

# Are we standing on the shoulders of fallen giants? Citations of fraudulent-now-retracted articles in marketing journals

Salim Moussa<sup>1</sup>

The advancement of knowledge relies on a foundation built by past research, yet when that foundation is compromised by fraud, the structure of science weakens. In marketing research, a series of research integrity scandals have led to multiple retractions from top-tier journals, exposing the field's reliance on studies later deemed fraudulent. This paper investigates the persistence of these fraudulent-now-retracted articles (FNRAs) in the marketing literature, asking whether they continue to be cited, in which journals, and whether they have influenced review articles. Analyzing 13 FNRAs, the author found that despite their formal retraction, these articles remain embedded in scholarly discourse. With 82 post-retraction citations in 37 marketing journals—with some appearing in literature reviews—the legacy of these FNRAs endures, misleading future research. By (unknowingly) standing on the shoulders of fallen giants, the field risks perpetuating error rather than progress. The author discusses implications for research integrity and corrective mechanisms.

**Keywords:** fraudulent articles; retraction; post-retraction citations; research integrity; marketing research.

## Introduction

Research integrity, defined as “active adherence to the ethical principles and professional standards essential for the responsible practice of research” (Korenman, 2006, p. 2), is the cornerstone of the academic research system. Over the past 13 years, marketing academia has been rocked by major research integrity scandals involving prominent scholars, leading to numerous article retractions from top-tier marketing journals (Luce et al., 2012; Meyer, 2015; Herndon, 2016; Moussa, 2022a; Moussa, 2022b; Shaw & Nave, 2023).

Many of these retractions resulted from university-led investigations that uncovered clear evidence of research misconduct (Funder, 2014; Moussa & Charlton, 2024). The scholars found responsible have since left academia, resigning from their positions. Among them is a Ferber Award recipient—an honor given for the best dissertation-based article published in the *Journal of Consumer Research* (JCR). Another researcher, linked to three retracted JCR articles and two corrections (one in *Journal of Consumer Psychology* [JCP] and the other in *Journal of Marketing*), has disappeared from academic circles, with their PhD officially revoked in 2024. These “fallen giants” once collaborated with some of the most influential figures in marketing research, including a former (co)editor-in-chief of the *International Journal of Research in Marketing* (JCR), a (former) co-editor-in-chief of JCP (*Marketing*

---

<sup>1</sup> Institut Supérieur d'Administration des Entreprises, Rue Houssine ben Kaddour, Sidi Ahmed Zarroug, Gafsa 2112, Tunisie. ORCID : [0000-0003-2589-0719](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2589-0719)  
E-mail: [salimmoussa@yahoo.fr](mailto:salimmoussa@yahoo.fr)

*Letters*), a former president of the Society for Consumer Psychology, and several of the field's most influential scholars.

In its Retraction Guidelines, the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE, 2019, p.4) defines a retraction as “a mechanism for correcting the literature and alerting readers to articles that contain such seriously flawed or erroneous content or data that their findings and conclusions cannot be relied upon”. Despite the importance of this corrective mechanism, studies have found that readers may be unaware that an article has been retracted (Sotudeh et al., 2022). Worse, such retracted articles may be perpetuated by subsequent citations that support their findings (Moussa, 2022b). This continued, inappropriate use of retracted articles undermines retractions' effectiveness as a corrective mechanism (Teixeira da Silva et al., 2025).

The continued citation of fraudulent-now-retracted articles (FNRA) is not a trivial issue. Each citation extends the influence of FNRA, potentially distorting future studies, misguiding marketing practices, misleading public policies, and eroding public trust in marketing research.

This study aims to systematically investigate the persistence of fraudulent-now-retracted marketing articles in the marketing literature. Specifically, it addresses three key research questions (RQs):

- RQ1: Do fraudulent marketing articles continue to be cited despite their retraction?
- RQ2: In which marketing journals are these retracted articles most frequently cited?
- RQ3: Have these retracted articles been included in reviews, potentially shaping broader syntheses of marketing research?

By answering these questions, this paper seeks to provide insights that are critical for scholars, academic associations, reviewers, and journal editors who contribute to marketing research. To the best of the author's knowledge, these RQs have never been explored before. Moreover, despite being a fundamental aspect of the scientific process, the issues of retracted articles and research misconduct remain largely absent from major marketing journals—almost a taboo in the field. While recent publications in leading marketing journals have addressed topics such as responsible research (e.g., Stremersch, Winer, & Camacho, 2021; Haenlein et al., 2022) and open science principles (e.g., Deer et al., 2025), they tend to sidestep discussions on research fraud and misconduct, leaving a critical gap in the conversation.

### **Understanding the retraction process: A focus on fraudulent research**

Retraction is the most severe form of correction in academic publishing, signaling that a published article is no longer considered part of the scholarly record. While retractions can occur for a range of reasons—including honest errors, methodological flaws, or ethical oversights—cases involving fraud (e.g., data fabrication or falsification) represent the most serious breaches of research integrity (COPE, 2019).

The retraction process typically begins when concerns are raised by individuals (e.g., a data sleuth or a whistleblower) or institutional bodies. In cases of alleged fraud, publishers often initiate formal investigations, sometimes in collaboration with the authors' institutions. If misconduct is confirmed, the journal issues a retraction notice, which ideally should include a clear explanation of the reason for retraction (Xu & Hu, 2023). However, in practice, retraction notices vary widely in clarity and detail, and

many are vague or incomplete, undermining their corrective function (Moussa & Charlton, 2024).

Despite the finality implied by retraction, retracted articles often remain accessible through publishers' websites, institutional repositories, and academic databases, and are not always clearly marked as retracted. This creates the conditions for what scholars have called "citation pollution"—where retracted work continues to be cited without acknowledgment of its retracted status (Bolland et al., 2022; Teixeira da Silva et al., 2025). This is particularly problematic in cases of fraud, where the research is not merely flawed but intentionally deceptive.

Moreover, fraudulent research often gains significant visibility *before* retraction, meaning that its influence may already be embedded in subsequent literature, reviews, and even practice. Naming no names, the annals of marketing science are dotted with once-celebrated researchers who rose to prominence—garnering awards, headlines, and admiration—only to later be exposed as fraudsters (Moussa & Charlton, 2024). These individuals did not merely make mistakes; they deliberately manipulated data and fabricated findings.

Retraction, while necessary, is therefore not always sufficient to reverse the epistemic and reputational damage caused by scientific misconduct. Understanding the mechanics and limits of the retraction process—especially in fraudulent cases—is essential for assessing how and why fake research continues to shape scholarly discourse (Thorp, 2022; Ivory & Elson, 2024).

### **Should fraudulent-now-retracted articles be cited?**

Citations give credibility and legitimacy to prior work. A citation, as Zinkhan (2004, p.370) views it, "is an indicator that a published article is not being 'lost' or 'overlooked' and that it is having some impact on the field and the work of future authors". For Hunt (2021, p.131), "there is no question that citations are an important indicator of the impact of a publication on other scholars' research". In their article on the structural influence of marketing journals, Baumgartner and Pieters (2003, p.125) state that "[i]f a journal publishes an article that is cited by articles in other journals, it contributes to the exchange of ideas in a field of inquiry and is thus considered influential". This reasoning holds true—as long as the cited article is a reliable and valid piece of scholarship. However, when an article is fraudulent and has been officially retracted, its citations no longer signify intellectual impact or academic influence. Instead, they become markers of misinformation, perpetuating errors, distorting knowledge, and undermining the integrity of the field (Moussa, 2022b). When a FNRA is cited without acknowledgment of its retraction, it perpetuates fabricated or falsified findings and risks misleading readers, especially practitioners or policy-makers relying on that information.

