MARKETING
ZFP – Journal of Research and Management

Guidelines for Authors

I. General Information

1. Submitting a paper to *Marketing ZFP – Journal of Research and Management* implies that the paper contains the author's original, unpublished work and that it is not submitted for publication elsewhere (work which has so far only been published in abstract form may be submitted).
2. Manuscripts must be written in British English.
3. Authors submitting papers that do not meet the guidelines outlined below (see II.) will be requested to revise their manuscript before the review process takes place.
4. Papers can be submitted as **Research Articles**, **Research Notes**, **Forum Articles** or as **Hybrid Registered Reports**. Research Articles should provide a relevant and significant contribution to marketing theory and practice. Manuscripts designated as Research Articles should not **exceed 9,000 words** including references and footnotes. Research Notes and Forum Articles include commentaries on published papers or current issues as well as short reports on replications or new (methodological) applications. Papers in this area should **not exceed 6,000 words**.

Research Articles	Forum Articles	Research Notes	Hybrid Registered Reports[1]
■ Scientific, theory based and mostly empirical ■ Innovative ■ Highest level	■ Controversy topics ■ Statements, Discussion ■ Illustrating cases ■ Useful for famous researchers	■ State of the Art-Articles ■ New topics, overviews for practice ■ Clear, good understandable ■ Textbook character, literature reviews	■ Qualitative or quantitative ■ Initially without empirical results ■ Additional submission option we try out as the first marketing journal.
Profile of the *Marketing ZFP – JRM*	Addition, Stimulations, Platform	Service	Service
Review	Review by the editor possible.	Review	Two reviews

*Notes: * Additional information and additional guidelines for this submission option at the end of this document.*

5. Submit your manuscript and corresponding file(s) by e-mail (**Word.doc/.docx document**) to the **editor of the journal**: editor@marketing-zfp.de (Prof. Dr. Prof. h.c. Bernhard Swoboda).

II. Manuscript Preparation

1. *General format:* Use Times New Roman font, 12-point, 12 pt-spaced, and allow margins of 2.5 cm (1 inch) on all four sides (see the "sample for authors" at the homepage). Endnotes may be used. Do not insert hyphens for syllable divisions (use automatic syllable division).
2. *First page:* The first page should contain the following information:
   (a) manuscript title,
   (b) name, permanent affiliation(s) and present position(s) of the author(s), and
   (c) complete address, including telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address. For manuscripts with multiple authors, please indicate the author responsible for correspondence.
3. *Second page:* The second page should provide (a) the manuscript title (**without author's name**), (b) an abstract (max. 150 words), and (c) up to five keywords.
4. *Third page*: This page contains an Executive Summary (400–600 words), which gives an overview of the most important results and management implications. The Executive Summary should be comprehensible for a wider audience. Particularly, readers from a management background without special methodological knowledge should be able to understand the main idea of the article. *This page is required after acceptance of the manuscript.*
   The Executive Summary can follow the guidelines of the *Journal of Marketing* (see currently: www.ama.org/publications/JournalOfMarketing/Pages/About.aspx).

MARKETING
ZFP – Journal of Research and Management

5. *Text:* The text should be clearly structured and didactically outlined: 1., 2., 2.1., 2.1.1., 2.1.2., 2.2., 3., 3.1. Subheadings are possible: use bold headings to indicate the paragraphs. Try to avoid accentuations in the text.
   If the manuscript contains hypotheses, please number them consecutively. Use abbreviations in the text: *H1*, *H2*. Hypotheses have the following format (indentation .75 cm; *italics*):
   H1: The more positively consumers evaluate A_{ad}*, the more positively consumers evaluate* A_b.
6. *Abbreviations* such as e. g., et al. have a protected blank (caps lock key + Ctrl + space bar). The same applies for % and § signs but not for algebraic signs or „/“.
7. *Tables:* Tables are numbered consecutively in accordance with their appearance in the text. Each table has a title below it, which should be centred. The word “Table” (abbreviated as “*Tab*.” in the text) and the corresponding number should appear in *italics* in the legend and references within the text (e. g., *Tab. 5*). Abbreviations in tables should be defined in remarks. This includes abbreviates for significance levels (see published manuscripts as examples).

