

The myopia of new marketing panaceas: the case for rebuilding our discipline

Olivier Badot, *ESCP-EAP Paris and IAE de Caen-Basse Normandie, France*

Bernard Cova, *Euromed Marseilles School of Management, France and Bocconi University Milan, Italy**

Abstract This essay tries to show how the inflation of marketing panaceas over the past 20 years has failed to calm the conflict between our discipline and consumers. Quite the contrary, it has had more of an incendiary effect because of its tendency to try to renew and regenerate itself by shamelessly appropriating referentials that go well beyond what is traditionally associated with the market sphere. The end result is that consumers have developed a new type of resistance to marketing approaches, one that will require second order types of changes in our discipline. Some of the seeds for this change can be found in the most recent marketing panaceas, which have been presented (and maybe conceptualised) using two ideas: 'market with' and 'societing'. The present essay does not aim to produce a new great theory of marketing, nor does it offer a new paradigm. It merely tries to stimulate reflection about which modes of thinking might help today's world to avoid marketing fundamentalism and colonialism.

Keywords Co-Creation, Colonialism, Fundamentalism, Resistance, 'S-D Logic', Societing

INTRODUCTION

Since the mid-1980s and the midlife crisis that marketing went through following its failure to properly incorporate the changes affecting society and therefore consumers (Brown 1995a), the discipline has constantly produced new and increasingly sophisticated approaches intended to help its methods and tools mesh between with the zeitgeist. Therefore, *"talk about a 'new marketing' has attracted considerable*

*Correspondence details and biographies for the authors are located at the end of the article.

interest” (Palmer and Ponsonby 2002, p. 177) so have discussions about the profile and the education of future marketers equipped for this ‘new marketing’ (Evans et al., 2002). New concepts and new frameworks have been introduced in order to rethink/reform our discipline (Brownlie et al. 1999; Hakansson et al. 2004; Sheth and Sisodia 2006) and to revisit some of its major frameworks such as the 4Ps (Constantinides 2006). Certain paradigmatic shifts have been proposed around such ‘new’ concepts as the ones of relation (Gummeson 1987), experience (Schmitt, 1999) and value (Ponsonby and Boyle 2004). As highlighted by Brown (1993a and 1993b), these ‘marketing panaceas’ form a vast practical literature intended to provide managers “*solutions to marketing’s ills*” (Brown 1995b, p. 50).

However, the outcomes of these restorative movements have been mixed, and certainly disappointing in terms of what was initially hoped for. The US has never had as many dissatisfied customers as it has since companies began implementing relational marketing and CRM approaches (Fournier et al. 1998). Consumers’ resistance to the very idea of marketing and to the approaches associated with it has continually strengthened (Johansson 2004; Kozinets and Handelman 2004). The combination of this increasing marketing saturation and new technologies of consumer control have led to an unprecedented level of marketing resistance (Rha et al. 2002). Thus, some scholars hypothesise that consumers have developed a marketing reflex (Brown 2003) which allows them to second-guess any new marketers’ intent. As a corollary of that, we hypothesise that the proliferation of new and more sophisticated marketing frameworks could foster this marketing reflex and the consumer’s resistance (Roux 2007) thus generating a new kind of marketing myopia. The present essay aims to join the conversation (Perry et al. 2003) on ‘new marketing’ and especially to: 1) recap the *new marketing* approaches on offer; 2) identify their limitations; 3) assess the current state of consumers’ resistance to marketing and to the new marketing panaceas; 4) identify a theoretical framework that is favourable to the joint development of marketing and consumers. The expected contribution of this essay is to pave the way for a rebuilding of our discipline through relinquishing the idea of control which is at the heart of two major factors leading to marketing myopia, e.g. fundamentalism and colonialism.

A PROLIFERATION OF ‘NEW MARKETING’ APPROACHES

Following in the footsteps of McKenna (1985) and Gummeson (1987), numerous authors have come forward - from Brookes (1988) to McDonald and Wilson (2002) - to announce the emergence of a new marketing redemptive based on a particular point of view: theirs! Some such as Brookes, who one decade after having published a book entitled ‘New Marketing’ (1988), published a second work on ‘New Marketing’ (Little and Brookes 1997) have gone on to become experts in the field of the new marketing. Certain authors become militant apostles of the cause of ‘New Marketing’ and design manifestos of ‘New Marketing’ (Grant 1999). Others stylise their approach by using a prefix of Greek origin ‘*neo*’ to propose a ‘Neo-Marketing’ (Badot and Cova 1992; Moutinho and al. 2002; Zyman 1999) a plural combination of various innovative approaches. The great majority of authors suggest through their text that they are the initiators of a form of new marketing and use a title rather like a brand on which they will be able to capitalise thereafter; for example Schmitt (1999) with his work *Experiential Marketing*. In all cases, their new marketing panacea is supposed to challenge kotlerian marketing (the so-called ‘old school marketing’) described by

Smithee (1997) as in continuous crisis, if not already outdated; it is the enemy which the panacea confronts to save companies and/or consumers, and it is also a way one calibrates oneself to show one's difference and *raison d'être*.

