

**Conceptual articles may disrupt the field of marketing:  
Evidence from a GPT-assisted study**

**Jennifer JooYeon Lee<sup>1\*†</sup>, Hyunuk Kim<sup>2\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Department of Administrative Sciences, Metropolitan College,  
Boston University, Boston, MA 02215, USA

<sup>2</sup> Department of Management and Entrepreneurship,  
Martha and Spencer Love School of Business, Elon University, Elon, NC 27244, USA

**Abstract**

Marketing scholars have underscored the importance of conceptual articles in providing theoretical foundations and new perspectives to the field. This paper supports the argument by employing two network-based measures – the number of citations and the disruption score – and comparing them for conceptual and empirical research. With the aid of a large language model, we classify conceptual and empirical articles published in a substantial set of marketing journals. The findings reveal that conceptual research is not only more frequently cited but also has a greater disruptive impact on the field of marketing than empirical research. Our paper contributes to the understanding of how marketing articles advance knowledge through developmental approaches.

*Keywords:* Knowledge development, Conceptual articles, Empirical articles, Disruption, Large language model, GPT, Marketing bibliography

\* The authors contributed equally to this work.

† Corresponding author: [leejen@bu.edu](mailto:leejen@bu.edu)

Academic knowledge is developed, disseminated, and utilized to advance the field of marketing (AMA Task Force 1988). Scholarly publications unfold the advancement by motivating the development of new thought, facilitating the dissemination process, and impacting the constituencies, including academia and practitioners. Each of the three stages (development, dissemination, and utilization) may influence others; certain methodologies used to develop a research article may result in its efficient dissemination, in turn, impact how much the findings of a study can be generalized (i.e., external validity). Research that matters will only be found when the understanding of the three stages precedes it.

Researchers have endeavored to uncover optimal strategies for scholarly productions in marketing. Some have initiated discussions on different types of methodologies to develop an article (e.g., classification of descriptive, data-driven, empirical, and conceptual articles by MacInnis 2004). They have contributed to a structured understanding of the broad spectrum of scholarly articles. Other researchers used bibliometrics to examine how knowledge is emanated to and utilized by the readers. For instance, how well is knowledge disseminated in the field has been conventionally measured through the impact factor metrics based on citation counts (Bettencourt and Houston 2001; MacInnis 2011; Stremersch, Verniers, and Verhoef 2007; Tellis, Chandy, and Ackerman 1999).

However, the assessment of scholarly impact solely through citation counts is limited in its scope, as it primarily focuses on the three aspects: paper, journal and authorship (Tahamtan, Safipour Afshar, and Ahamdzadeh 2016). This metric often falls short in capturing a paper's potential to open new research directions. In response to this constraint, an alternative methodology has been proposed and used to measure the extent to which a paper consolidates or

disrupts a field by using the structure of citation networks (Park, Leahey, and Funk 2023; Wu, Wang, and Evans 2019).

From the preceding discussion, we aim to understand how marketing articles stimulate knowledge progression by 1) using a proprietary language model to classify marketing papers on the basis of their knowledge development methods, conceptual and empirical, and 2) analyzing the patterns of knowledge dissemination of conceptual and empirical papers with respect to how they disrupt the field differently. This paper is organized as follows. Firstly, we appraise and integrate the literature on the methodologies of knowledge development. Next, we discuss the conventional and emerging metrics for evaluating the impact of scholarly articles. Thirdly, we conduct large-scale empirical analyses, along with a rigorous validation process to support our usage of the language model. Finally, we provide the study results on the trend and value of marketing articles.

## **Literature Review**

### ***Methodologies of Knowledge Development***

Marketing articles have employed a variety of methodologies, writing styles, formats, and approaches to develop knowledge. Each article varies in its level of emphasis on theories, empirical analyses, or conceptual frameworks. MacInnis (2004) classified the research endeavors on the basis of two attributes – conceptual and empirical content – yielding four distinctive categories of marketing articles: descriptive articles, data-driven articles, empirical articles, and conceptual articles. Similarly, Stremersch, Verniers, and Verhoef (2007) categorized marketing articles focusing on their adoption of conceptual, empirical, methodological, and analytical approaches.

