the Web of Science Core Collection database, a widely recognized and frequently accessed search engine for bibliometric studies (Martínez-López et al., 2020; Rialp et al., 2019; Sarin et al., 2020).

Using bibliometric analysis of the extracted *JBR* SIs data, we present results at five distinct levels, that is, (i) documents, (ii) authors, (iii) affiliated universities, (iv) countries, and (v) journal. We use several quantitative variables to depict the publication trend, authorship pattern, citation structure, influence, impact, activity, and productivity of *JBR* SIs. Knowledge structures of documents, authors, and authors' affiliations (i.e., universities and countries) are demonstrated by variables such as total publications (TP), number of sole-authored and co-authored publications (SA and CA), number of contributing authors (NCA), the cumulative number of affiliated authors (CNA), growth in authorship (GA), collaboration index (CI) (Baker et al., 2020), total cited publications (TCP), total citations (TC), citations per publication (C/P), citations per cited publication (C/CP), citation per cited publication per year (C/CP/Y), h-

index (h), g-index (g), number of active years (NAY), and productivity per active year (PAY) (see Appendix B1 for the definitions of descriptive variables).

At the journal level, *JBR* SI's impact on the field is demonstrated by knowledge networks through citation inflows and outflows. Subsequently, knowledge network maps for each of these levels are presented using VOSviewer (van Eck & Waltman, 2010) and Gephi application (Bastian et al., 2009). The VOSviewer and Gephi can handle a large set of data, have a superior mapping ability (Donthu et al., 2020; Martínez-López et al., 2018) and support all the features explored in this study. This analysis presents knowledge networks of intellectual connections based on co-citation, co-authorship, and bibliographic coupling analyses (Kessler, 1963; Small, 1973).

## **4. Results**

The data of *JBR* SI publications was accessed from the Web of Science Core Collection. Results are presented in two parts. The first section reports the knowledge structure of publications and notable contributors (authors, affiliations, and countries) of *JBR* SIs. It is followed by the knowledge network analysis carried out in form of the graphical representation of collaborations and intellectual connections among the articles, authors, authors' affiliations, and journals.

### **4.1. Knowledge structure**

This section first presents the publication and citation profile of *JBR* SIs, and then it discusses the most cited articles, the most prolific authors, institutions, and countries of *JBR* SIs during the period 1973–2020.

#### 4.1.1. Publication trend in *JBR* SIs

*JBR* SIs have published 2,959 articles cited 94,376 times. Fig. 1 shows the number of SI publications and citations per paper per year over its entire history (1973–2020). For the year 2020, data is displayed till August. *JBR* published its first SI in 1988 with 17 documents. Table 2 summarizes the publication trend of *JBR* SIs. In 2016, *JBR* had the highest number of publications (TP: 486), including both SA and CA articles (SA: 50; CA: 436), contributed by the highest number of *JBR* SI authors (NCA: 1,388). In the same year, *JBR* SIs also witnessed its greatest rise in popularity among academia as depicted by the highest growth in authorship (GA: 820). Although 2016 can be considered as the year of the highest number of impactful research (TCP: 470); 2005 had the highest citation impact (12,959), citations per publication (C/P: 75.78), citations per cited publication (C/CP: 77.14), and h and g indices (h-index: 63 and g-index: 109). In addition, 21% (9 out of 42) of the SI articles with 250 citations and more are from 2005. More important, we see rise in the number of publications per active year (PAY) towards the recent years of *JBR* SIs. By August 2020, *JBR* has already garnered its highest productivity in articles per active year (PAY: 102). Such a trend further grounds the rising popularity of *JBR* SIs in academia.

\*\*\*\* Insert Fig. 1 and Table 2 about here \*\*\*\*

Table 3 presents an overview of the differences between the *JBR* SIs and RIs. The *JBR* RIs score over SIs in almost all the indicators as follows: TP, 3,582 vs. 2,959; TCP, 3,153 vs. 2,765; TC, 1,02,999 vs. 94,376. However, *JBR* has published SIs only for 29 years in its 48 years of publishing. Interestingly, the productivity per active year of SIs (PAY) is 43.3% higher than the RIs (106.97/74.63). Such a measure indicates that the average academic contributions of SIs



in *JBR* are much higher than the RIs. Simultaneously, the number of *JBR* authors' affiliated countries suggests that SIs attract scholars from more countries (93 vs. 84). Such comparative indicators suggest higher scope for publications in *JBR* SIs.

\*\*\*\* Insert Table 3 about here \*\*\*\*

#### **4.1.2. The most cited articles in *JBR* SIs**

The number of citations indicates the impact or influence of a document (Svensson, 2010). Table 4 provides the details of the 20 most influential SI articles published in *JBR* between 1973 and 2020. Although these papers account for less than 1% of SI publications, they represent nearly 10% of the TC (9,294 of 94,376). The top cited articles listed in Table 4 highlight the broad diversity in topics such as entrepreneur's business model, virtual brand community and consumer engagement, e-commerce and online shopping, emotions in consumer behavior, and gender differences in online buying, demonstrating the wide impact of *JBR* across multiple subdomains of marketing and management.

