How to Prepare One's Tenure or Promotion Dossier

Adam Lindgreen, Copenhagen Business School and University of Pretoria's Gordon Institute of Business Science[1,2]

C. Anthony Di Benedetto, Fox School of Business, Temple University[3]

ABSTRACT

In earlier editorials, we have written about challenges academics face: generating research ideas, working with students, getting published, staying relevant to our various audiences, and finding a balance among our responsibilities. When going up for tenure or promotion, the academic has to put together all of these accomplishments in a dossier for review. This is a daunting task—everything the candidate has been working on over the last several years needs to be presented convincingly to the review committees at the candidate's institute. In this editorial, we present a detailed structure by which the candidate can present his/her tenure or promotion case in a complete, effective, and organized way. We also note the importance of understanding the specific requirements of the candidate's institute, so that appropriate adjustments and additions can be made.

Keywords: promotion and tenure, academic career, challenges faced by academics.

1. INTRODUCTION

In a series of previous editorials, we have addressed several of the challenges faced by academics. Our editorials can be categorized into five different areas: a) getting started, b) generating ideas and setting up for success, c) working with students, d) getting published, and e) staying relevant to our various audiences. Academics must address each of these five areas to be successful. We therefore begin this editorial by summarizing the key points of each area.

1.1. Getting Started

In order to get off to a good start, academics need to consider the importance of balancing and prioritizing research, teaching, and service (including outreach) (Lindgreen and Di Benedetto, 2020a). This is a challenging balancing act: research, teaching, and service often run in parallel;

[1] Adam Lindgreen, Department of Marketing, Copenhagen Business School, Solbjerg Plads 3, 2000 Frederiksberg C, Denmark and University of Pretoria's Gordon Institute of Business Science, 26 Melville Road, Illovo, Johannesburg, South Africa. E-mail: adli.marktg@cbs.dk.

[2] All authors contributed equally.

[3] C. Anthony Di Benedetto, Fox School of Business, Alter Hall 523, 1801 Liacouras Walk, Philadelphia, PA 19122-6083, USA. E-mail: tonyd@temple.edu.

all requirements place serious demands on time; and all have deadlines, which increase success and make the tasks seem overwhelming at times.

1.2. Generating Ideas and Setting Up for Success

In one editorial (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, and Kock, 2021), we noted the importance of generating original, and even outrageous, research ideas. We discussed using the OBC model (observe the world, bridge disciplines, and challenge assumptions and theories) for ideation, and discussed three main and four blended strategies derived from this model. The OBC model provides actionable recommendations for research idea generation, and ensures a solid theoretical grounding for each element of the model.

Another editorial (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, Brodie, and Naude, 2020a) explored the factors leading to the creation of superior academic research groups. It is most important to establish a successful research environment for academics, which will foster a climate that favors a sustainable research stream. This editorial detailed the experiences of two active research institutions—the Industrial Marketing and Purchasing (IMP) Group and the Contemporary Marketing Practices (CMP) Group, presenting how each of these groups has successfully created the conditions most conducive to success.

Since academics always face pressure to write grant applications and obtain funding, we also discussed the development of a successful funding strategy, and how best to navigate the funding review process. We also provided guidance on what reviewers are looking for when evaluating funding applications (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, Verdich, Vanhamme, Venkatraman, Pattinson, Clarke, and Khan, 2019).

By its nature, business-to-business research is inherently cross disciplinary. Due to differences in incentives, culture, terminology, and jargon, however, there is the possibility of opportunistic and counterproductive behavior between different disciplines. Therefore, one editorial was devoted to how best to undertake cross-disciplinary research (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, Brodie, and van der Borgh, 2020b). Specifically, we discussed theorizing processes in detail and examined how cross-disciplinary boundaries can best be overcome.

Finally, we investigated the opportunities, challenges, and difficulties involved in collaborative research between universities and businesses, and we offered recommendations on how academics can engage better with practitioners (Di Benedetto, Lindgreen, Storgaard, and Clarke, 2019).

1.3. Working with Students

Teaching is obviously is a raison d´être of universities—and one of the most critical responsibilities is to build the next generation of academics. In one editorial, we reflected on

Ph.D. supervision, and the role of the supervisor in building student publishing and teaching capabilities (Di Benedetto, Lindgreen, and Ringberg, 2021). We also discussed measures of teaching quality (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, Zenker, and Brodie, 2021), and how great research can be translated into great teaching for university students (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, Brodie, and Naude, 2020b). We noted recent findings on teaching excellence and explored the opportunities and that academics face. In particular, we focused on the process by which academics can deliver value to students by transforming their research in meaningful ways.