Among various types of research, the marketing discipline has witnessed precipitous growth in empirical methodologies. Marketing has continued to be more computationally focused, and empirical methodologies have outgrown conceptual approaches (MacInnis 2011; Rust 2006; Yadav 2010). Some researchers expressed concerns over this trend. MacInnis (2004) suspected that “our field may be developing an empirical bias, with authors, reviewers, and/or editors believing that conceptual papers are less scientific or rigorous than empirical papers.” Yadav (2010) criticized that due to the field’s focus on data and sophisticated analytical tools, there has been fragmentation within the discipline, leading to scholars' diminishing ability and interest to undertake comprehensive conceptual inquiries. Lehmann, McAlister, and Staelin (2011) also pointed out the marketing field’s growing emphasis on analytical rigor. They highlighted the potentially negative consequences of prioritizing analytical rigor over other important characteristics such as relevance, communicability, and simplicity of scholarly works. Increased complexity in the empirical analyses may be at the expense of managerial relevance, generalizability, or external validity of a study.

The significance of conceptual articles has been a long-discussed topic in the fields of marketing and business (AMA Task Force 1988; Grether 1976; MacInnis 2011; Yadav 2010). Yadav (2010) defined conceptual articles as papers primarily focusing on theoretical development without presenting data and/or analysis for purposes of theory testing. Research has shared diverse thoughts on the importance of the field’s devotion to theoretical contributions and how academic publications can contribute to conceptual advances (Hambrick 2007). MacInnis (2004) discussed the significant roles of conceptual articles in offering novel prospects and helping us move from a microscopic perspective to a macroscopic perspective. Scholars also stressed the importance of marketing discipline to create its own unique theories of market and

marketing phenomena (Stewart and Zinkhan 2006) and to suggest systematic template-based approaches to developing a conceptual paper (Jaakkola 2020). Despite the marketing group's consensus on the importance of theories, past studies identified an overall decline in the frequency of conceptual publications in the field of marketing (MacInnis 2004; Yadav 2010), possibly because of unfavorable review processes to theory-only articles (Stewart and Zinkhan 2006).

### ***Measures for Knowledge Dissemination***

The ongoing scrutiny of how articles are developed through different research methodologies calls for the measures to systematically assess their potential to be disseminated in the field. In this research, we discuss citation counts and disruption scores as the main measures to quantify the impact of conceptual articles in marketing. Our selection of the two measures is justified based on the criteria from Yadav (2010).

Yadav (2010) suggested the five criteria as a guideline to evaluate conceptual articles: exposition, theory building, potential impact, innovativeness, and validity. The author points out that while other elements can be applied in a more straightforward manner, evaluating an article's validity, potential impact and innovativeness presents substantial challenges. The judgments regarding the potential impact and the innovativeness focus on "the promise, the future potential, the problem-solving capacity, or what we might call the 'opportunity profile' of a claim" (Nickles 2006). The future orientation of these elements makes it challenging to assess conceptual articles, yet it is important for evaluating their forward-looking impacts.

Consequently, we focus on the potential impact and innovativeness elements in an effort to understand conceptual papers' potential to open new research directions. Yadav (2010)'s potential impact factor represents the scope and significance of issues in the substantive,

conceptual, and/or methodological domains that may require reassessment in light of the conceptual arguments. The innovativeness element addresses the heuristic power of a research article, which is the potential fruitfulness of the conceptual arguments presented, judged on the basis of forward-looking outcomes, such as new opportunities that could stem from these arguments. In the forthcoming sections, we first propose employing the conventional measure of citation counts to quantify the potential impact of a conceptual article. Subsequently, we adopt another measure known as the disruption score to capture the innovativeness aspect.

### ***A Conventional Metric: Citation Counts to Measure the Potential Impact***

Citation counts are often employed as useful metrics for assessing the potential impact of articles (Stremersch, Verniers, and Verhoef 2007). They are used to measure the influence of the work on the scientific community, as high-quality works will trigger more following studies than low-quality works (Bornmann and Daniel 2008). It quantifies the scientific impact of knowledge. Jaakkola and Vargo (2021) extended the discussion by classifying the typical proxies for scientific impact into citation counts, citation patterns within the discipline, citation flows across disciplines, and cross-disciplinary borrowing of theories.

The assessment of the conceptual articles' potential impact remains understudied in the field of marketing. Although a couple of prior empirical studies have examined this matter, their findings have been inconclusive. In an analysis of thirty years' worth of marketing publications, Yadav (2010) discovered that conceptual articles, relative to their numbers, account for disproportionately more citations. Conversely, Stremersch, Verniers, and Verhoef (2007) reported an insignificant impact of conceptual articles on citation counts. In our study, we adopt the conventional measure of citation counts to replicate the hypothesis tests conducted in the earlier

research. Accordingly, we set the following hypotheses to test the conceptual papers' publication and citation counts.