	Unit used for calculating the unit price		Price-level perception		Quality perception		Purchase intention	
	small	large	small	large	small	large	small	large
Salami	100 g	1 kg	4.35	4.99	3.98	4.19	3.58	3.24
	(*n* = 84)	(*n* = 67)	(1.47)	(1.52)	(1.22)	(1.21)	(1.44)	(1.50)
Tomatoes	100 g	1 kg	2.93	3.07	3.73	3.90	4.73	4.65
	(*n* = 84)	(*n* = 67)	(.93)	(.90)	(1.06)	(1.08)	(.84)	(.92)
Straw-	100 g	1 kg	3.88	4.72	3.56	3.90	3.81	3.26
berry jam	(*n* = 48)	(*n* = 49)	(1.33)	(1.48)	(.94)	(1.50)	(1.42)	(1.39)
Wall paint	100 ml	1 liter	3.28	3.84	3.00	3.39	3.86	3.56
	(*n* = 48)	(*n* = 49)	(1.31)	(1.57)	(1.24)	(.86)	(1.38)	(1.38)

Notes: Scale ranges from 1 = cheap to 7 = expensive, 1 = low to 7 = high quality, and 1 = low to 7 = high purchase intention. Standard deviations in parentheses. *** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; † $p < .10$; ns = not significant.

Tab. 1: Effect of small and large units used for calculating unit prices on price-level …

8. *Figures:* Figures (abbreviated as “*Fig*.”) should follow the same format as for tables. Figures need to be embedded in the text and submitted in separate PowerPoint file. Use the following fonts in your illustration: Times New Roman and Symbol. Please make sure that any text is adequately sized and the figure is interpretable in b/w print. If tables or figures appear in the appendix, they should be numbered separately and consecutively as *Tab. A1*, *Tab. A2* etc. In a first reference add „see appendix“, e. g. (see *Fig. A1* in the appendix).
9. *Mathematical notation:* Equations should be centred on the page and numbered consecutively. The number should be typed in parentheses flush with the left margin. Do not place a zero in front of any decimal points (.37). Leave one space on either side of operational signs, e. g. $p < .05$; $F = 2.42$. Mathematical notations (e. g. the sample size *n* or the correlation coefficient *r*) should appear in *italics*.
10. *Notes:* Notes should be kept to a minimum (e. g., below result tables). If notes are unavoidable in the text (e. g., extensive citation, explanations about the procedure, quotations that do not belong in the text), these should be listed at the end of the document (before the references) according to their numerical order (e. g. “[3] Model parameters have been estimated using the MLM estimator implemented in Mplus 6; Muthén and Muthén 2010”). Within the text itself, notes should be indicated only by sequential numbering in square brackets.
11. *Reference citations within the text*
    i. References should follow the citation style of the Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science that is supported by the most common citation-software (see the following examples). All cited sources in the text are specified in the reference list.

ii. *Indirect citation:* References should include the author's last name and year of publication, enclosed in parentheses, e. g. (Hair et al. 2014). If the author's name is used within the sentence, it is sufficient to provide the year of publication in parentheses, e. g. (Hüttl and Gierl (2012) distinguish between ...). If a particular page or sections (required for books) are cited please provide this information within the parentheses, e. g. (Hair et al. 2010, p. 69 or Hair et al. 2014, pp. 78–80). For up to two authors separate the names using the word "and", e. g. (Hüttl and Gierl 2012). For German sources use "S" and "und". For more than two authors, use the first author's name followed by "et al.", e. g. (Sattler et al. 2010). A list of citations is ordered alphabetically, where publications are separated by semicolons, e. g. (Bemmaor and Wagner 2000; Hüttl and Gierl 2012; Sattler et al. 2010). When referring to multiple publications from the same author that were published in the same year, the reference should be cited using lower case letters to distinguish between the two publications, e. g. (Koenigstorfer and Groeppel-Klein 2012a; 2012b; please use „and" when one source is English).