1.4. Getting Published

Developing and delivering publishable research is critical to an academic's career. One of our editorials considered how to put one's research into the best possible light to increase the likelihood of eventual acceptance (Lindgreen and Di Benedetto, 2021), and we discussed measures of research quality (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, and Brodie, 2021). A critical aspect of publishable research is the development of robust conceptual frameworks that are essential to building academic knowledge (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, Brodie, and Jaakkola, 2021). Since guidelines and conventions such as grounded theory are available for data-driven approaches to research, we examined theorizing processes in which existing theory plays a pivotal role. We also examined ways by which authors can improve their chances of publishing success, by offering advice on how to write, and revise, manuscripts for academic journals (LaPlaca, Lindgreen, and Vanhamme, 2018; LaPlaca, Lindgreen, Vanhamme, and Di Benedetto, 2018; Lindgreen and Di Benedetto, 2020a).

1.5. Staying Relevant to Our Various Audiences

The bottom line for academics is to be relevant to their audiences by delivering high-quality research. Accordingly, we discussed several different measures of research quality. We considered strategies that academics can use to ensure that the intended academic and practitioner audiences read their research output and will find it valuable (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, Brodie, and van der Borgh, 2020a). Such strategies include discussion of the research's meaningful contributions to the field; conceptual and theoretical development; compelling findings; and clear conclusions and implications. Academics should also consider guidelines to create visibility and understanding of their research's contributions in the offline research community and beyond.

Finally, we discussed the issue of defining, identifying, and measuring societal value of academic research (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, Evald, Clarke, Bjørn-Andersen, and Lambert, 2021). We proposed 'societal value' as a concept overarching both 'societal relevance' and 'societal impact', and we argued that societal value can be achieved if both societal relevance and impact are attained. These two sub-components of societal value measure different qualities, but they are related to and dependent on each other. We suggest viewing societal value as the product of societal relevance and societal impact; hence, the absence of either component in the research results in no societal value.

These editorials address the challenges we academics face in our daily work lives. However, at a few times in our career, we are faced with a different challenge: how to present all of our research, teaching, and service aspects to a review committee, which will evaluate us for tenure, and/or promotion to associate or full professor. This challenge is daunting: we must convert our dossier of academic-related activities into a tenure or promotion dossier, which is complete, detailed, consistent, updated, and (most importantly) convincing to the promotion and tenure committees and others who will be involved in the decision. The remainder of this editorial addresses how to assemble and organize an effective case for tenure and promotion.

2. PREPARATION OF THE PROMOTION DOSSIER

At some stage, all academics will apply for a position or for a promotion. How should they prepare their job or promotion dossier? As we have noted above, academics will have worked in a number of different but related areas: research, teaching, and service. In this next section, we discuss what academics can include in their letter to the assessment committee, and also how they can document, describe, and explain their achievements in all three areas. The latter is done in a number of appendices to the letter.

2.1. Letter to Assessment Committee

The letter to the assessment committee, which reviews candidates for the job or promotion applied for, should include the following elements:

1) A short introduction summarizing why the candidate believes he/she is well suited for the job or deserves the promotion;
2) Summary and evidence of the candidate's sustained research output of high quality;
3) Summary and evidence of the candidate's sustained education contributions that should be innovative and contributing to university pedagogy. This section of the letter also includes a discussion of supervision engagement, such as Ph.D. supervision;
4) Summary and evidence of the candidate's collaboration with industry and public organizations. This section of the letter can include a discussion of the candidate's contribution to societal value;
5) Summary and evidence of the candidate's leadership, as well as services (including outreach) and academic citizenship to the department, university, and wider academy;

6) Summary and evidence of the candidate's contributions to university strategy; and
7) An outline of the candidate's vision for the next five years regarding research, education, and outreach. This vision should be specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time specific.

The letter should not repeat information found in the subsequent appendices. Rather, the letter should be an overall introduction to the candidate's previous achievements and his/her vision for the future.

We recommend that the letter be as factual as possible. For example, a claim of 'research excellence' should be followed by some facts supporting the claim of excellent research. A mention of awards, honors, and other recognition could be appropriate in the different sections of the letter.

