

Introduction

Pauline Maclaran, Michael Saren, Barbara Stern,
and Mark Tadajewski

THEORY BUILDING AND THEORISING IN MARKETING

The development of theory is essential, not only for knowledge creation, but also for academic status. Disciplines build their own bodies of theory and apply their own unique lens to particular phenomena. In this respect, marketing is something of a magpie in that it 'borrows' many of its theories from other disciplines, particularly psychology and economics (Mittelstaedt, 1990). The challenge for marketing as an evolving, but relatively young discipline is to build its own distinct body of theory (Murray et al., 1997). To advance as a discipline, marketing needs to acknowledge and, in many cases, reconsider its theoretical foundations and conduct more research that contributes to the nature of knowledge and theory in marketing.

The aim of this handbook is to act as a stimulus for theory development by providing a comprehensive overview of key issues in marketing theory. In so doing, the editors hope to give greater conceptual cohesion to the field, by drawing together many disparate perspectives and presenting contributions from the leading scholars in one volume.

The handbook thus provides a substantive reference point from which to further develop the area by offering a comprehensive and up-to-date treatment of the major approaches, issues and debates and setting these within their historical contexts. Before going on to give a short summary of the six sections and their contents, we will first discuss some of the main issues concerning the development of marketing theory.

There have been many calls from within the marketing academy for a greater emphasis on marketing theory, in relation to both its development and applications (Alderson, 1957, 1965; Alderson and Cox, 1948; Brown, 1948). Notwithstanding many longstanding debates, arguments continue about what this theory should look like, with little resulting agreement (Brownlie et al., 1999; Dholakia and Arndt, 1985; Hunt, 2001, 2003; Sheth, 1992). A major reason why scholars cannot agree on a common definition for theory is because, depending on their philosophical orientation, they have different views of what constitutes theory.

Even so, underpinning all these debates is a steadily more explicit recognition that each way of seeking knowledge will invariably be

a partial view, highlighting some features of the object of interest, whilst eliding others (Laughlin, 1995; O'Shaughnessy, 2009), leading some to call for multiple paradigm research (Gioia and Pitre, 1990) which utilises the insights from a range of paradigms in the production of theory (Lewis and Grimes, 1999; Tadajewski, 2008). At the moment, within marketing and consumer research, such exercises have largely been at the methodological rather than metatheoretical level (e.g. Price and Arnould, 1998), and these investigations remain the preserve of a comparatively small group of scholars (see O'Shaughnessy, Möller et al., and Brodie et al., this volume) More generally, we can categorise the main 'ways of seeking knowledge' in marketing theory into very broad ideal types of positivist, interpretive and critical traditions (Hudson and Ozanne, 1988; Murray and Ozanne, 1991; Sherry, 1991), with each discussing what constitutes theory in contrasting ways.

For example, a positivistic researcher (cf. Hunt, 1991) will consider the production of theory to begin with a process of hypothesis postulation, based on a rigorous and objective evaluation of prior scientific research by a scholar who adopts a stance of relative value neutrality and objectivity (e.g. Senior and Lee, 2008; cf. Popper, 1976). Ontologically, therefore, by virtue of utilising the insights of a large range of previous studies, subscribers to this paradigm presume that the social world is largely independent of the idiosyncratic perspective of the researcher (Laughlin, 1995). Epistemologically, these initial hypotheses are subject to rigorous critique through a process of empirical testing and possible refutation (cf. Senior and Lee, 2008). Assuming these hypotheses are not subsequently refuted, the positivist researcher is able to say tentatively that the theory is true (Hunt, 1990). Ideally, such theory will result in the production of 'law-like generalizations' (Hunt, 1991) which enable the prediction of marketplace and consumer behaviour and is thereby used to inform managerial decision-making (Arndt, 1985).

By contrast, an interpretivist researcher questions the possibility of objectivity that is assumed in positivist research (Hudson and Ozanne, 1988). They are likely to contend that the practice of science and by extension theory development can never be an objective or dispassionate exercise. One reason for this is that the researcher is not 'separate' from the world, but an active participant in it and, indeed, the very act of observing can affect the outcome. Secondly, researchers can only view phenomena through their own individual subjective history, life experiences and academic socialisation (e.g. Markin, 1970).

Thus, interpretive researchers stress the 'emergent' nature of research. This means, not simply that findings emerge, but that the research design *per se* may be modified as a result of initial exploratory excursions into the field. Also, research need not necessarily be directed towards the production of nomothetic generalisations given the 'time- and context-specific' nature of interpretive research (Hudson and Ozanne, 1988: 513). For those working through this perspective, contextual 'detail becomes the *theory*' (Laughlin, 1995: 67; cf. Markin, 1970). Consequently, 'theory' is considered more as a story that explains how researchers and informants construct their worlds and the relationship between certain events and actions (Price, 2007). Here, theory is seen more as a process that involves deriving situation-relative insights that might result in analytical abstractions from the study of data-rich research contexts. The theory-practice link in this case is more complex than for positivistic research; some interpretive scholars argue that this type of research can provide managerially useful insights (Elliott and Jankel-Elliott, 2003), while others make a case for this 'scientific style' (Hirschman, 1985) to consider consumption research as an end in itself, not necessarily generating knowledge for marketing managers (Cayla and Eckhardt, 2008; Holbrook, 1985).

A researcher inclined towards the use of Critical Theory will instead view theory production as a historically informed activity that aims to question the existing organisation

of society in some respect. Running throughout the work of the Frankfurt School group of scholars was a commitment to 'heighten critical historical consciousness', which in the words of Leo Lowenthal, was their 'theoretical agenda' (Lowenthal, 1987: 70). For scholars in this tradition, theory and practice were inextricably linked in at least two senses. Firstly, they revised their theoretical perspectives on the basis of empirical evidence collected, for example, via observation (Fromm, 1962/2006), interviews and focus groups (Petersen and Willig, 2002). Secondly, they viewed theory production itself as 'adequate practice' (Lowenthal, 1987: 195). This was because it stimulated a critical consciousness among those exposed to it: 'It clashes with and is resisted by the cultural and, in part, political establishment' (Lowenthal, 1987: 195) by revealing 'the gap between the claims of culture and what it claims to offer' (Fromm, 1956/2005). Theory production from a Critical Theory stance, consequently, does not simply try to describe or explain the nature of society, it wants to go beyond this and critique it, offering insights that serve to create a more 'sane society' than one predicated on consumerism (Fromm, 1976/2007) and the continued expansion of the 'dominant social paradigm' (Kilbourne et al., 1997).

Thus, in order to understand developments in marketing theory, we need to understand the philosophy and sociology of science debates that have taken place in marketing and the contexts in which these have evolved, since these have clear implications for the way we understand the development of knowledge about marketing and consumption phenomena. An important role for the handbook is to provide this historical, philosophical, theoretical and conceptual record.

THE NEED FOR THEORY

The earliest calls for the theoretical development of marketing were made by Lyndon Brown (1948) and Wroe Alderson and Reavis

Cox (1948). At this time, the latter authors argued 'Only a sound theory of marketing can raise the analysis of such problems above the level of an empirical art and establish truly scientific criteria for setting up hypotheses and selecting the facts by means of which to test them' (1948: 139). Their rationale was that better theory would help identify what problems required solution and thus direct the researcher towards an understanding of which facts to assemble and how to analyse them. Robert Bartels (1951: 325), another early contributor to the debate, claimed that marketing 'can scarcely be said to have attained scientific status' because of its lack of general theories and principles to guide its scholarship. Others reinforced this view (Buzzell, 1963; White, 1940), demonstrating the extent to which marketing researchers were over-reliant on descriptive, qualitative research that remained at the contextual level and failed to achieve analytical generalisability – i.e. theory.

In the late 1950s, this lack of theory was further driven home in the Ford and Carnegie Reports on the state of business education in the US, which pronounced business schools' curricula as based on vocational research, which lacked the utilisation of rigorous research methods and analytical techniques (Tadajewski, 2006a). Both these reports advocated the adoption of more scientific approaches to management education. As a result, the Marketing Science Institute was established in 1961 and this began to emphasise theory to improve business performance, citing three key reasons (Halbert, 1965):

- 1 Theoretical rules are a prerequisite for developing knowledge. Without a theoretical base we have no base for analysis, nor can we decide what is relevant or not (e.g. Senior and Lee, 2008).
- 2 Theory can reduce the risk behind taking decisions and can therefore assist practitioners in increasing their productivity.
- 3 It is not sufficient for marketers to rely on theories developed in other disciplines as theoretical structures from one area are rarely directly applicable to another (e.g. Murray et al., 1997; O'Shaughnessy, 1997).

This early identification of a need for theory stimulated a variety of academics throughout the 1950s and 1960s to rally for various perspectives. These ranged from functionalist conceptualisations of marketing phenomena (e.g. Alderson, 1957, 1965), to empirically grounded and hermeneutic interpretations of consumer behaviours (e.g. Dichter, 1960). Functionalists viewed marketing as an organised behaviour system through which, for example, raw materials such as leather would undergo various assortments and transformation that ultimately result in a given end product, such as a pair of shoes (Alderson and Martin, 1965). Alderson's work was lauded by the Ford Foundation – the most important funding body for marketing research during the 1950s and 1960s (Bartels, 1988) – and was axiologically premised on making the marketing system run both more effectively and efficiently (Alderson, 1957, 1965). However, functionalism never became the central theoretical axis of marketing theory (Wooliscroft et al., 2006). Even at this time, there were multiple theoretical influences waxing and waning. Indeed up to this day, academics continue to argue about what marketing theory should look like with little resulting agreement (see Brown and Fisk, 1984; Brownlie et al., 1999; Dholakia and Arndt, 1985; Greenley, 1995; Hunt, 2002, 2003; McDonagh, 1995; Senior and Lee, 2008).