**Hypothesis 1:** Conceptual articles have higher citation counts than non-conceptual articles in marketing journals.

Although citation counts have the advantages of being objective and giving credit to broadly relevant papers, they are not without biases. Lehmann, McAlister, and Staelin (2011) criticized that citation counts are weighted toward topics that were relevant in the past. Citation counts also tend to favor review or new method types of papers over others and only capture direct references. Additionally, they may be subject to "game playing," where authors strategically cite the influential individuals they think, or hope, will review the paper. According to Koltun and Hafner (2021), the correlation between the h-index and recognition awards granted by the scientific community has substantially declined, which signals that citation counts no longer effectively measure the scientific reputation. Despite these limitations, citation counts continue to play a crucial role in important decisions related to hiring, promotion, reputation, funding, and institutional rankings; writing "impactful" articles is a prevailing mantra in academia (Jaakkola and Vargo 2021).

### ***An Emerging Metric: Disruption Score to Measure the Innovativeness Element***

In addition to the growing focus on impactful research, the marketing field has also recognized the need for the topics that challenge established norms and institutions (Jaakkola and Vargo 2021). Citation numbers in solitary cannot capture the distinct types of contribution, such as novelty and disruption (Wu, Wang, and Evans 2019; Wang, Zhou, and Zeng 2023). To address this gap, our research quantifies the disruptiveness of marketing articles by analyzing their citation patterns. Specifically, we adopt a variant of the *CDI* Index proposed by Funk and

Owen-Smith (2017) to reduce the disproportionate influence of highly cited papers in the calculation, which has been recently discussed in scientometrics (e.g., Bornmann et al. 2020).

On an additional note, in the discourse within the community of marketing scholars concerning research that challenges established institutions, there is an increased emphasis on conceptual works (Clark et al. 2014; MacInnis 2011; Yadav 2010), topics with higher relevance and importance (Kohli and Haenlein 2021; Reibstein, Day, and Wind 2009), and more interdisciplinary research (Moorman et al. 2019; Yadav 2018). We extend the discussion by measuring the marketing conceptual articles' ability to disrupt and further innovate the field with novel ideas.

**Hypothesis 2:** Conceptual articles have higher disruption scores than non-conceptual articles in marketing journals.

A valid classification of conceptual versus non-conceptual articles should precede the testing of the hypotheses. The following sections will discuss our classification process using GPT, as well as the validation process to support the use of this tool.

## **Methods**

### ***Using GPT to Identify Conceptual Articles***

GPT has great potentials for text annotation tasks as its performance is comparable to human experts and crowd workers, as evidenced in previous studies on identifying hate speeches (Huang, Kwak, and An 2023), classifying political affiliations from Twitter posts (Törnberg, 2023), and detecting the semantic characteristics of Twitter posts (Gilardi, Alizadeh, and Kubli 2023). We used GPT-3.5-Turbo-0301 to classify publications into conceptual and empirical articles based on the titles and abstracts. The temperature of GPT-3.5-Turbo-0301 is set to 0 to get the most deterministic outcomes. We borrowed the definitions of conceptual and empirical



articles from the editorial guidelines of the Journal of Marketing<sup>1</sup> to write the GPT query as below. “%s” in the query is the place for texts.

There are two types of articles published in the Journal of Marketing as below.

1. Conceptual articles: These types of articles make their contributions through theoretical arguments that introduce new topics, new constructs, new relationships, new theories, and even new paradigms for the field.

2. Empirical articles: Empirical articles use organized observations about marketing-relevant data of any type to offer important insights to the marketing discipline.

Based on the definitions above, classify an academic article with title “%s” and abstract “%s” into either the conceptual category or the empirical category.

Your response will be in a format “This article is in the [Category] because [Reasons]”.

To ensure whether GPT can be used to identify the article types, we compared GPT responses with the well-known lists of conceptual and empirical articles from the marketing journals. The overall accuracy of capturing conceptual articles is found to be over 90% across all three validation methods below. Although GPT does not attain the cognitive level of marketing scholars, our validations underscore its utility as an efficient tool for this annotation task.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ama.org/editorial-guidelines-journal-of-marketing/>

*Validation 1: Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science (JAMS) publications*

JAMS provides the labels for their articles relevant to this research:

“Conceptual/Theoretical Paper” and “Original Empirical Research”. From the five issues of JAMS from 2018 to 2022, we collected the titles and abstracts of 28 conceptual/theoretical papers and 214 original empirical research papers. GPT-3.5-Turbo-0301 correctly classified 26 conceptual/theoretical papers (92.9%) and 194 empirical research papers (90.7%).

*Validation 2: AMS Review publications*

AMS Review is a journal specialized in conceptual contributions to the field of marketing. For 115 publications with the label of “Theory/Conceptual” in all issues, GPT-3.5-Turbo-0301 correctly classified 111 papers (96.5%) as conceptual articles.