Obviously, sometimes elements under one heading equally could be discussed under another heading. For example, mentoring and coauthoring with less experienced colleagues is a form of academic citizenship, but could be discussed under the candidate's research output. To avoid double-counting or any confusion, the applicant may find guidance on where such elements should be included in the university's statement of promotion guidelines.

Appendix 1: Short Biography and Dashboards

The first appendix consists of the candidate's short biography and a number of dashboards (for the convenience of the assessment committee).

At the top of this document, the following should be listed:

- Full name of the candidate;
- Title of the candidate;
- Main affiliation (department and university) of the candidate;
- Contact details of the candidate; and
- Link to the candidate's homepage, LinkedIn, Google Scholar, ORCID, Scopus, and Publons.

Then follows a short biography of the candidate. This biography (running at a maximum of one page) could be structured around the following elements:

- Educational and employment background;
- Research (including any awards/prizes);
- Education and pedagogy (including any awards/prizes), as well as Ph.D. supervision, and administration and management (related to education and pedagogy);

- External research funding;
- Dissemination and esteem factors;
- Societal value and collaborations with industry and public organizations; and
- Services: academic citizenship, as well as administration and management.

Finally, the following three dashboards summarize—at an aggregate level—the candidate's achievements in research, education, and external funding.

a. Dashboard for research

	'Output'
Publications	
Journal publications, total	
AJG 3	
AJG 4	
AJG 4*	
FT 50	
Other journal publications	
Editorials (of substantial nature)	
Shorter review articles or similar	
Book reviews	
Books, total	
Monographs	
Anthologies	
Textbooks	
Book chapters	
Conference papers	
Case studies (published)	
Citations and other metrics	
Google Scholar	
Citations	
h-index	
m-value (h-index/years after first publication)	
hg-index	
L-index	
i-10	
Scholarly output, total	
Scopus	
Citations	
h-index	
c-score	
i-10	
Scholarly output, total	
Web of Science	
Citations	
h-index	
i-10	
Scholarly output, total	

Ranking	
How do you rank in terms of, say, citations, h-index, and scholarly output vis-à-vis your department, university, and wider community?	

b. Dashboard for education

	'Output'
Courses	
Bachelor courses	
Master courses	
MBA/Executive courses	
Ph.D. courses	
Theses	
Bachelor	
Master	
MBA/Executive	
Ph.D.	
As first supervisor	
As second supervisor	
Programs	
List names of programs managed	
Study boards	
List names of study board memberships	
List names of study board chaired	
Higher education academies	
List names of academy memberships	

c. Dashboard from external funding

	'Output'
Funding, part 1, successful	
University	Candidate's amount/University's amount/Total amount
National	Candidate's amount/University's amount/Total amount
International	Candidate's amount/University's amount/Total amount
Funding, part 2, successful	
Principal investigator	Amount
Co-investigator	Amount
Funding, part 1, unsuccessful	
University	Candidate's amount/University's amount/Total amount
National	Candidate's amount/University's amount/Total amount
International	Candidate's amount/University's amount/Total amount
Funding, part 2, unsuccessful	
Principal investigator	Amount
Co-investigator	Amount

Appendix 2: Curriculum Vitae (CV)

The CV should contain the followed detailed information:

- Academic qualifications (periods, degrees, institutions, overall grade (if any), and supervisors);
- Courses that do not form part of formal academic qualifications (periods, courses, grades, and institution);
- Employment history (periods, employers, and types of work); include outside university employment;
- Visiting fellowships (periods, institutions, type of fellowships);
- Membership of learned societies and professional affiliations (periods);
- Awards and other honors; break up into research, education, and others;
- Research initiatives and developments, and publication list. The whole section on research initiatives and developments, amongst other, will constitute a separate document and is 'taken out' of the CV;
- Educational and pedagogical initiatives and developments; teaching evaluations (that should also be included as separate documents); statements regarding the completion of the application (that should also be included as a separate document). The whole section on educational and pedagogical initiatives and developments will constitute a separate document and is 'taken out' of the CV;
- External research funding;
- Societal value and collaborations with industry and public organizations (periods, industries/organizations, types of project, and outputs);
- Dissemination and esteem factors (including journal editorships and editorial review boards);
- Services: academic citizenship, as well as administration and management (for education, as mentioned earlier)—internally and externally; and
- Names of between three and five external faculty members who can provide letters of recommendations. The information should include full name and title of the faculty members and their affiliation, e-mail addresses, and telephone numbers.