It has been argued that the need for theory is now even greater, because in an increasingly information-saturated world, knowledge needs to be firmly rooted in order to be distinctive and meaningful. Academics are now, not only producers of marketing knowledge, but also merchandisers, retailers and consumers of it as authors, researchers, teachers and consultants (Brownlie and Saren, 1995). One effect of this process is that the product life cycle of marketing knowledge is shortening and has a shorter shelf life. Under these conditions, higher-level theory can provide an anchor and a referent for the fast moving current generalisations (fmcg) of marketing information in order to differentiate and set them in context.

LEVELS OF THEORY

We consider that it is important to recognise and outline briefly here the different levels at which theories have been conceptualised (Maclaran et al., 2009). They can be classified by level of abstraction along a continuum from metatheory, through grand theory and middle range theory to practice theory, and from high to low levels of abstraction (Van Sell and Kalofissudus, 2007).

Metatheory is theory about theory, i.e. a body of knowledge about a field of study, or about what that field should concern itself with. It remains at a highly conceptual level although it also often incorporates other levels of theory. Much critical theorising takes place at this metatheoretical level in an attempt to deconstruct the field of marketing *per se* thereby overturning fundamental claims and assumptions (see, e.g. Bradshaw and Firat, 2007).

Grand Theory seeks a broad, but slightly less conceptual perspective about the field. Howard and Sheth's (1969) model of buyer behaviour is a good illustration of grand theory in that it tries to account for an overriding theory of how consumers behave in the purchase decision process. One of the reasons that marketing remains self-conscious about its scientific status (Bartels, 1951: 325) is because of its lack of general theories and principles to guide its scholarship (Saad, 2008).

Middle Range Theory was developed by Merton (1968) in order to build a stronger relationship with practice. Middle range theory seeks a less broad scope of phenomena than grand theory and is more specific. Unlike grand theory, it does not try to account for all the range of phenomena in a discipline or sub-field. Rather than trying to theorise abstract entities such as social systems, Merton regards middle range theory as beginning with the collection of observable data from specific and delimited research contexts.

Consumer Culture Theoretics (Arnould and Thompson, 2007) concentrate on the development of theories at the middle range.

Practice Theory tries to explain the way phenomena occur in practice, refusing to prioritise the conceptual importance of *either* individual actors or societal structures (Allen, 2002; Reckwitz, 2002; Whittington, 2006). It neither assumes that individual actors socially construct the world in the absence of societal influences or that societal structures completely determine microlevel action (Whittington, 2006). This type of theorising seeks to achieve a balance between theory and practice without privileging one over the other (Böhm, 2002).

THE ONGOING DEBATES

One of the most enduring debates, which still permeates many discussions today, concerns whether marketing is a science (Alderson and Cox, 1948; Bartels, 1951; Buzzell, 1963; Hunt, 1976), an art (Vaile, 1949) or somewhere in between the two (Stainton, 1952). Scholars have taken up various positions at either end of the art/science continuum (McTier Anderson, 1994). For example, whereas Hutchinson (1952) believed that the nature of marketing meant that it must always remain an art, Hunt (1976) argued strongly for its scientific status. Indeed, by the 1970s marketing science firmly dominated the discipline with a plethora of quantitative analysis techniques. The development of computer technology had increasingly permeated the academy during the 1960s, which enabled researchers to conduct much more complex statistical analyses (Wilkie and Moore, 2003). This concentration on method and technique led to criticism that marketers were too fascinated with 'tool kits', emphasising technology rather than theory (Hunt, 1983).

Another debate concerns the choice of philosophical orientation that is appropriate for marketing theory. According to various scholars, marketing theory should be fallibilistic realist (Hunt, 1984, 2002, 2003), critical realist (Easton, 2002), critical pluralist (Siegel, 1988), critical relativist (Anderson, 1983),

critical theoretical (Bradshaw and Firat, 2007; McDonagh, 2002; Murray and Ozanne, 1991, 1997), feminist (Bristor and Fischer, 1993, 1995; Maclaran and Catterall, 2000), humanist (Monieson, 1988), posthumanist (Campbell et al., 2006), postmodern (Brown, 1995, 1998; Sherry, 1991) and postcolonialist (Jack, 2008) amongst others. These debates are often linked to arguments about appropriate methodologies, ontologies, epistemologies, views of human nature and the value of social change (Anderson, 1986; Calder and Tybout, 1987, 1989; Holbrook and O'Shaughnessy, 1988; Jack and Westwood, 2006; Monieson, 1988; Muncy and Fisk, 1987).

Over the years, these continuing debates have spawned many different classifications of the main schools of thought in marketing, each with particular implications for theory. Carmen (1980) identifies six (microeconomic, persuasion/attitude change, conflict resolution, generalist system, functionalist and social exchange). Fisk and Meyers (1982) propose another six (network flow, market scarcity, competitive marketing management, evolutionary systems change, general systems and dissipative structures). Arndt (1985) has four paradigms (logical empiricist, subjective world, socio-political and liberating). Sheth et al. (1988) list twelve schools (commodity, functional, functionalist, regional, institutional, managerial, buyer behaviour, activist, macromarketing, organisational dynamics, systems and social exchange). Kerin (1996) chooses six metaphors that characterise marketing science and practice in each of the six decades since the launch of the *Journal of Marketing* in 1936 (applied economics, a managerial activity, a quantitative science, a behavioural science, a decision science and an integrative science). More recently, Wilkie and Moore (2003) have identified the '4 eras' of thought development. These are: 1900–1920: 'Founding the Field'; 1920–1950: 'Formalizing the Field'; 1950–1980: 'A Paradigm Shift-Marketing, Management, and the Sciences'; 1980–present; 'The Shift Intensifies – A Fragmentation of the Mainstream'.

Yet, despite such analyses that attempt to group marketing research into coherent streams of knowledge, most commentators recognise the lack of progress in developing marketing theory *per se*. Three key reasons for this have been put forward (Saren, 2000: 31–34):

- 1 There is a lack of attention to history (Baker, 2001; Greyser, 1997; Levy, 2003). Too often, new generations of marketing scholars reinvent the wheel, ignoring marketing's history and theoretical foundations (Baker, 1995; Tadajewski and Saren, 2008). Fullerton (1987) draws attention to the 'myth of the marketing era' and makes a compelling case that strong evidence of sales and marketing orientations can be found in the production era. Despite these doubts about the four-eras model, it still remains widely used in current introductory textbooks, much to the chagrin of marketing historians. It is not without reason, therefore, that marketing is bemoaned as 'ahistorical' (Fullerton, 1987).
- 2 There has been an over-emphasis on quantitative methods as part of marketing scholars' quest to claim scientific status. It has been argued that this has led to a lack of new theory generation, because such methods are more suited to theory testing (Bartels, 1988; Venkatesh, 1985). Although much theory generation in consumer research has arisen from interpretivist perspectives during the last twenty years, this has not gained mainstream marketing acceptance (Arnould and Thompson, 2007).
- 3 The pronounced shift to research specialism from the early 1980s onwards (reflected by the range of new marketing journals) has brought about theoretical fragmentation of the mainstream. It has become more difficult for scholars to engage with others beyond their particular sub-area due to theoretical and conceptual differences (Wilkie and Moore, 2006; cf. Hirschman, 1985), even though some scholars have argued that such a cross-fertilization of ideas would be highly desirable (Davies and Fitchett, 2005; Muncy and Fisk, 1987). This fragmentation has been encouraged by the pluralisation of publication outlets and by journal editors' zealous defence of research specialisms (Easley et al., 2000; Tadajewski, 2008).

This expansion of publication outlets presents a problem for marketing researchers

and scholars because of the number of books, journals and articles available and necessary for them to consult. With this in mind, in designing this handbook we have selected leading experts covering the entire range of major theoretical fields. Each author has contributed a new chapter on their topic, which together provides readers with a comprehensive and an up-to-date handbook of marketing theory. The handbook is divided into six sections: (1) *Historical Development of Marketing Theory*; (2) *The Philosophical Underpinnings of Theory*; (3) *Major Theoretical Debates*; (4) *Impact of Theory on Representations of the Consumer*; (5) *Impact of Theory on Representations of the Marketing Organisation*; (6) *Contemporary and Future Issues in Marketing Theory*.

SECTION 1: HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF MARKETING THEORY

The history of marketing theory is a topic that has long merited the attention of a variety of scholars. Building upon the tradition that ranges from the work of Robert Bartels' (1988) to Paul Converse's (1951) the 'Development of Marketing Theory: Fifty Years of Progress' scholars have long considered the development of marketing theory an essential building block for the future progress of the discipline (Alderson and Cox, 1948).

In equal measure, an understanding of the history of marketing theory and thought, which elucidates all of the various 'schools of thought' (Shaw and Jones, 2005), remains important for research students and seasoned academics alike. It goes some way in preventing scholars from reinventing various theoretical, conceptual and methodological wheels that conceivably could occur if theoreticians are historically illiterate (Hollander, 1995). In recognition of the importance of historical studies in foregrounding the further development of marketing theory, the first section of this collection engages with our

disciplinary history in all its many facets, ranging from the schools of thought in marketing, the development of consumer and marketing research, to the refinement of advertising theory and practice.

The first contribution by Shaw et al. introduces the development of the earliest schools in marketing thought. By earliest schools we mean, of course, the functional, commodity, institutional and interregional schools of thought. Via a close reading of the development of each of these schools Shaw et al. provide an exceptional orientation device for those new to the development of marketing theory, which is especially important given the fact that some of the work of scholars from these schools is often seen to underpin the most widely subscribed to school in current marketing thought, the marketing management school (Shaw and Jones, 2005; Sheth et al., 1988). Nor should we assume that, simply because these schools of thought are not given so much attention now, such labels can no longer describe the work of a distinct group of academics. As Shaw et al. and Zinn and Johnson (1990) have revealed, the ideas associated with the commodity school, to give one example, continue to be reflected in contemporary literature.