There appears to be consensus that retracted articles should not be used or cited. For instance, Atwater et al. (2014, p.1179) state that "retracted articles should not be cited because they have been effectively removed from the scientific record". For Woo and Walsh (2024, pp.5-6), "[r]etracted articles are nullified papers [...] such nullified papers should not then be used as a proper base for knowledge production". For Million and Budd (2024, p.263), "citing retracted articles often constitutes a form of dis- or misinformation because citations lend credence to problematic content".

Teixeira da Silva et al. (2025, p.1) advise that “if a retraction is due to misconduct, then it should not be cited”. Bolland et al. (2022, p.18) went as far as suggesting that “[p]apers citing retracted publications might need correction if findings depend on the retracted publication”. For COPE (2019, p.5), “[a]rticles that relied on subsequently retracted articles in reaching their own conclusions, such as systematic reviews or meta-analyses, may themselves need to be corrected or retracted”.

There are two types of citations of retracted papers: (a) pre-retraction citations or citations that an article receives prior to its retraction, and (b) post-retraction citations or citations that it receives post retraction and despite the retraction notice (Moussa, 2022b). Although the former type of citations is unavoidable (i.e., pre-retraction citations), the latter (i.e., post-retraction citations) is particularly concerning, especially when FNRAs are still cited as valid work and presented as central to the argument of the article citing them, despite the issuance/availability of retraction notices.

When journals in marketing—or any applied field—cite FNRAs, the impact is not merely academic. These citations can influence business strategies, shape public policies, and inform real-world decisions. In such contexts, overlooking the retraction of a fraudulent paper is not a minor slip—it is a consequential failure.

## Methodology

### Retracted articles

As indicated in section 2, retractions occur for various reasons, including plagiarism, duplicate publication, or honest errors (COPE, 2019). However, this study focuses exclusively on articles retracted due to data fabrication or falsification within marketing research. The rationale for this selective focus is clear: the authors responsible for these fraudulent articles have resigned or parted ways with their institutions following university-led investigations. Their departure signals not only the severity of their misconduct but also institutional acknowledgment that these articles were fundamentally flawed and beyond redemption (Funder, 2014; Moussa & Charlton, 2024). By retaining only fraudulent articles, this analysis remains centered on the most egregious cases of research misconduct—those severe enough to result in institutional separation. This approach reinforces the urgency of maintaining vigilance in academic publishing and preventing fraudulent work from distorting future scholarship. Furthermore, the “standing on the shoulders of fallen giants” metaphor is particularly fitting for fraudulent marketing research—articles that once shaped the field but were later exposed as deceptive. Including other types of retractions, such as those due to honest errors, would dilute this metaphor’s impact and weaken the argument. Fraudulent articles represent a unique threat to scientific integrity, making their continued citation especially problematic.

To uncover instances of FNRAs in marketing, the author conducted a thorough search of CrossRef’s Retraction Watch database (<http://retractiondatabase.org/>) on March 10, 2025. This database serves as a crucial repository for tracking academic misconduct, retractions, and ethical breaches in research. By systematically scanning its records, the author aimed to identify marketing articles that were once accepted as

legitimate contributions but were later discredited due to fabrication, falsification, or other forms of academic dishonesty.

Table 1 lists all identified FNRA's from JCR (nine articles), *Journal of Marketing Research* (JMR, one article), *Journal of Consumer Psychology* (JCP, one article), *Psychology & Marketing* (P&M, one article), and *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research* (JACR, one article). These 13 FNRA's were co-authored by four marketing scholars, three of whom left academia after university-led investigations, while the fourth quietly parted ways with their institution following multiple retractions.

According to COPE's retraction guidelines and the National Information Standards Organization's (NISO) recommendations on retraction communication, a proper retraction requires a separate, freely accessible notice that clearly states the reason for retraction and identifies the individual or entity responsible for it. The notice should include: (a) an issuance date, (b) a unique Digital Object Identifier (DOI), and (c) a bi-directional link to the original article, which must be clearly tagged as "Retracted". Additionally, the PDF of the retracted article should be digitally watermarked with "Retracted" on every page. To preserve the integrity of the scholarly record, the retracted article remains accessible online.

Table 1 presents for each of these 13 FNRA's: (a) its DOI; (b) the DOI of its retraction notice; (c) the date of its retraction; and (d) reason(s) for retraction (as per retraction notice).

**Table 1.** The thirteen fraudulent-now-retracted marketing articles

Article #	Retracting journal	DOI of retracted article	DOI of retraction notice	Retraction date	Reason(s) for retraction
1	JCR	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1086/657430">https://doi.org/10.1086/657430</a>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1086/667237">https://doi.org/10.1086/667237</a>	12 June 2012	Fraudulent/fabricated data
2	JCR	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1086/662139">https://doi.org/10.1086/662139</a>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1086/667689">https://doi.org/10.1086/667689</a>	11 July 2012	Not provided
3	JCR	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1086/648688">https://doi.org/10.1086/648688</a>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1086/676823">https://doi.org/10.1086/676823</a>	10 April 2014	Blameworthy inaccuracies
4	JCR	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1086/661553">https://doi.org/10.1086/661553</a>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1086/676822">https://doi.org/10.1086/676822</a>	10 April 2014	Blameworthy inaccuracies
5	JCR	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1086/677225">https://doi.org/10.1086/677225</a>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucz057">https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucz057</a>	22 November 2019	Data and analysis anomalies
6	JCR	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucy053">https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucy053</a>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/uca009">https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/uca009</a>	18 February 2020	Data and analysis anomalies
7	JCR	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucy060">https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucy060</a>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/uca033">https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/uca033</a>	3 July 2020	Data and analysis anomalies
8	JCR	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucx036">https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucx036</a>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/uca039">https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/uca039</a>	30 July 2020	Data and analysis anomalies
9	JCR	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucx061">https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucx061</a>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/uca048">https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/uca048</a>	8 October 2020	Data and analysis anomalies
10	JMR	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.47.2.251">https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.47.2.251</a>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1177/00222437221139856">https://doi.org/10.1177/00222437221139856</a>	14 March 2014/1 December 2022	Retraction following an university-led investigation
11	JACR	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1086/697083">https://doi.org/10.1086/697083</a>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1086/710128">https://doi.org/10.1086/710128</a>	9 June 2020	Irregularities in the raw data
12	JCP	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2015.01.001">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2015.01.001</a>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpv.1196">https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpv.1196</a>	14 October 2020	Unavailable raw data
13	P&M	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20375">https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20375</a>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20565">https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20565</a>	30 July 2012	Fraudulent/fabricated data

Note : JCR=Journal of Consumer Research, JMR=Journal of Marketing Research, JACR=Journal of the Association for Consumer Research, JCP=Journal of Consumer Psychology, P&M=Psychology & Marketing.