While the global movement of 'New Marketing' has previously been examined, most notably by Palmer and Ponsonby (2002) whose work studied the social construction of new marketing in such areas as one-to-one marketing, minimal work has been conducted into identifying these new marketing panaceas. Some work has been undertaken, but in a limited way and directed towards only one paradigmatic perspective (Brown 1993a; Brown 1993b; Morris and al. 2002). Brown (1993a) chose eight marketing panaceas to highlight their common concerns – in his view postmodernism: an emphasis on dealing with the customer as an individual; a desire to retain existing customers rather than searching for new ones. Morris and al. (2002) analysed thirteen marketing panaceas to determine their common entrepreneurial features: efficiency in marketing expenditures by leveraging resources, creative and alternative approaches for managing marketing variables, and an ability to effect change in the environment. In both cases, the marketing panaceas chosen were accurately selected to serve the re-conceptualisation *a priori* of the authors.

Trying to transcend these highly focused approaches, we've realised that the world of new marketing panaceas is very vast in scope. Over the past 20 years, marketing researchers, consultants and practitioners have fearlessly invented up to 100 new panaceas. These are the ones that we have identified in the panorama that follows. In this overview, only trans-industry and trans-segment approaches to marketing are counted. Indeed, it is our opinion, that these are the only ones that allow for universality in their approach, and thus consequently, can signal when a change in the discipline occurs. Thus, marketing approaches dedicated to specific sectors (aerospace, arts and culture, banking and insurance, construction, high-tech, luxury, fashion, NGO, policy, retail, sports, cities and territories...); types of offers (products, services, projects...); exchange and means of communication (blogs, the Internet, mobile phones, television, point of sale...); specific segments, such as generational (youth, generation X or Y, seniors...), geographical markets (Mediterranean, Pan-European, Global...), or dedicated organisations grouped as a function of size (SME, MNC's...) are not included in this overview.

Furthermore, we retained only panaceas which integrated into their name the word 'marketing'. This led us to eliminate deliberately an extensive selection of B2B panaceas developed which do not use the term 'marketing', but rather terms such as 'selling' or 'management' to describe their approaches. These types of relational approaches include: key partner management, key account management, client portfolio management, customer value management, as well as terms such as network management and supply chain management. Similarly, commercial approaches such as consultative selling, solution selling, value selling or enterprise selling were omitted, as were contractual approaches such as full service contract or one stop shopping. Along the same lines, B2C approaches such as brand management or category management were not included.

In spite of these deletions, we easily arrived at more than seventy panaceas proposed in papers, articles, or web sites (see Table 1). One can therefore understand the confusion of the marketing layman in the search of a valid and current approach to replace or improve on traditional kotlerian marketing. The landscape can be seen as a group of shapeless and shifting marketing panaceas in which all proclaim the title of 'new marketing' by stressing marketing's 'new paradigm'. Panaceas can come from academics such as Philip Kotler (Kotler and al. 2002), industry consultants,

TABLE 1 A list of marketing panaceas 1985-2005

Ambush Marketing	Experience Marketing	Real Time Marketing
Anti-Marketing	Exponential Marketing	Relationship Marketing
Authenticity Marketing	Family Marketing	Retro-marketing
Buzz Marketing	Geo-marketing	Reverse Marketing
Cause Related Marketing	Ghetto Marketing	Scarcity Marketing
Co-Marketing	Grass Roots Marketing	Sensory Marketing
Community Marketing	Green Marketing	Situational Marketing
Convergence Marketing	Guerrilla Marketing	Social Marketing
Contextual Marketing	Holistic Marketing	Societal Marketing
Counter Marketing	Interactive Marketing	Solution Marketing
Creative Marketing	Knowledge Marketing	Stakeholder marketing
Cult Marketing	Life Event Marketing	Stealth Marketing
Customer Centric Marketing	Loyalty Marketing	Street Marketing
Database Marketing	Maxi Marketing	Sustainable Marketing
Eco-Marketing	Macro Marketing	Symbiotic Marketing
Emotion Marketing	Mega Marketing	Time Based Marketing
Empowerment Marketing	Micromarketing	Total Relationship Marketing
Environmental Marketing	Multilevel Marketing	Trade marketing
Ethnic Marketing	Network Marketing	Trend Marketing
Ethno-marketing	Neural Marketing	Tribal Marketing
Entrepreneurial Marketing	Niche Marketing	Turbo Marketing
Event Marketing	Non Business Marketing	Undercover Marketing
Expeditionary Marketing	Nostalgia Marketing	Value Marketing
	Olfactory Marketing	Viral Marketing
	One-to-One Marketing	Yield Marketing
	Permission Marketing	
	Radical Marketing	

or practitioners in search of fame and recognition. It should be noted that the majority of panaceas that have attained broader international recognition originate from America, whereas European or Asian initiatives have achieved more limited acknowledgement.

MARKETING PANACEAS AND MARKETING MYOPIA

Though marketing has in the past adopted and adapted concepts from other disciplines, and has borrowed from other fields, for example metaphorical names such as guerrilla marketing, in reading this long list of panaceas, one can, like Smithee and Lee (2004) be initially struck by the strange couplings which it suggests. With the proliferation of marketing panaceas over the past twenty years, this phenomenon seems to have taken an even greater hold and generates such odd names as tribal marketing or viral marketing. Smithee and Lee (2004) thus envisage a development of the use of the metaphor in marketing names: *“given the many successful outcomes of past interdisciplinary sorties in search of metaphor, much may be gained from focusing on virgin territories. Marketing has been slow to grasp the manifold opportunities that exist in fields as diverse as the medical sciences, the physical sciences and information*

sciences, to name just a few" (Smithee and Lee 2004, p. 150) - and thus bet on the arrival of panaceas such as "marketing by osmosis" or "marketing transgenics".