The second contribution by Jones et al. brings the analysis introduced by Shaw et al. to almost the present day. We say 'almost here' because other recent commentators (Lagrosen and Svensson, 2006) have attempted to make the case for introducing a number of further schools of thought, namely, services and relationship marketing schools respectively. Again, whether these form distinct schools of thought is itself debatable. Some have argued, for example, that a 'services dominant logic' underpins or should be viewed as undergirding all marketing theory and practice (Vargo and Lusch, 2004).

Whatever stance one takes on this issue, there are a variety of intellectual sources that can be drawn upon and Chapters 12 and 23 in this collection will introduce the interested reader to the new 'schools' flagged up by Lagrosen and Svensson (2006). Putting these

issues aside, Jones et al.'s chapter charts the development of marketing thought from roughly the 1950s to the present. They introduce a range of schools including the marketing management, marketing systems, consumer behaviour, macromarketing, marketing history and the exchange schools. Each of these schools is dissected by the authors in considerable detail.

The chapter by Kassarjian and Goodstein clearly articulates the development of consumer research as a distinct discipline. In their contribution, Professors Kassarjian and Goodstein take a perceptive and innovative approach to historical research in marketing. They interweave their account of the emergence and subsequent shifts in the theoretical emphases of consumer research with external environmental changes. Such a strategy overcomes a major criticism that the history of consumer research is often depicted in a decontextualised (Schroeder, 2000; Scully, 1996) and ahistorical manner (Tadajewski, 2006b, 2009). Taking us on a journey from the earliest days in the development of marketing and consumer thought, through the Second World War, Kassarjian and Goodstein account for the adoption of the various 'grand theories of human behavior' within the discipline, charting their successes and ultimate declines. The authors draw upon their considerable knowledge of the development of consumer research to clearly delineate the history of the subject (see also Belk, 2009; Levy, 2003; Mittelstaedt, 1990; Tadajewski, 2006b). There is, however, an absence in their chapter that is worth highlighting in the interest of completeness, namely, Kassarjian's own contribution to the discipline, which has been considerable. From 1960 onwards he has played a major role in furthering our understanding of consumer research methods and theory in the areas of consumer perception to name just one topic (e.g. Kassarjian, 1963).

In another extensive historical overview, the next chapter, by David Stewart, includes the prehistory of market research. He documents the informal exchange of various forms of business intelligence from the fourteenth

century onwards. Moving closer to the present, Stewart notes the changing nature of the US industrial economy and its implications for the emergence and 'evolution' of marketing research. Naturally enough, with the growing distance between producers and the ultimate consumer, it became increasingly important for producers to understand the nature of consumer needs, wants and desires. Indeed, the history of marketing practice often reveals that producers were cognisant of the value and importance of market research in determining production schedules. Stewart notes the key figures and companies in the history of both marketing theory and practice, highlighting the key techniques and methodological tools that have been adopted during the course of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

Rounding off our historical surveys, Chris Hackley sketches the history of advertising thought. Hackley parses the voluminous advertising literature into three key strands: managerial, scientific and cultural approaches. Each of the three approaches that Hackley details can potentially feed into the others and each conceptualises advertising theory and practice in slightly different, but not necessarily incommensurable ways. Managerial and scientific approaches are, he documents, the most prominent strands in the marketing and advertising literatures. More recently, he claims, there has been what can be called an anthropological turn in advertising, with scholars and practitioners alike, beginning to appreciate and apply the methods and insights of cultural anthropology in campaign and theory development.

SECTION 2: THE PHILOSOPHICAL UNDERPINNINGS OF THEORY

As Shelby Hunt and Jared Hansen point out in the first chapter in this section, all research is underpinned by philosophical assumptions. Research reflects a particular way of looking at the world (ontological assumptions) and

possesses a certain orientation that dictates legitimate ways of establishing valid claims to knowledge (epistemological assumptions), all of which will influence the methodology used in consumer and market research (Anderson, 1986). Debates surrounding what constitutes the most appropriate way of seeking knowledge about marketing phenomena are long standing. These range from the first philosophy of science debates that began at the turn of the twentieth century between the *laissez faire* oriented scholars and their German Historical counterparts (Jones and Monieson, 1990), through the empiricist versus interpretive oriented motivation researchers of the 1950s and 1960s (Tadajewski, 2006b), to the 'spirited debate' between the critical relativist (Anderson, 1983, 1986) and scientific realist contingents (Hunt, 1990, 1992).

Hunt and Hansen rally against a variety of forms of relativism. In marketing, critical relativism was initially put forward by Paul Anderson in a series of seminal contributions to the philosophy of marketing thought. He considered the existing logical empiricist emphasis of marketing theory to be seriously problematic. Perhaps the major objection, among many identified by Anderson, is that the objective image of science as a process of hypothetico-deductive reasoning propounded by logical empiricists is not consistent with the actual practice of science. Researchers exhibit varying degrees of tenacity when it comes to their favoured theories and concepts and do not seek to undermine them (Feyerabend, 1975). But more than this, Anderson wanted to question the idea that there was a single scientific method that could be used in the search for knowledge (Anderson, 1986; see also Muncy and Fisk, 1987; O'Shaughnessy, 1997).

By contrast, Hunt and Jared outline the problems that they and a number of philosophers of science perceive with respect to relativism. In an effort to theoretically sensitise marketing scholars to the alternative philosophical perspectives sketched out by philosophers of science, they discuss at length

realism and its more recent cousin, scientific realism, explicating this position through recourse to actual case studies in the marketing literature. Scientific realism with its explicit fallibilistic emphasis is, Hunt and Jared claim, the most appropriate philosophy for marketing theory if we are interested in distinguishing 'illusion from reality' (Hunt, 1990: 9). Obviously, not all agree with this interpretation of scientific realism as the most appropriate philosophy for marketing, but this in itself indicates the vitality of marketing theory (e.g. Anderson, 1988; Kavanagh, 1994; Muncy and Fisk, 1987; O'Shaughnessy, 1997, 2009; Peter, 1992).

Following Hunt and Jared, our next contribution by Fuat Firat and Mark Tadajewski outlines the history and debate surrounding 'critical marketing studies' (Tadajewski and Brownlie, 2008; Tadajewski and Maclaran, 2009). One of the central axes of critical marketing studies is the idea that there is something not quite right with the way marketing is currently conceived and practiced. Gone is the emphasis on distributive justice, critique and a sceptical questioning of the key concepts that are routinely invoked in marketing, with these having been replaced by a relatively uncritical managerial performativity. Theoretical and conceptual touchstones like consumer sovereignty or the marketing concept are accepted as givens, and they are not examined to see whether they have theoretical merit, reflect the present structuring of the marketing system or, indeed, act as ideological veils for inequitable marketplace power relations.

Critical marketing studies, Firat and Tadajewski assert, try to do exactly this, examining key marketing ideas, concepts and theories, asking questions about whose interests these serve and what power relations they elide. Important in this undertaking is the use of some form of critical social theory such as that associated with Marxism, the Frankfurt School, Feminism, Poststructuralism and others (Saren, 2007). This reference to 'critical' social theory should not, critical marketers tell us, be taken to indicate that critical marketing

is totally dismissive of marketing *per se*. But rather that critical marketing is concerned with engaging in a negative activity, which is in turn positive in its own way. As a prominent Critical Theorist, Leo Lowenthal suggested, 'it is exactly the negative [in Critical Theory studies] that was the positive: this consciousness of not going along, the refusal. The essence of Critical Theory is really the inexorable analysis of what is' (Lowenthal, 1987: 62). In other words, as Firat and Tadajewski explain, we can consider critical marketing studies as an attempt at questioning the status quo or what passes for received wisdom in marketing and consumer research.

Our next chapter, by Kristian Möller, Jacqueline Pels and Michael Saren argues that over the last thirty years, marketing theory and practice has become increasingly heterogeneous. To illustrate this, the authors provide a meta-theoretical interrogation of the domain of marketing theory. They make the case that although paradigms provide us with a way of viewing marketing theory and practices in all their many facets, paradigms also limit what we see. Following the work of Johan Arndt, Möller et al. ask marketing theoreticians to consider the value of exploring marketing using multiple paradigms and concomitantly with a plurality of research methodologies. Drawing from the organisation studies literature, they outline a variety of ways to negotiate the restrictions of incommensurability in an effort to illustrate the benefits of multiple paradigm research, paradigm interplay and metatriangulation, among others.

In the final contribution to section two, John O'Shaughnessy examines the debates surrounding scientific methods and the multiple systems of explanation that marketing scholars can draw upon. In a rigorous, critical analysis, O'Shaughnessy questions the idea that there can be one single scientific method, arguing instead that multiple ways of seeking knowledge are open to marketing and consumer researchers. Indeed, in an analysis that cuts to the heart of many discussions about marketing theory, O'Shaughnessy can be read as suggesting that there never have been,

nor are there likely to be any law-like generalisations in marketing theory.

In a seminal review O'Shaughnessy introduces a whole range of key ideas from the philosophy of science including: methodological monism, methodological individualism, methodological exclusivism, methodological pluralism and perspectivism, along with clarifying the ubiquitous term 'paradigm' and the controversy about the incommensurability of paradigms, among others. As an enthusiastic exponent of paradigmatic pluralism himself, like the contributors of our previous chapter, O'Shaughnessy cautions marketing scholars from uncritically subscribing to any one paradigm and in so doing, refusing to consider the perspectives offered by other, perhaps equally compelling – if different – ways of understanding marketing and consumer phenomena.