*Validation 3: GPT classifications for the exemplar conceptual articles from Yadav (2010)*

Out of 23 exemplar conceptual articles are listed in the paper titled “The Decline of Conceptual Articles and Implications for Knowledge Development” by Yadav (2010), GPT-3.5-Turbo-0301 correctly classified 22 articles as conceptual articles (95.7%).

***Data***

We collected the bibliographic information (title, abstract, references, publication year, number of authors) of the academic articles published in 96 journals. The journals are selected if they are in the first and second quartiles of Scimago journal ranking (Category ID: 1406) and are indexed in Web of Science 2022


(<https://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php?category=1406&wos=true>). We used the Dimensions database, which is a large scholarly database covering diverse disciplines (Herzog, Hook, and Konkiel 2020). Six journals (‘American Review of Public Administration’, ‘Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences’, ‘International Journal of Design’, ‘International

Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research’, ‘Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management’, and ‘Qualitative Market Research’), which had no papers after 2023 in the Dimensions database, were excluded to limit our analyses to active and data-accessible marketing journals. Next, we created a citation network by connecting the papers published in the selected 90 journals and their references published in the same list of journals. Each link has a direction from a paper’s reference to the paper. For example, if a paper  $i$  has three references  $r_1, r_2, r_3$ , where  $r_2, r_3$  were published in any of the selected journals, the two links  $r_2 \rightarrow i$  and  $r_3 \rightarrow i$  are created. Our citation network consists of 107,952 papers from 88 journals and 1,544,040 links.

### ***Disruption Measure***

To quantify the extent to which academic articles disrupt the field of marketing and lead subsequent research, we calculated their disruption scores by adopting a network-based measure suggested as the ‘*CDt Index*’ (referred to as  $D$  in this paper) by Funk and Owen-Smith (2017) for patents, which was later used by Wu, Wang, and Evans (2019) for academic papers.  $D_i$ , the disruption score of an article  $i$ , is defined as  $(N_F - N_B)/(N_F + N_B + N_R)$  where  $N_F$  is the number of articles citing only  $i$ ,  $N_B$  is the number of articles citing both  $i$  and  $i$ ’s references, and  $N_R$  is the number of articles citing only  $i$ ’s references. The higher an article’s  $D$  is, the more the article disrupts the existing line of research. Figure 1 shows two examples. In the left network of Figure 1,  $N_F$  is 3 ( $p_1, p_2, p_3$ ),  $N_R$  is 1 ( $p_4$ ), and  $N_B$  is 0, leading  $D_i$  to be 0.75. In the right network of Figure 1,  $N_F$  is 0,  $N_R$  is 0, and  $N_B$  is 4 ( $p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4$ ), leading  $D_i$  to be -1.

Figure 1: Examples of the disruption scores of an article  $i$ . The node labeled  $r$  indicates an article cited by  $i$ , and the node labeled  $p$  indicates an article citing  $i$  or  $i$ 's references.



This index well captures the disruptive entities in a network but is not suitable for some disciplines where many research articles tend to rely on some highly cited, seminal articles. The field of marketing is not an exception. For instance, Thaler (1985)'s seminal work on mental accounting, which was known as the most cited article in Marketing Science as of 2002 (Shugan 2002), continued to gain attention in the field and maintained its position as the second most cited article in the year of 2017 when Thaler received the Nobel Prize in Economics (Sudhir 2017). In such areas where emerging articles tend to cite strong, seminal articles, the disruption score of a new article could be low even if it contains disruptive knowledge. To address this issue, we adopted a variant proposed by Bornmann et al. (2020), which applies a threshold  $l$  to consider  $i$ 's references cited at least  $l$  times when obtaining  $N_B$ . We term this variant  $N_B^l$ , and  $D^l$  is equal to  $(N_F - N_B^l)/(N_F + N_B^l + N_R)$ . If  $l$  is set to 2 for the network on the right hand side of Figure 1, the disruption score becomes 0 as  $N_F$  is 1 ( $p_2$ ),  $N_R$  is 1 ( $p_4$ ), and  $N_B^l$  is 1 ( $p_1$ ). Bornmann et al. (2020) recommended  $l = 5$ , and we report results for  $l = 2, 3, 5$ .

### ***Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) Regressions***

We conducted regression analyses to validate our hypotheses for 17,603 papers 1) having more than 10 outgoing links (referred to as the number of marketing references) and more than 10 incoming links (referred to as the number of marketing citations) in the directed network; 2) published between 1991 and 2020; and 3) of which abstract has more than 500 characters (including whitespaces). The first filtering condition is for removing the cases of extreme disruption scores due to a small set of marketing references and citations. The second condition is for reducing the biases due to seminal papers initiating the field of marketing or recent papers not enough being cited yet. The third condition is for securing sufficient texts to be fed into GPT for the classification of the articles.