iii. *Direct citation:* Direct citations are enclosed in quotation marks and should be referenced at the end of the citation, e. g. "The perceived quality of the parent brand and its perceived fit with the extension category might largely determine consumers' extension product evaluations, and dominate the effects of advertising at early stages of the product's life cycle" (Sattler et al. 2010, p. 326).

12. *Reference list*: A complete list of all the references used in the text should be provided at the end of the document and listed in alphabetical order of authors' names (10 pt and capitalization in all English references).

    i. Books with single or multiple authors

    Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 7th Ed., New York: Pearson.

    ii. Articles in books with single or multiple authors

    Groeppel-Klein, A. (2014). The Problem of Consumer Sovereignty and the Convept of Consumer Democracy. In C. Scholz, & J. Zentes (Eds.), *Beyond Substainability*, Baden-Baden: Nomos, 109–121.

    iii. Articles in journals with single or multiple authors

    Bemmaor, A. C., & Wagner, U. (2000). A Multiple-Item Model of Paired Comparisons - Separating Chance from Latent Preference. *Journal of Marketing Research* 37(4), 514–524.

    Hüttl, V., & Gierl, H. (2012). Visual Art in Advertising: The Effects of Utilitarian vs. Hedonic Product Positioning and Price Information. *Marketing Letters*, 23(3), 893–904.

    Sattler, H., Völckner, F., Riediger, C., & Ringle,C. (2010). The Impact of Brand Extension Success Factors on Brand Extension Price Premium. *International Journal of Research in Marketing,* 27(4), 319–328.

    iv. Two or more publications of the same author(s) with the same publication date

    Koenigstorfer, J., & Groeppel-Klein, A. (2012a). Consumer Acceptance of the Mobile Internet. *Marketing Letters*, 23(4), 917–928.

    Koenigstorfer, J., & Groeppel-Klein, A. (2012b). Wahrnehmungs- und Kaufverhaltenswirkungen von Nährwertkennzeichnungen auf Lebensmitteln. *Marketing ZFP – Journal of Research and Management*, 34(3), 213–226.

    v. Publications of the same author but different years of publications have to be listed chronologically.

    Swoboda, B., & Olejnik, E. (2013). A Taxonomy of Small- and Medium-Sized International Family Firms. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship,* 11(2), 130–157.

    Swoboda, B., & Olejnik, E. (2016). Linking Processes and Dynamic Capabilities of International SMEs: The Mediating Effect of International Entrepreneurial Orientation. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 54(1), 139–161.

If an author has different co-authors in different publications, the references must be listed according to the number of co-authors (1) and alphabetical (2).

Swoboda, B., & Elsner, S. (2013). Transferring the Retail Format Successfully into Foreign Countries. *Journal of International Marketing,* 21(1), 81–109.

Swoboda, B., Elsner, S., & Morschett, D. (2014). Preferences and Performance of International Strategies in Retail Sectors: An Empirical Study. *Long Range Planning,* 47(4), 319–336.

Swoboda, B., Elsner, S., & Olejnik, E. (2015). How do Past Mode Choices Influence Subsequent Entry? A Study on the Boundary Conditions of Preferred Entry Modes of Retail Firms. *International Business Review, 24*(3), 506–517.

Swoboda, B., Puchert, C., & Morschett, D. (2015). Explaining the Differing Effects of Corporate Reputation Across Nations: A Multilevel Analysis. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, (DOI: 10.1007/s11747-015-0457-2).

vi. Unpublished works (e. g., conference papers, working papers)

Bartikowski, B., & Gierl H. (2014). The Role of Consumer Responsibility Attribution when Consumers co-produce. *Paper presented at the AMA Winter Marketing Educators' Conference*, Orlando.