SECTION 3: MAJOR THEORETICAL DEBATES

This section examines some of the major controversies that have permeated theoretical debates in marketing. The chapters here explore the controversies surrounding different conceptual perspectives in marketing and examine in depth the influence on development of theory of the various schools of thought, which were discussed in Section 1. These schools and their theories are set in their contemporary context and cover major debates about theories concerning the performativity of markets, the concept of networks, debates (and silence) about market ideology and the service dominant logic in marketing.

The first contribution by Luis Araujo and Hans Kjellberg explains how marketing practice and practices influence the operation of markets. Whatever one's opinion of the ontological status of the market, the view that marketing managers take of the nature and scope of the markets in which they consider operating is important, not just epistemologically,

but also teleologically. In other words, the particular definition and understanding of the market that managers adopt itself affects their operations and the outcomes in their chosen, enacted market 'place'. Araujo and Kjellberg discuss the empirical aspects and theoretical implications of this market-making perspective of marketing practice.

The Service Dominant Logic (SDL) approach is outlined by Steve Vargo and Robert Lusch (2004, 2006, 2008) in the next chapter. As a new contender for dominance in marketing theory, in a short time SDL has raised strong interest and discussion about theory development in marketing. The focus of SDL is on marketing as a value co-creation process that is service-based. Marketers can only provide value propositions, embedded in offerings, and their value depends entirely on the experiential evaluation of customers. They contend that service is the fundamental basis of exchange and 'goods are distribution mechanisms for service provision'. Another key aspect is the role of know-how, capabilities and competencies ('operant resources'), which are the key resources for both creating value propositions and extracting value from them as the primary source of competitive advantage. The corollary is that the role of tangible, finite 'operand resources' is to provide the raw material for the pro-active intangible resources to 'activate', as it were.

Central to the SDL approach is its distinction from that referred to by Vargo and Lusch as the historical, still prevailing Goods Dominant Logic (GDL) based on tangible goods and the activities associated with their delivery. The GDL is presented as an antithesis to the SDL, which provides a '*shift in thinking*':

It represents a shift from thinking about value in terms of *operand resources* — usually tangible, static resources that require some action to make them valuable — to *operant resources* — usually intangible, dynamic resources that are capable of creating value. That is, whereas G-D logic sees services as (somewhat inferior to goods) *units of output*, S-D logic sees service as a *process* — doing something for another party. (Vargo and Lusch 2008: 8)

Vargo and Lusch advocate that the SDL should form the basis of a unified theory of marketing. It can be seen more in terms of an orientation, however; a perspective providing guidelines for how certain existing schools of marketing should be utilised in normative fashion in value creation.

As Djelic (2007) observes, the emergence of the twentieth century neoliberal ideology of politics and markets was indeed a curious blend of economic liberalism, Calvinist doctrine and Spencerian evolutionism. Robin Wensley was one of the earliest marketing academics to question the limits of the extension of the marketing analogy, particularly in the professional and public sector contexts (Wensley, 1990). His chapter in this handbook covers what he regards as the central issues relating to the ideological aspects of markets from two different perspectives. Firstly, in terms of market ideology, he examines the efficacy of the concept of ‘the magic of the market’ as the solution to problems of welfare and choice associated with Adam Smith’s ‘invisible hand’. Wensley critically analyses the development and evolution of what has been labelled as the hegemony of neoliberal perspectives on the efficacy of markets and market mechanisms. In the final part of this contribution, he considers global and cultural issues, including issues of identity and how these relate to markets and consumption.

Arguably, the dominant conceptualisation of what is considered a ‘marketing phenomenon’ in normative marketing theory is centred on the notion of exchange (Bagozzi, 1978). Any marketing ideas or actions involve the *exchange* of products, services, knowledge and money. Thus, in this view, three components must exist as *sine qua non* for an exchange to occur, namely, a seller, a buyer and a product:

- Marketing production
- Products and services
- Buyers and consumption

This conceptualisation of marketing has stimulated some major debates in the decades

since it was first proposed and, in the penultimate chapter in this section, Richard Bagozzi elaborates and reflects on his notion of exchange as fundamental to marketing.

The development of theory and research in marketing is heavily dependent on the language we use and marketing thought and writing is full of metaphors, tropes and figures of speech. The chapter by Stephen Brown opens with an illustration of the power of the metaphor with reference to Levitt’s original Harvard Business Review (HBR) article ‘Marketing Myopia’. He reminds us that this was published as a reply to motivation researchers such as Ernest Dichter, who were damaging marketing’s image at the time (Levitt, 1960). By stressing that ‘proper’ marketing placed customer needs at the centre of its operation, Brown argues that Levitt’s article represented a brilliantly argued refutation of ‘the rip-off brigade’. Regarding its core metaphor, however, Brown reminds us that when we re-read *Marketing Myopia* we can see that the myopic trope of the title hardly appears in the text at all. Indeed, short-sightedness hardly gets a mention, even though it is ‘perhaps the most famous metaphor in the history of marketing thought’ (Brown, 2004).

In his chapter, Brown points to various types of dangers in the over-use in marketing of this ‘rolling stone of mossy metaphors’. Much of what passes for marketing ‘theory’, he argues is ‘little more than morbidly obese metaphor’. The crucial question he asks then: are metaphors a good thing? Brown’s chapter shows clearly that they are certainly over-used; from the metaphorical excesses of management speak to the patented ‘metaphor elicitation technique’ in marketing. Perhaps they even fulfil a useful function in the era of service dominance. Even if the real, tangible economy is receding fast maybe we do not need it anyway, Brown says, ‘because the hyperreal economy, the intangible economy of mental leaps, analogical acumen, and metaphor manufacturing will save the day’. Furthermore, as he points out, metaphors have their dark side too – they blinker our

thinking, they conceal as much as they reveal, they shape our discourse and delineate understanding.

SECTION 4: THE IMPACT OF THEORY ON REPRESENTATIONS OF THE CONSUMER

This section looks in detail at the implications of theory for how we conceptualise and undertake research into specific marketing phenomena. We have chosen to focus on consumer behaviour, because conceptions of the customer are central to the development of marketing theory. In addition, consumer behaviour is a research area which has included many diverse perspectives since its emergence in the 1950s as a major sub-area of marketing. This diversity has included concepts drawn from cognitive psychology, psychoanalysis, the mathematical sciences, sociology and cultural anthropology. In the last twenty years, there has been a particularly strong backlash against quantitative perspectives in consumer behaviour especially the information processing view of the consumer (e.g. Belk, 1986) and the (re)emergence of many innovative, interdisciplinary perspectives rooted in the interpretivist paradigm (Levy, 1996), drawing on ethnographic and semiotic methods. The chapters in this section illustrate how different theoretical lenses impact on representations of the consumer.

Critiques often highlight the risk of cultural homogeneity amongst consumers, a homogeneity, they contest, that is driven by increasingly globalised brandscapes. This section commences with a chapter by Russell Belk that unpacks the complexities of the 'global consumer' and refutes the criticism of homogeneity as over-simplistic. Taking a cross-cultural perspective, Belk explores how globalisation affects the three key intersections of desire, possession and identity. In contrast to traditional marketing perspectives that focus on needs and wants, Belk et al.

(2003) conceptualise consumer desires as involving passion and obsession. Belk argues that, on both utilitarian and cultural levels, there are many contextual factors that affect consumer desires and ensure that local meanings and value systems intersect in unique ways with global consumption patterns. Despite the great degree of global interconnectedness in consumer desires, Belk illustrates how consumers from around the world resist or localise the influences of global consumer culture. Examining three specific product categories where consumption is alleged to be global in character, he focuses on Chinese food, American rap music and global Christmas celebrations to show the different shades of meaning that consumers attach to these, depending on utilitarian and cultural contexts.

Consumer desire is looked at through a very different lens in the chapter that follows, by Richard Bagozzi, who identifies it as a key component in consumer decision making processes that lead to consumer action. Highlighting the theoretical gap between consumer behaviour and consumer action, Bagozzi draws on a range of interdisciplinary perspectives from psychology, neuroscience and various applied areas of the social sciences, to augment previous consumer behaviour decision making models. In so doing, he proposes a framework to reconcile this theoretical gap. Taking the variables and processes that influence consumers' reasons for acting, he groups these into four key categories for analysis, namely, the bases for self-regulation of desire, cause of goal desires, causes of action desires and implications of action intentions. Overall, he claims that previous psychological perspectives have been too narrowly focused and, in agreement with other writers in this section, he highlights the need to understand consumers in their everyday lives, rather than through laboratory experiments. Accordingly, Bagozzi argues that his proposed framework to study consumer agency and action moves us from a passive reactive conceptualisation of consumption to an active self-regulatory

perspective. As Belk's chapter also shows, consumers are not just acted on by marketing activities and stimuli, but rather they respond creatively, often adapting these to their own advantage.

In contrast to the cognitive stance of dominant psychological perspectives and Belk's cultural lens to analyze global consumer desire, Gordon Foxall has long been at the forefront of behavioural approaches to understand consumer choice in marketing and consumer research (Foxall, 1986, 1990, 1994). He illustrates how his analytic approach, termed 'consumer behavior analysis', can help us understand the complex behaviours that underpin consumers' purchasing and consumption activities. Arguing for a model of consumer choice based on radical behaviourism, he details the theory and research that has guided development of the Behavioural Perspective Model (BPM). Rooted in behavioural economics, which combines experimental economics and operant psychology, the BPM model enables a heightened sensitivity to the effects of environmental contingencies on consumers' actions.