\*\*\*\* Insert Table 4 about here \*\*\*\*

The top-cited article by Morris et al. (2005), published in the SI on *The Nonprofit Marketing Landscape*, synthesized the literature of entrepreneurship business models and presented an integrated framework with six components relevant for such businesses. Similarly, the work of Brodie et al. (2013), which ranks second in terms of TC but first in terms of citations per year, was published in the SI on *Thought Leadership in Brand Management*. This work focused on consumers' engagement and its dynamic multidimensional nature, which demonstrated that engaged consumers show greater consumer loyalty, commitment, satisfaction, trust, and emotional bonding. Among the other influential works, the study of Kim and Ko

(2012) (citations per year: second in rank) on social media marketing and luxury fashion brands, published in the SI on *Fashion Marketing and Consumption of Luxury Brands*, examines the relationships among various types of equity (value, relationship, brand, and customer) and purchase intention. The findings enable luxury brands to forecast the purchasing behavior of their customers more accurately and manage their assets and marketing activities accordingly.

#### **4.1.3. The most prolific authors and authors' affiliations in *JBR* SIs**

Table 5 lists the most productive authors according to the number of their publications and citation count. Although Michel Laroche (Concordia University) leads the ranking with 33 publications cited 1,254 times followed by Kun-Huang Huarng of the Feng Chia University with 25 publications; Jean-Charles William Chebat (HEC Montréal) is the top-cited author (TC: 1,457) with 21 publications followed by Barry J. Babin (Louisiana Tech University) cited 1,368 times of 13 publications. However, in terms of C/CP, Babin ranks first (105.23), followed by Chebat (C/CP: 72.85). Moreover, Table 5 highlights that 13 of the top *JBR* SIs' authors have papers with more than 100 citations. Similarly, 18 authors have been credited with a minimum of 50 citations.

Interestingly, Suraksha Gupta emerged as the most collaborative researcher for associating with 39 other authors in her 9 publications (CI: 3.33). However, Laroche is the most influential and impactful author leading with the highest *h* and *g* indices (*h*-index: 19; *g*-index: 31). Although Laroche is the most active author contributing publications in 17 of the 29 years of *JBR* SIs (NAY: 17); Huarng ranks first as the most productive researcher (PAY: 3.57).

\*\*\*\* Insert Table 5 about here \*\*\*\*

Table 6 lists the most prolific affiliated institutions of the authors in *JBR* SIs. The results show that authors affiliated with the University of Valencia lead with the highest count of 102 publications, followed by INCAE Business School (58) and Feng Chia University (49). In terms of influence demonstrated by TC, Concordia University (1,467), the University of Alabama (1,466), and the University of Valencia (1,408) take the first three spots, respectively. Regarding the average impact demonstrated by C/CP, Georgia State University (55.38), the University of Wisconsin Madison (47.81), and the University of Western Ontario (47.71) occupy the first three ranks, respectively.

However, authors affiliated with the University of Alabama had the leading and highest collaborative index (CI: 3.47), whereas authors affiliated with the University of Valencia were the most influential and impactful (*h*-index: 22; *g*-index: 32). Although the University of Alabama reemerges as the most active authors' affiliated institution (NAY: 16); the University of Valencia leads as the most productive institution in the 29 years of publishing *JBR* SIs (PAY: 9.27). In general, such indicators demonstrate *JBR*'s ability to attract authors from reputed institutions to regularly feature in its SIs.

\*\*\*\* Insert Table 6 about here \*\*\*\*

Among the most prolific countries, Table 7 shows that authors affiliated with the USA (NAA: 2,193) contributed the highest count of *JBR* SI publications (TP: 997) and lead by a huge margin over the UK (TP: 392) and Spain (TP: 299). In terms of TC, the USA was the most influential authors' affiliated country (38,423) followed by the UK (11,207) and Australia (9,295). On the other hand, in terms of C/P, the top three influential countries were the Netherlands (50.96), Norway (50.16), and New Zealand (48.02), respectively. Moreover, of note, the top 30 authors' affiliated nations account for approximately 91.35% of the publications

(2,703/2,959 publications) and 91.32% of the TC (86,189/94,376) of *JBR* SIs. Among the other indicators, Belgium topped the list for its highest collaborative index (CI: 2.88), whereas the USA reemerged as the most influential (*h*-index: 98), impactful (*g*-index: 149), active (NAY: 27), and productive (PAY: 36.93) authors' affiliated country in our study. As a general observation, we found that *JBR* SIs have largely been dominated by English speakers; however, there is ample scope to tap the business acumen and practices prevailing in the emerging world.

\*\*\*\* Insert Table 7 about here \*\*\*\*

Another interesting aspect is to review the leading authors and authors' affiliations frequently citing *JBR* SIs. Table 8 lists the authors and authors' affiliations that often cite *JBR* SI articles. In terms of the authors, Juyoung Kim, affiliated with Sogang University, emerges as the leader for citing 149 *JBR* SI articles, followed by Sanghyn Lee, affiliated with Dongguk University, and Juhyun Lee, affiliated with Sejong University, citing 145 and 124 articles, respectively. For universities, the authors from the Hong Kong Polytechnic University cited *JBR* SIs 547 times, followed by the University of Valencia (454) and Griffith University (415). Regarding the countries, the USA was found to be the top authors' affiliated nation for frequently citing *JBR* SIs (13,365 times) followed by China (6,836) and the UK (5,652).

\*\*\*\* Insert Table 8 about here \*\*\*\*

## **4.2. Knowledge networks**

This section presents the intellectual associations prevailing in *JBR* SIs. First, we demonstrate the networking of journals in *JBR* SIs. Top journals frequently citing *JBR* SIs indicate the knowledge outflows, whereas the top sources frequently cited in *JBR* SIs show its' knowledge inflows. Subsequently, we develop a co-citation network to map the journal's

intellectual congruence and impact among its peers (Cancino et al., 2017; Martínez-López et al., 2018). Journals are considered to be co-cited if they are jointly referred to in *JBR* SIs. The high number of such references reveals stronger intellectual association. Such an approach can also be extended to authors and articles.