It is worth noting that one of the 13 articles (i.e., Article #10) has two retraction dates. According to its retraction notice, published on December 1, 2022, JMR initially retracted the article on March 19, 2014. However, this retraction was never included in Sage Publications' official scholarly record. Sage, which has published JMR since 2018, only formally acknowledged the retraction eight years later.

### Citation database

To collect citation data for these 13 FNRA, the author accessed Clarivate's Web of Science Core Collection (WoS-CC) through an institutional subscription on March 12, 2025. The search was conducted using each article's DOI to ensure accurate results. The WoS-CC is the preferred database for analyzing post-retraction citations because of its higher curation standards, structured indexing, and superior citation tracking accuracy compared to Scopus or Google Scholar (Koo & Lin, 2024; Moussa, 2022b; Ortega & Delgado-Quirós, 2024).

On the WoS-CC database, 12 of the 13 retracted articles in Table 1 were tagged as "Retracted Publications" with the trademark red exclamation mark inside a red triangle used by Clarivate to alert users. For the JACR's FNRA, CrossRef was used instead of WoS-CC, as the journal has not yet been indexed there.

## Post-retraction citations

Following previous research, a post-retraction citation is defined as any publication that cites a retracted article after the official retraction notice was issued (Moussa, 2022b).

A positive post retraction citation, is according to Bar-Ilan and Halevi (2017, p.550), as a citation that “indicates that the retracted article was cited as legitimate prior work and its findings used to corroborate the author/s current study”. A negative post-retraction citation “indicates that the authors mentioned the retracted article as such [i.e., retracted article] and its findings inappropriate” (Bar-Ilan & Halevi, 2017, p.550).

To assess whether citing articles referenced the FNRA in a positive light, the author employed a rigorous, multi-step process: First, the titles of citing articles were examined for any immediate indications of relevance. Next, their abstracts were reviewed to identify discussions of retracted studies, research misconduct, or scientific integrity. When ambiguity remained, the full texts were downloaded and scrutinized, focusing on the in-text citations to determine whether the retracted article was framed positively or negatively. Though time-intensive, this process guarantees a high level of accuracy, ensuring that each citation is properly contextualized and interpreted.

## Findings

Table 2 shows how frequently the 13 FNRA continued to be cited in marketing journals after their retraction. In total, 12 of these fraudulent articles accumulated 362 citations, with 82 (22.652%) occurring post-retraction in marketing journals (cf., RQ1). This finding highlights the persistence of retracted research in academic discourse, raising concerns about the effectiveness of retraction notices in preventing misinformation from spreading.

**Table 2.** Post-retraction citations of the thirteen fraudulent-now-retracted articles in 81 papers published in 37 marketing journals

Retracted article #	Total Citations	Post-Retraction Citations in marketing Journals	Citing marketing Journals	DOIs of citing articles (with review papers noted)
1	11	2	<i>Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics (APJML)</i> (1)	10.1108/APJML-07-2018-0256
			<i>Journal of Product &amp; Brand Management (JPBM)</i> (1)	10.1108/JPBM-09-2014-0717
2	5	3	<i>Journal of Consumer Behaviour (JCB)</i> (2)	10.1002/cb.1473 10.1002/cb.1772
			<i>Journal of Retailing &amp; Consumer Services (JR&amp;CS)</i> (1)	10.1016/j.jretconser.2021.102511
3	70	13	<i>Psychology &amp; Marketing (P&amp;M)</i> (2)	10.1002/mar.20765 10.1002/mar.21004
			<i>International Journal of Consumer Studies (IJCS)</i> (1)	10.1111/ijcs.12679
			JR&CS (1)	10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.07.002
			<i>International Journal of Retail &amp; Distribution Management (IJRDM)</i> (1)	10.1108/IJRDM-05-2021-0224
			<i>Journal of Social Marketing (JSM)</i> (1)	10.1108/JSOCM-09-2019-0137
			APJML (1)	10.1108/APJML-05-2020-0343
			<i>European Journal of Marketing (EJM)</i> (1)	10.1108/EJM-09-2019-0731
			<i>Journal of Fashion Marketing &amp; Management (JFMM)</i> (2)	10.1108/JFMM-07-2019-0140 10.1108/JFMM-08-2016-0076
			<i>Foundations and Trends in Marketing (FTM)</i> (1)	10.1561/17000000060 (review article)
			<i>Journal of Business Research (JBR)</i> (1)	10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.07.042
4	23	6	<i>International Journal of Pharmathautical &amp; Healthcare Marketing (IJPHM)</i> (1)	10.1108/IJPHM-09-2014-0052
			P&M (2)	10.1002/mar.21570 10.1002/mar.22083 (scoping review)
			JCB (1)	10.1002/cb.1624 (theoretical review)
			<i>Young Consumers (YC)</i> (1)	10.1108/YC-09-2023-1871
			<i>Journal of Marketing Management (JMM)</i> (1)	10.1080/0267257X.2021.2012231
			<i>Recherche et Application en Marketing (RAM)</i> (1)	10.1177/2051570717699372
5	53	13	IJCS (1)	10.1111/ijcs.12631
			JR&CS (1)	10.1016/j.jretconser.2024.104005
			<i>Journal of International Consumer Marketing (JICM)</i> (1)	10.1080/08961530.2023.2195692
			<i>Qualitative Market Research (QMR)</i> (2)	10.1108/QMR-02-2023-0028 10.1108/QMR-01-2021-0006
			JPBM (1)	10.1108/JPBM-02-2023-4366
			<i>Journal of Brand Management (JBM)</i> (1)	10.1057/s41262-023-00350-9
			<i>Industrial Marketing Management (IMM)</i> (1)	10.1016/j.indmarman.2023.09.014
			<i>Journal of Services Marketing (JSerM)</i> (1)	10.1108/JSM-02-2021-0053
			<i>Journal of Advertising (JA)</i> (1)	10.1080/00913367.2021.1988774
			<i>Marketing Intelligence &amp; Planning (MIP)</i> (1)	10.1108/MIP-01-2021-0017
6	6	2	<i>International Journal of Research in Marketing (IJRM)</i> (1)	10.1016/j.ijresmar.2019.11.003
			EJM (1)	10.1108/EJM-10-2018-0690
7	11	5	JCB (1)	10.1002/cb.2383
			JPBM (1)	10.1108/JPBM-03-2020-2795 (semi-systematic literature review)
7	11	5	JR&CS (2)	10.1016/j.jretconser.2024.103766

