



Google Scholar Citations Score Analysis

What does your Google Scholarship Score mean?

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Citations | 11501 |
| Citations | 2153 |
| Citations | 9999 |
| Citations | 1251 |
| Citations | 888 |
| Citations | 22543 |
| Citations | 6789 |
| Citations | 2358 |
| Citations | 8543 |
| Citations | 4321 |
| Citations | 8881 |



The Gold Standard



(GPS: Google Profile for Scholarship)

For some time now, I have been intrigued by the Google Scholar Citations Score. So, I have been Googling the Google itself—I mean its Citations pages. Below I compiled 50 scholars, trying to sample as many with seminal contributions as came to mind. My selection was arbitrary, biased heavily by my “availability heuristic” and personal topic interests. My sincere apology for not including many just as deserving. I use this list as my data to spur some hypotheses about what GSS numbers might mean. Eyeball the list below and I will meet you on the other side to share some hypotheses I came up with.

Dan Ariely (58469). Illuminating the logic behind the seemingly irrational consumer. Experimental consumer research has never been so charming in its design and so profound in its findings, told with so much autobiographically authentic story-telling magic.

Joanna Peck (*) Proved that products touch us back

Claas Christian Germelmann (*). Anyone who researches “Men and the Food Leftovers of Attractive Others:” deserves kudos!

héctor gonzalez jimenez (*) Although the bulk of his research focus is on consumer nurture of the self with brands, his most enthralling gift to feed our curiosity is a preview of our self-aware humanoid double.

Margot Racat (*) Ditch your mouse. Your shopper finger has a new world to explore—the utility and joy of touch sensation on products' digital images

Zeynep Gürhan-Canli (*) What we should miss what we should not--we all have experienced FOMO. Now we can navigate it guided by a scholar's schema.

Russ Belk (72830). His gift of Consumer Odyssey has enlightened as much as it has also entertained the whole generation of consumer psychologists and anthropologists and serious as well as curious students.

Sianne Gordon-Wilson (*) Her sustainability consumer findings gave us a good body of knowledge; of more topical and therefore more consequential value is her exploration of consumer repivoting during COVID Times.

Alisa Minina (*) With pioneering consumer research she unravels a new consumer type: the globe-trotting digital wallet jugglers, or cephalopodics as she names them. (A more tongue-friendly Octopus or Nautilus might get better traction, though.). Btw, "liquid consumption" (her other research interest) has nothing to do with booze.

Anil Bilgihan (*). With 145 articles in his 10-year scholarship career (15 in 2021!!), don't let the quantity stop your wonderment—Bilgihan has uncovered more facets of hospitality and consumer interface than perhaps anyone else in marketing.

Ron Paul Hill (14308) Voice of the impoverished consumer.

Bram Van den Bergh (*). Bikinis accelerate our intertemporal choices; testosterone effects on gendered-brand choices; the pursuit of inequality among individualists; locomotion—getting shoppers to walk faster or slower; arm flexion (extension) makes us choose vices (virtues)! How many consumer psychologists do we need to research these diverse ideas? Just one!

Aradhana Krishna (12815) Shining a light on the sensory side of products.

Bernard Cova (22485). With 432 total entries (!), this master ethnographer has unraveled the deep layers that crisscross the web of brands, popular culture, consumption communities, consumer self-propping, and the deeds and misdeeds of marketing/"murketing."

Ricardo Godinho Bilro (*). He enriched the consumer engagement literature with a gamification lens.

Kevin Keller (172632) Chief architect of brand equity

James Mourey (**) Gut feeling makes products our pals) (Score: missing!)

Lorena Blasco-Arcas (*). Engagement platforms—they are deeply in our digital life both as consumers and as social beings. Her research tells us how they serve us as consumers as well as serve marketers.

Varsha Jain (*) The single most significant source of understanding luxury branding, especially in the strange curious marketplace called *India*

Liliana L. Bove (*). Every services manager should know how employees and customers impact each other in value co-creation, and her research stream is a must-read... then broaden your services system vision by grasping the other side of the coin: "value co-destruction" by misbehavin' customers!

