Dedication

When this *Handbook* was conceived in cooperation with Alan Sturmer of Edward Elgar Publishing, Jim Brown was asked to be co-editor. He quickly agreed, and we exchanged and refined several drafts on how to proceed; but then life intervened (in the vernacular, “you know what happens”), and Jim had to withdraw. Rajiv Dant stepped in, we made a few modifications to the plans and approached potential authors – almost all of whom agreed (although, once again, life happens, so not everyone could complete their chapter). Chuck Ingene moved to Oklahoma in 2014 to work with Rajiv, both to complete the *Handbook* and to build the doctoral program. Then the Grim Reaper intervened. On July 4, 2015, Rajiv was struck down by a massive heart attack while visiting Griffith University in Australia. Chuck inherited all the doctoral students, with its concomitant time commitment. Jim – his troubles over – kindly returned as co-editor. As we complete our duties, we extend our heartfelt thanks to Alan Sturmer, Alison Hornbeck, Karissa Venne, Caroline Kracunas, and everyone else at Edward Elgar Publishing for their remarkable patience as we dealt with our personal and professional problems.

Before proceeding, we highlight our use of an uncommon notation for citations in this Dedication; we do so to conserve space. Please see footnote 1 for details.1

When our editorial journey began, we knew, respected, and had learned from many academics. Here we recall three scholars with whom we were particularly close. It is with honor and deep sorrow that we dedicate this *Handbook* to the memories of our colleagues, friends, and mentors Louis P. (Pete) Bucklin, Rajiv P. Dant, and Robert F. (Bob) Lusch. They each made seminal contributions to our profession’s understanding of the richness and complexity of distribution channels research. We were fortunate to benefit from their guidance and wisdom. Each of them influenced us personally and professionally, shaped our thoughts about distribution channels as a field, and our appreciation of teaching and research as academic endeavors. As our editorial journey draws to a close, we hail our friends and mentors: Pete, Rajiv, and Bob.

**LOUIS PIERRE (PETE) BUCKLIN (SEPTEMBER 20, 1928–JUNE 16, 2012)**2

Louis P. (Pete) Bucklin earned his PhD in marketing from Northwestern University in 1960, and promptly joined the University of California, Berkeley, where he spent his entire career. At various times he was Chair of Marketing and International Business, Director of the business school’s PhD program, and Associate Dean.

For half a century and more, marketing scholars have built on the foundations laid by Pete’s pioneering works. In an early paper he highlighted the interdependence of manufacturers and retailers by arguing that the breadth of distribution should be affected by how much effort consumers will put into buying the “right” product, whether it be a convenience, shopping or specialty good (1963).3 This fundamental (and, at the
time, controversial) insight ineluctably led to *A Theory of Distribution Channel Structure* (1966), a monograph which stressed that the purpose of a channel’s structure is to minimize total system cost – including costs incurred by end-users, whether consumers or firms. To have read *A Theory* at the time revealed Pete’s solid grounding in economics, with his appreciation of the postponement-speculation tradeoff in both production and distribution. The long-term impact of these insights was confirmed 20 years later when Pete Bucklin received the 1986 Paul D. Converse Award for his 1963 article and his 1966 monograph.4

A related concern of Pete’s was the issue of control in a distribution channel. Many chapters in this *Handbook* address control, either directly or indirectly; indeed, control is a major theme in behaviorally oriented channels research. Current research heeds *part* of Pete’s advice: “the need for control in distribution systems emerges because coordination left to market forces alone often results in less than optimal decision patterns for both the operators of the system *and for the consumers it serves*” (1973, p. 46, emphasis added). In the opinion of the co-editors, today’s channels research often gives short shrift to consumers. We return to this issue in Chapter 23 of this *Handbook*.

Pete continued his channel research by building on interorganizational exchange theory and transaction cost economics with his student, Sanjit Sengupta. They observed that channel relationships are not just vertical, they can be horizontal. They delved into “co-marketing alliances . . . lateral relationships between firms at the same level in the value-added chain” (1993, p. 32). The impact of this conceptual and empirical analysis was substantial – the paper received the 1993 Alpha Kappa Psi Award for advancing the practice of marketing.