**Table 2 continued**

				10.1016/j.jretconser.2024.104098
			APJML (1)	10.1108/APJML-07-2022-0629
			<i>Journal of Service Research (JSR)</i> (1)	10.1177/10946705231157076
			QMR (1)	10.1108/QMR-02-2021-0018
8	22	7	P&M (1)	10.1002/mar.22008
			JCB (1)	10.1002/cb.2375
			<i>Journal of Marketing Communications (JMC)</i> (1)	10.1080/13527266.2023.2220338
			<i>Journal of Global Scholars of Marketing Science (JGSMS)</i> (1)	10.1080/21639159.2024.2397586
			JPBM (2)	10.1108/JPBM-11-2021-3752
				10.1108/JPBM-09-2019-2573
			JSR (1)	10.1177/10946705211012475
9	12	0	-	-
10	38	3	<i>Journal of Marketing Research (JMR)</i> (1)	10.1177/00222437231194950
			P&M (1)	10.1002/mar.21801
			JCB (1)	10.1002/cb.2441
11	21	2	IJCS (1)	10.1111/ijcs.12658 (literature review)
			EJM (1)	10.1108/EJM-03-2022-0190
12	30	3	JCB (1)	10.1002/cb.2005
			JBR (1)	10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.113951
			EJM (1)	10.1108/EJM-04-2020-0260
13	60	23	P&M (2)	10.1002/mar.21315 (literature review)
				10.1002/mar.21398
			IJCS (2)	10.1111/ijcs.12658 (literature review)
				10.1111/ijcs.12243
			<i>Journal of Consumer Marketing (JCM)</i> (1)	10.1108/JCM-02-2017-2096
			JR&CS (1)	10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.02.011
			JCB (1)	10.1002/cb.1562
			International Journal of Sport Marketing & Sponsorship (IJSMS) (2)	10.1108/IJSMS-02-2024-0040
				10.1108/IJSMS-15-04-2014-B005
			MIP (1)	10.1108/MIP-03-2023-0125
			<i>International Journal of Advertising (IJA)</i> (1)	10.1080/02650487.2022.2073134
			JSerM(1)	10.1108/JSM-08-2020-0361
			JBR (1)	10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.007
			<i>Journal of Marketing (JM)</i> (1)	10.1177/0022242920914861
			<i>Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science (JAMS)</i> (1)	10.1007/s11747-019-00638-w
			<i>International Journal of Online Marketing (IJOM)</i> (1)	10.4018/IJOM.2018100103
			<i>Journal of Destination Marketing &amp; Management (JDMM)</i> (1)	10.1016/j.jdmm.2016.09.002
			EJM (3)	10.1108/EJM-05-2016-0261
				10.1108/EJM-06-2014-0346
				10.1108/EJM-12-2011-0776 (Review with critique)
			<i>Journal of Travel &amp; Tourism Marketing (JTTM)</i> (2)	10.1080/10548408.2016.1208788
				10.1080/10548408.2016.1167386
			<i>Journal of Advertising Research (JAR)</i> (1)	10.2501/JAR-2015-001
Totals	362	82	P&M (8), JCB (8), EJM (7), JR&CS (6), IJCS (5), JPBM (5), APJML (3), JBR (3), QMR (3), JTTM (2), JSR (2), JSerM (2), IJSMS (2), MIP (2), JFMM (2), JICM (1), YC (1), JM(1), JMR (1), JAMS (1), IJRM (1), JCM(1), JBM (1), JAR(1), JA (1), IJA (1), IJPHM (1), IJRDM (1), JDMM (1), IJOM (1), JSM (1), JMC (1), JGSMS (1), IMM (1), RAM (1), FTM (1), JMM (1)	81 citing articles including seven review papers

### **Positive post-retraction citations**

Despite being retracted, 12 of these FNRAs continued to be cited 82 times across various marketing journals. Article #3 (70 total citations, 13 post-retraction citations) and Article #13 (60 total citations, 23 post-retraction citations) are the most cited, with the latter having the highest number of post-retraction citations. These articles appear to have a lasting influence despite their retraction, which is particularly concerning given their fraudulent nature. According to Clarivate's WoS-CC, Article #9 received 12 citations, yet none of them appeared in a marketing journal after its retraction.

Were all 82 post-retraction citations positive? A thorough review of the titles and abstracts of the 81 citing papers revealed no indication of negative citations—none addressed retracted studies, research misconduct, or scientific integrity. Two articles citing Article #13 initially raised some ambiguity, but after downloading and analyzing their in-text citations, it became clear that all 82 post-retraction citations framed the retracted article in a positive light. To illustrate this trend, Table 3 presents a selection of 24 sentences explicitly citing 12 of the 13 FNRAs, extracted from the full texts of sampled citing papers.

**Table 3.** A sample of in-text citation for 12 of the 13 fraudulent-now-retracted articles in 24 papers

Retracted article #	DOIs of citing article (online publication date)	Cited in (sub)section (on page[s])	In-text citation
1	10.1108/APJML-07-2018-0256 (November 25, 2019)	Theoretical background (page 723)	“Their importance to self-image construction encourages luxury fashion marketers to depict human models with meanings consumable through product purchase or use ([...] Trampe et al., 2011 [...]).”
	10.1108/JPBM-09-2014-0717 (March 21, 2016)	Methodology (page 104)	“Using student sample has also been a common practice in many previous studies on cosmetics consumption(e.g., [...] Trampe et al., 2011 [...]).”
2	10.1002/cb.1473 (March 21, 2014)	Discussion (page 92)	“Liu et al. (2012), in a rare consumer research study into the effects of messy environments, concluded that a cluttered environment in decisionmaking may lead to favourable outcomes, such as efficiency in the construction of choice options. Messiness, the authors concluded, was not symptomatic of a messy mind but actually produced ‘better’ thinking”.
	10.1002/cb.1772 (June 14, 2019)	Hypotheses development (page 315)	“Prior studies suggest that a disorganized and messy environment can clutter one’s mind and complicate one’s judgments ([...] Liu, Smeesters, & Trampe, 2012)”.
	10.1016/j.jretconser.2021.102511 (March 8, 2021)	Literature review (page 2)	“Further, disorganized and messy stores can lead to similar cognitive overload as they cause cognitive clutter and thus, complicate one’s decision-making ([...] Liu et al., 2012)”.
3	10.1002/mar.20765 (December 11, 2014)	Sample selection and procedure (page 98)	“female students from a university were recruited as volunteer participants for this study; they constitute an appropriate sample (e.g., [...] Smeesters, Mussweiler, & Mandel, 2010)”.
	10.1002/mar.21004 (April 11, 2017)	Conceptual background (page 539)	“these comparisons typically elicit contrast effects, which occur when the self is judged to be clearly dissimilar from the ideal standard, and place increased emphasis on the perceived discrepancy between the consumer’s body and that of the model ([...] Smeesters, Mussweiler, & Mandel, 2010)”.
	10.1111/ijcs.12679 (March 9, 2021)	Discussion (page 319)	“Prior research repeatedly found that exposure to idealized advertising images influences the way consumers feel about themselves (e.g., [...] Smeesters et al., 2010)”.
	10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.07.002 (July 10, 2019)	Research model and hypotheses development (page 364)	“Women with low BMIs react positively to thin models (e.g., Smeesters et al., 2010)”.
4	10.1002/mar.21570 (August 10, 2021)	Introduction (page 2210)	“Wizards sense threats to their autonomy from messages attempting to compel a moral obligation, therefore they may develop a negative attitude toward the source of the message ([...] Liu et al., 2012)”.
	10.1108/YC-09-2023-1871 (January 31, 2024)	Method and measurement (page 584)	“Decision importance [...] was measured using the method recommended by Liu et al. (2012)”.
5	10.1016/j.ijresmar.2019.11.003 (January 15, 2020)	Cited nine times in various sections, including the introduction (page 622), theoretical background (page 624), and method (page 628)	“For example, Huang et al. (2014) showed hubristic pride (but not authentic pride) can increase the motivation to show uniqueness, leading individuals to choose options that will allow them to differentiate themselves from others”.
	10.1016/j.indmarman.2023.09.014 (October 14, 2023)	Study 1 (page 272)	“Scores >3 on the implicit theory scale indicate agreement with a fixed mindset; scores <3 imply compliance with a growth mindset (Huang, Dong, & Mukhopadhyay, 2014).”
6	10.1002/cb.2383 (July 24, 2024)	Study 1 (page 2888)	“As in Huang et al. (2019), we coded the product choices of the participants, with the option of self-improvement products set as ‘1’ and general products set as ‘0.’”

