The Future of Quantitative Marketing: Results of a Survey

Donald R. Lehmann · Oded Netzer · Olivier Toubia

Published online: 23 January 2015
© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2015

Abstract We report the results of a survey conducted in November 2014 in which 29 quantitative marketing scholars from around the world reflected on the present and future of their field. The survey focused on substantive areas, methods and tools, practical and managerial relevance, doctoral training, and promotion and tenure. The results of the survey revealed several general insights on the challenges and opportunities faced by the field of quantitative marketing research.

Keywords

1 Introduction

The present issue of *Customer Needs and Solutions* features two papers that analyze trends in quantitative marketing research [1, 2], mostly from the perspective of the publication output and professional success of researchers in the field. As a complement to these two papers, we decided to investigate the trends in quantitative marketing by running a short survey. This survey was designed to capture views and ideas on what promising questions quantitative marketing researchers should study in the future and what tools would be appropriate to answer these questions. Our survey also touched on the

training of doctoral students and issues related to promotion and tenure. Finally, our survey probed some of the bigger challenges and opportunities faced by our field.

2 Survey Description and Sample

Our survey consisted of a mix of open-ended and close-ended questions. We received responses from 29 colleagues during November 2014. Most respondents were members of the CNS editorial board. These marketing academics included both junior and senior faculty members from schools in the USA, Europe, and Asia. Several of them were past or current editors of major journals in our field (e.g., *Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Marketing Research*, *Marketing Science*).

A set of tables reports the answers to the close-ended questions, and a set of figures shows word clouds for each open-ended question. These word clouds were created using wordle.net, setting the maximum number of words at 50 and manually removing some words that did not contribute meaningfully (such as “n/a” or “etc.”). Appendix 1 reports the raw results from the open-ended questions. Appendix 2 provides the list of the questions asked in the survey.

In the following sections, we provide an interpretation of the results along the following dimensions: substantive areas (Section 3), methods and tools (Section 4), practical and managerial relevance (Section 5), doctoral students’ training (Section 6), and promotion and tenure (Section 7). We have attempted to remain as objective and unbiased as possible in our interpretation of the results. However, we strongly encourage readers to study the raw data and draw their own conclusions.

D. R. Lehmann (✉) · O. Netzer · O. Toubia
Columbia Business School, New York, NY, USA
e-mail: drl2@columbia.edu

O. Netzer
e-mail: on2110@columbia.edu

O. Toubia
e-mail: ot2107@columbia.edu

3 Substantive Areas

When asking our respondents to list substantive areas/question that should be studied in the near and distant future, the following areas seem to emerge at the top: business-to-business (B2B) marketing (including but not limited to sales force management), health care, social media, return on investment (ROI) measurement, and emerging markets (see Fig. 1 and Appendix 1). Not surprisingly, “big data” was often mentioned as well, and in particular, the issue of “improving insights from big data.” Several respondents also mentioned the increased variety of the types of data available (e.g., video and audio) and the need to “marry quantitative and qualitative approaches.” It is also important to note that several of our respondents stressed that “the usual 3C, 4Ps” are still relevant and worthy of investigation. One of the respondents suggested “don’t expect much change in substantive areas.” We also highlight an intriguing and thought-provoking area of research identified by one of the respondents: “The consumption of products, we have a lot of knowledge about how people buy, but I think less about how people consume.”

In terms of substantive areas that should not be studied as heavily in the future as they were in the past, scanner data and “basic choice modeling” come at the top of the list (see Fig. 2 and Appendix 1). Related to the above comments about the continued relevance of the 3Cs and 4Ps, it is important to note that several respondents indicated that there is no area that cannot benefit from more work. Quotes along these lines include “there is always room to revisit topics” and “I don’t think any topic that was useful in the past can be judged as NOT useful in the future; there is likely to be some incremental value in studying those subjects.”

Finally, 24 out of 28 respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “Quantitative research in marketing should focus more on substantive/theoretical issues than it currently does” (see Table 1). One of the respondents indicated

Fig. 1 “Please list some substantive areas/questions that you think should be studied by quantitative marketing researchers in the (near and distant) future”

Fig. 2 “Please list some substantive areas/questions that have been studied in the past by quantitative marketing researchers, but that should *not* be studied as heavily in the (near and distant) future”

“If we continue focusing on highly complex articles without substantial insights, the citations and reach that modelers may generate would diminish and we would become more narrower.”