In the later part of our analysis, we develop the co-authorship of authors and their affiliations, and the bibliographic coupling networks of *JBR* SI articles. Co-authorship takes into account the actual authorship of the articles such that the network nodes represent authors and the interlinkages represent co-authorships. The strength of the link between authors is indicated by the number of times two researchers have co-authored (van Eck & Waltman, 2020). In contrast, bibliographic coupling focuses on a publication's reference list and indicates the relative intellectual congruence between documents based on commonalities in their references. Documents are considered to be bibliographically coupled if they share at least one common reference, for example, documents "A" and "B" citing document "C" (Kessler, 1963). The higher the number of common references, the stronger the link (intellectual connection) between the articles (van Eck & Waltman, 2020). In sum, co-authorship networks focus on the actual working relationships among authors and their affiliations, whereas bibliographic coupling networks unveil their intellectual associations. Finally, we conclude the section by summarizing the bibliographic coupling network that classified *JBR* SI articles into seven intellectual clusters demonstrating the common themes of *JBR* SIs.

#### **4.2.1. The top journals citing and cited by *JBR* SIs**

Table 9 lists the journals frequently citing *JBR* SIs (knowledge outflow). The results show that *JBR* itself leads the ranking (3,140 papers), followed by the *Sustainability* (1,175), the

*Industrial Marketing Management* (975), and the *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* (665). Overall, 95% of the journals (19 out of 20) are ranked as "2" or above in AJG (2018), and 85% (17 out of 20) are rated as either "A" or "A\*" according to ABDC (2019). This demonstrates that the quality of contributions by *JBR* SIs is well appreciated by scholars who publish in these highly regarded outlets of the discipline.

\*\*\*\* Insert Table 9 about here \*\*\*\*

Furthermore, Table 9 presents the most cited journals within *JBR* SIs. The list demonstrates that *JBR* (itself) is the most cited source (7,421 citations), followed by the *Journal of Marketing* (6,263), the *Journal of Consumer Research* (4,848), and the *Journal of Marketing Research* (3,858). Interestingly, 70% (14/20) of the journals cited are rated as "4" or "4\*" according to AJG (2018), and 95% are "A" or "A\*" as per ABDC (2019). This indicates that manuscripts published in the *JBR* SIs bear a stronger theoretical and intellectual foundation. Moreover, we investigate the networking among the most cited sources in *JBR* SIs. Fig. 2 depicts the co-citation network of journals, with a threshold of more than 250 citations. It demonstrates two clusters: the red cluster includes 33 journals with stronger association among *JBR*, *Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Consumer Research*, *Journal of Marketing Research*, and *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*; the green cluster includes 30 journals revealing connections among *Strategic Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, and *Academy of Management Journal*. These clusters also confirm that leading journals in the field of marketing and management are regularly co-cited by *JBR* SIs. Conversely, larger nodes of the marketing journals suggest the dominance of marketing topics in the *JBR* SIs.

\*\*\*\* Insert Fig. 2 about here \*\*\*\*

#### 4.2.2. Co-authorship networks: Authors and authors' affiliations

Academic research output is the product of collaborative work, and it usually involves collaborations among authors, institutions, and countries (Acedo et al., 2006; Finardi & Buratti, 2016). Fig. 3 depicts the authors' collaboration trends in *JBR* SIs. It shows that single-author publications are nearly 13% (373 out of 2,959), whereas 87% (2,586 out of 2,959) of the publications are co-authored by two and more authors, in which 32% articles are by two, 35% by three, 14% by four, and the remaining 6% by five and more authors.

\*\*\*\* Insert Fig. 3 about here \*\*\*\*

However, when internationalization of collaborations is considered, Table 7 shows an increasing trend of intra-country collaborations (SCP: single-country publications) as nearly 59% (1,747 out of 2,959) of the publications emerge out of collaborations among countries. Moreover, it shows a higher percentage of publications from the top seven countries (USA, UK, Spain, Australia, Canada, China, and France) accounting for approximately 70% (2,068 out of 2,959) of the total *JBR* SIs. Fig. 4 demonstrates the evolution of the relative contribution of these countries over successive five-year periods from 1991. Since 2001, the relative contributions of the top seven countries have steadily declined from 82% to 70% in the last 5-year period. This decline reflects that, over the years, *JBR* SIs have gained attention from authors all over the world making it a truly global endeavor.

\*\*\*\* Insert Fig. 4 about here \*\*\*\*

Co-authorship networks of authors, affiliated institutions, and countries are developed to demonstrate research groups, centers, and regions of excellence for *JBR* SIs, using VOSviewer and Gephi. Co-authorship network of authors with more than five publications and 100 plus

citations in *JBR* SIs are classified into nine clusters (see Appendix: Fig. A1). The largest cluster (grey) consists of 30 authors led by Michel Laroche (Concordia University), whereas the second-largest cluster (purple) consists of 11 authors and is led by K.-H. Huarng. In terms of the co-authorship link, the most prominent link exists between M. Cleveland and M. Laroche. In general, we have observed that co-authorial linkages spread throughout the figure indicating frequent association among collaborating authors in *JBR* SIs. The other important nodes are formed by B. Bartikowski (blue) and D. Ribeiro-Soriano (purple).