**Table 3 Continued**

7	10.1177/10946705231157076 (February 16, 2023)	Conceptual Background (pages 588-589)	“This extant literature on avoidance groups in marketing has [...] further cement a desired social identity (e.g., Coleman, Williams, and Morales 2019 [...]).”
	10.1016/j.jretconser.2024.103766 (February 24, 2024)	<b>Theoretical</b> background (page 3)	“Compensatory consumption provides an inner drive to solve threatening self-discrepancies ([...] Coleman et al., 2019)”.
8	10.1002/cb.2375 (July 4, 2024)	Experiment 2 (pages 2758-2759)	“To measure participants' attention to the blessing message, [...], a method adapted from a substantial body of previous research (e.g., Coleman et al., 2017 [...]).”
9	-	-	-
10	10.1177/00222437231194950 (August 1, 2023)	Limitations and future research (page 776)	“Finally, previous research has found consumers more likely to switch to domestic brands following death-related media coverage (Liu and Smeesters, 2010)”.
11	10.1108/EJM-03-2022-0190 (October 24, 2023)	Literature review (page 3081)	“Because pride is a pleasurable experience that is socially appreciated, [...] it has been extensively examined in current literature as one of the main motives for luxury consumption (Williams et al., 2018)”.
12	10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.113951 (April 28, 2023)	Theoretical background (page 2)	“Brands may also offer enriching benefits to customers by allowing them to signal their values to others (Coleman & Williams 2015)”.
13	10.1002/mar.21398 (August 13, 2020)	Theoretical background (page 8)	“Numerous studies in psychology and marketing have reported model attractiveness to be a significant factor positively affecting the evaluation of advertised products, advertisements, and advertising messages ((e.g., [...] Trampe, Stapel, Siero, & Mulder, 2010)”.
	10.1177/0022242920914861 (April 27, 2020)	Cited four times, including in the introduction (page 67), research framework (page 70), and Study 2 (page 80)	“Product relevance is well grounded in the existing literature on attractiveness in marketing and serves as a key moderator on how the attractiveness of an endorser or salesperson affects their performance (Trampe et al. 2010).”
	10.1007/s11747-019-00638-w (February 21, 2019)	Research background (page 1050)	“Among motivational variables, [...] product relevancy (Trampe et al. 2010), and [...] likely exert impacts on information processing”.
	10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.007 (April 20, 2021)	Cited eight times, including in Study 2 (page 94) and measurement (page 95)	“Following Trampe et al.'s (2010) procedure, we manipulated elaboration likelihood using personal relevance and personal responsibility of playing the IGA.”

As Table 3 shows, these FNRA continue to infiltrate marketing research, shaping new studies and reinforcing their perceived legitimacy despite their retracted status. Disturbingly, they appear most frequently in critical sections of academic papers, where they wield the greatest influence:

- Theoretical background and literature review (eight occurrences): These retracted articles are cited as foundational sources, embedding fraudulent research into academic discourse and giving it undue credibility.
- Methodology and measurement (five occurrences): FNRA and their flawed methods are being adopted without scrutiny, compromising the integrity of subsequent research.
- Hypotheses development and research framework (four occurrences): Even more troubling, fraudulent findings are actively shaping new research questions, steering future studies in misleading directions.

- Study sections (Experiment, Sample Selection, etc.) (four occurrences): Researchers are unknowingly replicating fabricated experimental designs, perpetuating unreliable approaches.
- Discussion and limitations (three occurrences): Even in post-analysis reflections, retracted articles are treated as legitimate, potentially distorting interpretations and conclusions.
- Introduction (two occurrences): Some papers rely on these FNRA to justify their research focus, further amplifying their misleading influence.

The uncritical acceptance of these FNRA highlights a systemic issue—flawed science is not merely lingering in the literature but actively shaping the future of the field. Notably, all in-text citations, exhibited in Table 3, treated the FNRA as legitimate. Phrases such as “following [author]’s procedure,” “prior research suggests,” and “extant literature confirms” demonstrate that these retracted articles were presented as authoritative, with no acknowledgment of their retraction. Several papers explicitly followed methodological approaches derived from retracted research, reinforcing its ongoing influence. To us Baumgartner and Pieters’ (2003) and Stremersch et al.’s (2015) typology of citations in marketing research, these citations are not mere “perfunctory mention”. Instead, they are application, affirmation, and review citations.

The fact that these FNRA are cited multiple times within single papers suggests that their impact is deeply embedded in marketing scholarship. Their presence in core sections—theoretical frameworks, hypotheses, and methods—indicates that fraudulent findings are not only being referenced but actively shaping conceptual foundations and experimental designs.

The absence of critical engagement with these retracted articles suggests two alarming possibilities: either researchers are unaware of their retraction, or they are neglecting to verify the validity of their sources. In either case, the continued reliance on fraudulent research threatens the integrity of marketing science and underscores the urgent need for greater academic vigilance.

### **Distribution of post-retraction citations across journals**

Table 2 lists 37 different journals that have cited 12 of the 13 retracted articles. These journals span various subfields of marketing, including consumer behavior (e.g., P&M, JCB, and IJCS), marketing research (e.g., JMR, IJRM, and QMR), advertising (e.g., JA, JAR, and IJA), branding (e.g., JPBM and JBM), retailing (e.g., JR&CS and IJRDM), and services marketing (e.g., JSR and JSerM) indicating the widespread impact of these FNRA across the discipline.

The journals that cited these retracted articles the most were P&M (eight times), JCB (eight times), EJM (seven times), and JR&CS (six times), indicating that these journals are particularly affected by the continued citation of fraudulent research. Two other journals, IJCS (five times) and JPBM (five times), also contributed to the continued dissemination of these fraudulent works (cf., RQ2).

The APJML, QMR, and JBR each contribute a smaller share (with three citations each). However, the presence of citations to FNRA in elite, FT50-listed, outlets such

as JM, JMR, and JAMS raises concerns about the integrity of knowledge production and citing behavior in marketing.

### **Journals that cited their own retracted articles**

By cross-referencing Table 1 (i.e., retracted articles and their retracting journals) with Table 2 (i.e., post-retraction citations), one can identify two journals that cited their own retracted articles post-retraction. JMR cited its own retracted article (i.e., Article# 10) despite officially retracting it twice (i.e., on March 14, 2014, and December 1, 2022). The DOI of the citing 2024 JMR article is provided here (DOI:10.1177/00222437231194950). P&M cited its own retracted article (i.e., Article#13) twice, including in a literature review (DOI: 10.1002/mar.21315). As such, JMR and P&M failed to filter out their own retracted research, citing it in later publications.