The final chapter in this section returns us to a cultural theoretical lens as Pauline Maclaran, Margaret Hogg and Alan Bradshaw review the field of enquiry commonly referred to as interpretivist consumer research or Consumer Culture Theory (Arnould and Thompson, 2005). As can be seen in the two preceding chapters, the major influences of economics and psychology have meant a strong focus on the purchasing act in consumer behaviour theory. Maclaran, Hogg and Bradshaw document how a cultural perspective shifts this focus towards broader conceptualisations of the experiences embodied in consumer behaviour (Belk, 1995). Building on previous categorisations of this body of interpretivist work, they foreground seven key representations of the consumer: consumers in their cultural contexts; consumers in their subcultural contexts; consumer identities and the meaning of possessions; consumers as gift-givers; consumers and

their sense of (market)place; consumers as storytellers and myth-makers; dissatisfied and disadvantaged consumers.

SECTION 5: THE IMPACT OF THEORY ON REPRESENTATIONS OF THE MARKETING ORGANISATION

This section looks in detail at the implications of theory for how we conceptualise the marketing function in the organisation and the role of marketing by and for the organisation. These chapters illustrate how different theoretical lenses impact on representations of the marketing organisation. The traditional view of the firm and how managers conduct marketing activities has evolved significantly over the past twenty years or so. The theoretical basis has shifted from the biological analogy of the autonomous organism operating in a changing business environment, towards an overlapping network of market actors operating in more or less contingent or strategic modes. Some of the research which underpins this shift comes from researchers such as those in the International Marketing and Purchasing (IMP) group and also from renewed attention to the concept of market orientation and its measurement. This section reviews and revisits the theoretical and empirical research developments that have advanced marketing views of the firm, economic theories of the marketing organisation, the social construction of marketing management and behavioural approaches to the organisation of the marketing function.

In 1982, a research project, carried out in five European countries by a group which became known as the IMP, reported how they had developed an approach which challenged traditional ways of examining industrial marketing and purchasing. In business-to-business settings, the IMP study showed that companies, on both the customer and supplier sides, were dominated by some long-term business relationships with a limited number

of counterparts. Within the context of these relationships, both marketing and purchasing of industrial goods were seen as 'interaction processes' between the two parties. These researchers also observed that interaction in itself included an important content of its own. In their chapter, Lars-Erik Gadde and Håkan Håkansson review and explain how this concept of interaction in networks challenged prevailing conceptualisations in B2B marketing in four major respects. Firstly, IMP challenged the narrow analysis of single discrete purchases and emphasised the importance of business relationships. Secondly, the view of industrial marketing as manipulation of marketing-mix variables in relation to a passive market was challenged. The third aspect concerned the assumption of an atomistic market structure where buyers and sellers can easily switch business partners. Fourthly, IMP challenged the separation of theoretical and empirical analysis into either the process of purchasing or the process of marketing.

Although this emphasis on the role and importance of business relationships and interaction have been recognised by other schools of thought, Gadde and Håkansson show that there is no general agreement regarding the implications for theories of business (see also Chapter 9 in this volume by Möller et al.). They emphasise that the main objective of the IMP project now is to develop a framework for analysis of business interaction building on an outward-in perspective, implying that the internal organising of a company must reflect its way of approaching business partners. Gadde and Håkansson also explore how interaction is related to the three network layers of activities, resources and actors. In conclusion, they analyze how these conditions, concerning network interaction, may impact on the internal organisation of an enterprise.

Over the last three decades, since the first IMP studies discussed in the foregoing section, a range of alternative, broader perspectives of organisations has emerged in the marketing literature. Greater emphasis is now

placed on marketing organisations' processes, relationships with customers and networks with stakeholders. The next chapter by Roderick Brodie, Vicki Little and Richard Brookes in this section draws on the research undertaken by the Contemporary Marketing Practice (CMP) research group, which develops the case for a multi-theory perspective of the marketing organisation. The chapter examines the conceptual foundations of CMP research, and how it evolved to encompass a multi-theory approach. Brodie et al. then review the empirical evidence about the characteristics and behaviour of contemporary marketing organisations that has been generated since the formation of the CMP group. They follow this with a discussion of how the various conceptual and methodological developments have informed theory development relating to the contemporary marketing organisation. Two of these theoretical and methodological developments are then reviewed – middle range theory, which is an intermediate step between the working hypothesis and unified general theory, and living case studies as co-creative learning with practitioners. The chapter shows how these two key developments of CMP group research have enabled researchers to draw on practice to inform theory and to examine more clearly the relationship between practice and performance.

In the early 1990s, researchers became concerned about the lack of empirical evidence regarding the impact of marketing activities on corporate performance (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990; Narver and Slater, 1990; Ruekert, 1992; Shapiro, 1988). This was partly stimulated by concern over the lack of status and authority of marketing at board level. The notion of market orientation (MO) was developed originally in order to begin to address this issue empirically with the MO construct representing the *implementation* aspects of the marketing concept and the means of measuring marketing performance. Narver and Slater (1990: 24) suggested that market orientation '... consists of three behavioural components – customer orientation,

competition orientation, and interfunctional coordination, and two decision criteria long-term focus and profitability'. Kohli and Jaworski (1990: 6) defined MO through three interrelated elements: (i) the organisation wide generation of market intelligence pertaining to current and future customer needs, (ii) dissemination of intelligence across departments and (iii) organisation-wide responsiveness to it. Profitability and performance in general was regarded as a consequence of MO rather than part of the construct. These initial contributions generated many studies on different aspects of market orientation. These explored issues such as whether MO is primarily dominated by customer orientation or represents a multidimensional construct comprising, customer, competitor and market orientation. Another question concerned the passive versus proactive nature of the market orientation construct, i.e. whether it was primarily 'market driven' or included also 'market making' characteristics.

This theme is developed by Jonathan Knowles and Tim Ambler in the following chapter on market orientation and marketing metrics. Initially, they note that market orientation is far from universal among organisations and conclude from this that not all executives agree about the importance of marketing. They assert that this is partly due to different understandings of the term 'marketing', which can be broadly defined as being *both* the whole company's activities designed to satisfy customers and thereby achieve its own objectives, *and* the activities of the functional marketing department (Webster, 1992). A third view defines marketing by the activities that constitute the marketing budget, i.e. marketing research, communications and promotions (Ambler, 2003). The chapter begins by analysing four key marketing performance indicators or 'silver metrics'. It continues with a review of the evolution of marketing metrics and discusses the definition and role of the concept of brand equity as a key construct in the assessment of the productivity of marketing

in financial terms. Knowles and Ambler conclude that no single metric is adequate for performance assessment and therefore none is adequate for planning purposes either. They explain how the four 'silver metrics' that they identify and review should be used in combination with other metrics of marketing performance to provide a compelling portrait of how the company is performing in the market. Finally they argue that we need to better understand the dynamics in changes of orientation and metrics selection itself.

The purpose of the chapter that follows is to analyse how relationship marketing can be conceptualised and managed using a promise management approach. Here Christian Grönroos proposes a marketing definition and approach that helps academics and business practitioners alike to understand and implement a relational strategy in both business-to-business and business-to-consumer contexts. He argues that conventional marketing definitions have become a hindrance for developing marketing in accordance with changes in today's business environment. This is because the focus of traditional definitions is on one function of marketing, i.e. the exchange of pre-produced value without accounting for relationships or dialogue which may add value. Also they postulate a structural set of marketing variables, rather than a marketing *process*. Such definitions have become a straitjacket for marketing practice and for marketing theory. Instead, Grönroos argues that relationship marketing is better viewed as a process-oriented approach to customer management which is best understood as *promise management*; i.e. a process of enabling, making and keeping promises to customers, by meeting the expectations which are created by the promises made. Grönroos bases his analysis mainly, but not entirely, on the Nordic School of thought in marketing research (see Berry and Parasuraman, 1993; Grönroos, 2007).

There are several benefits of the promises management approach to the marketing organisation. It shifts the interest of research

into marketing from structure to process. Grönroos argues that previous definitions of marketing have always been over preoccupied with structural elements and neglected the importance of process, which has only been recognised implicitly by them. Also, by emphasising *value-in-use*, it allows for supplier and customer co-production of solutions and thus value co-creation together with customers. Furthermore, viewing marketing as a process includes activities that necessarily go beyond a single marketing function, because the promise management perspective should permeate all organisational functions. Finally, the new definition recognises the fact that everyone involved in interactions with customers are not automatically customer-focused. By focusing on promises, it recognises that part-time marketers exist, whereas conventional marketing approaches do not allow for ways of coping for the part-time marketer, nor trigger any interest in studying them from a marketing perspective. The process of enabling promises explicitly emphasises the need to prepare employees who are not tasked nor trained for their key 'part-time' marketing-related roles.

SECTION 6: CONTEMPORARY AND FUTURE ISSUES IN MARKETING THEORY

Each of the chapters in this final section offers a rethink of some aspect of marketing theory. Overall, the chapters consider the changing sociocultural and political contexts in which theory is developed and highlights contemporary issues likely to impact most on the future development of marketing theory. The authors discuss future research agendas in the light of current trends and, for example, the role of e-marketing and the implications of new technologies are recurrent themes throughout the section. By concluding this handbook with new ways of conceptualising aspects of marketing and

consumer behaviour theory, we hope to leave our readers with inspiration to explore for themselves the many rich avenues for further research into marketing theory.

Macromarketing looks at marketing activities in the context of their wider economic, social, political and ecological environments, and has emerged as a significant area of scholarship where many new theories are required to better understand marketing's impact on society (Firat and Dholakia, 1982; Kilbourne et al., 1997). Roger Layton's thought-provoking chapter that opens this section takes just such a macro viewpoint in its comprehensive analysis of marketing systems and their theoretical implications. Layton argues that, although contemporary marketing theory offers many insights into the nature of exchange relationships between buyers and sellers, it has not had nearly as much to say about the nature of the networks that these interactions generate. Illustrating how micro decisions create macro outcomes, he discusses the important interconnections between marketing systems, macromarketing and quality of life. These interconnections, he argues, relate particularly strongly to critical problem areas such as obesity, food, finance, energy and environment. Layton enlivens his arguments with an analysis of the marketing system in which a community store in a remote aboriginal township in Central Australia is embedded, showing how complex multi-level structures can emerge from simple, localised exchange.