The co-authorship network of affiliated institutions is classified into seven major clusters of the universities publishing more than 15 documents with 100 citations (see Appendix: Fig. A2). The largest cluster (purple) is led by the University of Manchester and is comprised of 22 affiliated institutions. The second-largest cluster (green) is led by the University of Wollongong and is comprised of 12 affiliated institutions. The other two main clusters are led by Karlstad University (blue) and the University of Leeds (orange) consisting of 9 and 7 affiliated institutions, respectively. The largest co-authorial linkage exists between the University of Polytechnic Valencia and the University of Valencia. However, their respective small nodes indicate that majority of the co-authorial linkages occur within the respective universities and therefore their prominence in the network is comparatively lower.

Simultaneously, the co-authorship network map for countries shows three main clusters with the USA (blue) having stronger co-authorship connections with Canada, UK, France, China, South Korea, Australia, and Spain. Moreover, co-authorial prominence is shared among the USA (blue), Canada, UK, and South Korea; and Germany (orange), Finland, and Sweden, whereas Slovenia and Croatia emerge as the prominent nodes among the cluster represented by green (see Appendix: Fig. A3).



### 4.2.3. Bibliographic coupling of *JBR* SI articles

Articles are considered to be bibliographically coupled if they share at least one common reference source (Kessler, 1963). Bibliographic coupling analysis of the documents, cited at least once, groups *JBR* SIs into seven clusters representing 94% (2,768/2,959) of the publications (see Table 10). These clusters represent commonalities in references, which indicate intellectual connections among these articles (Kessler, 1963). Fig. 5 provides an overview of the evolution of these clusters across successive five-year periods over the entire history of the journal.

\*\*\*\* Insert Table 10 and Fig. 5 about here \*\*\*\*

Cluster 1—Consumer behavior and emerging technologies—covers 28% (776 of 2,768) of publications and 34% (32,032 of 94,376) of citations received by *JBR* SIs. The themes of this cluster relate to online retailing, innovation adoption, and consumer emotions. Frambach and Shillewaert's (2002) study on innovation adoption by organizations remains the most influential work of this cluster with 472 citations. They reviewed organizational innovation adoption literature and provided a conceptual framework, which demonstrates that the success of innovation adoption depends on two sets of factors, that is, organizational and individual parameters. Kim and Ko (2012) analyzed the influence of social media marketing on customer equity of luxury fashion brands that remains the second most influential work with 431 citations. They identified how social media marketing activities influence different types of customer equity drivers such as value, relationship, and brand equity. The third most influential work in this cluster is by Forsythe and Shi (2003) that tackles the risk perceptions of internet shopping with 428 citations. Using a risk-based theoretical framework, they examined how different types of risk, that is, financial, product performance, psychological, and time/convenience loss risks,

affect consumers' patronage behavior towards internet shopping. Other notable studies in this cluster are Ha and Stoel (2009) and Mollen and Wilson (2010) that are cited 420 and 381 times, respectively.

Cluster 2—Organizational resources and networks—has 26% (723) of publications and 21% (20,149) of citations of the *JBR* SIs, covering domains of entrepreneurship, organizational resources, and business networks. Morris et al.'s (2005) entrepreneurship business model framework remains the most influential study of this cluster with 783 citations. They proposed a six-component business model that covers factors related to product offerings, market dynamics, firm capabilities, competitive dynamics, economics, and investors and demonstrated its application in practice. The second most influential work in this cluster is by Håkansson and Ford (2002) on business networks. They examined the nature of networks and identified different paradoxes that result from the higher level of dependencies, such as the inability to act independently, need to empathize for coexistence, and network control dynamics. By debating these paradoxes, they provided a guideline on how firms should approach and interact in their networks to avoid these problems. Following them, Halinen and Törnroos's (2005) study on the use of the case method to study business networks ranks third with 436 citations. They identified potential challenges (network boundary, network complexity, time considerations of the study, and cross case-comparisons) for case method researchers who aim to study networks and provide related solutions. Other notable studies in this cluster are by Murphy et al. (1996) and Ragatz, Handfield, and Peterson (2002) with 363 and 324 citations, respectively.

Cluster 3—Dynamics of consumer power in marketing—with 15% (425) publications and 14% (13,101) citations focuses on emerging concepts of marketing that examine the engagement and importance of customers in market-based activities, covering consumer-brand

relationships, brand communities, customer identity, and co-creation domains. The most influential work in this cluster is by Brodie et al. (2013) with 781 citations. Using netnography, they examined engagement in brand communities and found that engagement is dynamic and interactive and results in value co-creation. Moreover, they found that engaged customers tend to have higher levels of satisfaction and relational bonding. The study of Yi and Gong (2013) on scale development of customer value co-creation ranks second among the most influential works with 335 citations. Across four studies, they developed a second-order scale with two dimensions of customer value co-creation, that is, customer participation and customer citizenship. The former is related to first-order factors of information seeking, information sharing, responsible behavior, and personal interaction, whereas the latter is related to feedback, advocacy, helping, and tolerance. Holbrook's (2006) qualitative study, using an innovative method, ranks third with 296 citations. Using his grandfather's 60-year-old Kodachrome slides (as photographic essays) and logbook, he demonstrated the importance of fantasies, feeling, and fun as drivers of customer value and argues that these aspects cannot be explored appropriately using structured experimental and quantitative techniques. Other influential studies in this cluster are by Payne et al. (2009) and Tynan et al. (2010) with 280 and 270 citations, respectively.