### **Review articles as a source of post-retraction citations**

As Table 4 reveals, seven review papers cited five FNRA's a total of eight times, signaling that fraudulent findings have been absorbed into broader syntheses of marketing literature (cf., RQ3). These review papers referenced the five FNRA's without any acknowledgment of their retraction, treating them as valid and authoritative sources in discussions on priming, consumer behavior, and advertising effectiveness.

It is especially concerning that one of these seven review articles was authored by a former editor-in-chief of both JCR and JCP, demonstrating that the inadvertent citation of FNRA's is not limited to novice or early-career researchers—it can happen even to the most experienced scholars. This issue is even more troubling given prior research showing that citation impact in marketing is heavily influenced by who is citing a work—specifically, author visibility and self-promotion (Stremersch, Verniers, & Verhoef, 2007). As a result, this particular literature review not only legitimizes the FNRA but also amplifies its impact due to the prominence of its author, further embedding misinformation in the field.

Far more troubling is that one 2021 review article (i.e., DOI: 10.1111/ijcs.12658) cited two separate FNRA's —i.e., Article #11 and Article #13— potentially amplifying their impact despite their fraudulent origins. This suggests that fraudulent research is not only persisting but being reinforced through (systematic) review and synthesis, entrenching falsehoods deeper into the marketing academic record.

Unlike empirical studies, which have a limited scope of influence, review papers act as knowledge hubs, shaping the field by summarizing and legitimizing past research. When fraudulent work is incorporated into systematic reviews, theoretical models, and literature reviews, its impact becomes exponentially more dangerous—misinformation is codified into the foundations of the discipline. This means that new conceptual frameworks and research agendas may be built upon fabricated or falsified research, leading to a cascade of flawed theories and misguided future research. For instance, Article #13 was cited five times across multiple tables in an IJCS literature review, further entrenching its perceived credibility. Such repeated citations create an illusion of legitimacy, making it even harder to purge fraudulent findings from academic

discourse. Notably, as of March 13, 2025 and according to Clarivate's WoS-CC, this IJCS literature review has garnered 101 citations (see Table 4).

The continued presence of these FNRA in review papers exposes a systemic failure in academic vigilance—one that risks not only corrupting future research but also misleading managers and distorting real-world applications. This is not a mere oversight; it is a fundamental breach of scientific integrity, one that demands urgent corrective action.

**Table 4.** In-text citation of five fraudulent-now-retracted articles in seven review papers

Retracted article #	DOIs of the citing review article (online publication date)	Cited in (sub)section (on page[s])	In-text citation	Number of received citations by the review paper
3	10.1561/17000000060 (December 20, 2019)	Body image (page 275)	“Smeesters et al. (2010) showed ads featuring moderately/extremely thin/heavy models to mostly female undergrads who were low, average, or high BMI”.	3
4	10.1002/mar.22083 (July 26, 2024)	Cited in Table 2 (page 2774)	“Consumers’ purchase choices differ when primed with monetary versus nonmonetary stimuli (Liu et al., 2012)”.	1
	10.1002/cb.1624 (October 18, 2016)	Priming techniques (page 313)	“For example, Liu et al. (2012) primed participants with one of two unscrambling tasks – monetary related or non-monetary related, which produced differing product choices”.	46
6	10.1108/JPBM-03-2020-2795 (April 4, 2022)	Proposing an (in)congruence theoretical framework (page 613)	“For example, [...] resulting in favourable product evaluation (Huang et al.,2019)”.	31
11	10.1111/ijcs.12658 (February 16, 2021)	Discussion and suggestions for future research (page 679)	“Another important mediating variable is wow-effect, which is associated with a positive valence emotional experience that is characterized as feelings of amazement and wonder or awe-inducing information (Williams et al., 2018).”	101
13	10.1002/mar.21315 (December 15, 2019)	A proposed prescriptive model: Comprehensive celebrity endorsement strategy framework (page 498)	“A preponderance of literature; however, suggests that endorsers’ physical attractiveness positively influences advertising effectiveness only for attractiveness-related product categories, such as cosmetics and toiletries [...] Trampe, Stapel, Siero, & Mulder, 2010”.	132
	10.1111/ijcs.12658 (February 16, 2021)	Cited five times in five tables	Table 1, Table 5, Table 6, Table 8, and Table 9	101
	10.1108/EJM-12-2011-0776 (November 4, 2014)	Replication of the ELM (page 2043)	“Most studies have focused on trying to replicate a portion, variable, or construct of the ELM [...] Trampe et al., 2010”.	179

## Discussion and implications

The phrase “standing on the shoulders of giants” captures the spirit of scientific progress—each generation building on the insights of those before it. But what happens when those supposed giants turn out to be fraudsters? As Woo and Walsh (2024) argue, the academic structure begins to wobble. Our findings confirm this unsettling reality: even after being retracted for fraud, marketing articles continue to be cited—not as cautionary tales, but as if they were still credible contributions.

Across 37 marketing journals (indexed in Clarivate’s WoS-CC), 13 FNRA have received 82 citations post-retraction. Rather than being treated as intellectual warnings, these retracted papers are still embedded in the literature—silently shaping theories, justifying empirical claims, and influencing managerial recommendations. This is not just a matter of citation noise. It is the persistent circulation of

misinformation under the guise of knowledge, revealing a critical breakdown in editorial vigilance and scholarly responsibility.

Some of these FNRAs have shown a troubling resilience. Article #13, despite being pulled for data fabrication, was cited 23 times after its retraction. Article #3 followed with 13 citations, as did Article #5. These works, built on deception, continue to be treated as legitimate reference points—without any acknowledgment of their fraudulent and retracted status.

Even more concerning is the complete lack of critical engagement with these citations. In our review of citing papers, not a single one flagged the 13 articles as retracted. On the contrary, they treated them as authoritative, often using them to justify new empirical results. This creates a dangerous feedback loop: fraudulent research beget new research, which in turn spreads misinformation further. Fraudulent findings, instead of being discarded, become the scaffolding of future work.

This phenomenon signals a systemic failure. Retractions alone are not enough to scrub fraudulent research from the academic record (Bolland et al., 2022; Teixeira da Silva et al., 2025). Without active vigilance from authors, reviewers, editors, and institutions, FNRAs remain alive in the literature—polluting the very foundation on which knowledge is built.

The numbers speak for themselves. Table 2 shows that the 13 fraudulent studies amassed 362 citations in total, with nearly a quarter (22.65%) occurring after retraction. The most frequently cited was Article #13, followed closely by Articles #3, #5, and #7. These were once celebrated contributions; now, they are academic debris still embedded in the walls of the discipline. Citing FNRAs—whether due to ignorance or negligence—risks infecting entire frameworks with false assumptions. It is like constructing an academic Jenga tower: one fraudulent block threatens to bring down everything built on top of it.

Certain subfields appear especially vulnerable. Journals like P&M and JCB each cited FNRAs eight times, while JR&CS and IJCS followed closely behind. But even elite (e.g., JM, JMR, JAMS) and prestigious (e.g., JSR and IJRM) marketing journals were not immune. Their post-retraction citations reveal cracks in the very institutions charged with upholding scholarly standards.