Canan Corus (**). Can consumer research (CR) serve pious goals? From morality of food and health to inequality in the consumption of social and public space to deliberative democracy for civic engagement to transformative service for higher consumer wellbeing, Corus (with her coauthors) informs our CR minds on out-of-sight topics and awakens our CR souls.

Fernando Fastoso (*) Marketers: If you want to court the narcissistic consumer, his research is your lifeline.

Bo Edvardsson (23612) From Mayo Clinic to Eataly to Arab Spring (social movement as a service system!), he has shone light on the anatomy of service system design and its value impact that should inform and will enrich all future research and thoughtful practice alike.

H. Shankar Krishnan (4644) A multi-act discovery tour of consumer memory processes.

Dhruv Grewal (73157). A master mixologist of consumer psychology, the internet, retailing, and marketing strategy.

Phillip Kotler (441277) The 'K' in marketing is for Kotler

Linda D. Hollebeek (18015) With 20 years of dogged, awesome pursuit, nurtured from its cradle to its adolescence, the innovative CB concept of consumer engagement.

Inés López López (*) On the gratification of sharing the tales of our consumption experiences.

A. Parasuraman (211967) Taming the elusive concept of services quality from the customer's point-of-view

Jochen Wirtz (35865) Encyclopedic treatment of services marketing knowledge, useful for both research and practice.

Nirmalaya Kumar (25440) Most extensive wisdom on milking channel relationships as strategic corporate asset.

Candice Hollenbeck (*). Harnessing research-based deep understanding of identity construction in brand communities, and then with it to decipher anti-brand communities.

Albert M. Muniz (15943). Sociology comes to branding; brand communities receive an ethnographic super-illumination.

Jiewen Hong (*) Go-to source for insights on the Chinese consumer behavior. Also unraveling consumers who make decisions with mixed emotions and a dose of reason.

Melike Demirbag Kaplan (*) From energy consumption to fashion to health to brand avoidance to branding of places to design thinking in education, her consumer psychology lens is our guide to topics far and wide.

Ian Phau (11275) In trance of the star designer, or happily building attachment, or basking in schadenfreude, if you want to look inside the black box of the luxury consumer, indulge in Ian Phau's bundle of luxury research.

Bernardo Figueiredo (*) Who among us is not a globally mobile cosmopolitan? Turns out we construct our psychological consumption world differently than do the less mobile consumers, we just did not

realize it. His penetrating ethnographic research will help greater self-awareness as jet-setter consumers.

Robert Kozinets (37019) Father of netnography

Lorraine Lau-Gesk (**) Enlightening us on the duality in the consumer cognizance of brands: harmony and tension in emotions, cultures, selfhood, volition.

Deborah MacInnis (31288) In how many ways can an ad influence our brand attitude and in how many ways can you love a brand--Her research is our roadmap.

CW Park (32815) Elevating brand-building scholarship to a must-read for C-Suites

Rosanna Smith (*) Delightfully deep insights on authenticity—in art appreciation, beauty makeup, and expressive acts; you don't know *authenticity* until you read her work.

Justin Paul (*) Elevating a mere concept, masstige, to a delightful theory

Melanie Rudd (*) Forget material products. Learn wiser ways of time consumption as a tool of happiness.

Nhat Quang Le (*) In the short career (Ph.D., 2019), he dedicated his consumer research toolbox to hitherto ignored human-suffering sectors (e.g., assisted dying), giving us a new reason to be proud of our profession. For readers not attracted by do-good contexts (e.g., donor behavior), his Instagram research foray is like a "fortune cookie" sweet treat.

Amna Kirmani (10857) "5G insights"—to use a metaphor from the world of wireless—on marketing communications and persuasion

Arch Woodside (30362) Quite possibly one of the world's 50 most eclectic marketing scholars.