What is striking in this panorama of marketing panaceas is the fact that the discipline of marketing, whose very etymology is tied to the word 'market', is basically trying to look beyond the market (environment, social groups, social relations, social experiences, etc.) in its bid to renew itself. If one looks at all this from an external view of the discipline, as opposed to what Smithee and Lee (2004) proposed, one can even find it almost indecent to want at all costs to unite certain terms that are completely external to the market with the word marketing. That resembles a set of attempts to maintain marketing through an IV drip of fresh blood coming from fields external to the market: the metaphorical coupling of marketing with such a term suggests that marketing is able to seize some parts without inevitably marrying them to values that are subjacent to them (Cornelissen 2003; O' Malley and Tynan 1999).

These attempts seem to go hand in hand with the marketisation of goods and values which remained up to that point out of the commercial sphere (Boltanski and Chiapello 2006): to regenerate itself, marketing, like capitalism, must draw from outside of the commercial sphere. The case of eco-marketing and the marketisation of products derived from ecological agriculture is a good example of this operation in binomial marketing/capitalism. Unfortunately, as Boltanski and Chiapello (2006) showed, this led to an over-riding result: a suspicion increasingly directed towards capitalism and marketing. Pairing marketing with an idea, a good, a value... but coming from beyond the market casts a certain doubt on the resulting marketing panacea. Globally, the risk is that these panaceas, instead of reducing the gap between marketing and society, tend to exacerbate it by increasing consumers' feeling of intrusion in their daily lives. For example, experiential marketing gives consumers a sense that they are being deprived of their everyday life, that companies are taking their lives away from them to organise something abstract that is beyond their control:

they're selling you your life! It's you that they're selling, but in an already digested form. They've thought of everything: books, gadgets, postcards. Even worse, some of these things are really good. But the problem is that they serve it already warm, having calculated everything. Yet it was more fun when things were spontaneous, when you were in the driving seat

(interview with a consumer exiting a Parisian concept store)

However, if we were to analyse these panaceas in greater detail, we would perceive a progressive shift over the years towards a search for lesser consumer dispossession. A manner to organise the vast majority of these panaceas is to consider the way in which their authors see or don't see the core object of marketing: *the market*. Indeed, marketing, even from its etymology, is centred on the market and, more precisely, on its actions on the market. Kotlerian marketing does not escape from it: the first key concept of marketing as described in the textbook *Marketing Management* is the market, and more specifically, its market-target, i.e. the segments on which the company will act. It largely appears that most marketing panaceas try to differentiate themselves from the Kotlerian view of the market as a group of segments, to rest on alternative perspectives for the market which go beyond and/or beneath this view.

The first group of panaceas positions itself differently from Kotlerian marketing,

by taking the perspective of the market niche, i.e. fragments of consumers of minimal size compared to the traditional segments.

A second group, which was a dominating factor in the Nineties, opened the way to a redefinition of the market through the form of client relationships, i.e. of relations between the company and their customers (direct or indirect) designed to increase and recognise loyalty to a company, its brands, products and services.

A third group of panaceas distinguishes itself from kotlerian marketing by focusing on the market environment, i.e. on the cultural, natural, political and social structures which encompass the market, and on the actors outside of the market who act on the market.

A fourth group of panaceas that has emerged strongly since the beginning of 2000, is one that is concerned with the subjective experiences of the customer, i.e. what the customer experiences (emotions, feelings, feelings...) with the offers coming from the market. The contributions of Consumer Culture Theory (Arnould and Thompson 2005) are noticeable in a number of these panaceas. Logic subjacent with this fourth group of panaceas, takes the individual consumer, whose traditional role is as a purchaser and destructor of goods, and turns him/her into an active actor (customer agency) in his/her everyday life in which consumption and the market are integrated.

A fifth group of panaceas, for the moment the least significant, takes as its perspective the competences of the customer, i.e. it does not focus on part of the market, nor on the relationship or customer experience as elements of the target market, but rather on the competences of the customer as a basis of interaction, dialogue and especially of rebalancing. Logic subjacent with this group of panaceas concerns an obliteration of the border between producer and consumer who thus together, become co-creators of solutions, meanings and values for the life of the consumer, as well as the activity of the company (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004). The last two groups of panaceas have arisen since the year 2000, manifesting interesting attempts at seeking freedom from marketing myopia and achieving a more useful incorporation of consumers' experiences and competences.

A GROWING CONSUMER ANTIPATHY?

Alongside this shift in marketing panaceas, we have witnessed the growth and mutation of consumer resistance. The association between our societies' so-called post-modern changes and technology's post-industrial changes (first and foremost being the rise of the Internet) led to the emergence of consumers who are more apt to resist corporate marketing actions and who possess greater expertise in terms of their consumption and in regards to the products and brands they consume. As Brown has written, "*today's consumers are wise to the wiles of marketers. They possess a 'marketing reflex', an inbuilt early warning system that detects incoming commercial messages, no matter how subtle, and automatically neutralises them*" (Brown 2003, p. 37). This 'marketing reflex' rose against the backdrop of consumers' renewed resistance to marketing:

the new anti-marketers are not against the free market as such... But, the anti-marketers today argue that the process has gone too far, the system is out of whack, and our consumer paradise has turned into a quagmire of commercialism, consumption, and materialism. Marketing, they say, is a major culprit

(Johansson 2004, p. 41)

TABLE 2 The growing anti-marketing trend

Advertising/Marketing Opinions - Then and Now			
1964 AAAA Study View of Advertising		2004 Yankelovich Study Views of Marketing	
Favourable	41%	Wholly positive	28%
Unfavourable	14%	Wholly negative	36%
Mixed	34%	Neutral/mixed	36%