In the second chapter, Elizabeth Hirschman joins an increasing number of scholars (e.g. Fullerton and Nevett, 1988) who call for a greater acknowledgement of the past as a foundation for understanding the present structure of markets and marketing. Highlighting the analogous relationship between 'marketing-as-process' (Vargo and Lusch, 2004) and the bio-evolutionary process of natural selection, Hirschman explores the role of marketing in cultural evolution. In an ambitious analysis that covers a period of some hundred thousand years, she looks at how marketing activities

and social systems have long been intertwined. From this analysis, she proposes a reframing of contemporary marketing theory. Arguing that marketing-as-process has evolved through three concentric cultural cycles, she pinpoints us as now having entered the third, the Era of Consumer Constructed Innovativeness, an era that is enabled by the global availability of creative technologies. Echoing themes that are explored further in the last two chapters of this section, she contends that this is likely to have as dramatic an effect on our culture as did the introduction of agriculture. In conclusion, she identifies three areas of marketing theory that would benefit from this evolutionary perspective: companies as families/tribes; reciprocity versus opportunism in markets; and brands as social markers.

Evolutionary theory is also the theme of the next chapter, but this time from a psychological, rather than a cultural perspective. Gad Saad is the foremost proponent of evolutionary psychology as a lens to better develop theory on consumer behaviour (Saad, 2007). Despite the take-up of Darwinian Theory across a wide range of disciplines in the natural and social sciences as well as in the humanities, to date this perspective has largely remained absent from consumer research. Following a brief discussion of the key tenets of Darwinian Theory in general, and evolutionary psychology in particular, Saad reviews work that has operated at the nexus of evolutionary theory and consumption. He then discusses key epistemological benefits of adopting Darwinian Theory as the organising meta-theoretical framework of consumer research, showing how it can bring many insights to existing interpretations of consumer behaviour and open up many new directions to pursue.

Since Holbrook and Hirschman's (1982) seminal contribution arguing against cognitive information processing models of consumer behaviour, there has been an increasing emphasis on the hedonic and experiential dimensions that surround consumption acts

(see also Chapter 19 in this volume). Consistent with this emphasis, experiential marketing has developed not only as a management perspective, but also as a strong research area. The penultimate chapter of this volume, by Bernard Cova and Daniele Dalli, explores theories of experiential marketing, particularly in relation to its linking value and the role of consumers in co-creating that value. Emphasising the strong collective aspects of contemporary consumption, and the fact that 'the link is more important than the thing' (Cova, 1997), they highlight the social bonds that are formed through goods, services and brands, bonds that underpin theories of experiential marketing. An important part of their review shows how, when consumers are active agents in the creation of this linking value, their immaterial labour is being appropriated without financial remuneration (see also Cova and Dalli, 2009). Crucially they argue that current theories of relationship or tribal marketing ignore the role of consumers in creating experiences and actual linking value. Accordingly, Cova and Dalli argue that this significant oversight limits the capability of extant theoretical models to account adequately for the complex and intimate nature of these processes.

The final chapter of the volume explores the intersections of technology, consumers and marketing theory. Nikhilesh Dholakia, Detlev Zwick and Janice Denegri-Knott begin with an overview of how technology has shaped marketing practice and consumer behaviour historically in order to lay the groundwork for the longstanding nexus between marketing and technology from the time of the industrial revolution. They then focus their narrative on the pervasive and deep impacts of new information technologies on marketing practice and theory. To do this, they examine first the distinctive core conceptual elements and main characteristics of new information technologies and why new information technologies often create impacts that are not merely accretive and accelerative, but also radical and transformational.

In subsequent parts of the chapter, focusing strongly on marketing theory, they examine a number of tendencies that have driven marketing and consumer behaviour theories, particularly after the advent of the mass Internet era. In particular, they explore three key issues: (1) is there an emergent theory, or are there emergent theories of information technology marketing? (2) is there an emergent theory, or are there emergent theories of technology consumption and (3) how are high or new information technologies shaping or informing major theories in marketing in areas such as customer relationship management, co-creation, and customer centricism and loci of control in the value creation and consumption process? The chapter ends with a suggestion for a future-oriented research direction about technology and marketing theory.

Overall, the editors of this handbook believe that these six sections together provide a comprehensive reference point for scholars wishing to engage in the development of marketing theory. Having reflected on both historical and contemporary debates, our expert group of authors have also raised many critical concerns for the future development of marketing theory. We hope that doctoral students and new researchers in marketing and consumer behaviour will find this handbook a particularly useful resource to inform them about the complexities of theory development in marketing. After all, the future of marketing theory lies largely with them.

REFERENCES

- Alderson, W. (1957) *Marketing Behavior and Executive Action*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Alderson, W. (1965) *Dynamic Marketing Behavior*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Alderson, W. and Cox, R. (1948) 'Towards a Theory of Marketing', *The Journal of Marketing*, 13(2): 137–152.
- Alderson, W. and Martin, M.W. (1965) 'Toward a Formal Theory of Transactions and Transvections', *Journal of Marketing Research*, 2(2): 117–127.
- Allen, D.E. (2002) 'Toward a Theory of Consumer Choice as Sociohistorically Shaped Practical Experience: The Fits-Like-A-Glove (FLAG) Framework', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28(4): 515–532.
- Ambler, T. (2003) *Marketing and the Bottom Line*, Second Edition. London: FT Prentice Hall.
- Anderson, P.F. (1983) 'Marketing, Scientific Progress, and the Scientific Method', *Journal of Marketing*, 47(4): 18–31.
- Anderson, P.F. (1986) 'On Method in Consumer Research: A Critical Relativist Perspective', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13(September): 155–173.
- Anderson, P.F. (1988) 'Relativism Revidivus: In Defense of Critical Relativism', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(December): 403–406.
- Arndt, J. (1985) 'The Tyranny of Paradigms: The Case for Paradigmatic Pluralism in Marketing', in N. Dholakia and J. Arndt (eds) *Changing the Course of Marketing: Alternative Paradigms for Widening Marketing Theory*, pp. 3–25. Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Arnould, E. and Thompson, C. (2007) 'Consumer Culture Theory (and we really mean theoretics): Dilemmas and Opportunities Posed by an Academic Branding Strategy', in R. W. Belk and J. F. Sherry, Jr. (eds) *Consumer Culture Theory*, Vol. 11 of *Research in Consumer Behavior*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Arnould, E.J. and Thompson, C.J. (2005) 'Consumer Culture Theory (CCT): Twenty Years of Research', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(4): 868–882.
- Bagozzi, R.P. (1978) 'Marketing as Exchange: A Theory of Transactions in the Market Place', *American Behavioral Scientist*, 21: 535–556.
- Baker, M.J. (1995) 'The Future of Marketing', in M.J. Baker (ed.) *Companion Encyclopedia of Marketing*, pp. 1003–1018. London: Routledge.
- Baker, M.J. (2001) 'Introduction', in M.J. Baker (ed.) *Marketing: Critical Perspectives on Business and Management*, pp. 1–25. London: Routledge.

- Bartels, R. (1951) 'Can Marketing be a Science?', *Journal of Marketing*, 51(1): 319–328.
- Bartels, R. (1988) *The History of Marketing Thought*, Third Edition. Columbus: Publishing Horizons.
- Belk, R.W. (1986) 'Art Versus Science as Ways of Generating Knowledge About Materialism', in D. Brinberg and R.J. Lutz (eds) *Perspectives on Methodology in Consumer Research*, pp. 3–36. New York: Springer Verlag.
- Belk, R.W. (1995) 'Studies in the New Consumer Behaviour', in D. Miller (ed.) *Acknowledging Consumption*, pp. 58–95. London: Routledge.
- Belk, R.W. (2009) 'The Modelling-Empiricism Gap: Lessons from the Quantitative-Qualitative Gap in Consumer Research', *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 45(1): 35–38.
- Belk, R.W., Ger, G. and Askegaard, S. (2003) 'The Fire of Desire: A Multi-sited Inquiry into Consumer Passion', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30 (December): 326–351.
- Berry, L.L. and Parasuraman, A. (1993) 'Building a New Academic Field – The Case for Services Marketing', *Journal of Retailing*, 69(1): 13–60.
- Böhm, S. (2002), 'Movements of Theory and Practice', *Ephemera*, 2(4), 328–351.
- Bradshaw, A. and Firat, A.F. (2007), 'Rethinking Critical Marketing', in M. Saren, P. Maclaran, C. Goulding, R. Elliott, A. Shankar and M. Catterall (eds) *Critical Marketing: Defining the Field*, pp. 30–43. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Bristor, J.M. and Fischer, E. (1993) 'Feminist Thought: Implications for Consumer Research', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19(March): 518–536.
- Bristor, E. and Fischer, E. (1995) 'Exploring Simultaneous Oppressions: Toward the Development of Consumer Research in the Interest of Diverse Women', *American Behavioral Scientist*, 38(4): 526–536.
- Brown, L.O. (1948) 'Toward a Profession of Marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, 13(1): 27–31.
- Brown, S. (1995) *Postmodern Marketing*. London: Routledge.
- Brown, S. (1998) *Postmodern Marketing Two*. London: International Thompson Business Press.
- Brown, S. (2004) 'Theodore Levitt: The Ultimate Writing Machine', *Marketing Theory*, 4(3): 209–238.
- Brown, S.W. and Fisk, R. (1984) *Marketing Theory: Distinguished Contributions*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Brownlie, D. and Saren, M. (1995) 'On the Commodification of Marketing Knowledge', *Journal of Marketing Management*, 11(7): 619–628.
- Brownlie, D., Saren, M., Wensley, R. and Whittington, R. (eds) (1999) *Rethinking Marketing: Towards Critical Marketing Accountings*. London: Sage.
- Buzzell, R.D. (1963) 'Is Marketing a Science?', *Harvard Business Review*, 41(1): 32–40.
- Calder, B.J. and Tybout, A.M. (1987) 'What Consumer Research Is ...', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14(1): 136–140.
- Calder, B.J. and Tybout, A.M. (1989) 'Interpretive, Qualitative, and Traditional Scientific Empirical Consumer Behavior Research', in E.C. Hirschman (ed.) *Interpretive Consumer Research*, pp. 199–208. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Campbell, N., O'Driscoll, A. and Saren, M. (2006) 'Cyborg Consciousness: A Visual Culture Approach to the Technologised Body', *European Advances in Consumer Research* 7: 344–351.
- Carmen, J.M. (1980) 'Paradigms for Marketing Theory', in J.N. Sheth (ed.) *Research in Marketing*, Vol. 3. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Cayla, J. and Eckhardt, G.M. (2008) 'Asian Brands and the Shaping of a Transnational Imagined Community', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35(August): 216–230.
- Converse, P.D. (1951) 'Development of Marketing Theory: Fifty Years of Progress', in H.G. Wales (ed.) *Changing Perspectives in Marketing*, pp. 1–31. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press.
- Cova, B. (1997) 'Community and Consumption: Towards a Definition of the Linking Value of Products or Services', *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(3/4): 297–316.
- Cova, B. and Dall'Aglio, D. (2009) 'Working Consumers: The Next Step in Marketing Theory?', *Marketing Theory*, 9(3): forthcoming.
- Davies, A. and Fitchett, J.A. (2005) 'Beyond Incommensurability? Empirical Expansion on