Cluster 4—Measurement issues—has 10% (264) of publications and 12% (11,668) of citations, covering themes related to formative measurements, the validity of measurements, firm performances, and customer evaluations. Diamantopoulos et al.'s (2008) state-of-the-art review on formative measurements is the most cited work in this cluster with 600 citations. The article reviews a broad array of studies to demonstrate the benefits of using formative measurements, related problems, and solutions. Johnson and Grayson's (2005) study on cognitive and affective dimensions of trust ranks second with 447 citations. By grounding their conceptualization of

trust in social psychology, they demonstrated that trust has both cognitive and affective dimensions. They exhibited that although these dimensions are highly correlated, they tend to have different antecedent drivers. Netemeyer et al.'s study (2004) on the development of multifaceted customer-based brand equity ranks third with 426 citations. Using four studies, they developed a customer-based brand equity scale with four dimensions as follows: perceived quality, perceived value for the cost, uniqueness, and willingness to pay a price premium. Then, they demonstrated the internal consistency and validity of their scale across 16 different brands within six product categories. Other notable studies in this cluster are by Bruner and Kumar (2005) and Coltman et al. (2008) with 417 and 407 citations, respectively.

Cluster 5—Globalization of marketing—has 8% (216) of publications and 7% (7,025) of citations. Major themes addressed in this cluster are related to cross-cultural research, global consumer culture, young consumers, and big data. Soares et al.'s (2007) study examining Hofstede's cultural dimension in international marketing research remains the highest cited article with 262 citations. They examined different approaches to conceptualize culture in marketing studies and concluded that it is operationalized at three distinct levels, that is, nationality level, Hofstede's cultural dimensions, and individual level. The work by McCarty and Shrum (1994) ranks second, which examined the drivers of recycling solid wastes. They found that the values of individualism and self-gratification negatively affect recycling attitudes and behaviors. Sivarajah et al.'s (2017) study ranks third in this cluster with 254 citations. They addressed an increasingly emerging issue of big data analytics and provided a state-of-the-art review of its challenges and different types of big data analytics methods. Other notable studies in this cluster are by Cleveland and Laroche (2007) and Noble et al. (2009) with 230 and 187 citations, respectively.

Cluster 6—Future-oriented strategies and tools—has 7% (206) of publications and 3% (2,887) of citations, covering themes related to predictive modeling, fuzzy set analysis, incubators, and innovation. This is the latest of all clusters and has accumulated most of its citations over the past five years only. The most influential study in this cluster is by Shmueli et al. (2016) with 118 citations. They first proposed a general framework of prediction and then identified best practices for different types of predictions that are possible using partial least square models (PLS). Mas-Verdú et al.'s (2015) study on the role of business incubators in the survival of a firm remains the second most influential work with 69 citations. They recognized that incubators by themselves are not sufficient conditions for firm survival. Only firms that are sufficiently large and in manufacturing have a better survival rate with the use of incubators. Gonçalves et al.'s (2016) study on the green buying behavior with 59 citations ranks third. They demonstrated that the consumption values (functional, emotional, conditional, or social) must be present in a combination of two or more to influence green purchasing behavior effectively. Other important studies in this cluster are by Frambach et al. (2016) and Gunawan and Huarng (2015) with 49 and 47 citations, respectively.

Cluster 7—Market relationships—has 6% (158) of publications and 8% (7,518) of citations. Major themes addressed in this cluster are related to commitment, trust, and market orientation. Ritter and Gemünden's (2003) study on network competence with 371 citations is the most influential work in this cluster. Network competence is defined as a firm's ability to manage relationships over time fostered by access to resources, the relational orientation of human resources, intra-organizational communication dynamics, and corporate culture and openness. They demonstrated that firms with higher levels of network competence have better inter-organizational collaborations and innovation success. Gounaris's work (2005) with 273

citations ranks second. They demonstrated that service providers' quality of service and bonding strategies help foster trust between the service provider and their customers, who in turn demonstrate better relationships of affective commitment and less transaction-specific calculative commitment. Jaramillo et al. (2005) study with 184 citations ranks third in this cluster. They performed a meta-analysis of 25 years of research on organizational commitment and its impact on salespersons' job performance. They demonstrated that the relationships between commitment and performance are stronger for sales (vs. non-sales) employees and people from collectivist (vs. individualistic) cultures. Other influential studies in this cluster are by Lages et al. (2005) and Maignan and Ferrel (2001) with 175 and 164 citations, respectively.

## **5. *JBR*'s special versus regular issues**

Table 11 compares the national contributions of *JBR*'s SIs and RIs. Although all of the RIs authors' affiliated countries appear in *JBR*'s SIs, interestingly, countries such as Nicaragua, Laos, Bulgaria, Barbados, Cameroon, El Salvador, Kenya, Mauritius, Palestine, Rwanda, Slovakia, Syria, and Tanzania also feature in *JBR*'s SIs. Such evidence may suggest that SIs attract scholars even from such countries that are usually unrepresented in RIs of the journal. In other words, *JBR*'s SIs are more diverse and international in their intellectual content, creating more opportunities for emerging scholarship from developing nations.