A recent study by Yankelovich Partners, a North American consulting group, shows that 60% of consumers have a much more negative opinion of marketing and advertising now than a few years ago; 61% feel that the amount of marketing and advertising is out of control; and 65% feel constantly bombarded with too much marketing and advertising. If we compare these results with ones obtained 40 years ago in the same context, things are very different (Table 2). People are becoming more and more anti-marketing, and as J. Walker Smith, Yankelovich's C.E.O. says, this

marketing resistance is not a desire to stop shopping altogether. Consumers just want a better way to interact with marketers. Smarter, technologically empowered, time-starved consumers want marketing that shows more respect for their time and attention. Until we get better at engaging consumers, they're going to continue to push back and resist what advertisers are trying to deliver to them

(www.yankelovich.com)

One notion can help us to grasp this new form of resistance – the construct of hijacking (de Certeau 1980; Denegri-Knott 2006; Wipperfurth 2005). Today's consumers hijack things in a way that differs from the variant that Situationists used to defend (Vanegeim 1967), as explained by Michael Borrás, an Underground Internet Artist who manages the *Systaime* website (www.systaime.com) which specialises in artistic hijacking:

The principle underlying the name 'Systaime' [Note Trans., a title incorporating the root word 'aime', meaning love in French] is the idea that to by-pass a system (an IT system, a political organisation, etc.) or to hijack or subvert it, a person must first be in love with it.

The same reasoning could be applied to consumption hijackings that usually happen on a collective basis. Groups like "adbusters" and "no logo" (Klein 2000) are not legion, nor do they necessarily have the support of broad swathes of the general population, even amongst young people or Web activists. The extreme nature of the "adbusters" discourse, which borders on the intolerant, is a poor reflection of our peers' complex and contradictory relationship to the commercial world and to the brands that symbolise it. What we have are playful consumers that disobey but do not rebel in a bid to re-appropriate their daily existence (Denegri-Knott 2006).

Thus, today's resistant consumer is not an individual engaged in a political struggle against the market or capitalism (Kozinets and Handelman 2004) but a simple, non politicised person (Roux 2007) who is finding it harder and harder to put up with

the exaggerations and bad taste s/he finds in marketing and who, thanks to recent IT developments, has regained (or has the possibility of regaining control) over his/her own consumption behaviour. This is because the Internet serves as a training ground where this individual can learn to develop a different kind of relationship to companies, one based on equality since the new consumer can use his/her exchanges with other consumers to develop knowledge about a product or brand without having to source such knowledge from a company (Berthon et al. 2007). By sharing their experiences, consumers are creating on-line contents that will either enhance or contradict the information companies diffuse. Participating in the creation of this content is an act that gives consumers the impression of having greater control over their own consumption and lives. Thanks to the Internet, consumers are self-made, self-governing subjects, and this has a knock-on effect on their consumption modes: today's consumers use the marketplace as an instrument of empowerment in order to enhance their self-esteem, much in the same way as employees once used their place of work to develop their identities. The end effect is what we call consumer empowerment (Wright et al. 2006), meaning that power is being assumed by consumers.

Recent experiences have highlighted how hard it can be for some companies to interact with this type of empowered consumer. Consumers today would appear to be more active, participative, activist, recreational, social and community-minded than ever before. Some consumers' shared passion for or against a brand concretises nowadays in expertise and competence-based group learning systems. The presence of impassioned, interconnected and expert consumers is therefore predicated on a rebalancing of capabilities in the company-consumer relationship. Remember what happened in early 2006 to Diet Coke and Mentos: hundreds of amateur videos flooded the Internet showing an oddball experiment in which people would drop quarter-size Mentos candies into bottles of Diet Coke. The combination resulted in a geyser of soda that would shoot as high as 20 feet into the air. A wary Coca-Cola at first distanced itself from the exploding Diet Coke and Mentos viral video phenomenon, fearing a loss of control over its brand. Coke tried to counter the incipient word-of-mouth reaction by saying that the experiment didn't fit with the brand personality of Diet Coke and that they wished people would drink the cola and not experiment with it. Mentos, on the other hand, relished the estimated \$10 million dollars in exposure from a viral video that had cost it nothing. But the story didn't end there. Despite initially shunning the Diet Coke/Mentos viral video and pursuing its previous marketing direction, Coke tried to capitalise on it a few months later and it has now fully embraced the concept. Today the two companies collaborate with the video makers, who had imposed their power, overcoming Coca-Cola's initial resistance.

BREAKING FREE FROM MARKETING FUNDAMENTALISM AND MARKETING COLONIALISM

In our opinion, the emergence of empowered consumers' resistance forces marketing to face up to its responsibilities. It is high time that our discipline cease engaging in type 1 changes (as per the definition given by the Palo Alto school, c.f., Watzlawick et al. 1971), meaning more of the same via simplistic and relatively myopic marketing panaceas. Instead, it needs to undertake type 2 changes to rebuild a new logic

(Watzlawick et al. 1971). As we noted, the last panaceas groups to have appeared, where the consumer is viewed as an actor and producer like companies are, already seem to pursue this logic of type 2 change. For the past two years, there has been an energetic debate throughout the marketing scientific community concerning a possible change of paradigm (Hakansson et al. 2004; Hakansson and Waluzewski 2005; Littler and Tynan 2005; Lusch and Vargo 2006a and 2006b; Vargo and Lusch 2004a and 2004b; Sheth and Sisodia 2006). All in all, these discussions pave the way for two major reflections that are connected to the two major sources of marketing myopia, i.e. marketing fundamentalism and marketing colonialism.