GPT classified 3,943 articles as conceptual and 13,643 as empirical, and identified 17 articles falling outside the realms of conceptual and empirical classifications. While acknowledging that the above steps may not perfectly remove the noises in the data, we believe that GPT complements our approach to a considerable extent. For the subsequent analyses, we only used the articles that GPT classified as conceptual or empirical articles.

We set the dependent variables as the number of marketing citations and disruption scores, and the independent variables as the binary indicator of whether an article is conceptual (referred to as 'Conceptual' in regression tables), publication year group (1991-1995, 1996-2000, 2001-2005, 2006-2010, 2011-2015, 2016-2020), and the number of authors. The publication year group is included to check if older articles tend to have higher numbers of marketing citations and if the declining trend of disruptive knowledge over time (Park et al. 2023) is also found in the field of marketing. The number of authors is included to check if large teams are associated with the articles with higher numbers of marketing citations and if small teams are more likely to

conduct disruptive research as Wu, Wang, and Evans (2019) found in the science and technology disciplines.

## Results

### *The Citation Impact of Conceptual Articles*

Three OLS regression models (Table 1) confirm that conceptual articles tend to have higher citations than empirical articles in the field of marketing, supporting Hypothesis 1. Specifically, Model 1 shows that the academic articles published earlier were cited more compared to the recent articles. In Model 2, the number of authors is significant, but adding this variable does not increase the adjusted R-squared. Interestingly, according to Model 3, conceptual articles are likely to be cited significantly higher than empirical articles in general. The coefficient of ‘Conceptual’ is also not negligible when explaining the number of marketing citations.

Table 1: The OLS regressions explaining the number of marketing citations with publication year groups, the number of authors, and a binary indicator of whether an article is conceptual.

	Dependent Variable: The Number of Marketing Citations					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Coefficient (SE)	<i>p</i>	Coefficient (SE)	<i>p</i>	Coefficient (SE)	<i>p</i>
Intercept	83.281 (3.040)	< .001	80.611 (3.154)	< .001	77.575 (3.162)	< .001
1996-2000	-16.369 (3.638)	< .001	-16.477 (3.637)	< .001	-16.268 (3.628)	< .001
2001-2005	-19.879 (3.370)	< .001	-20.159 (3.371)	< .001	-19.923 (3.362)	< .001
2006-2010	-39.257 (3.210)	< .001	-39.729 (3.213)	< .001	-39.353 (3.205)	< .001
2011-2015	-49.762 (3.162)	< .001	-50.464 (3.169)	< .001	-50.250 (3.161)	< .001
2016-2020	-57.451 (3.149)	< .001	-58.534 (3.167)	< .001	-58.420 (3.159)	< .001

# of Authors			1.254 (0.397)	.002	1.411 (0.396)	< .001
Conceptual (Binary)					10.723 (1.120)	< .001
# of Observations	17,603		17,603		17,603	
Adjusted R-squared	.054		.054		.059	

### *The Disruptiveness of Conceptual Articles*

As we hypothesized, conceptual articles impact the marketing academia not just by being frequently cited by the subsequent papers, but by opening new branches of research (Hypothesis 2 supported). We ran OLS regressions for  $D^2$ ,  $D^3$ , and  $D^5$  with the same independent variables (Table 2).

Table 2: The OLS regressions explaining  $D^2$ ,  $D^3$ , and  $D^5$  with publication year groups, the number of authors, and a binary indicator of whether an article is conceptual.

	Dependent Variable					
	$D^2$		$D^3$		$D^5$	
	Coefficient (SE)	$p$	Coefficient (SE)	$p$	Coefficient (SE)	$p$
Intercept	.0019 (.0007)	.007	.0077 (.0007)	< .001	.0134 (.0008)	< .001
1996-2000	.0025 (.0008)	.003	.0011 (.0009)	.216	-.0005 (.0009)	.586
2001-2005	.0006 (.0008)	.423	-.0009 (.0008)	.236	-.0027 (.0008)	.001
2006-2010	-.0026 (.0007)	< .001	-.0052 (.0008)	< .001	-.0077 (.0008)	< .001
2011-2015	-.0034 (.0007)	< .001	-.0068 (.0007)	< .001	-.0100 (.0008)	< .001
2016-2020	-.0030 (.0007)	< .001	-.0071 (.0007)	< .001	-.0110 (.0008)	< .001
# of Authors	-.0001 (.0001)	.389	-.0001 (.0001)	.426	-.0001 (.0001)	.553
Conceptual (Binary)	.0004 (.0003)	.079	.0013 (.0003)	< .001	.0021 (.0003)	< .001
# of Observations	17,603		17,603		17,603	
Adjusted R-squared	.025		.031		.051	