Wagner, U., & Diamantopoulos, A. (2010). Research Productivity in Business Economics: The Case of Marketing 2. *Working Paper*, Wien.

III. Final Version of Accepted Manuscripts

Submit your manuscript as well as the corresponding file(s) (text, figures, etc.) by e-mail to the editor.

In difference to the guidelines in point II.2./3. An accepted manuscript contains the following information on the *first two pages*:

1. Manuscript title
2. Name(s) of author(s)
3. Photo(s) of the author(s) (b/w photo with light background, good contrast is recommended)
4. Name(s) with permanent affiliation(s), present position(s) of the author(s), and complete address, including telephone, fax number number, and e-mail address
5. Acknowledgements (if applicable)
6. Abstract (100–150 words)
7. Keywords (max. five)
8. Executive Summary (400–600 words) [after acceptance]

Chronological order for *further pages*:

8. Text
9. Notes (if applicable)
10. References
11. Appendix (if applicable)

Page proofs will be sent to the author(s) by the publisher, which should be read and corrected carefully. The responsibility for detecting errors is up to the author(s). Corrections should be restricted to Marketing ZFP – Journal of Research and Management instances in which the proof is at variance with the manuscript.

For preparing the final version of your manuscript, please consult the download **"Sample for authors"** at the homepage of the journal (there you can find further helpful downloads, e. g. "Sample for reply to reviewers"). Author(s) submitting papers that do not meet the guidelines outlined above will be requested to revise their manuscript. Upon acceptance of an article, author(s) will be asked to transfer copyright of the article to the publisher.

We are looking forward to your manuscript submissions! May 2017

Note

[1] MZFP – JRM: New Hybrid Registered Reports Submission Option

I. General Information

Popper (1974) explained the fundamental mission of empirical research as a "method of proposing bold hypotheses, and exposing them to the severest criticism, in order to detect where we have erred". Strong criticism includes the risk to fail. The New York Times (2014) requested some years ago *"To Get More Out of Science, show the Rejected Research"*; to encourage researchers to inform the public about theoretical sound but empirically falsified research ideas which could avoid future misallocations of research. However, what happens to our research when we try to publish falsified hypotheses? We all know the dilemma.

Scientists should be striving to produce replicable *and* innovative research. Sometimes this is a vicious circle. New hypotheses drawn from new theoretical models are fascinating but have a high risk to fail. Past experience has also shown that researchers who take the risk may be tempted (if the results are different than hopefully expected) to do some data trimming or "p-hacking" to make the (only "marginally significant") results more "publishable". As a result, some of these "innovative studies" are published but they are not replicable or lead other researchers on a misleading path. With respect to qualitative studies, researchers may be tempted to misinterpret participants' responses on purpose by slightly changing the original wording of the quotations. An initiative to get more empirical findings that are meaningful and surprising as well as replicable, reliable and honest is the *hybrid registered reports submission option*. Some journals have launched this option. Authors submit a paper in two steps: *First*, authors write the first part of their paper including the introduction, theoretical background, hypotheses, planned methods and an outline of how they intend to operationalize their constructs and conduct their empirical study (without empirical results). This abbreviated paper then undergoes a peer review and is evaluated on its rigor and relevance. *Second*, if the reviewers agree that the paper has merits and the intended methods are sound then the researchers will write down the results of the empirical study and the paper will be published irrespectively of the outcome. According to our knowledge, *Marketing ZFP – Journal of Research and Management* is the first Marketing journal that offers this hybrid registered reports submission option.