Appendix 3: Research

Following a statement about his/her research, the candidate should summarize his/her research using the following two tables:

a. Articles in international peer-reviewed journals

Article title	# Authors	Journal	AJG ranking	Your role	# Google Scholar	# Scopus	Theoretical contributions	Managerial contributions	Educational value	Societal value

b. Research pipeline for the next five years

Project title	Names of coauthors	Journal	AJG ranking	Theoretical contributions	Managerial contributions	Educational value	Societal value

All the candidate's published should be listed (follow *Journal of Marketing*-style wherever possible). This includes theses, articles in international peer-reviewed journals, articles in other international journals, editorials, shorter review articles, and book reviews, monographs, anthologies (edited books), textbooks, book chapters, conference papers, case studies, and working papers. It would be very helpful if the ranking of the journal (AJG and, if applicable, FT 50) and of the publisher (BFI) were added to each publication (definitely for the journal articles and the monographs, anthologies, and textbooks).

When applicable, information about awards and other honors including esteem factors and endorsements could be added for particular publications (although this information also will appear elsewhere in the CV).

It would be of interest to add if a publication has been co-authored with a student, as this provides evidence of supervision at a high level. The candidate also could add what his/her contribution has been to each publication, certainly for the journal publications.

We also add that research should focus not only on journal impact factor. A number of different indicators should be used to assess research publications' scientific content. This is why we suggest the consideration on research publications' theoretical contributions, managerial contributions, education value, and societal value (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, and Brodie, 2021).

Appendix 4: Education and pedagogy, Ph.D. supervision, and administration and management

Following a statement about his/her teaching, the candidate should summarize his/her teaching. Evaluations include whether students feel they have learnt something, and whether thee believe the teacher overall was a good teacher. The following three tables should be used:

a. Education and pedagogy

Period	Course title	Academic level	Program	University	Your role	Pedagogical approach	Student evaluations	Evidence of course success vis-à-vis other courses	Awards and innovations	Societal value/engagement with industry

b. Ph.D. supervision

Period	Student name	University	Your role	Placement after completion	Co-authored papers out of Ph.D. dissertation

c. Administration and management

Period	Course	University	Your role	Explanatory text	Societal value/engagement with industry
Period	Program	University	Your role	Explanatory text	Societal value/engagement with industry

Appendix 5: Entry criteria and evidence of fulfillment of entry criteria

Going back to the areas that academics work in, the candidate should reflect on how he/she fulfills the criteria for the department's (and the university's) job category he/she is applying for or wishes to be promoted to. In the following table, and as an example, we have listed these areas as research; education; external research funding; academic citizenship, as well as administration and management; dissemination and esteem factors; and societal value and collaborations with industry and public organizations. As illustrated, the second column lists the entry criteria to the given job category, in this case a full professorship, while the third column should list—in bullet points—the candidate's achievements vis-à-vis these six areas. We have used the example of the full-professorship entry criteria at the Department of Marketing at Copenhagen Business School. These criteria are abbreviated to REEAD.

a. REEAD criteria and fulfilment of REEAD criteria

REEAD criteria	Department's requirements	Fulfilment of REEAD criteria (in summary format only)
	To be considered for a full professorship requires that candidates perform at an international level as a leading academic in research, deliver outstanding contributions to education, engage in research dissemination to a variety of stakeholders, contribute to their Department' and wider School's engagement and internationalization activities, participate proactively in their Department's life, ideally have undertaken larger administrative roles, and are held in high esteem in the international research community. Candidates (and their work) are recognized internationally by top scholars in the field.	
Research	Must have five or more publications in AJG 4/4* journals (at least one of these publications should be in the AJG's list of marketing journals; FT 50 journals are a plus) or equivalent. Must have presented personally their research at one or more of the leading marketing conferences. Must have a promising pipeline of research that could be published in AJG 4/4* journals.	
Education	Should have completed their Ph.D. in marketing from a respected business school or university. Must have participated in course and, ideally, program development and received satisfactory teaching evaluations (commensurate to CBS standards). Should have participated in teaching at all levels. Needs to have shown seriousness in teaching; and must have adhered to academic integrity and must have engaged in pedagogical initiatives that ensure that students aspire to mastering the subject taught. Should actively engage with students, for example, participating as respondents to students' surveys, giving advice on elective courses or which career to follow, writing recommendation letters, etc. (e.g., acting as a mentor). Must be willing to participate in Departmental and School-wide education activities such as study boards. Must be able to document experience in Ph.D. supervision and ideally Ph.D. courses and assessment. The following could be relevant for candidates with an interest in truly outstanding teaching performance (the importance here is whether the activities are truly agenda setting): Could author textbook(s) for the international market. Could appear regularly as a guest speaker outside the academic world on the basis of educational expertise. Could be member of book publishers' inspection committees. Could be involved in international accreditation or recognition of study results. Could be involved in	