For  $D^2$ , which is still sensitive to highly cited papers, ‘Conceptual’ is marginally significant. On the other hand, for  $D^3$  and  $D^5$ , ‘Conceptual’ becomes significant at the level of 0.001. Similar to the Park et al. (2023)’s finding of the decline in disruptive knowledge over time in the science and technology fields, the coefficients of the publication year groups are found to decrease over time, according to the models for  $D^3$  and  $D^5$ . The number of authors is not significant, which is unlike the regression results for the number of marketing citations as presented in Table 1.

## **Conclusion**

### ***Discussion***

Our findings, as observed in marketing publications, align with the conclusions drawn by Park et al. (2023) in their study of the science and technology fields; Disruptive research tends to decline over time, and the marketing field is no exception. More precisely, our research indicates that marketing conceptual articles exhibit a higher level of disruptiveness compared to the empirical ones. Recognizing the potential of conceptual articles to disrupt the marketing field, we suggest the imperative need to develop and disseminate conceptual articles as a means to advance academia.

There are two hurdles to attaining academic disruption, especially considering the surging quantity of scholarly publications: 1) new publications’ limited chance against the seminal papers, and 2) conceptual papers’ challenges in the presence of empirical overemphasis. Firstly, the overall increasing number of publications can slow down the development and recognition of new ideas, which may be exacerbated as citations are more likely to be made to the seminal



papers published in the earlier years (Chu and Evans 2021). This tendency is also evidenced in our study, which shows the academic articles published earlier were cited more compared to the recent articles. Secondly, previous research has presented concerns over the outgrowth of empirical methodologies in marketing (MacInnis 2011; Rust 2006; Yadav 2010). Our data also shows that the empirical articles have been more prevalent than conceptual articles in terms of publication quantity. This trend may further limit the advancement of conceptual publications. It is worthwhile to note that despite this imbalanced number of publications, we find that conceptual articles are cited more frequently than empirical articles. Considering that the number of citations (regardless of their development methodology) has consistently declined over time, conceptual papers' ability to draw future researchers' attention demonstrates their capability to impact the field.

The field's continued endeavor to highlight the value of new conceptual articles may help us address such considerations. For instance, we suggest the leading academic societies publish special issues on conceptual ideas or create niche journals or venues specialized in conceptual articles, such as AMS Review, a journal that is positioned to focus exclusively on conceptual contributions. By doing so, we can potentially broaden the scope of the field of marketing and clear some impediments to academic disruptions.

### ***Theoretical and Practical Implications***

As discussed earlier, academic knowledge is developed, disseminated, and utilized to advance the field (AMA Task Force 1988). The three stages form an interconnected relationship where each stage dynamically influences the others. For instance, how knowledge is developed may impact how efficiently the idea is disseminated in the field, which may further determine if the idea is practically utilized by the recipients.

The present research contributes to theory by advancing the understanding of the earlier parts of this knowledge process: development and dissemination of knowledge. Our findings yield implications for two of the knowledge development methodologies (i.e., conceptual and empirical) and the two measures to assess the potential of knowledge dissemination (i.e., citation impact and disruption score). Specifically, we contribute to the marketing academia by expanding the previous discussions on the value of conceptual papers (e.g., MacInnis 2004; Yadav 2010). We extend the previous findings on the conceptual papers' citation impact by collecting additional data and identifying the articles published in the recent decade. Moreover, our practical implications for marketing researchers include an application of the novel metric to measure the conceptual papers' potential to disrupt the field. Further discussion on the disruption score may contribute to the marketing researchers' recognition of the significance of publishing innovative and groundbreaking research. Additionally, we promote the practical usage of the emerging GPT tool to efficiently classify a large set of data. Our three-stage validation process also provides a robust foundation for future GPT-based practices to build upon.

### ***Limitations and Future Research***

We discuss several limitations of the present research. Firstly, our research is limited in providing implications for the last part of the knowledge process, the utilization stage. This stage relates to scholars' motivation to conduct research that matters and research that influences society. Extending our investigation of the preceding two stages of the knowledge process, we call for further academic discussion on the following important and interrelated topics on knowledge utilization: the external validity of the research methods and the influences of academicians on marketing practitioners. Externally valid research findings can be easily generalized to a broader research context, including other situations, settings, businesses, and

people. Consequently, the studies that are applicable outside of the academic context can influence the industry practitioners' decision-making. A well-developed publication should not only be efficiently disseminated within the academic field but also be generalizable outside of the research context, further benefiting the non-academic practitioners.