In addition to analysing intra-channel processes, including control mechanisms, Bucklin was concerned with broader issues as early as *A Theory*, the first words of which are “Study of the distribution channel is basic to the understanding of the marketing process. It is basic because it focuses upon the essential nature of marketing: the interactions among commercial institutions and between these institutions and the consumer” (1966, p. xi). Pete focused on these institutional interactions in *Competition and Evolution in the Distributive Trades* (1972), a comprehensive conceptual and empirical study of the structure of retailing and wholesaling in the United States. Structure matters because it affects competition between channel members, as well as the efforts (e.g., time and money) consumers must put forth. Structural issues are not uniquely American; Pete and his student, Hirotaka Takeuchi, contrasted retailing in Japan and the United States (Takeuchi 1977).5 Their article expanded our knowledge of cross-country commonalities in retail structure. In the co-editors’ opinion, cross-national studies have received insufficient attention in the literature, particularly on the topic of competitive structures.

The Takeuchi-Bucklin paper also altered Chuck’s career path. It persuaded me that it was possible to publish articles in marketing journals that were based on economic logic with a geographic orientation; that is, using my training in economics with an emphasis on location theory. (At that time, I had little knowledge of marketing scholarship, so knew next to nothing about what was already a truly rich literature, much of it written by Pete.) In 1978 I switched to marketing at the urging of Bob Lusch, and with the endorsement of Pete Bucklin, two people to whom I shall be forever grateful. Coincidentally, that year *Productivity in Marketing* (1978) appeared. Not coincidentally, my early work in
marketing built on Pete’s incisive volume (Ingene 1982; 1984). Apparently it met Pete’s approval, as he kindly asked me (and Gary Frazier) to discuss his contributions at the Converse Award ceremony (Ingene 1986).

Pete formally retired from Berkeley in 1993, but kept teaching until 2001. During his “retirement” he served as editor of the Journal of Retailing (1996–2001), succeeding Ingene in that role – and preceding by several years Jim’s and Rajiv’s co-editorship of Journal of Retailing. As we recall the man and the scholar, Pete Bucklin was a gentle genius with an ever-curious mind, who continually challenged conventional wisdom over many facets of distribution, and who successfully persuaded colleagues throughout the marketing field of the value of his arguments, doing so in a manner that simultaneously made them his friends.


Rajiv P. Dant earned his PhD in marketing from the Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University (Virginia Tech) in 1986. After years as a peripatetic professor, Rajiv settled down at the University of Oklahoma in 2008 where, as Director of the Marketing Division, he recruited Chuck for the Robin Siegfried Centennial Chair in Marketing in 2014. At his untimely death, Rajiv held the Helen Robson Walton Centennial Chair in Marketing Strategy.

Rajiv is well known for his work on behavioral facets of distribution channels. His early work focused on both conflict management (1992a) and operationalizing the norms of exchange relationships (Kaufmann 1992). The latter article included measures that have been adapted and extended by numerous scholars over the past quarter century.

Around the turn of the century, Rajiv embarked on a project that produced arguably the most comprehensive longitudinal dataset on behavioral relations in marketing channels ever created. He assembled multiple research teams to examine various aspects of this dataset. One team developed an insightful relational mediator model to organize the literature underlying a meta-analysis on interorganizational relationships (Palmatier 2006). This article won the 2011 Stern Award for its outstanding contributions to interorganizational research and the 2016 Sheth Foundation/Journal of Marketing Award for making a long-term contribution to the marketing discipline. A related team (Palmatier 2007) compared the efficacy of four performance perspectives on channel relations: commitment-trust, dependence, transaction cost economics, and relational norms; this article received the Stern Award in 2015.

Rajiv returned to his conflict management roots to explore how past interactions affect current intra-channel communications, conflict resolution behaviors, and performance (Koza 2007). Another use of the dataset studied the co-existence of trust and opportunism (Lado 2008). Yet another team investigated how unfairness exacerbates the negative impact of conflict on channel relationships (Samaha 2011).

Capitalizing on the longitudinal nature of Rajiv’s dataset, one team presented the concept of relationship velocity – the speed with which trust and commitment change over the course of a channel relationship (Palmatier 2013). Another team identified five latent relationship states that described how different marketing strategies are needed to move channel relationships to higher performing states (Zhang 2016). We believe both these
papers will stimulate research on how relationships change over time (e.g., Harmeling and Palmatier, Chapter 13 in this *Handbook*).