4 Methods and Tools

A few tools were mentioned by several respondents as carrying promise into the future (see Fig. 3 and Appendix 1). These include machine learning, Bayesian methods, natural language processing, experiments (in particular field experiments), simulation, as well as eye tracking and other behavioral metrics.

In terms of tools that may not be as promising in the future as they have been in the past (see Fig. 4 and Appendix 1), some of the respondents questioned the future of conjoint analysis and time series econometrics. Some reservations were also raised on the value brought by structural modeling. As with the substantive areas, several respondents believed that any tool may remain useful as long as it makes correct inferences and generates useful insights. As one respondent put it, “it is the use to which the tool is put and new insights generated that matters.”

Finally, 17 out of 29 respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that “quantitative research in marketing should focus more on methodological issues than it currently does,” compared to 4 who agreed or strongly agreed (see Table 2). However, as 1 respondent noted: “Saying that marketing should focus more on substantive research and less on methodological research does NOT mean that the standards for empirical work should be less stringent. Just that contributions should be judged more on findings and importance and not only for using complex methods.”

Table 2 Response of the 29 respondents with the statement “Do you agree with the following statement: ‘Quantitative research in marketing should focus more on methodological issues than it currently does’”

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Strongly agree		1	3%
2	Agree		3	10%
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree		8	28%
4	Disagree		11	38%
5	Strongly Disagree		6	21%
	Total		29	100%
Statistic		Value		
Min Value		1		
Max Value		5		
Mean		3.62		
Variance		1.10		
Standard Deviation		1.05		
Total Responses		29		

topics that should be covered in marketing doctoral courses and on the type of non-marketing courses that marketing doctoral students should take.

In terms of topics to be covered in quantitative marketing doctoral courses, the topics identified by our respondents tended to mirror the substantive and methodological areas that were identified as promising (see Fig. 5 and Appendix 1). These include emerging markets, experiments, social media, big data statistics, sales force management, and the analysis of

text/video data. In addition, several respondents recommended covering “dynamics” in our PhD courses, although we suspect that different respondents had different specific topics in mind under this general umbrella.

In terms of non-marketing doctoral courses recommended to doctoral students in our field, our respondents identified courses typically offered in economics departments (e.g., microeconomics, econometrics, game theory, industrial organization), statistics departments (Bayesian statistics), as well as

Table 3 Response of the 29 respondents with the statement “Do you agree with the following statement: ‘Quantitative research in marketing should focus more on practical/managerial issues than it currently does’”

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Strongly agree		14	48%
2	Agree		10	34%
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree		5	17%
4	Disagree		0	0%
5	Strongly Disagree		0	0%
	Total		29	100%
Statistic		Value		
Min Value		1		
Max Value		3		
Mean		1.69		
Variance		0.58		
Standard Deviation		0.76		
Total Responses		29		

Some of our respondents made eloquent and passionate comments on the training of doctoral students that go beyond specific topics or courses, which are worth highlighting. For example, one respondent advised instructors of marketing doctoral courses to “focus on a key aspect in our courses: teaching our students to EXPLAIN their models and results to a wider audience....Often I see hiring departments lament how a modeler may be a great candidate on paper but just can’t explain his or her research and its positioning!” Another interesting comment we highlight was “In my opinion, we grossly overselect quant doctoral students based on proven math performance, then throw more and more math at them. They don’t know much about the real world OR real data, let alone what people are doing in other fields.”