A first reflection can lead to argue that marketing inherited a model of exchange from economics, which had a dominant logic based on the exchange of goods, which are usually manufactured output (Vargo and Lusch 2004a). The goods-dominant logic focused on tangible resources, embedded value and transactions. The same reflection can also lead to argue (Vargo and Lusch 2004b) that the sub-discipline of services marketing which has emerged in the late 70's is built on the same goods and manufacturing-based model: it treats services as a special kind of (intangible) product. Consequently, the use of the singular 'service' in the proposed Service-Dominant (S-D) logic of marketing indicates a process of doing something for/with someone, whereas the plural 'services' implies units of output which are consistent with the goods-dominant logic (Lusch and Vargo 2006b). In this S-D logic, it is expected that by co-creating the function as well as the meaning of his/her experience (Ponsonby and Boyle 2004), the customer co-constructs value for her/himself: "*the customer is always a co-creator of value*" (Lusch and Vargo 2006b, p. 284). S-D logic moves the orientation of marketing from a 'market to' philosophy where customers are promoted to, targeted, and captured, to a '*market with*' philosophy where the customer and supply chain partners are collaborators in the entire marketing process (Lusch and Vargo 2006a). It is this '*market with*' philosophy that we find at work in the most recent group of marketing panaceas such as empowerment marketing, grass roots marketing, knowledge marketing, permission marketing, reverse marketing, solution marketing, etc.

We believe that this '*market with*' philosophy has a promising future, with significant development to come from approaches centred around elements associated with the competencies of consumers engaged in a value co-creation process (Lusch and Vargo 2006b). The shift towards co-creation will require a genuine marketing revolution. We hope for once that we are not misusing the term, which is used far too often to describe trivial changes in the field of marketing. The idea of knowing one's consumer may be central to marketing but it's often used in a restrictive and manipulative sense, equated with the attempt to know everything about consumers so as to satisfy them and secure their loyalty. Seldom has the idea been proposed in marketing that the consumer possesses knowledge that can be of interest to the company. Quite the contrary, we believe that the '*market with*' philosophy will convince firms to incorporate 'Others' into their thinking – not because they want to exploit them but because they will try to learn from consumers' expertise and experience. The co-creation construct could serve as a catalyst to get companies to abandon the fundamentalist approach that marketing managers so often take. The general view of fundamentalism is often a very simplistic one that usually has religious overtones (Cassano 2006). In actual fact, fundamentalism is the best way of describing the attitude of all those who believe that they hold a truth, even that they are the truth; hence that everyone else is wrong. Fundamentalism occurs when a behaviour is considered a right solution and never as a problem. Marketing management can

be said to be fundamentalist (Hetzel 1996). This is one of the major reasons for its myopia. Conversely, 'market with' approaches are anti-fundamentalist because they tolerate other actors' differences, and perhaps even more importantly, because they advocate learning from 'Others', be this from average consumers, lead users or user communities.

A second reflection can lead researchers to drop the suffix 'ing' and to re-concentrate on the study of markets (Hakansson and Waluzewski 2005; Venkatesh and Penaloza 2006). Indeed, Venkatesh and Penaloza (2006, p. 137) highlight "*the need to shift the disciplinary emphasis, not by disregarding the role of marketing, but by enlarging its scope to the market and in turn embedding such markets within the social and historical contexts*". By extending this notion and combining it with the elements highlighted by our panorama of marketing panaceas, we believe instead that this reflection can lead to the word 'market' being dropped with only the suffix 'ing' being kept. Can we in effect, always speak about marketing when the action (-ing) required proceeds in the society and not only in the market? Perhaps instead, the neologism 'societing' proposed more than a dozen years ago (Badot and al., 1993) appears more adaptable? What is societing? It is a term introduced by Southern European researchers through the crossing of marketing and sociology (Badot and al., 1993), which generated a review by the same name (<http://members.xoom.virgilio.it/societing/>) and which means, according to the authors, either 'put in the society' or 'to make society'. This term regularly disappears then reappears in European literature on marketing and sociology (Cova 1999; Earls 2003 and 2007; de Leonardis 1999; Morace 2002; Woolgar 2004; Woolgar and Simakova 2004). In societing, "*the company is not a simple economic actor who adapts to the market, but a social actor embedded in the societal context*" (Badot and al. 1993, p. 51). It is this kind of societal thought that provides the backbone of the penultimate group of marketing panaceas, which includes emotion marketing, life event marketing, retro-marketing, sensory marketing, tribal marketing, etc.

Rather than a shift of a paradigm to another type of transition, from the transaction to the relationship, from product to service, from product/service to experience, from product/service to solution, from creation to co-creation, from the individual to 'tribe', from market to network, from customer to stakeholder..., what the adoption of the term societing will allow, is the encapsulation of all these swings in a responsible way: our sphere of activity is no longer the market, but the society with all the consequences that it comprises. One of the consequences in particular is not to consider this approach as paired with the development of capitalism, thereby avoiding the trap of over-marketing (Johansson 2004). But, this reflection has a taste of '*dejà vu*' if it is poorly understood: this occurs quite simply by "*broadening the concept of marketing*" (Kotler and Levy 1969) in a hidden way, by transforming it into societing. This turn would be played and the managerial perspective applied via kotlerian marketing to the market would extend now to the entire society:

the broadening movement was an effort to free the marketing paradigm from the narrow confines of commercial marketing and to show its application to a far large number of contexts in which exchange and relationship activities take place

(Kotler 2005, p. 114).