Less widely known are Rajiv’s tireless efforts in promoting franchising as an academic area in marketing. He was a member of the Board of Governors of the International Society of Franchising (iSoF) from 1993 to 2015; three times he served as iSoF conference chair; he also co-edited several special issues on franchising, including one for the *Journal of Retailing* (2011a). And he was a member of the Education Committee of the practitioner-oriented International Franchise Association from 1992 to 2014.

Rajiv investigated a broad variety of franchising issues, including ownership redirection, franchising fees, and setting forth a research agenda for the discipline. Ownership redirection entails a franchisor purchasing the more profitable franchised outlets, an approach that not all franchisees appreciate (1992b; 1996; 2003; Windsperger 2006). He was also involved in a detailed study of franchisors juggling an initial franchise fee and a royalty rate (Kaufmann 2001). Chronicling research in franchising and developing an agenda for future research endeavors is another way in which Rajiv contributed to the academic field of franchising (2011b).

Moreover, Rajiv dabbled in retailing. In fact, three of us – Jim, Rajiv, and Chuck – collaborated with Pat Kaufmann to pen a supply chain management paper on a “Big Middle” perspective of retail evolution (Brown 2005). Then, from 2006 to 2011, Rajiv and Jim co-edited the *Journal of Retailing*, operating under an editorial philosophy that the domain of retailing included upstream B2B value chain elements as well as downstream B2C considerations.

Rajiv’s influence on the field extends beyond his scholarship and professional service. He was an extraordinary friend and colleague. We have been immeasurably enriched by being counted among his many friends. Shortly after his death, the *Journal of Retailing* memorialized Rajiv by publishing recollections of him by our academic colleagues (Brown and Ingene 2015). We reproduce it in the Postscript to this *Handbook*, and thank Elsevier for granting permission to once again express our feelings, and those of many of his friends, in a eulogy that was written two days after Rajiv’s passing.

**ROBERT FRANK (BOB) LUSCH (JANUARY 21, 1949–FEBRUARY 23, 2017)**

Bob Lusch earned his PhD in marketing from the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1975, from which he joined the University of Oklahoma (OU). From 1975 to 1987, he held faculty positions at OU and Arizona State University before rejoining OU as Dean of the College of Business (1987–92), after which he became the Helen Robson Walton Chair in Marketing and the George Lynn Cross Research Professor at OU. In 2000, Bob moved to Fort Worth as Dean of the M.J. Neeley School of Business at Texas Christian University (2000–04). In 2004 he relocated to his hometown of Tucson as Head of the Marketing Department at the University of Arizona (UA), a position he held until 2010 when he was appointed Executive Director of the McGuire Center for Entrepreneurship at UA and the James and Pamela Muzzy Chair in Entrepreneurship.

While most scholars now associate Bob with his work on service-dominant logic, his
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research career actually began with distribution channels, an interest he held throughout his life. His early channels research delved into how channel conflict affects performance (1976a) and how sources of power shape the level of conflict (1976b). Bob and his co-authors also explored the nature of power (1982; 1985), developed and tested a fully articulated model of the impact of power on conflict (Brown 1983), examined how power relates to channel commitment (Brown 1995), and investigated the nature of channel member satisfaction (Ross 1983).

As marketers began to study trust and organizational justice in distribution channels, so did Bob. With co-authors, he scrutinized the role of trust in supporting organizational change (2003); the effects of contracts and justice on relationships (Brown 2006); and the benefits of procedural and distributive justice on relationships (Griffith 2006). Bob’s later research on marketing channel behavior dealt with channel member collaboration (Zacharia 2011).

The role of governing channel relationships also captured Bob’s attention. One paper found that contract breaches raise the likelihood that a channel relationship will dissolve (2011b); but identification with a channel partner will temper this likelihood. A paper with Jim Brown introduced the notion of normative (soft) contracting to the channels literature; empirically they found soft contracts to have a stronger impact on relational behavior and channel performance than hard or explicit contracts (1996). This paper was awarded the Journal of Marketing’s 1996 Harold Maynard Award for Theoretical Contributions to Marketing, and the American Marketing Association (AMA)/Stern Award for Contributions to Marketing Channels Literature.

Bob was also an astute student of retailing, a key institution in distribution channels. In early papers, Chuck and Bob examined the structure of US department store retailing (Ingene 1980); then built upon that empirical work by developing and testing a theoretical model of retail structure in the context of US grocery retailing (Ingene 1981a). Bob and Chuck then analysed the productivity of capital invested in US retailing, finding that, in the aggregate, retail capital productivity declined from 1951 to 1974 (Ingene 1981b).