We asked our respondents their opinions on whether the hurdles for publication in top marketing journal and for tenure have increased (see Table 4). Twenty out of 29 respondents

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Strongly agree		11	38%
2	Agree		9	31%
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree		7	24%
4	Disagree		1	3%
5	Strongly Disagree		1	3%
	Total		29	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	5
Mean	2.03
Variance	1.11
Standard Deviation	1.05
Total Responses	29

Appendix 1. Raw data from open-ended questions

Please list some substantive areas / questions that you think should be studied by quantitative marketing researchers in the (near and distant) future:

- What is the relationship between employee satisfaction and customer satisfaction, jointly on firm performance - Look at more industrial, B2B market issues - More papers that link survey data to behavioral metrics and do theory testing from that

Emerging Markets, Sustainability, Entrepreneurship, Innovation, Nonprofit marketing, Business to Business Marketing, location specific and high frequency sensor based targeting

don't expect much change in substantive areas

virtual experience, artificial intelligence,

The usual 3C, 4Ps Perhaps more strategic stuff as well e.g., innovation, impact of digitization - more at firm and industry level Emerging models such as crowdsourcing, sharing economy (Uber AirBnB etc.)

Networks Understanding unstructured data - video, audio, text Unique business models in emerging markets Large scale analytics Method development for market research companies Health Care Focus on policy questions

social media

platform (two-sided) marketing problems; multichannel marketing optimization; digital advertising business models; B2B sales funnel management; sales force structure and specialization and compensation

More work on emerging markets (more generally) Specifically, how is/should innovation be done for low-income communities, especially in emerging markets? How do low-income communities adopt and use innovations? What impact do these have on their livelihoods?

social media, branding, mobile application, online community, crowd sourcing

Machine Learning; Bayesian Nonparametrics; data fusion; estimating complex models on "big data"; marrying quantitative and qualitative approaches; interface between marketing, OM, and engineering; dealing with vast missingness in real data.

What happens in the marketplace...natural experiments and a few actual ones

Industry specific issues. For example, pharmaceutical, entertainment, financial services industries.

Analytics in general, algorithmic approaches to analytics, text analytics, network analytics,

Pricing, ROI on marketing investments, behavior/psychology and its effects in traditional empirical methods, explaining retention/CRM beyond the approaches now taken.

Big data issues Digital analytics Homogeneization of quali and quanti

Brand Equity

Gleaning usable insights from digital data; purchase channel substitution and complementarity (problems Macy's and Best Buy face); Dealing with large data volume that is sparse at the same time (lots of zeroes, few 1's); media choices people make, screen substitution and implications for advertisers; Ad effectiveness and ROI measurement; Cross platform advertising (TV, mobile, PC, Tablet); Attribution modeling; Linking buyer behavior to mobile activities; Linking Geo/Spatial data to buyer behavior

Improving insights from big data; there's still a lot we don't know about the 4Ps, in particular, media interaction effects; integrating neuromarketing with marketing modeling

Public Policy related to health etc. Macro issues related to transportation, utilities, infrastructure

all the usual topics plus big data analytics, machine learning & structural model interfaces etc. to gain customer insights

Black swan/rare occurrences, outliers. The following is not overly specific, but I think we should look at things that could occur in the future that do not occur now. For instance, a hand held calorie ray gun to determine the calories in a meal, carbon emissions labels, tools that automatically keep track of all of your purchases

social media analytics with an emphasis on B2B or sales force referral reward programs marketing channel relationships and dynamics sales management and incentives

B2B marketing issues

a. Models on the dynamics of social networks with an emphasis on helping marketers influence how networks and communities form (1) around products and brands and (2) among consumers themselves. b. Models that allow to simplify very complex choice problems for consumers, such as deciding between houses with hundreds of attributes; c. Test the sensitivity of structural models to key assumptions, such as testing whether parameters are truly invariant using multiple datasets across time.

Sales forces training, Team incentives

1. Resource allocation among customers, and the impact on preferences. 2. The marketing involvement in energy efficiency and energy conservation. In a way this may be considered as a subset of "sustainable development". 3. The consumption of products, we have a lot of knowledge about how people buy, but I think less about how people consume. This is likely to be important when considering durable products. How people consume them is likely to impact/explain what they purchase next. It seems we are in position (see the next topic) to begin collecting much of this data, and thereby help development of new products. 4. Marketing applications in the "The internet of things" seems to be a promising avenue, and one I think could be a niche CNS could claim. E.g. consider movement of smart technology from phones to TVs, and is now moving toward other consumer electronics such as refrigerators, air conditioning, cars, and so on.