It is worth noting that Vargo and Koskela-Huotari (2020) raised a potential issue regarding the conceptual articles' limited ability to provide practical impact. They state that "this dearth of conceptual and theoretical articles is leading to a situation in which marketing is becoming characterized as a theory-importing-only discipline and increasingly marginalized," partially due to "conceptual articles not being adequately practical." They also add that "the contributions of conceptual-only articles must rest on their ability to compellingly connect and synthesize theory from the literature with problems to be solved, both theoretical and practical."

Accordingly, we suggest further research on conceptual marketing papers' potential to produce knowledge to solve real-life, practical problems, or to make informed decisions. One possible direction is to investigate the academic citation network of business-related industry patents.

Secondly, the methodology employed in the present study comes with inherent limitations. To start, identifying conceptual articles is not a trivial task. Human annotators may read the full texts and determine whether an article is developed through conceptual approaches. While their decisions may be credible, it demands a significant investment of time and effort. On the contrary, employing large language models expedites the process compared to the manual annotation but may come at the expense of accuracy.

To enhance the efficacy of the large language models, it is recommended for future research to undertake further comprehensive validations, supplementing the three-stage validations conducted in the present study. One viable strategy is to collaborate with marketing scholars to

examine the consistency among experts' opinions and their alignment with the outcomes from the large language models.

These methodological limitations, however, are expected to ease over time; As the capabilities of the large language models continue to evolve, the divergence between human judgment and AI-driven decisions is expected to narrow. This evolution holds the promise of refining our ability to accurately identify conceptual articles.

Finally, our results yield limited insights into the impact of the number of authors on citation counts and disruption scores. Authors typically affiliate themselves with one or more scientific communities, where they regularly communicate their research findings with peers who share similar research interests. Larger communities, for example, may extensively reference the papers circulated within their society compared to those from other communities. Accordingly, we suggest future research to break down citations by various factors to gain a nuanced understanding of the citation impact of conceptual articles. Factors such as academic and social connections (Zingg, Nanumyan, and Schweitzer 2020) and research topics (Sjögårde and Didegah 2022) are suggested for consideration in this decomposition process.

### **Conflict of Interest**

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare that are relevant to this article.

### **Acknowledgement**

This paper was written using data obtained on January 10, 2024, from Digital Science's Dimensions platform, available at <https://app.dimensions.ai>.

## References

- AMA Task Force on the Development of Marketing Thought (1988), "Developing, disseminating, and utilizing marketing knowledge," *Journal of Marketing*, 52 (4), 1-25.
- Bettencourt, Lance A. and Mark B. Houston (2001), "The impact of article method type and subject area on article citations and reference diversity in JM, JMR, and JCR," *Marketing Letters*, 12, 327-340.
- Bornmann, Lutz and Hans-Dieter Daniel (2008), "What do citation counts measure? A review of studies on citing behavior," *Journal of Documentation*, 64 (1), 45-80.
- Bornmann, Lutz, Sitaram Devarakonda, Alexander Tekles, and George Chacko (2020), "Are disruption index indicators convergently valid? The comparison of several indicator variants with assessments by peers," *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1 (3), 1242-1259.
- Chu, Johan SG and James A. Evans (2021), "Slowed canonical progress in large fields of science," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118 (41), e2021636118.
- Clark, Terry, Thomas Martin Key, Monica Hodis, and Daniel Rajaratnam (2014), "The intellectual ecology of mainstream marketing research: an inquiry into the place of marketing in the family of business disciplines," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 42, 223-241.
- Funk, Russell J. and Jason Owen-Smith (2017), "A dynamic network measure of technological change," *Management Science*, 63 (3), 791-817.
- Gilardi, Fabrizio, Meysam Alizadeh, and Maël Kubli (2023), "ChatGPT outperforms crowd-workers for text-annotation tasks," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120 (30), e2305016120.
- Grether, Ewald T. (1976), "The first forty years," *Journal of Marketing*, 40 (3), 63-69.