- Diversity in Research', *European Journal of Marketing*, 39(3): 272–293.
- Dholakia, N. and Arndt, J. (eds) (1985) *Changing the Course of Marketing: Alternative Paradigms for Widening Marketing Theory*. Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Dichter, E. (1960) *The Strategy of Desire*. New York: Doubleday.
- Djelic Marie-Laure (2007) 'Moral Foundations of Contemporary Capitalism: From Markets to Marketization', Uppsala Lectures.
- Easley, R.W., Madden, C.S. and Dunn, M.G. (2000) 'Conducting Marketing Science – The Role of Replication in the Research Process', *Journal of Business Research*, 48(1): 83–92.
- Easton, G. (2002) 'Marketing: A Critical Realist Approach', *Journal of Business Research*, 55(2): 103–109.
- Elliott, R. and Jankel-Elliott, N. (2003) 'Using Ethnography in Strategic Consumer Research', *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 6(4): 215–223.
- Feyerabend, P. (1975) *Against Method*. London: New Left Books.
- Firat, A.F. and Dholakia, N. (1982) 'Consumption Choices at the Macro Level', *Journal of Macromarketing*, 2(Fall): 6–15.
- Fisk, G. and Meyers, P. (1982) 'Macromarketers Guide to Paradigm', in R. Bush and S.D. Hunt (eds) *Marketing Theory: Philosophy of Science Perspectives*. Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Foxall, G.R. (1990) *Consumer Psychology in Behavioral Perspective*. London and New York: Routledge/republished 2004: Frederick, MD: Beard Books.
- Foxall, G.R. (1986) 'The Role of Radical Behaviorism in the Explanation of Consumer Choice', *Advances in Consumer Research*, 13, Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, pp. 195–201.
- Foxall, G.R. (1994) 'Behaviour Analysis and Consumer Psychology', *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 15: 5–91.
- Fromm, E. (1956/2005) *The Sane Society*. London: Routledge.
- Fromm, E. (1962/2006) *Beyond the Chains of Illusion: My Encounter with Marx and Freud*. New York: Continuum.
- Fromm, E. (1976/2007) *To Have Or To Be?* New York: Continuum.
- Fullerton, R.A. (1987) 'The Poverty of a Historical Analysis: Present Weaknesses and Future Cure in U.S. Marketing Thought', in A.F. Firat., N. Dholakia. and R.P. Bagozzi (eds) *Philosophical and Radical Thought in Marketing*, pp. 97–116. Lexington, KY: Lexington Books.
- Fullerton, R.A. and Nevett, T. (eds) (1988) *Historical Perspectives in Marketing*. Boston: Lexington Books.
- Gioia, D.A. and Pitre, E. (1990) 'Multiparadigm Perspectives on Theory Building', *Academy of Management Review*, 15(4): 584–602.
- Greenley, G. (1995) 'A Comment on the Commodification of Marketing Knowledge', *Journal of Marketing Management*, 11(7): 665–670.
- Greyser, S.A. (1997) 'Janus and Marketing: The Past, Present, and Prospective Future of Marketing', in D.R. Lehmann and K.E. Jocz (eds) *Reflections on the Futures of Marketing: Practice and Education*, pp. 3–14. Chicago: Marketing Science Institute.
- Grönroos, C. (2007) *In Search of a New Logic for Marketing. Foundation of Contemporary Theory*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Halbert, M. (1965) *The Meaning and Sources of Marketing Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hirschman, E.C. (1985) 'Scientific Style and the Conduct of Consumer Research', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 12(September): 225–239.
- Holbrook, M.B. and Hirschman, E.C. (1982) 'The Experiential Aspects of Consumption: Consumer Fantasies, Feelings and Fun', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(September): 132–140.
- Holbrook, M.B. (1985) 'Why Business is Bad for Consumer Research: The Three Bears Revisited', in E.C. Hirschman and M.B. Holbrook (eds) *Advances in Consumer Research*, pp. 145–156. 12, Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Holbrook, M.B. and O'Shaughnessy, J. (1988) 'On the Scientific Status of Consumer Research and the Need for an Interpretive Approach to Studying Consumption Behavior', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(3): 398–402.
- Hollander, S.C. (1995) 'My Life on Mt. Olympus', *Journal of Macromarketing*, 15(1): 86–106.

- Howard, J.A. and Sheth, J.N. (1969) *The Theory of Buyer Behavior*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hudson, L.A. and Ozanne, J.L. (1988) 'Alternative Ways of Seeking Knowledge in Consumer Research', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14(4): 508–521.
- Hunt, S.D. (1976) 'The Nature and Scope of Marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, 40(3): 17–26.
- Hunt, S.D. (1983) 'General Theories and the Fundamental Explananda of Marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, 47(4): 9–17.
- Hunt, S.D. (1984) 'Should Marketing Adopt Relativism?', in M. Ryan and P.F. Anderson (eds) *Marketing Theory: Philosophy and Sociology of Science Perspectives*, pp. 30–34. Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Hunt, S.D. (1990) 'Truth in Marketing Theory and Research', *Journal of Marketing*, 54(July): 1–15.
- Hunt, S.D. (1991) 'Positivism and Paradigm Dominance in Consumer Research', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18(1): 32–44.
- Hunt, S.D. (1992) 'For Reason and Realism in Marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, 56(2): 89–102.
- Hunt, S.D. (2001) 'The Influence of Philosophy, Philosophies and Philosophers on a Marketer's Scholarship', *Journal of Marketing*, 64(October): 117–124.
- Hunt, S.D. (2002) *Foundations of Marketing Theory: Towards a General Theory of Marketing*. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.
- Hunt, S.D. (2003) *Controversy in Marketing Theory: For Reason, Realism, Truth and Objectivity*. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.
- Hutchinson, K.D. (1952) 'Marketing as Science: An Appraisal', *Journal of Marketing*, 16(January): 286–292.
- Jack, G. (2008) 'Postcolonialism and Marketing', in M. Tadajewski and D. Brownlie (eds) *Critical Marketing: Issues in Contemporary Marketing*, pp. 363–384. Chichester: John Wiley.
- Jack, G. and Westwood, R. (2006) 'Postcolonialism and the Politics of Qualitative Research in International Business', *Management International Review*, 46(4): 481–501.
- Jones, D.G.B. and Monieson, D.D. (1990) 'Early Development in the Philosophy of Marketing Thought', *Journal of Marketing*, 54(1): 1–20113.
- Kassarjian, H.H. (1963) 'Voting Intentions and Political Perception', *The Journal of Psychology*, 10: 85–88.
- Kavanagh, D. (1994) 'Hunt Versus Anderson: Round 16', *European Journal of Marketing*, 28(3): 26–41.
- Kerin, R.A. (1996) 'In Pursuit of an Ideal: The Editorial and Literary History of the Journal of Marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, 60(1): 1–13.
- Kilbourne, W., McDonagh, P. and Prothero, A. (1997) 'Sustainable Consumption and the Quality of Life: A Macromarketing Challenge to the Dominant Social Paradigm', *Journal of Macromarketing*, Spring: 4–24.
- Kohli, A.K. and Jaworski, B.J. (1990) 'Market Orientation: The Construct, Research Propositions, and Managerial Implications', *Journal of Marketing*, 54(1): 1–18.
- Lagrosen, S. and Svensson, G. (2006) 'A Seminal Framework of Marketing Schools: Revisited and Updated', *Journal of Management History*, 12(4): 369–384.
- Laughlin, R. (1995) 'Empirical Research in Accounting: Alternative Approaches and a Case for "Middle-Range" Thinking', *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 8(1): 63–87.
- Levitt, T. (1960) 'M-R Snake Dance', *Harvard Business Review*, 38(6): 76–84.
- Levy, S.J. (1996) 'Stalking the Amphisbaena', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 23(3): 163–176.
- Levy, S.J. (2003) 'Roots of Marketing and Consumer Research at the University of Chicago', *Consumption, Markets and Culture*, 6(2): 99–110.
- Lewis, M.W. and Grimes, A.J. (1999) 'Metatriangulation: Building Theory from Multiple Paradigms', *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4): 672–690.
- Lowenthal, L. (1987) *An Unmastered Past: The Autobiographical Reflections of Leo Lowenthal*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lusch, S.L. and Vargo, R.F. (eds) (2006) *The Service Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate and Directions*, New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Maclaran, P. and Catterall, M. (2000) 'Bridging the Knowledge Divide: Issues on the