Please list some tools that you think should be used by quantitative marketing researchers in the (near and distant) future:

- Is there any benefit to using complicated empirical models in marketing journals? Please force papers to report a simple regression model as the benchmark. - Go back to first principles---why over complicate everything?

There should be more focus on text analytics, large scale field experiments, and methods for analysis of big data.

Econometrics, Machine Learning

machine learning, complex system, large scale simulation

Classical and Bayesian Econometrics, Non parametric methods (diff-in-diff, RD), Machine Learning, Natural Language Processing, Geospatial methods, Web analytics

model selection machine learning

mathematical programming (nonlinear, integer, mixed-integer, dynamic); econometric models, kalman filtering; game theory, optimal control, simulations

More analysis of verbal and observational data. More analysis of geographical data. More use of multiple method data, including qualitative data and observational insight. More field and natural experiments.

secondary data analysis, field experiment, online experiment

Hammers :) Seriously, though... the vast array of tools from computer science, particularly machine learning. We need to build FAST, SCALABLE, RELIABLE models, like the kind used by web sites, but better.

Big data, simulation or Bayesian estimation...Two way markets...eye tracking and behavioral consumer metrics

More use of computational methods in general, and agent-based modeling in particular--field should tend more toward the computer science viewpoint, sacrificing some precision and exactness for speed and tractability

Dynamic optimization: deterministic and stochastic.

machine learning, simulation based tools, more Bayesian methods, optimal control, functional analyses, nonparametric statistics

Our current tools, perhaps combining big data and theory-driven empirical models. Setting best practices with big data with an eye on the risk of overfitting.

Observational protocols Mobile and other digital devices

PLS

We need more computer science folks in our field. Machine learning, AI types of tools (That don't require

you to begin with a model specification). Data base fundamentals (SQL, NoSQL, Hadoop, MapReduce). Traditional statistics tools are still invaluable. If I was to start over I would take many computer science classes on the above topics as a PhD student.

Don't have anything original to say here beyond what we're already using

Randomized control trials quasi-experiment

see above

Text\lexical analysis, MRI/EKG/eye tracking, and creation of better (more complete and finer detail) databases that are free to all. For instance Wharton has Red Cross data, but would only make it available to 6 teams. The ACSI is only available at the company level

behavioral economics: social preferences and bounded rationality field experiments dynamic structural modeling

Field experiments, laboratory market experiments.

Social network analysis, definitely. I would also invite modelers to devote more time assembling original datasets using content analysis as I've found it to be a great way to complement secondary datasets by creating new variables that may produce key new insights.

Lab and filed experiments

1. I think there's a need for further refinement of price elasticities, particularly their managerial relevance.

2. More emphasis on tools useful for making marketing decisions.

Please list some substantive areas/questions that have been studied in the past by quantitative marketing researchers, but that should NOT be studied as heavily in the (near and distant) future:

- STOP the over-reliance on grocery store stuff. It is just passé - Choice modeling is getting too much play, and we can stop some of it. Instead, focus on more useful substantive areas such as: why do people spend so much time on the internet and at home?

I don't think this question is a fair one. I don't think any topic that was useful in the past can be judged as NOT useful in the future; there is likely to be some incremental value in studying those subjects. Clearly, there are some areas where the relative possibility of innovations may be lower compared to focus on new areas. For instance, the incremental value of learning from scanner data (simply through building choice models) is likely to be low now relative to 20 years ago. However, there continues to remain interesting substantive questions that have not been addressed in the past, and such research should be supported.

n/a

structural modeling

Diffusion (?), Promotion response

N/A

None - as the environment is constantly changing requiring new insights into old questions.

n/a

Analysis of scanner data. There's not much there to do any longer.

Attitude models, brand switching, perceptual maps,

basic choice modeling

N/A

Communication campaigns GRP

There is no area that cannot benefit from more work

Brand choice models Price promotion effects Firm-level capabilities Stock returns

sales promotions

Brain activity

online advertising and its effectiveness channel structure stock market response to marketing

I think there is always room to revisit topics. The key decision here is whether to publish articles on a given topic just on the complexity of the model itself, versus the actual insight produced by the model. If we continue focusing on highly complex articles without substantial insights, the citations and reach that

modelers may generate would diminish and we would become more narrower.