Bob and his student, Soo-Young Moon, investigated labor productivity using data from a cross-sectional survey of hardware retailers. They found marketing mix variables, store type, ownership structure, wage rates and firm size to be key productivity determinants (1984). Collaborating with another student, Ray Serpkenci, and using a multi-method approach that was rather unique for its time, they analysed data from a US variety store retailer; finding that a store manager’s job tension lowered both job performance and job satisfaction, while job performance was positively correlated with store performance (1990).

In 2004, Steve Vargo and Bob published their seminal work on service-dominant logic—aka SDL (Vargo 2004). In it they argued that the field of marketing should reorient itself from the exchange of goods to the exchange of service. Toward that end they identified differences between the prevailing goods-dominant logic and their proposed service-dominant logic, and developed eight foundational premises underlying SDL. Subsequent papers further articulated SDL (Vargo 2008a; 2008b). SDL was extended to retail by arguing that, to achieve competitive advantage, retailers had to work with customers to create value for customers as well as themselves. They also argued that it was necessary to leverage employees’ knowledge and skills to more effectively implement their market-
In subsequent articles, Bob and his co-authors illustrated the implications of SDL to supply chain management (Flint 2014; Lusch 2011a). A key implication for supply chain management is the unbundling of supply chain information from physical goods while bundling resources to provide maximum value in a particular exchange context (2010).

For his innovative work in developing SDL, the seminal article by Vargo and Lusch (2004) was bestowed the Journal of Marketing’s 2004 Harold Maynard Award for Theoretical Contributions to Marketing; this paper was also recognized with the 2010 AMA/Sheth Foundation Award honoring an article that has made a long-term contribution to the discipline of marketing. The impact of this article is manifold. The Web of Science reveals it to be the fourth most cited article published in the Journal of Marketing since its inception in 1936, having over 4,100 citations as we go to press.8

Bob continued working productively up to the very end (see Chapter 2 in this Handbook). His vitality helps explain how, while generating an astounding publication record, Bob had the energy to hold key positions in the AMA: editor of the Journal of Marketing (1996–99), Chair of the Board (2000–01), and Vice President for Publications (2011–14).

The academy recognized Bob Lusch’s overall contributions to scholarly knowledge, doctoral education, and professional service by honoring him with multiple lifetime achievement awards. A partial list of the most prominent of those awards includes the Outstanding Marketing Educator Award from the Academy of Marketing Science (1997); a Lifetime Achievement Award from AMA’s Interorganizational Special Interest Group (2009); the AMA/Irwin/McGraw-Hill Distinguished Marketing Educator Award for distinguished service and outstanding contributions in marketing education (2015); membership in the Inaugural Cohort of AMA Fellows (2015), and the Paul D. Converse Award (2016). These awards testify to the great esteem in which the profession held Bob Lusch.

Finally, a parting note. Neither of us can overstate Bob’s impact on our lives. Chuck’s career switch to marketing began in a weight room as we “pumped iron” while plumbing the intricacies of economic behavior (Bob said marketing behavior!). Those in-depth conversations altered Chuck’s life’s journey. Although Bob and Jim worked at different institutions, they found a way to collaborate on distribution issues of mutual interest for more than 30 years. And, amongst his many contributions, Bob introduced Chuck and Jim. Bob was a dear friend, a wise mentor, and a caring colleague. Speaking for Rajiv, all three of us were fortunate to have experienced his guiding light.

Charles A. Ingene and James R. Brown

NOTES

1. A date in parentheses refers to an article or book written by the person we are praising; for example, the citation “(1963)” would conventionally be written as “Bucklin (1963);” this notation may reflect a single- or multiple-authored piece. When a name is given (e.g., “Name 1978”), Name may be the sole author, or may be the first author with one or more co-authors; note that Name is not the person we are praising. See the References at the end of this Dedication for complete citations using conventional notation.

2. For more information on Pete’s career and contributions, see Randy Bucklin’s “Introduction to the Special

3. See note 1.
4. Re-reading A Theory of Distribution Channel Structure today, we see the intellectual seed of a consumer-oriented, service-dominant logic that we discuss in reference to Bob Lusch later in this Dedication.
5. See note 1 above.
6. For more information on Rajiv’s career and contributions, see Brown and Ingene (2015). It is reproduced as a Postscript to this Handbook with the kind permission of Elsevier who hold the Copyright.
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