II. Guidelines for authors and reviewers

Hybrid registered reports (HRR) are a specific form of empirical articles. In contrast to the "traditional-one-step-paper", in the case of registered reports, introduction, methods, and proposed analyses are reviewed before the empirical part is being conducted or drawn up. Reports sent for blind peer-review in *Stage 1* will solely be evaluated on the merits of the research question, its theoretical derivation and comprehensiveness and on the rigor of the planned methodology, not on any statistical results (the outcome of the empirical study is *not* part of the first submission). The reports that pass *Stage 1* (which may also include a revision and resubmission), will be accepted in principle for publication or receive an R&R. After this in-principle acceptance (IPA), in a second step, the scientists write down the empirical part of their study that includes all results and discussion parts (*Stage 2*) and combine the second part of their paper with the first one. This full paper will then be resubmitted. If the *Stage 2* submission is congruent with what was committed to in Stage 1, and if it includes a reasonable interpretation and discussion of the results then the paper is going to be published - *regardless of the empirical results*! The HRR submission option is flexible and therefore appropriate for quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods, and also for papers involving multiple studies.

Stage 1: Initial report submission and review

- Stage 1 submissions should enclose the first part of the manuscript and a cover letter which declares any conflicts of interests and whether the presented data were already used in any other research study, and if so, how. Submissions should consist of the following sections:
  a) A theoretical part, i. e. a review of the relevant literature that explains the research questions and a complete exposition of the research goals and hypotheses including its theoretical and/or conceptual reasoning. Topics should come from the Marketing areas published in Marketing ZFP – Journal of Research and Management.
  b) A methodological part, i. e. a detailed presentation of the proposed sample, a description of the study (e. g., experiment, observation, focus groups etc.) and analysis procedure, in sum all information that is required to evaluate whether the research questions will be answered in a fair and appropriate way. Regarding research procedures, an extensive description is required. Initial Stage 1 submissions should include a specific description of all planned analyses with all independent, dependent, moderating or mediating variables (as hypothesized). Any covariates or regressors should be stated including a justification for their inclusion. Although only pre-planned analyses are allowed be reported in the main results section of Stage 2 submissions, unplanned but interesting additional post hoc analyses will be permitted in a separate section of the findings.

- Reviewers will evaluate not only the plausibility of the hypotheses or research questions, but also their innovativeness and the appropriateness of the selected methods. Thus it may happen that reviewers appreciate the soundness and feasibility of the theoretical part but recommend a different empirical approach or a different statistical analysis to improve the methodological rigor. In such a case, authors can be offered the opportunity to rework the manuscript.
- IPA decisions are time-bound. The editor will fix an individual date for the submission of the Step 2 manuscript. This time period granted by the editor depends on whether the empirical study described in Stage 1 has already been conducted or not. This period should not exceed four months.
- Note: Only the editor (not the reviewers) will be informed by the authors whether empirical data is already available in Stage 1 or not which helps to avoid "outcome guessing" of the reviewers (otherwise the reviewers might assume the authors chose the HRR option just because the hypotheses were falsified).

Stage 2: Complete manuscript review

- For a full review, researchers prepare and resubmit their manuscript including the accepted version of Stage 1 and all empirical results of Stage 2, a discussion of the study(ies), limitations and recommendations for further research. A cover letter has to confess any divergences or additional analyses from Stage 1. The stated hypotheses must not be modified or appended. Concerning the results, all relevant information to prove their rigor and validity has to be reported (e. g., exact p-values, effect sizes, exact quotations or triangulations' results in the case of qualitative data).
- As mentioned, additional analyses that were not part of the registered submission may wished to be included. In such cases, analyses are principally permitted but have to be reported in a distinct section of the results headed "exploratory analyses" for deductive research, or "additional analyses" for inductive work. If possible, the authors should also conclude some managerial perspectives of the paper.
- The same reviewers as in the first stage will consider the resubmission. For Stage 2 papers, reviewers decide whether the analysis plan is omitted and the theoretical part and methods are the same as approved in Stage 1. The reviewer evaluates if the results are reported clearly and congruently with the pre-registered version. In the case of any additional statistical analyses or further results, reviewers will decide whether the additionally presented information is methodologically sound, and informative or helpful. Furthermore, it is important to decide if the scientists' conclusions and managerial implications are justified given the data.