This idea has no place however. It is not a question of broadening the field of application of the marketing techniques in a colonialist way applicable to all human activities, but on the contrary, in a postcolonial fashion (Frenkel and Shenhav 2006),

to take into better account all the actions undertaken by the societal agents including brands, the consumers, the marketers, the stakeholders.... While the study of marketing techniques privileges the perspective of marketing managers (Johansson, 2004), the societing approach requires attention to the perspectives of marketers, as well as consumers and other operative agents. This macro scope (Hunt 1976, 2002) offers consumers a major role in the play in addition to companies (Arnould and Thompson 2005): they can, similar to companies or other societal agents, introduce a meaning, an idea, etc. into the marketplace and into the society.

It is here that societing thinking combines with the '*market with*' philosophy associated with the S-D logic: our discipline is interested in the joint action of society's actors operating in the marketplace. Until now, marketing has been a polite way for companies to say 'controlling the market' through the management of relationships, customers, people, accounts, journalists and so on (Earls 2007). In breaking free from fundamentalism and colonialism, our discipline has to banish the very idea of control. Companies cannot control their consumers or their stakeholders just as consumers or stakeholders cannot control companies. All of them can just interact with the other societal actors in order to engage themselves in a co-creation process. Mozilla Firefox provides a possible case scenario for this evolution of the discipline. In the world of OSS (Open Source Software), it is widely recognised that collective effort, social interaction and group influence are all crucial to the development and use of software like Linux. Mozilla Firefox is a case where individual consumers become community members and subsequently marketing agents trying to use the Net's power to attain certain marketing goals for their favourite product (Krishnamurty 2005a). Firefox's success derives from 63,000 volunteers having spread the word by putting up links to the main download site (including in their e-mail signature file), discussing Firefox in blogs, posting its icon to their personal websites, collecting testimonials and visiting technical sites where they vote for their favourite browser. In addition, over 10,000 volunteers donated \$30 each to help launch a full-page advert in the New York Times. Krishnamurty (2005b) identifies the central tenet for this type of approach as the idea that consumers should be exerting their power in the marketplace through constructive collective action with other actors such as developers, programmers, media, companies, etc. In this case scenario we can see that everyone, e.g. every societal actor, does marketing. It is not restricted to companies.

This is less a consumer takeover of power and more a diminution of the power being wielded by marketers and their firms. Consumers and stakeholders are not asking for power themselves but they do want firms to wield less power, i.e., to leave some room in their mutual relations system so that they can reappropriate their daily life in a way that lies outside of the dictates of a company-driven world. This is almost a 'hand-holding' approach to the society, one whose main consequence is a moderation of many marketing management excesses, and that could dispense our discipline from the hundreds panaceas of marketing myopia.

This is diametrically opposed to the teaching on offer in Business Schools and Universities, where learners are trained to manage, control, master, predict – all of this supposedly for the greater satisfaction of the consumer (Cova 2005). This moderate position of a company *vis-à-vis* the consumers and stakeholders will generate a more comprehensive and less utilitarian approach (Godbout 2007) that does not invoke simplistic reflections phrased in terms of producers actions or responses to consumers but instead calls for a more complex understanding both of how companies fit into society and also of their interrelations with all of its actors. In other words, this is a socially relevant perspective of the interface between clients, firms and all of the business and non business actors.

CONCLUSION

The present essay does not aim to produce a new *grand theory* of marketing, nor does it offer a new paradigm. It merely tries to stimulate reflection about which modes of thinking might help today's world to avoid marketing myopia. Indeed, the short-sightedness or lack of discernment in marketing management is largely due to our way of seeing the world, society and consumption. The combined study of the latest marketing panaceas on offer and consumers' new forms of resistance leads to the choice of two programs for perceiving reality to reconstruct marketing: S-D Logic and societing. The former, renowned since Vargo and Lusch's famous 2004 *JM* paper invited us to see and think in 'market with' co-creation terms and not in 'market to' terms. The latter invites us to assume that the perimeter of our observations, actors and actions is no longer the market but society as a whole, and that from this stems a different perspective for our discipline and the way we conceive and we teach it. They will both allow us to break free from marketing fundamentalism and marketing colonialism.

REFERENCES

- Arnould, E. J. and Thompson, C. J. (2005), "Consumer Culture Theory (CCT): Twenty Years of Research", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 31, No. 4, March, pp. 868-882.
- Badot, O., Bucci, A. and Cova, B. (1993), "Societing: Managerial Response to European Aestheticization", *European Management Journal*, Special issue EAP 20th Anniversary, pp. 48-55.
- Badot, O. and Cova, B. (1992), *Le Néo-Marketing*, Paris: ESF.
- Berthon, P. R., Pitt, L. F., McCarthy, I. and Kates, S.M. (2007), "When Customers Get Clever: Managerial Approaches to Dealing with Creative Consumers", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 50, No. 1, pp. 39-47.
- Boltanski, L. and Chiapello, E. (2006), *The New Spirit of Capitalism*, London: Verso.
- Brookes, R. (1988), *The New Marketing*, Aldershot, Hants: Gower.
- Brown, S. (1993a), "Postmodern Marketing?", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 19-34.
- Brown, S. (1993b), "Postmodern Marketing: Principles, Practice and Panaceas", *Irish Marketing Review*, Vol. 6, pp. 91-99.
- Brown, S. (1995a), "Life Begins at 40? Further Thoughts on Marketing's 'Mid-Life Crisis'", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 4-17.
- Brown, S. (1995b), *Postmodern Marketing*, London: Routledge.
- Brownlie, D., Saren, M., Wensley, R. and Whittington, R. (eds.) (1999), *Rethinking Marketing*, London: Sage.
- Cassano, F. (2006), "Contro tutti i fondamentalismi". In: Carù, A. and Cova, B. (eds.), *Marketing Mediterraneo. Tra Metafora e Territorio*, Milan: Egea, pp. 197-206.
- de Certeau, M. (1980), *L'invention du quotidien. 1. Arts de faire*, Gallimard: Paris.
- Constantinides, E. (2006), "The Marketing Mix Revisited: Towards the 21st Century Marketing", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 22, No. 3/4, pp. 407-438.
- Cornelissen, J. P. (2003), "Metaphor as a Method in the Domain of Marketing", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 209-225.
- Cova, B. (1999), "From Marketing to Societing: When the link is more important than the thing". In: Brownlie, D., Saren, M., Wensley, R. and Whittington, R. (eds.), *Rethinking Marketing*, London: Sage, pp. 64-83.
- Cova, B. (2005), "Thinking of Marketing in Meridian Terms", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 205-214.