Less emphasis in the retailing of fast moving consumer goods, more on other types of goods and services.

Please list some tools that have been used in the past by quantitative marketing researchers, but that should NOT be used as heavily in the (near and distant) future:

Conjoint? Choice models?

I don't think this question is a fair one. I don't think any tool that was useful in the past can be judged as NOT useful in the future, unless it has been shown to be wrong in making inferences. Clearly, there are some areas where the relative possibility of innovations may be lower compared to focus on new areas. In that spirit, I believe some of the Time Series Econometrics Tools have been used to make inappropriate claims inconsistent with the underlying methodological theories. We may not want to use these tools in such erroneous ways in the future, but that does not mean time series econometrics itself has no value for our field.

cross-sectional data models

Conjoint, Multivariate Statistical Methods, Segmentation (?), Bass Model, VAR models, Bayesian Learning models

N/A

None - it is the use to which the tool is put and new insights generated that matters

n/a

Game theory: I find it sterile, unrealistic in its assumptions, and unilluminating for the VAST majority of real world problems and data sets. Dynamic programming: except in rare cases, it's hideously complex, with little payoff.

Causal modeling..lisrel and PLS...mediation tests...models including subjective and attitudinal data

NA

Models where there are first-order endogeneity concerns, but where no attempts to control the endogeneity that has been used.

Conjoint analysis PLS

I like the theory that micro/macro economics brings to the table but I'm uncertain about the value structural models bring. The structural approach makes a very good point (how were the data generated and the need to incorporate that in the model) but the solutions/proposed approaches tend to be "assumption heavy". In the end the final product is little practical usability. Industry seemed to have not found them of value. So yes, a move away from structural would be good.

purely statistical models

diffusion models Hotelling models

I believe the complexity-to-insight ratio of modeling articles in recent times has been somewhat problematic, e.g. with the advent of structural models. I would like to see less emphasis on complexity (while maintaining rigor) and more emphasis on bringing new insights in general.

cluster analysis, structural equation model

While the logit model is a great tool for analysis of discrete choice, I think it should be used with more caution.

Please list some key topics that you think should be covered in quantitative marketing PhD courses:

Linking survey data to behavioral metrics

Emerging Markets, Sustainability, Entrepreneurship, Innovation, Nonprofit marketing

it depends on the course

computer science, video data analytics

causal inference

Marketing resource allocation; pricing optimization; Marketing mix analyses (including offline and online marketing coordination); principal-agent problems of sales forces and channels; customer lifetime

value analyses; diffusion models; platform models
 Emerging markets and field and natural experiments.
 social media marketing
 The actual full content of web logs from real companies. Pragmatic, real-time optimization techniques.
 [Generally speaking: PhD programs are too focused on extremely narrow, specialized mathematical techniques that rarely give clear, usable answers.]
 Big data, Bayesian estimation, natural experiments
 Optimization. Dynamic systems. Stochastic processes.
 coding, algorithms, big data based analytical approaches
 4Ps, dynamics, empirical game theoretic models, theory models, equilibrium concepts, demand estimation?
 Big data Basic statistics (vs too complex and elaborated techniques)
 Basic model building skills; current methods, both analytical and empirical; understanding the key assumptions underlying models developed in published research; creative thinking.
 customer data analytics, social marketing issues (besides regular topics that are always covered)
 Implementation of methods.
 channel relationships sales management and incentives pricing
 choice models, conjoint, game theoretic models, optimization models, experimental economics (field and lab), modeling consumer psychology
 This is the most important comment I can give. I would URGE us as quantitative marketers to focus on a key aspect in our courses: teaching our students to EXPLAIN their models and results to a wider audience. They need to be able to explain their model to crowd more familiar with, say, research based on ANOVA; and also to crowds not familiar with their specific research areas. Often I see hiring departments lament how a modeler may be a great candidate on paper but just can't explain his or her research and its positioning! Regarding topics, I think nonparametric econometrics, social network analysis, and an emphasis on coding and recovering parameters, which on occasion is ignored.
 sales force management, mechanism design
 Big data methodology, text analysis
 Dynamic (state space) modeling

Please list some non-marketing courses that you would recommend to current quantitative marketing PhD students:

Applied Microeconometrics.
 how to make sense of qualitative data using basic courses on understanding human behavior (e.g., courses in sociology--) courses in biostatistics , biology and so forth
 Economics, Computer Science, Operations Research
 stats, econometrics (classical, Bayesian, structural), machine learning, optimization
 epidemiology, computer science (computer vision, pattern recognition)
 IO sequence, Econometrics Sequence, Network Analysis, Machine Learning, Bayesian Statistics
 machine learning NLP
 Microeconomics 1 & 2, game theory, dynamic optimization, nonlinear programming, econometrics 1 & 2, Bayesian statistics, time series analyses including VAR models, industrial organization. media economics
 Geography, neuroscience, computer science (especially natural language processing), anthropology
 sociology, neuropsychology, online data collection mechanism, artificial intelligence
 Machine learning; Bayesian nonparametrics; discrete optimization and control; time series; missing data.
 market analysis, disaggregate modeling, R,
 Computer science. Machine learning. Natural language processing. Text and sentiment analysis.
 Operations research. Operations management.
 network analyses in social psychology, text analytics and natural language processing from Comp Sci.,

Microeconomics, Econometrics, Industrial organization, game theory, Statistics, programming, effective communications
 Finance Psychology
 In addition to what I say above (computer science), greater focus on sociology and social networks.
 Creativity, experimental design, industrial organization, Bayesian statistics, econometrics
 industrial organization, econometrics, machine learning, dynamic programming, cognitive psychology, neuroscience, behavioral economics,....
 econometrics, hazard modeling, biostats, computer programming
 behavioral economics industrial organization theory experimental economics
 Courses outside marketing that I would find useful (although a bit obvious) would be Experimental Economics and Econometrics in Economics departments. For learning about novel new techniques I would suggest courses in Computer Science (e.g. on networks, machine learning, etc.). I think these last courses would greatly complement a modeler's skill set. Finally, to detect new areas that may expand the list of business A-journals modelers can publish in, I would say Management and Entrepreneurship courses. I find that those areas are in need of more rigor that modelers can bring to the table, thus complementing their business school's colleagues' skills.
 experimental/behavioral economics
 Machine learning
 Contract theory, consumer demand theory (or price theory), possibly sociology

Please list some key challenges that you think will be faced by quantitative marketing researchers in the near and distance future:

becoming more and more quantitative, people seem to look too much at the quant side, forgetting that the real objective should be to look at the basic human behavior.
 other disciplines are studying problems traditionally in marketing, and they are doing this in a manner more connected to real life challenges (e.g. forecasting are done by computer scientists)
 Lack of relevance to business and policy communities especially as Computer Science/Information Systems folks dominate the applied (big data) space and IO economists the policy and structural space.
 dealing with massive data
 Finding the right balance between relevance and rigor and substantive impact.
 Increasing narrowness of what counts as research: both theoretically and methodologically.
 n/a
 There's really only one: actually using all the data coming in, from different sources, to build complex models that we can estimate in time for them to be useful to someone.
 Learn to communicate your model to non-modelers. The current emphasis on model free analysis is critical to that goal.
 They will need to be familiar with relevant research conducted in other department (e.g., operations management) in areas such as new product development, innovation management, channels of distribution
 Ideas, impact on practice, data availability for both outcomes and predictors
 Many of the ones we currently face.
 Make sense of their data Be simple and clear in their usage
 The really innovative things are happening in computer science. So we have some catching up to do. I feel the field is stagnating a bit. The fight to stay relevant continues as well.
 As I noted in a recent comment in IJRM, competing with the marketing science being conducted at Facebook, Microsoft, Google, etc.
 Methods are getting more varied or sophisticated. Takes quite a few more years to master the basic tool box compared what the students are facing in behavioral marketing
 Different reviewers have different standards. For instance, some articles are published with main effects and interactions in the same model, but do not have a main effects only model to show the model

improvement. Another example, some articles are published with Tobin's q , and yet I will get papers rejected with the comment that the reviewer does not believe in Tobin's q .

finding the appropriate balance between methodology and substantive issues

Working on topics that are relevant to product and sales managers (as opposed those only of interests to the marketing research department). Keeping marketing as a distinct field (i.e., separate from IO in economics, etc) Bridging the quant and behavioral subfields in marketing - these two areas are becoming increasingly distinct.