\*\*\*\* Insert Table 11 about here \*\*\*\*

In terms of themes, *JBR*'s SIs are more current than RIs. Table 12 compares the popular themes covered in *JBR*'s SIs to those in RIs. Themes featured at least 15 times are listed in the table. Simultaneously, Fig. 6 visualizes the correlation among prolific themes in *JBR*'s SIs versus RIs based on the thematic occurrence, whereas Fig. 7 compares the prominent topics of *JBR*

based on their average citations. As evident in the table and the figures, *JBR*'s SIs have attracted more topics. Furthermore, based on the average publications per year (APY), denoting the degree of relevancy and hotness of *JBR* topics and themes, servitization (2018.4), FSQCA (2017.3), social media (2017.1), QCA (2016.9), virtual reality (2016.7), sustainability (2016.5), and luxury (2016.5) are among the current and evolving topics in *JBR*'s SIs.

\*\*\*\* Insert Table 12, Fig.6 and Fig.7 about here \*\*\*\*

As indicated in Fig. 6, commitment and trust co-appear in both SIs and RIs. Entrepreneurship and innovation topics dominate SIs, whereas trust and customer satisfaction, innovation and performance, absorption capacity and innovation, and branding and scale development appear more frequently in *JBR*'s RIs. Simultaneously, in terms of the influential themes depicted in Fig. 7, the majority of themes appearing in *JBR*'s SIs have influenced the broader academic domains denoted by the comparatively big-sized nodes, whereas only a few are found to be influential among RIs. Thus, it can be inferred that *JBR* published more current topics in its SIs, and such topics added immense value to academia as evident by the high number of citations.

## 6. Summary and conclusions

This bibliometric review provides an objective state-of-the-art examination of the *JBR* SIs published between 1973 and 2020. It identifies the knowledge structure that demonstrates the publications, citations, most prolific authors, affiliated institutions, and countries. In addition, it reviews the knowledge networks among articles, authors, and their affiliations emerging out of the contributions in *JBR* SIs. The first *JBR* SI in 1988 consisted of 18 scientific publications.

However, over the years, the steady growth in SIs has made *JBR* a comprehensive repository of academic excellence.

This work finds that 2016 remained the most productive year in terms of SI publications, whereas 2005 was the most impactful year across all metrics (citations, citations per publication, citations per cited publication, and *h* and *g* indices.). As for authors' contributions, Michel Laroche, affiliated with Concordia University, is the leading author in *JBR* SIs with 33 publications, followed by Kun-Huang Huarng affiliated with Feng Chia University with 25 publications. Jean-Charles William Chebat of the HEC Montréal is the top-cited author, whereas Barry J. Babin is the author with the highest average citations per cited publication. The University of Valencia and INCAE Business School are the most productive institutions in *JBR* SIs, respectively. However, in terms of citations per paper, Concordia University, the University of Alabama, and the University of Valencia are the most influential institutions, respectively. Conversely, contributions from the USA prevail by a wide margin over others like the UK, Spain, Australia, and Canada.

With regard to intellectual connections between *JBR* and other management and marketing journals, *JBR* SIs have stronger connections with the leading business and marketing journals. The most often cited journals in *JBR* SIs (knowledge inflows) between 1973 and 2020 are the *JBR (itself)*, the *Journal of Marketing*, the *Journal of Consumer Research*, and the *Journal of Marketing Research*, respectively. On the other hand, the *JBR (itself)*, *Sustainability*, and *Industrial Marketing Management*, and the *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, respectively, are the leading journals citing *JBR* SI articles (knowledge outflows) published between 1973 and 2020. Moreover, the knowledge network analyses based on co-citation, co-authorship, and bibliographic coupling demonstrate the intellectual connections among the



journals, articles, authors, affiliations, and countries, using VOSviewer and Gephi software. The graphical mapping allows the audience to visualize the contributors' intellectual connections and co-authorship networks easily and with a higher degree of understanding. Comparison of *JBR*'s SIs and RIs revealed higher academic contributions and representation of authors from more countries, especially among those emerging scholars from developing nations.

Thus, *JBR*'s SIs radiate more internationality in their intellectual outputs. Simultaneously, *JBR*'s SIs target more number of current topics that add higher academic value reflected in their rising number of publications and citations. Finally, it should be noted that the findings of this bibliometric review are based on the data collected from the Web of Science Core Collection database. Therefore, the findings may also be subject to the limitations of this database. Data from other sources may change the results, warranting further research.

**Conflict of Interest:** On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

**Funding Statement:** This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

**Data Availability Statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available in Web of Science (<https://apps.webofknowledge.com>).

## 7. References

- Baker, H. K., Kumar, S., & Pattnaik, D. (2020). Research constituents, intellectual structure, and collaboration pattern in the Journal of Forecasting: A bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Forecasting*, *n/a(n/a)*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/for.2731>
- Barley, S. R. (2015). 60th Anniversary Essay: Ruminations on How We Became a Mystery House and How We Might Get Out. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839215624886>
- Bastian, M., Heymann, S., & Jacomy, M. (2009). Gephi: An open source software for exploring and manipulating networks. *Third International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*. <https://www.aaai.org/ocs/index.php/icwsm/09/paper/view/154>.
- Bonilla, C. A., Merigó, J. M., & Torres-Abad, C. (2015). Economics in Latin America: A bibliometric analysis. *Scientometrics*, *105*(2), 1239–1252. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1747-7>
- Brodie, R. J., Ilic, A., Juric, B., & Hollebeek, L. (2013). Consumer engagement in a virtual brand community: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, *66*(1), 105–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.07.029>
- Bruner, G. C., & Kumar, A. (2005). Explaining consumer acceptance of handheld Internet devices. *Journal of Business Research*, *58*(5), 553–558. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2003.08.002>
- Cancino, C., Merig, J. M., Coronado, F., Dessouky, Y., & Dessouky, M. (2017). Forty years of Computers & Industrial Engineering. *Computers and Industrial Engineering*, *113*(C), 614–629. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2017.08.033>