- Denegri-Knott, J. (2006), "Consumers Behaving Badly: Deviation or Innovation? Power Struggles on the Web", *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol. 5, No. 1, February, pp. 82-94.
- Earls, M. (2003), "Advertising to the Herd: How Understanding our True Nature Challenges the Ways we Think about Advertising and Market Research", *International Journal of Market Research*, Vol. 45, No. 3, pp. 311-336.
- Earls, M. (2007), *Herd. How to Change Mass Behaviour by Harnessing Our True Nature*, Chichester: John Wiley.
- Evans, M., Nancarrow, C., Tapp, A. and Stone, M. (2002), "Future Marketers, Future Curriculum: Future Shock?", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 18, No. 5/6, pp. 579-596.
- Fournier, S., Dobscha, S. and Mick, D.G. (1998), "Preventing the Premature Death of Relationship Marketing". *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 76, No. 1, Jan-Feb, pp. 42-51.
- Frenkel, M. and Shehav, Y. (2006), "From Binarism Back to Hybridity: A Postcolonial Reading of Management and Organization Studies", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 6, pp. 855-876.
- Godbout, J.T. (2007), *Ce qui circule entre nous. Donner, recevoir, rendre*, Paris: Seuil.
- Grant, J. (1999), *The New Marketing Manifesto: The 12 Rules for Building Successful Brands in the 21st Century*, London: Orion Business.
- Gummeson, E. (1987), "The New Marketing: Developing Long Term Interactive Relationship", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 10-20.
- Hakansson, H. and Waluszewski, A. (2005), "Developing a New Understanding of Markets: Reinterpreting the 4Ps", *Journal Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 110-117.
- Hakansson, H., Harrison, D. and Waluszewski, A. (2004), *Rethinking Marketing: Developing a New Understanding of Markets*, Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hetzel, P. (1996), "The Fall and Rise of Marketing Fundamentalism". In: Brown, S., Bell, J. and Carson, D., (eds.), *Marketing Apocalypse – Eschatology, Escapology and the Illusion of the End*, London: Routledge, pp. 171-186.
- Hunt, S. D. (1976), "The Nature and Scope of Marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 17-28.
- Hunt, S. D. (2002), *Foundations of Marketing Theory: Toward a General Theory of Marketing*, Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe.
- Johansson, J.K. (2004), *In Your Face, How American Marketing Excess Fuels Anti-Americanism*, Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson.
- Klein, N. (2000), *No Logo. Taking Aim at the Brand Bullies*, Toronto: Random House.
- Kotler, P. (2005), "The Role Played by the Broadening of Marketing Movement in the History of Marketing Thought", *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 114-116.
- Kotler, P., Jain, D. C. and Maesincee, S. (2002), *Marketing Moves: A New Approach to Profits, Growth & Renewal*, Harvard: HBS Press.
- Kotler, P. and Levy, S. (1969), "Broadening the Concept of Marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 10-15.
- Kozinets, R. V. and Handelman, J. (2004), "Adversaries of Consumption: Consumer Movements, Activism and Ideology", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 31, No. 3, Dec., pp. 691-704.
- Krishnamurty, S. (2005a), "About Close-door Free/Libre/Open Source (FLOSS) Projects: Lessons from the Mozilla Firefox Develop Recruitment Approach", *Upgrade* [online], Vol. 6, No. 3. Available at: <http://www.upgrade-cepis.org/issues/2005/up6-Krishnamurty.pdf> [Accessed 25 March 2007].
- Krishnamurty, S. (2005b), "The Launching of Mozilla Firefox – A Case Study in Community-Led Marketing", Working Paper [online]. Available at: <http://opensource.mit.edu/papers/sandeep2.pdf> [Accessed 25 March 2007].
- de Leonardis, O. (1999), "Social Markets, Social Quality, and the Quality of Social Institutions", *European Journal of Social Quality*, Vol. 1, No. 1/2, pp. 32-44.