Hope Schau (11392) Perspectives on consumer search for self-identities in the marketplace and the dialectic between creating it vs pursuing it

Jag Sheth (57129) Doyen of marketing knowledge on its diverse facets—classic and novel—that transcend calendar, nation, topic, and theory/practice boundaries.

Mary Steffel (*) Illuminates the consequences of consumers delegating decisions (to which consumers remain naive). And anyone who does 25 experiments for one paper deserves a big salute!

.....

*<10k; ** Missing

Some Pre-Logical Ideas on Our GPS Coordinates (*GPS: Google Publications Score*)

Academic researcher's own GPS (Google Publications Score)

1. The scores depend on longevity; a researcher with a 20-year career is likely to have a higher score than a researcher with a mere five-year history.

2. The above is countervailed by this: The score has a “generation” effect biased in favor of recency. Papers published some 20 or 30 years ago will have a smaller “tail” than those published say, five or ten years ago. This is due to the exponential growth of both the number of researchers (citers) and the number of publication outlets.
3. The GPS is biased in favor of topic currency. (Note: High topic currency (no matter how long ago that currency occurred and how long it lasted) may not reflect the relative value of that topic in the body of entire discipline.)
4. The citation of various papers on the same topic in subsequent papers reflects only that the cited papers share the topic name with the citing paper; the relative individual contribution of the cited papers to the citing paper, even when dutifully so detailed by the citer, has no impact on the GPS.
5. Many papers get cited with a mere reading (by the citer) of the abstract, and some not even that; this is done in good faith to acknowledge where credit is due; yet GPS hides the true differential credit different cited papers deserve.
6. GPS is blind to the valence of the citations. A paper cited to borrow prior knowledge receives exact equal recognition to that received by a paper that might have been cited for its weak theory or method, as in a literature review.
7. The final GPS of individual papers have low correlation with how many readers truly admired that paper. Thus, your paper with low score might have been admired by more readers than another paper with a higher score.

Two possible moderators:

1. Breadth Over Depth Effect: 20 papers on the same topic will solidify a real gain for the discipline but will likely produce fewer cites than, say, 2 papers each on 10 different topics.
2. Cross-topic contribution: A paper (or book) on advances in methods will likely garner more citations than even a landmark paper on a content topic. (The former informs the works of a larger aggregate body of researchers).

TOWARD A MORE LOGICAL INTERPRETATION

Therefore, one approach to interpreting the GPS might be this:

1. On an average, higher productivity or seminal authors do get higher scores. The key phrase is “on the average,” as there are some conspicuous exceptions (see low numbers of 8k for two of the stellar researchers in this list).
2. The GPS may be read as if it is an ordinal (not continuous) scale and a very coarse scale at that; e.g., a +/-10% as a single point on the ordinal scale; e.g., a score of, say, 50,000 is part of the same band as 45,000 and 55,000; a score of 160,000 belongs in the 144 to 176K band, and so on.
3. The bands of scores don't make a vertical linear line either; instead, they make a circular ring. Thus, no band is hierarchically higher than others. Thus, a score of 50 is not “lower” than a score of 100K or 150K, or 250K. They are just independent, individual entities with meaning within and unto themselves.

4. Low scorers need not feel “low” and they deserve a degree of respect indexed not by the GPS but instead by our personal reading of their work and our unbiased appreciation of its contribution.
5. On the flipside, a high GPS score does not get air-drawn in thin air. The coarseness of the scale and our suggestion of a circular form visualization notwithstanding, still a high score is generally built upon a strong and deep and wide foundation of years of hard work by the researcher and high productivity and a faculty of deeper thinking and innovative contribution to knowledge.
6. The emotional gain from the GPS is and should be asymmetrical. A low score is absolutely positively no cause for grief. A high score is not an excuse for gloating either **and no scholar does.** Still, low or high, it is, in equal measure, a source of small joy in life. In our individual and collective life. We should embrace it with pride and comfort and healthy elation and inter-collegial celebration.

Submitted respectfully.

[Home](#)