- Cleveland, M., & Laroche, M. (2007). Acculturaton to the global consumer culture: Scale development and research paradigm. *Journal of Business Research*, *60*(3), 249–259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.11.006>
- Coltman, T., Devinney, T. M., Midgley, D. F., & Venaik, S. (2008). Formative versus reflective measurement models: Two applications of formative measurement. *Journal of Business Research*, *61*(12), 1250–1262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.01.013>
- Diamantopoulos, A., Riefler, P., & Roth, K. P. (2008). Advancing formative measurement models. *Journal of Business Research*, *61*(12), 1203–1218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.01.009>
- Donthu, N., Kumar, S., & Pattnaik, D. (2020). Forty-five years of Journal of Business Research: A bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, *109*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.10.039>
- Ellegaard, O., & Wallin, J. A. (2015). The bibliometric analysis of scholarly production: How great is the impact? *Scientometrics*, *105*(3), 1809–1831. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1645-z>
- Fagerberg, J., Fosaas, M., & Sapprasert, K. (2012). Innovation: Exploring the knowledge base. *Research Policy*, *41*(7), 1132–1153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2012.03.008>
- Forsythe, S. M., & Shi, B. (2003). Consumer patronage and risk perceptions in Internet shopping. *Journal of Business Research*, *56*(11), 867–875. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(01\)00273-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(01)00273-9)
- Frambach, R. T., Fiss, P. C., & Ingenbleek, P. T. M. (2016). How important is customer orientation for firm performance? A fuzzy set analysis of orientations, strategies, and

- environments. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(4), 1428–1436.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.10.120>
- Frambach, R. T., & Schillewaert, N. (2002). Organizational innovation adoption: A multi-level framework of determinants and opportunities for future research. *Journal of Business Research*, 55(2), 163–176. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(00\)00152-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(00)00152-1)
- Gonçalves, H. M., Lourenço, T. F., & Silva, G. M. (2016). Green buying behavior and the theory of consumption values: A fuzzy-set approach. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(4), 1484–1491. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.10.129>
- Gounaris, S. P. (2005). Trust and commitment influences on customer retention: Insights from business-to-business services. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(2), 126–140.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(03\)00122-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(03)00122-X)
- Gunawan, D. D., & Huarng, K.-H. (2015). Viral effects of social network and media on consumers' purchase intention. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(11), 2237–2241.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.06.004>
- Ha, S., & Stoel, L. (2009). Consumer e-shopping acceptance: Antecedents in a technology acceptance model. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(5), 565–571.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.06.016>
- Håkansson, H., & Ford, D. (2002). How should companies interact in business networks? *Journal of Business Research*, 55(2), 133–139. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(00\)00148-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(00)00148-X)
- Halinen, A., & Törnroos, J.-Å. (2005). Using case methods in the study of contemporary business networks. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(9), 1285–1297.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2004.02.001>

- Hoffman, D. L., & Holbrook, M. B. (1993). The Intellectual Structure of Consumer Research: A Bibliometric Study of Author Co-citations in the First 15 Years of the Journal of Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19(4), 505–517. JSTOR.
- Holbrook, M. B. (2006). Consumption experience, customer value, and subjective personal introspection: An illustrative photographic essay. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(6), 714–725. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.01.008>
- Jaramillo, F., Mulki, J. P., & Marshall, G. W. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational commitment and salesperson job performance: 25 years of research. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(6), 705–714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2003.10.004>
- Johnson, D., & Grayson, K. (2005). Cognitive and affective trust in service relationships. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(4), 500–507. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(03\)00140-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(03)00140-1)
- Kessler, M. M. (1963). Bibliographic coupling between scientific papers. *American Documentation*, 14(1), 10–25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.5090140103>
- Khan, M. A., Ali, I., & Ashraf, R. (2020). A Bibliometric Review of the Special Issues of Psychology & Marketing: 1984-2020. *Psychology & Marketing*, 37(9), 1144–1170. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21393>
- Kim, A. J., & Ko, E. (2012). Do social media marketing activities enhance customer equity? An empirical study of luxury fashion brand. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(10), 1480–1486. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.10.014>

- Lages, C., Lages, C. R., & Lages, L. F. (2005). The RELQUAL scale: A measure of relationship quality in export market ventures. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(8), 1040–1048. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2004.03.001>
- Landström, H., Harirchi, G., & Åström, F. (2012). Entrepreneurship: Exploring the knowledge base. *Research Policy*, 41(7), 1154–1181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2012.03.009>
- Maignan, I., & Ferrell, O. C. (2001). Antecedents and benefits of corporate citizenship: An investigation of French businesses. *Journal of Business Research*, 51(1), 37–51. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(99\)00042-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(99)00042-9)
- Martínez-López, F. J., Merigó, J. M., Gázquez-Abad, J. C., & Ruiz-Real, J. L. (2020). Industrial marketing management: Bibliometric overview since its foundation. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 84, 19–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2019.07.014>
- Martínez-López, F. J., Merigó, J. M., Valenzuela-Fernández, L., & Nicolás, C. (2018). Fifty years of the European Journal of Marketing: A bibliometric analysis. *European Journal of Marketing*, 52(1/2), 439–468. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-11-2017-0853>
- Mas-Verdú, F., Ribeiro-Soriano, D., & Roig-Tierno, N. (2015). Firm survival: The role of incubators and business characteristics. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(4), 793–796. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.11.030>
- McCarty, J. A., & Shrum, L. J. (1994). The recycling of solid wastes: Personal values, value orientations, and attitudes about recycling as antecedents of recycling behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 30(1), 53–62. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(94\)90068-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(94)90068-X)
- Mollen, A., & Wilson, H. (2010). Engagement, telepresence and interactivity in online consumer experience: Reconciling scholastic and managerial perspectives. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(9), 919–925. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.05.014>