One, being able to improve the way we communicate our complex results and models in an understandable way. Two, being able to justify the use of highly complex models that, say, may take weeks to converge, without bringing in commensurate insight. Third, being able to justify the dearth of top publications we may have vs. CB faculty that publish at a much higher rate. For the rankings game, 6 JCRs count much more than 2 Marketing Sciences, and I wonder what Deans will make of this in the future.

Relevance of other fields to marketing topics (e.g. economics, computer science) The need for rigour sometimes overwhelms interesting problems

Please share any additional thoughts that you may have:

We need to get out of the rut of becoming "ghost econ/quant departments" faking it as marketing departments.

the difference between CB and quant output (# pubs) is hurting quant faculty and leads to their shrinking numbers in marketing depts

Glad you are doing this! And that it helps to change the training students get. In my opinion, we grossly overselect quant doctoral students based on proven math performance, then throw more and more math at them. They don't know much about the real world OR real data, let alone what people are doing in other fields.

We need less anal retentive attention to issues such as endogeneity, and more tolerance of approximately correct methodological approaches that actually address real problems. There should be less data in search of a (contrived) problem.

The number of quality outlets for quantitative work is too little when compared to a burgeoning field.

More cross-disciplinary work involving methodology development and transfer should feature more.

Code and [simulated if necessary] datasets along with a workshop or tutorial style annexure series should accompany all methods papers.

Saying that marketing should focus more on substantive research and less on methodological research does NOT mean that the standards for empirical work should be less stringent. Just that contributions should be judged more on findings and importance and not only for using complex methods.

I'm thoughtless

It's tough to publish quantitative unless the reviewers completely buy in with the theory that you're using. In addition, there are many many hoops and test that one must apply to quantitative results. Reviewers seem to get hung up on these issues much more so than seeing the overall contribution.

Quantitative marketing has come a very long way. I think the next step is to better educate quantitative marketers to explain what they do, and a renewed focus in the substance of our work to increase our reach in marketing academia, and to ensure a better future in the market and beyond for our students. New journals such as CNS are extremely promising in this regard.

Appendix 2. List of questions in survey

For verification purposes, please indicate your name and academic institution. Please note that the results of the survey will only be reported at the aggregate level.

Please list some substantive areas / questions that you think should be studied by quantitative marketing researchers in the (near and distant) future:

Please list some tools that you think should be used by quantitative marketing researchers in the (near and distant) future:

Please list some substantive areas/questions that have been studied in the past by quantitative marketing researchers, but that should NOT be studied as heavily in the (near and distant) future:

Please list some tools that have been used in the past by quantitative marketing researchers, but that should NOT be used as heavily in the (near and distant) future:

Please list some key topics that you think should be covered in quantitative marketing PhD courses:

Please list some non-marketing courses that you would recommend to current quantitative marketing PhD students:

Please list some key challenges that you think will be faced by quantitative marketing researchers in the near and distance future:

Do you agree with the following statement: “Quantitative research in marketing should focus more on methodological issues than it currently does.”

Do you agree with the following statement: “Quantitative research in marketing should focus more on substantive/theoretical issues than it currently does.”

Do you agree with the following statement: “Quantitative research in marketing should focus more on practical/managerial issues than it currently does.”

Do you agree with the following statement: “It has become harder to publish quantitative research in top marketing journals.”

Do you agree with the following statement: “It has become harder for quantitative marketing researchers to get tenure.”

Please share any additional thoughts that you may have:

References

1. Rajiv S, Chu J and Jiang Z (2015) Publication, citation, career development and recent trends: empirical evidence for quantitative marketing researchers. *Cust Needs Solutions*
2. Zamudio C and Meg M (2015) Which modeling scholars get promoted, and how fast? *Cust Needs Solutions*
3. Lehmann DR, McAlister L, Staelin R (2001) Sophistication in research in marketing. *J Mark* 75:155–165
4. Reibstein DJ, Day G, Wind J (2009) Guest editorial: is marketing academia losing its way? *J Mark* 73:1–3