- Hambrick, Donald C. (2007), "The field of management's devotion to theory: Too much of a good thing?" *Academy of Management Journal*, 50 (6), 1346-1352.
- Herzog, Christian, Daniel Hook, and Stacy Konkiel (2020), "Dimensions: Bringing down barriers between scientometricians and data," *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1 (1), 387-395.
- Huang, Fan, Haewoon Kwak, and Jisun An (2023), "Is ChatGPT better than Human Annotators? Potential and Limitations of ChatGPT in Explaining Implicit Hate Speech," In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*, 294-297.
- Jaakkola, Elina (2020), "Designing conceptual articles: four approaches," *AMS Review*, 10 (1-2), 18-26.
- Jaakkola, Elina and Stephen L. Vargo (2021), "Assessing and enhancing the impact potential of marketing articles," *AMS Review*, 11 (3-4), 407-415.
- Kohli, Ajay K. and Michael Haenlein (2021), "Factors affecting the study of important marketing issues: Additional thoughts and clarifications," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 38 (1), 29-31.
- Koltun, Vladlen and David Hafner (2021), "The h-index is no longer an effective correlate of scientific reputation," *PLOS ONE*, 16 (6), e0253397.
- Lehmann, Donald R., Leigh McAlister, and Richard Staelin (2011), "Sophistication in research in marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, 75 (4), 155-165.
- MacInnis, Deborah J. (2004), "Where have all the papers gone? Reflections on the decline of conceptual articles," *Association for Consumer Research Newsletter*, 1, 1-3.
- MacInnis, Deborah J. (2011), "A framework for conceptual contributions in marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, 75 (4), 136-154.

- Moorman, Christine, Harald J. van Heerde, C. Page Moreau, and Robert W. Palmatier (2019), "Challenging the boundaries of marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, 83 (5), 1-4.
- Nickles, Thomas (2006), "Heuristic appraisal: Context of discovery or justification?" in *Revisiting discovery and justification: Historical and philosophical perspectives on the context distinction*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 159-182.
- Park, Michael, Erin Leahey, and Russell J. Funk (2023), "Papers and patents are becoming less disruptive over time," *Nature*, 613 (7942), 138-144.
- Priem, Jason, Heather Piwowar, and Richard Orr (2022), "OpenAlex: A fully-open index of scholarly works, authors, venues, institutions, and concepts," *arXiv Preprint*, arXiv:2205.01833.
- Reibstein, David J., George Day, and Jerry Wind (2009), "Guest editorial: is marketing academia losing its way?" *Journal of Marketing*, 73 (4), 1-3.
- Rust, Roland T. (2006), "From the editor: the maturation of marketing as an academic discipline," *Journal of Marketing*, 70 (3), 1-2.
- Shugan, S. M. (2002), "The mission of marketing science," *Marketing Science*, 21(1), 1-13.
- Sjögårde, Peter and Fereshteh Didegah (2022), "The association between topic growth and citation impact of research publications," *Scientometrics*, 127 (4), 1903-1921.
- Stewart, David W. and George M. Zinkhan (2006), "Enhancing marketing theory in academic research," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34, 477-480.
- Stremersch, Stefan, Isabel Verniers, and Peter C. Verhoef (2007), "The quest for citations: Drivers of article impact," *Journal of Marketing*, 71 (3), 171-193.
- Sudhir, K. (2017), "Congratulations to Richard Thaler for winning the Nobel Prize in Economics," *Marketing Science*, 36(6), 813-814.

- Tahamtan, Iman, Askar Safipour Afshar, and Khadijeh Ahamdzadeh (2016), "Factors affecting number of citations: a comprehensive review of the literature," *Scientometrics*, 107, 1195-1225.
- Tellis, Gerard J., Rajesh K. Chandy, and David S. Ackerman (1999), "In search of diversity: The record of major marketing journals," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36 (1), 120-131.
- Törnberg, Petter (2023), "ChatGPT-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political twitter messages with zero-shot learning," *arXiv Preprint*, arXiv:2304.06588.
- Vargo, Stephen L. and Kaisa Koskela-Huotari (2020), "Advancing conceptual-only articles in marketing," *AMS Review*, 10, 1-5.
- Wang, Ruijie, Yuhao Zhou, and An Zeng (2023), "Evaluating scientists by citation and disruption of their representative works," *Scientometrics*, 128 (3), 1689-1710.
- Wu, Lingfei, Dashun Wang, and James A. Evans (2019), "Large teams develop and small teams disrupt science and technology," *Nature*, 566 (7744), 378-382.
- Yadav, Manjit S. (2010), "The decline of conceptual articles and implications for knowledge development," *Journal of Marketing*, 74 (1), 1-19.
- Yadav, Manjit S. (2018), "Making emerging phenomena a research priority," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 46, 361-365.
- Zingg, Christian, Vahan Nanumyan, and Frank Schweitzer (2020), "Citations driven by social connections? A multi-layer representation of coauthorship networks," *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1 (4), 1493-1509.