- Morris, M., Schindehutte, M., & Allen, J. (2005). The entrepreneur's business model: Toward a unified perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(6), 726–735. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2003.11.001>
- Murphy, G. B., Trailer, J. W., & Hill, R. C. (1996). Measuring performance in entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Research*, 36(1), 15–23. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(95\)00159-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(95)00159-X)
- Nerur, S. P., Rasheed, A. A., & Natarajan, V. (2008). The intellectual structure of the strategic management field: An author co-citation analysis. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(3), 319–336. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.659>
- Netemeyer, R. G., Krishnan, B., Pullig, C., Wang, G., Yagci, M., Dean, D., Ricks, J., & Wirth, F. (2004). Developing and validating measures of facets of customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(2), 209–224. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(01\)00303-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(01)00303-4)
- Noble, S. M., Haytko, D. L., & Phillips, J. (2009). What drives college-age Generation Y consumers? *Journal of Business Research*, 62(6), 617–628. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.01.020>
- Payne, A., Storbacka, K., Frow, P., & Knox, S. (2009). Co-creating brands: Diagnosing and designing the relationship experience. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(3), 379–389. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.05.013>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, N. P., & Bachrach, D. G. (2008). Scholarly Influence in the Field of Management: A Bibliometric Analysis of the Determinants of University and Author Impact in the Management Literature in the Past Quarter Century: *Journal of Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308319533>

- Ragatz, G. L., Handfield, R. B., & Petersen, K. J. (2002). Benefits associated with supplier integration into new product development under conditions of technology uncertainty. *Journal of Business Research*, 55(5), 389–400. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(00\)00158-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(00)00158-2)
- Rialp, A., Merigó, J. M., Cancino, C. A., & Urbano, D. (2019). Twenty-five years (1992–2016) of the *International Business Review*: A bibliometric overview. *International Business Review*, 28(6), 101587. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2019.101587>
- Ritter, T., & Gemünden, H. G. (2003). Network competence: Its impact on innovation success and its antecedents. *Journal of Business Research*, 56(9), 745–755. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(01\)00259-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(01)00259-4)
- Sarin, S., Haon, C., Belkhouja, M., Mas-Tur, A., Roig-Tierno, N., Segó, T., Porter, A., Merigó, J. M., & Carley, S. (2020). Uncovering the knowledge flows and intellectual structures of research in Technological Forecasting and Social Change: A journey through history. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 160, 120210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120210>
- SCImago, n. d. (2019). *SJR - SCImago Journal & Country Rank [Portal]*. <http://www.scimagojr.com>
- Shmueli, G., Ray, S., Velasquez Estrada, J. M., & Chatla, S. B. (2016). The elephant in the room: Predictive performance of PLS models. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(10), 4552–4564. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.03.049>
- Sivarajah, U., Kamal, M. M., Irani, Z., & Weerakkody, V. (2017). Critical analysis of Big Data challenges and analytical methods. *Journal of Business Research*, 70, 263–286. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.08.001>



- Small, H. (1973). Co-citation in the scientific literature: A new measure of the relationship between two documents. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 24(4), 265–269.
- Soares, A. M., Farhangmehr, M., & Shoham, A. (2007). Hofstede's dimensions of culture in international marketing studies. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(3), 277–284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.10.018>
- Svensson, G. (2010). SSCI and its impact factors: A “prisoner's dilemma”? *European Journal of Marketing*, 44(1/2), 23–33. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090561011008583>
- Tynan, C., McKechnie, S., & Chhuon, C. (2010). Co-creating value for luxury brands. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(11), 1156–1163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.10.012>
- van Eck, N. J., & Waltman, L. (2010). Software survey: VOSviewer, a computer program for bibliometric mapping. *Scientometrics*, 84(2), 523–538. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-009-0146-3>
- van Eck, N. J., & Waltman, L. (2020). VOSviewer manual. *Leiden: Univeristeit Leiden*, 1(1), 1–53.
- Van Fleet, D. D., Ray, D. F., Bedeian, A. G., Downey, H. K., Hunt, J. G., Griffin, R. W., Dalton, D., Vecchio, R. P., Kacmar, K. M., & Feldman, D. C. (2006). The Journal of Management's First 30 Years. *Journal of Management*, 32(4), 477–506. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206306286715>
- Woodside, A. G. (1977). JBR the past and the future. *Journal of Business Research*, 5(1), 1–4. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(77\)90021-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(77)90021-2)

Yi, Y., & Gong, T. (2013). Customer value co-creation behavior: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(9), 1279–1284.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.02.026>

Zinkhan, G. M., & Leigh, T. W. (1999). Assessing the Quality Ranking of the Journal of Advertising, 1986–1997. *Journal of Advertising*, 28(2), 51–70.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1999.10673583>

\*\*\*\* Insert Appendix A and B about here \*\*\*\*