Perhaps the most striking failures are cases where journals cite their own retracted articles. JMR referenced a paper it had already retracted, twice. P&M included its own retracted article (Article#13) in a literature review, treating it as a credible source. These incidents reflect more than oversight; they reveal an erosion of editorial accountability at the very core of the publishing process.

Literature reviews, in particular, are where the consequences become most insidious. These papers synthesize knowledge and guide future research agendas. Yet seven reviews cited five FNRAs a total of eight times—embedding falsehoods deeper into theoretical narratives. One IJCS review even cited two retracted articles (Articles #11 and #13), inadvertently granting them renewed legitimacy and making them harder to dislodge from the academic record.

If marketing scholarship is to maintain its integrity, decisive reforms are needed. Journals must adopt stricter policies for handling citation of retracted work. Editorial

boards should conduct regular pre and post-publication audits to identify and address citation pollution. And most of all, there needs to be a cultural shift toward more careful and critical citing practices. Scientific progress depends on building atop solid ground—not on the ruins of falsified claims.

Some may still dismiss the issue. “So what if a few marketing articles cite retracted papers?” Others may respond with an indifferent “Beh”. But this complacency is precisely the problem. Citing FNRA without acknowledgment is not a harmless quirk, it is a sign of deeper failures in scholarly communication. It perpetuates falsehoods, erodes trust, and undermines the credibility of the peer-review system. And if retractions do not actually prevent bad research from being cited, then their purpose is fundamentally undermined. Ultimately, the “so what” and “beh” responses are not just dismissive, they are enablers. They reflect a culture of indifference that allows citation pollution to thrive and misinformation to echo long after the original fraud has been exposed.

Some may go further and argue: “Sure, the data were fabricated, but the theory was good—why not cite it?” But this, too, is misguided. An idea built on fraudulent evidence is not neutral; it is compromised at its root. Citing a FNRA without qualification lends it undue legitimacy and misleads readers. If the theoretical contribution has merit, it should be reconstructed and tested independently, using valid data. Intellectual credit belongs to the work that withstands scrutiny, not the one built on deception. To cite a fraudulent article for its “interesting idea” is like quoting a forged document in court because the argument sounds persuasive. It may be rhetorically tempting, but it corrodes the very system that depends on truth as a baseline.

If we are to preserve the credibility of marketing as a discipline, we must do more than retract fraudulent articles; we must stop resurrecting them in our references.

### **Recommendations**

This paper highlights a concerning issue: retracted marketing articles continue to shape the field, not just in passing mentions but as foundational references in theoretical, methodological, and empirical research. Without active measures to address this, misinformation may perpetuate, influencing future studies and potentially leading to flawed research conclusions, misleading managerial implications, and potentially harming policies.

To prevent future authors from unknowingly “standing on the shoulders of fallen giants,” more rigorous safeguards are needed (Bolland et al., 2022; Teixeira da Silva et al., 2025). Below are some practices that academic associations, authors, reviewers, and editors can follow:

- For academic associations: Academic associations like the American Marketing Association and the Academy of Marketing Science have been instrumental in shaping the field of marketing as we know it today (Cochoy, 2014; Babin et al., 2021). To uphold research integrity, these—and others—associations should take an active role in educating researchers on how to identify and avoid citing retracted articles. This can be achieved through dedicated sessions at annual

conferences or informative webinars, ensuring that scholars remain vigilant and well-informed.

- For authors: They should regularly consult trusted databases, like Retraction Watch, to check the retraction status of cited works. Before finalizing their manuscripts, authors must conduct a systematic cross-check of references for retraction notices. If citing a retracted article is unavoidable (e.g., in a discussion of the reasons for retraction or bibliometric studies), the authors must explicitly mention its retraction status both in the text (e.g., Doe [2025, retracted] initially found) and the references list (e.g., Doe, J. [2025], Retracted: article title, journal name, volume and issue numbers, pagination, DOI). Another good practice is to reference the retracted article along with its retraction notice.
- For reviewers: During the peer review process, reviewers should check references for reliability and current status, particularly in key theoretical or methodological citations. They must alert authors and editors if retracted articles are cited, ensuring the issue is addressed before publication.
- For editors: They should use automated tools, like CrossRef, to screen citations in submitted manuscripts. Editors must require authors to verify the validity of their citations and include a statement confirming this during submission. They must provide clear guidelines on avoiding retracted articles in the journal's author instructions. They also have to monitor published articles for any subsequent identification of retracted references and issue corrections or errata if necessary.

By collectively implementing these practices, the marketing research community can significantly reduce the risk of propagating fraudulent findings.

### **Conclusion, limitations, and future research directions**

This study will likely spark intense debate—both supportive and critical—but such a discussion is not only necessary, it is long overdue. Addressing fraudulent research and its citations is not just a matter of academic rigor; it is essential for the integrity of the marketing discipline itself. If marketing scholars do not take the lead in confronting these issues, then who else will?

Despite using a small sample of 13 FNRA's from marketing journals, this study underscores the pressing need for greater vigilance in citation practices within marketing research. The continued citation of FNRA's highlights a critical gap in scholarly due diligence—one that extends beyond early-career researchers to even the most established scholars. To maintain research integrity, marketing academics must adopt more rigorous citation screening methods, leveraging tools and databases that flag retracted work. Moreover, academic associations, journal editors, and peer reviewers should play an active role in fostering awareness and accountability. Only through a collective effort can the field ensure that the foundation of marketing knowledge remains credible, reliable, and free from the lingering influence of fraudulent research.

This study reveals that consumer behavior journals—such as P&M, JCB, and IJCS—are the most affected by citations of the 13 fraudulent-now-retracted articles. Given that 12 of the 13 FNRA's were originally published in consumer behavior journals, this result

is not entirely unexpected, though it does highlight a limitation of the study. Interestingly, JCR, JCP, and JACR have not cited these fraudulent articles post-retraction, raising the question of whether these journals enforce stricter review processes or employ tools to screen for retracted citations. It would be valuable for their editorial teams to share how they managed to avoid citing these articles.

This paper likely only scratches the surface of the issue surrounding citations to FNRA in marketing journals. A deeper analysis could expand on this study findings' in several ways. One approach is to include additional retracted articles from journals where marketing's "fallen giants" published their deceptive research (Moussa & Charlton, 2024). Given marketing's long-standing openness to insights from other disciplines—such as social psychology—it is likely that these additional FNRA will also find their way into marketing journals through citations. Another avenue is to examine citations to these and other fraudulent articles in marketing journals not yet indexed in Clarivate's WoS-CC, using databases like Dimensions or Scopus (Ortega & Delgado-Quirós, 2024). Additionally, future researchers might choose to wait for ongoing research scandals—of which there are at least three currently unfolding—and analyze citations to articles later confirmed as fraudulent. The JM, JMR, and JCR have recently (i.e., on August 20, 2021, September 20, 2024, and April 10, 2024, respectively) issued expressions of concern for three of their articles. An expression of concern is typically issued when doubts arise about the integrity or accuracy of a published article, but the issues are not yet deemed serious enough to justify an immediate retraction (Moussa, 2025).