	relevant professional field(s) in teaching and education (case studies, assignments, guest speakers).	
External research funding	Should have the capability to attract and manage substantial external funding from major funding organizations. Is expected to have experience in obtaining and managing externally funded projects consistent with the opportunities afforded. Unsuccessful grant applicants generally are not considered.	
Academic citizenship, as well as administration and management	Should have participated actively in their Department's activities, for example research seminars, brown-bag sessions, etc. Should be active in the promotion of an open and inspiring research debate culture. Should ideally have undertaken some administrative roles within the Department, as well as represented the Department within and occasionally outside CBS. Should be willing to be a member of CBS Board, Academic Council, Study Boards, and CBS Wire, among others. Must have shown willingness to take on tasks that benefit the Department if so required, for example being mentor to junior and/or more inexperienced faculty members. Academic leadership is a strong part of a full professorship.	
Dissemination and esteem factors	Should have demonstrated impact on the research community, for example by reviewing for conferences and journals, participating in international networks, starting collaboration with international scholars, and arranging workshops, sessions, or panels at conferences. This includes being journal editor, member of influential journal advisory/editorial boards, or at least reviewer for such journals. Could be a member of relevant committees at learned societies. Should have demonstrated ability to inform and engage broader audiences through media interviews or workshops with practitioners. Citations to published work (for example, through Google Scholar) should have increased steadily. Could sit on research funding bodies. Dissemination also includes research-based contributions to major national and international news outlets, high-quality practitioner journals, podcasts, books, etc.	
Societal value and collaborations with industry and public organizations	Must have undertaken societal valuable research activities in a number of ways including publication (in high-quality journals and monographs, textbooks, and anthologies); education (at all levels); partnership (e.g., interaction and collaboration with business and the wider society); policy (e.g., advisory boards and government	

	committees); and research funding (e.g., from research foundations, government, and industry).	

3. CONCLUSIONS

Many of our previous editorials have provided focus on effective research, teaching, and service. We have tackled topics such as initiating an impactful research agenda, working with students and practitioners, and being and staying relevant by providing value to our audiences. The first part of this editorial summarizes these and related topics. The issue of how to convert one's list of accomplishments in research, teaching, and service into a successful tenure or promotion dossier, however, has been left unanswered, and we have tried to shed some light on this important transition process in this editorial.

We provided some general guidance on creating an excellent tenure or promotion dossier, including the cover letter to the assessment committee, short biography, dashboards on research, education, and external funding, CV, details on research publications and pipeline, details on education and pedagogy, and fulfillment of departmental/university-level criteria. For the latter, we provided the specific criteria used in the Department of Marketing at the Copenhagen Business School for promotion to full professor as a detailed example. These guidelines have face validity: they include the standard information that should be included in a tenure or promotion dossier, and we have given some idea as to the level of detail that is likely to be expected by the review committee.

Having provided these general guidelines, we also stress that it is important for the candidate for tenure or promotion to understand the specific requirements at their institution. There will almost certainly be a document spelling out particular requirements to be included in the tenure or promotion dossier. It is important for the candidate to pay close attention to these recommendations as specified by the institution. Obviously, the CV will be part of the dossier, as will evidence of research productivity, teaching contributions, successful grant writing, and so on. All of this must be included, in exactly the format required by the institution. It should go without saying that the information is updated, and consistent. It is frustrating for the promotion or tenure committee to review a candidate's file, only to notice that a paper listed in the CV is not included in the dossier, or that a paper is listed as "published" in one place but "forthcoming" in another.