- Feminisation of Marketing Practice', *Journal of Marketing Management*, 16(6): 635–646.
- Maclaran, P., Saren, M., Goulding, C. and Stevens, L. (2009) 'Rethinking Theory Building and Theorizing in Marketing', *Proceedings of the 38th European Academy of Marketing Conference*, Nantes, France.
- Markin, R.J. (1970) 'Consumer Motivation and Behavior: Essence Vs. Existence', *Business & Society*, 10: 30–36.
- McDonagh, P. (1995) 'Radical Change Through Rigorous Review? A Commentary on the Commodification of Marketing Knowledge', *Journal of Marketing Management*, 11(7): 675–679.
- McDonagh, P. (2002) 'Communicative Campaigns to Effect Anti-Slavery and Fair Trade: The Cases of Rugmark and Cafédirect', *European Journal of Marketing*, 36(5/6): 642–666.
- McTier, A.L. (1994) 'Marketing Science: Where's the Beef?', *Business Horizons*, 37(1): 8–17.
- Merton, R.K. (1968) *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press.
- Mittelstaedt, R.A. (1990) 'Economics, Psychology and the Literature of the Subdiscipline of Consumer Behavior', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 18(4): 303–311.
- Monieson, D.D. (1988) 'Intellectualization in Marketing: A World Disenchanted', *Journal of Macromarketing*, 8(2): 4–10.
- Muncy, J.A. and Fisk, R.P. (1987) 'Cognitive Relativism and the Practice of Marketing Science', *Journal of Marketing*, 51(January): 20–33.
- Murray, J.B. and Ozanne, J.L. (1991) 'The Critical Imagination: Emancipatory Interests in Consumer Research', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18(2): 129–144.
- Murray, J.B. and Ozanne, J.L. (1997) 'A Critical-Emancipatory Sociology of Knowledge: Reflections on the Social Construction of Consumer Research', in R. Belk (ed.) *Research in Consumer Behavior*, pp. 57–92. Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Murray, J.B., Evers, D.J. and Janda, S. (1997) 'Marketing, Theory Borrowing and Critical Reflection', *Journal of Macromarketing*, 15(2): 92–106.
- Narver, J.C. and Slater, S.F. (1990) 'The Effect of Market Orientation on Business Profitability', *Journal of Marketing*, (10): 20–35.
- O'Shaughnessy, J. (1997) 'Temerarious Directions for Marketing', *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(9/10): 677–705.
- O'Shaughnessy, J. (2009) *Interpretation in Social Life, Social Science and Marketing*. London: Routledge.
- Peter, J.P. (1992) 'Realism or Relativism for Marketing Theory and Research: A Comment on Hunt's "Scientific Realism"', *Journal of Marketing*, 56(April): 72–79.
- Petersen, A. and Willig, R. (2002) 'An Interview with Axel Honneth: The Role of Sociology in the Theory of Recognition', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(May): 265–277.
- Popper, K.R. (1976) 'The Logic of the Social Sciences', in T.W. Adorno, H. Albert, R. Dahrendorf, J. Habermas, H. Pilot and K.R. Popper (eds) *The Positivist Dispute in German Sociology*, Trans G. Adey and D. Frisby, pp. 87–104. London: Heinemann.
- Price, L.L. (2007) 'That's Interesting, But Now What?', *Presented at the Consumer Culture Theory Qualitative Workshop*, Toronto, May.
- Price, L.L. and Arnould, E. (1998) 'Conducting the Choir: Representing Multimethod Consumer Research', in B.B. Stern (ed.) *Representing Consumers: Voices, Views and Visions*, pp. 339–364. London: Routledge.
- Reckwitz, A. (2002) 'Towards a Theory of Social Practices: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(2): 245–265.
- Ruekert, R.W. (1992) 'Developing a Market Orientation: An Organizational Strategy Perspective', *International Research in Marketing*, 9: 225–245.
- Saad, G. (2007) *The Evolutionary Bases of Consumption*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Saad, G. (2008) 'The Collective Amnesia of Marketing Scholars' Regarding Consumers Biological and Evolutionary Roots', *Marketing Theory*, 8(4): 425–448.
- Saren, M. (2000) 'Marketing Theory', in M.J. Baker (ed.) *Marketing Theory – A Student Text*, pp. 21–42. London: Thomson Learning.
- Saren, M. (2007) 'Marketing is Everything: The View from the Street', *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 25(1): 11–16.

- Schroeder, J.E. (2000) 'The Consumer in Society: Utopian Visions Revisited', *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 18(6/7): 381–387.
- Scully, J.I. (1996) 'Machines Made of Words: The Influence of Engineering Metaphor on Marketing Thought and Practice', *Journal of Macromarketing*, 16(2): 70–83.
- Senior, C. and Lee, N. (2008) 'A Manifesto for Neuromarketing Science', *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 7: 263–271.
- Shapiro, B. (1988) 'What the Hell is Market Oriented?', *Harvard Business Review*, (November/December): 119–125.
- Shaw, E.H. and Jones, D.G.B. (2005) 'A History of Schools of Marketing Thought', *Marketing Theory*, 5(3): 239–281.
- Sherry, J.F. (1991) 'Postmodern Alternatives The Interpretive Turn in Consumer Research', in T.S. Robertson and H.H. Kassarian (eds) *Handbook of Consumer Research*, pp. 548–591. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Sheth, J.N. (1992) 'Acrimony in the Ivory Tower: A Retrospective on Consumer Research', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 20(4): 345–353.
- Sheth, J.N., Gardner, D.M. and Garrett, D.E. (1988) *Marketing Theory: Evolution and Evaluation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Siegel, H. (1988) 'Relativism for Consumer Research (Comments on Anderson)', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(1): 129–132.
- Stainton, R.S. (1952) 'Science in Marketing', *The Journal of Marketing* 17(1): 64–66.
- Tadajewski, M. (2006a) 'The Ordering of Marketing Theory: The Influence of McCarthyism and the Cold War', *Marketing Theory*, 6(2): 163–199.
- Tadajewski, M. (2006b) 'Remembering Motivation Research: Toward an Alternative Genealogy of Interpretive Consumer Research', *Marketing Theory*, 6(4): 429–466.
- Tadajewski, M. (2008) 'Incommensurable Paradigms, Cognitive Bias and the Politics of Marketing Theory', *Marketing Theory*, 8(3): 273–297.
- Tadajewski, M. (2009) 'Eventualizing the Marketing Concept', *Journal of Marketing Management*, 25(1–2): 191–217.
- Tadajewski, M. and Brownlie, D. (2008) 'Critical Marketing: A Limit Attitude', in M. Tadajewski and D. Brownlie (eds) *Critical Marketing: Issues in Contemporary Marketing*, pp. 1–28. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tadajewski, M. and Maclaran, P. (eds) (2009) *Critical Marketing Studies*, Vol. I. London: Sage.
- Tadajewski, M. and Saren, M. (2008) 'The Past is a Foreign Country: Amnesia and Marketing Theory', *Marketing Theory*, 8(4): 323–338.
- Tadajewski, Mark (2006) 'The Ordering of Marketing Theory: The Influence of McCarthyism and the Cold War', *Marketing Theory*, 6(2): 163–199.
- Vaile, R. (1949) 'Towards a Theory of Marketing—A Comment', *Journal of Marketing*, 14(April): 520–522.
- Van Sell, S.L. and Kalofissudus, I. (2007) 'Formulating Nursing Theory', www.nursing.gr/theory.html. Last accessed 11 July 2008.
- Vargo, S. and Lusch, R.F. (2008) 'Service-Dominant Logic: Continuing the Evolution', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(1): 1–10.
- Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004) 'Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1): 1–17.
- Venkatesh, A. (1985) 'Is Marketing Ready for Kuhn?', in N. Dholakia and J. Arndt (eds) *Changing the Course of Marketing: Alternative Paradigms for Widening Marketing Theory*, pp. 45–67. Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Webster, F.E. Jr. (1992) 'The Changing Role of Marketing in the Corporation', *Journal of Marketing*, 56(10): 1–17.
- Wensley, R. (1990) "'The Voice of the Consumer?": Speculations on the Limits to the Marketing Analogy', *European Journal of Marketing*, 24(7): 49–60.
- White, W.L. (1940) 'Marketing Research', *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 209: 183–192.
- Whittington, R. (2006) 'Completing the Practice Turn in Strategy Research', *Organization Studies*, 27(5): 613–634.
- Wilkie, W.L. and Moore, E.S. (2003) 'Scholarly Research in Marketing: Exploring the '4 Eras' of Thought Development', *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 22(2): 116–146.
- Wilkie, W.L. and Moore, E.S. (2006) 'Macromarketing as a Pillar of Marketing Thought', *Journal of Macromarketing*, 26(2): 224–232.

Wooliscroft, B., Tamilia, R.D. and Shapiro, S.D. (eds) (2006) *A Twenty-First Century Guide to Aldersonian Marketing Thought*. New York: Springer.

Zaltman, G., LeMasters, K. and Heffring, M. (1982) *Theory Construction in Marketing*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Zinn, W. and Johnson, S.D. (1990) 'The Commodity Approach in Marketing: Is It Really Obsolete?', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 18(4): 345–353, Holt, Rinehard & Winston.