### **Funding**

The author received no financial support for this paper.

### **Competing interests**

The author declares no potential conflicts of interest regarding this paper.

## References

- Atwater, L. E., Mumford, M. D., Schriesheim, C. A., & Yammarino, F. J. (2014). Retraction of leadership articles: Causes and prevention. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(6), 1174-1180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.10.006>
- Babin, B. J., Moulard, J. G., & Lindquist, J. D. (2021). A bridge to relevance: on the history of the Academy of Marketing Science®(AMS). *AMS Review*, 11(3), 454-463. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-021-00221-z>
- Bar-Ilan, J., & Halevi, G. (2017). Post retraction citations in context: a case study. *Scientometrics*, 113(1), 547-565. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2242-0>
- Baumgartner, H., & Pieters, R. (2003). The structural influence of marketing journals: A citation analysis of the discipline and its subareas over time. *Journal of Marketing*, 67(2), 123-139. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.67.2.123.18610>
- Bolland, M. J., Grey, A., & Avenell, A. (2022). Citation of retracted publications: A challenging problem. *Accountability in Research*, 29(1), 18-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2021.1886933>
- Cochoy, F. (2014). The American Marketing Association: A handrail for marketers and marketing history. *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing*, 6(4), 538-547. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JHRM-01-2013-0003>
- Committee on Publication Ethics (2019). Retraction guidelines Version 2. <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.4> (Last accessed 13 October 2024).
- Deer, L., Adler, S. J., Datta, H., Mizik, N., & Sarstedt, M. (2025). Toward open science in marketing research. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 42(1), 212-233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2024.12.005>
- Funder, D. (2014). Notice: PSPB Articles by Authors With Retracted Articles at PSPB or Other Journals: Stapel, Smeesters, and Sanna. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40(1), 132-135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213508152>
- Haenlein, M., Bitner, M. J., Kohli, A. K., Lemon, K. N., & Reibstein, D. J. (2022). Guest editorial: Responsible research in marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 50(1), 8-12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-021-00812-z>
- Herndon, N. C. (2016). Research fraud and the publish or perish world of academia. *Journal of Marketing Channels*, 23(3), 91-96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1046669X.2016.1186469>
- Hunt, S. D. (2021). The nature and origins of impactful research in marketing. *Journal of Global Scholars of Marketing Science*, 31(2), 130-141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21639159.2020.1785915>
- Ivory, J. D., & Elson, M. (2024). A tale of three retractions: a call for standardized categorization and criteria in retraction statements. *Current Psychology*, 43(17), 16023-16029. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-05216-6>

- Koo, M., & Lin, S. C. (2024). Retracted articles in scientific literature: A bibliometric analysis from 2003 to 2022 using the Web of Science. *Heliyon*, 10(20), e38620. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e38620>
- Korenman, S.G. (2006). *Teaching the responsible conduct of research in humans* (RCRH). Los Angeles: University of California. Available at: <https://ori.hhs.gov/education/products/ucla/default.htm> (Last accessed 3 March 2025)
- Luce, M. F., McGill, A., & Peracchio, L. (2012). Promoting an environment of scientific integrity: Individual and community responsibilities. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39(3), iii-viii. <https://doi.org/10.1086/667924>
- Meyer, R. J. (2015). A field guide to publishing in an era of doubt. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 52(5), 577-579. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.52.5.577>
- Million, A. J., & Budd, J. (2024). Disinformation in science: Ethical considerations for citing retracted works. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 61(1), 257-265. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pra2.1025>
- Moussa, S. (2022a). Celebrating Failure: Learning lessons from a leading consumer behavior journal's retractions. *Consumer Behavior Review*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.51359/2526-7884.2022.254032>
- Moussa, S. (2022b). The propagation of error: retracted articles in marketing and their citations. *Italian Journal of Marketing*, 2022(1), 11-36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43039-021-00044-7>
- Moussa, S. (2025). Expressions of concern about two articles in the Journal of Islamic Marketing: Is it time to resolve them?. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-04-2024-0150>
- Moussa, S., & Charlton, A. (2024). Retraction (mal) practices of elite marketing and social psychology journals in the Dirk Smeesters' research misconduct case. *Accountability in Research*, 31(7), 751-766. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2022.2164489>
- National Information Standards Organization (2024). Communication of Retractions, Removals, and Expressions of Concern. <https://doi.org/10.3789/niso-rp-45-2024> (Last accessed March 10, 2025).
- Ortega, J. L., & Delgado-Quirós, L. (2024). The indexation of retracted literature in seven principal scholarly databases: a coverage comparison of dimensions, OpenAlex, PubMed, Scilit, Scopus, The Lens and Web of Science. *Scientometrics*, 129(7), 3769-3785. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-024-05034-y>
- Serghiou, S., Marton, R. M., & Ioannidis, J. P. (2021). Media and social media attention to retracted articles according to Altmetric. *Plos one*, 16(5), e0248625. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248625>
- Shaw, S. D., & Nave, G. (2023). Don't hate the player, hate the game: Realigning incentive structures to promote robust science and better scientific practices in

- marketing. *Journal of Business Research*, 167, 114129.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114129>
- Sotudeh, H., Barahmand, N., Yousefi, Z., & Yaghtin, M. (2022). How do academia and society react to erroneous or deceitful claims? The case of retracted articles' recognition. *Journal of Information Science*, 48(2), 182-198.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551520945853>
- Stremersch, S., Verniers, I., & Verhoef, P. C. (2007). The quest for citations: Drivers of article impact. *Journal of Marketing*, 71(3), 171-193.  
<https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.71.3.171>
- Stremersch, S., Camacho, N., Vanneste, S., & Verniers, I. (2015). Unraveling scientific impact: Citation types in marketing journals. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 32(1), 64-77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2014.09.004>
- Stremersch, S., Winer, R. S., & Camacho, N. (2021). Faculty research incentives and business school health: A new perspective from and for marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 85(5), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00222429211001050>
- Teixeira da Silva, J. A., Santos-d'Amorim, K., & Bornemann-Cimenti, H. (2025). The Citation of Retracted Papers and Impact on the Integrity of the Scientific Biomedical Literature. *Learned Publishing*, 38(2), e1667.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1667>
- Thorp, H. H. (2022). Rethinking the retraction process. *Science*, 377(6608), 793.  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.ade3742>
- Woo, S., & Walsh, J. P. (2024). On the shoulders of fallen giants: What do references to retracted research tell us about citation behaviors?. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 5(1), 1-30. [https://doi.org/10.1162/qss\\_a\\_00303](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00303)
- Xu, S. B., & Hu, G. (2023). What to communicate in retraction notices?. *Learned Publishing*, 36(3), 463-467. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1548>
- Yang, S., Qi, F., Diao, H., & Ajiferuke, I. (2024). Do retraction practices work effectively? Evidence from citations of psychological retracted articles. *Journal of Information Science*, 50(2), 531-545.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515221097623>
- Zinkhan, G. M. (2004). Accessing academic research through an e-database: Issues of journal quality and knowledge use. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32(4), 369-370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070304267963>

## Funding

The author received no financial support for this paper.

**JEL Classification:** M30; M31