The institution will likely also require letters from external reviewers, so the candidate should be familiar with this procedure as well (how many letters should be invited, how many names does the candidate need to provide to the committee, does the institution also invite other external reviewers separate from the candidate's list, etc.). Any specific requirements in the letter to the assessment committee should be followed closely. For example, a statement of research activity may be required, in which the candidate identifies two or three "streams of research". For each stream, the candidate will need to show which published articles contribute to that stream, and what future work is planned or forthcoming that will extend the stream. It may be that the promotion or tenure committee places great value on evidence of streams of research, so this would be good to know when preparing the letter. Again, the requirements will vary across institutions, so it is up to the candidates to ensure they have followed the requirements correctly.

As academics, we spend our working time in the pursuit of research, teaching, and service. We spend years building up our research records, delivering educational value by teaching, supervising Ph.D. students, developing courses, and providing service to the institution and to society. All these activities are assessed at the times we seek tenure, or promotion to associate or full professor. For a candidate to be successful with tenure or promotion, it is important not only to have built up a strong record of accomplishment in research, teaching, and service, but also to present the evidence in the dossier effectively, in full detail, and in the format required by the institution. We hope that we have provided guidance so that the candidate can make the most effective tenure/promotion case possible.

REFERENCES

Di Benedetto, C.A., Lindgreen, A., and Ringberg, T. (2021), "Editorial: How to guide your Ph.D. students," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 93, pp. A4–A13.

Di Benedetto, C.A., Lindgreen, A., Storgaard, M., and Clarke, A.H. (2019), "Editorial: How to collaborate really well with practitioners," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 82, pp. 1–8.

LaPlaca, P., Lindgreen, A., and Vanhamme, J. (2018), "How to write really good articles for premier academic journals," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 68, pp. 202–209.

LaPlaca, P., Lindgreen, A., Vanhamme, J., and Di Benedetto, C.A. (2018), "How to revise, and revise really well, for premier academic journals," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 72, pp. 174–180.

Lindgreen, A. and Di Benedetto, C.A. (2020a), "Editorial: How to balance like an academic," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 88, pp. A1–A5.

Lindgreen, A. and Di Benedetto, C.A. (2020b), "Editorial: How reviewers really judge manuscripts," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 91, pp. A1–A10

Lindgreen, A. and Di Benedetto, C.A. (2021), "Editorial: How authors really frame a top manuscript," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 94, pp. A11–A17

Lindgreen, A., Di Benedetto, C.A., and Brodie, R.J. (2021), "Editorial: Research quality: what it is, and how to ensure it," *Industrial Marketing Management*, in press.

Lindgreen, A., Di Benedetto, C.A., Brodie, R.J., and Naude, P. (2020a), "Editorial: How to build great research groups," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 81, pp. 1–13.

Lindgreen, A., Di Benedetto, C.A., Brodie, R.J., and Naude, P. (2020b), "Editorial: How to translate great research into great teaching," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 85, pp. 1–6.

Lindgreen, A., Di Benedetto, C.A., Brodie, R.J., and van der Borgh, M. (2020a), "Editorial: How to get great research cited," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 89, pp. A1–A7

Lindgreen, A., Di Benedetto, C.A., Brodie, R.J., and van der Borgh, M. (2020b), "Editorial: How to undertake great cross-disciplinary research," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 90, pp. A1–A5.

Lindgreen, A., Di Benedetto, C.A., Brodie, R.J., and Jaakkola, E. (2021), "Editorial: How to develop great conceptual frameworks for business-to-business marketing," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 94, pp. A2–A10.

Lindgreen, A., Di Benedetto, C.A., Evald, M.R., Clarke, A.H., Bjørn-Andersen, N., and Lambert, D. (2021), "Editorial: How to define, identify, and measure societal value," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 97, pp. A1–A13.

Lindgreen, A., Di Benedetto, C.A., and Kock, F. (2021), "Editorial: How to develop original, courageous ideas in business marketing research," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 95, pp. A1–A4.

Lindgreen, A., Di Benedetto, C.A., Verdich, C., Vanhamme, J., Venkatraman, V., Pattinson, S., Clarke, A.H., and Khan, Z. (2019), "How to write really good research funding applications," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 77, pp. 232–239.

Lindgreen, A., Di Benedetto, C.A., Zenker, S., and Brodie, R.J. (2021), "Editorial: Teaching quality: what it is, and how to ensure it," *Industrial Marketing Management*, in press.