- Little, V. and Brookes, R. (1997), "The New Marketing: What Does Customer Focus Now Mean?", *Marketing and Research Today: The Journal of the European Society for Opinion and Marketing Research*, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 96-105.
- Littler, D. and Tynan, C. (2005), "Where Are We and Where Are We Going?", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 39, No. 3/4, pp. 261-271.
- Lusch, R. F. and Vargo, S. L., (eds.) (2006a), *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions*, Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe.
- Lusch, R. F. and Vargo, S. L. (2006b), "Service-Dominant Logic: Reactions, Reflections and Refinements", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 281-288.
- McDonald, M. and Wilson, H. (2002), *The New Marketing*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- McKenna, R. (1995), *The Regis Touch*, New York: Addison Wesley.
- Morace, F., (ed.), (2002), *European Asymmetries. Asimmetrie Europee*, Milan: Scheiwiller.
- Morris, M.H., Schindehutte, M. and LaForge, R.W. (2002), "Entrepreneurial Marketing: A Construction Integrating Entrepreneurship and Marketing Perspectives", *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, Vol.10, No. 4, pp. 1-18.
- Moutinho, L., Davies, F. and Hutcheson, G. (2002), "Exploring Key Neo-Marketing Directions through the Use of an Academic 'Think Tank'", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 36, No. 4, pp. 417-432.
- O'Malley, L. and Tynan, C. (1999), "Concept, Metaphor or Reality? The Prognosis for Relationships in Consumer Markets", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 20, No. 10, pp. 571-579.
- Palmer, A. and Ponsonby, S. (2002), "The Social Construction of New Marketing Paradigms: The Influence of Personal Perspectives", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 173-192.
- Perry, C., Carson, D. and Gilmore, A. (2003), "Joining a Conversation", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 37, No. 5/6, pp. 652-667.
- Ponsonby, S. and Boyle, E. (2004), "The 'Value of Marketing' and 'The Marketing of Value' in Contemporary Times – A Literature Review and Research Agenda", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 20, No. 3/4, pp. 343-361.
- Prahalad, C.K. and Ramaswamy, V. (2004), *The Future of Competition: Co-Creating Unique Value with Customers*, Harvard: HBS Press.
- Rha, J.-Y., Widdows, R., Hooker, N. H. and Montalto, C. P. (2002), "E-Consumerism as a Tool for Empowerment", *Journal of Consumer Education*, Vol. 19, No. 20, pp. 61-69.
- Roux, D. (2007), "Ordinary Resistance as a Parasitic Form of Action: a Dialogical Analysis of Consumer/Firm Relations". In: Fitzsimons, G. and Morwitz, V. (eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 34, (forthcoming).
- Schmitt, B. H. (1999), *Experiential Marketing: How to Get Customers to SENSE, FEEL, THINK, ACT and RELATE to Your Company and Brands*, New York: The Free Press.
- Sheth, J. N. and Sisodia, R. S. (eds.) (2006), *Does Marketing Need Reform? Fresh Perspectives on the Future*, Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe.
- Smithee, A. (1997), "Kotler is dead!", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 31, No. 3/4, pp. 317-325.
- Smithee, A. and Lee, T. (2004), "Future Directions in Marketing Knowledge: A Panoramic Perspective from Hollywood", *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 149-154.
- Vanegeim, R. (1967), *Traité du savoir-vivre à l'usage des jeunes générations*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Vargo, S. L. and Lusch, R. F. (2004a), "Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 68, No. 1, January, pp.1-18.
- Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004b), "The Four Service Marketing Myths: Remnants of a Goods-Based Manufacturing Model", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 324-335.
- Venkatesh, A. and Penaloza, L. (2006), "From Marketing to Markets: A Call for Paradigm Shift". In: Sheth, J. N. and Sisodia, R. S. (eds.), *Does Marketing Need Reform? Fresh*

- Perspectives on the Future*, Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, pp. 134-150.
- Watzlawick, P., Weakland, J. and Fisch, R. (1971), *Change: Principles of Problem Formation and Problem Resolution*, New York: Norton
- Wipperfurth, A. (2005), *Brand Hijack: Marketing without Marketing*, New York: Portfolio.
- Woolgar, S. (2004), "What Happened to Provocation in Science and Technology Studies", *History and Technology*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 339-349.
- Woolgar, S. and Simakova, E. (2004), "Marketing Marketing: an Exploratory Paper". In: Proceedings of the 4s-EASST Conference, Paris, August.
- Wright, L. T., Newman, A. and Dennis, C. (2006), "Enhancing Consumer Empowerment", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 40, No. 9/10, pp. 925-935.
- Zyman, S. (1999), *The End of Marketing as We Know It*, New York: Collins.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Olivier Badot is Professor at ESCP-EAP Paris, senior researcher at the University of Caen-Basse Normandie (IAE) and visiting Professor at the School of Management of the University of Ottawa. His researches focus on retailing: he has developed a specific semio-ethnological approach to analyse the roles played by retailers in their environment and to audit their strategies and mix consistency. Professor Badot has published around 20 (individual or collective) books, many scientific articles and reports, and has given numerous lectures and speeches in French, English or Spanish. He holds two PhDs: one in industrial economics (ENST Paris) and one in ethnology (La Sorbonne).

Olivier Badot, ESCP-EAP and IAE de Caen-Basse Normandie, 79 Av. de la République, 75011 Paris, France.

T +33 1 49 23 26 16

F +33 1 49 23 22 48

E obadot@escp-eap.net

Bernard Cova is Professor of Marketing at Euromed Marseilles - School of Management and Visiting Professor at Università Bocconi, Milan. A pioneer in the Consumer Tribes field since the early nineties, his internationally-influential research has emphasized what he calls "the Latin approach" of tribal marketing. His work on this topic has been published in the *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, the *European Journal of Marketing*, *Marketing Theory* and the *Journal of Business Research*. He is also known for his groundbreaking research in B2B marketing, especially in the field of project marketing.

Corresponding author: Bernard Cova, Euromed Marseilles and Università Bocconi Milan, Domaine de Luminy, BP 921, 13288 Marseille, Cedex 9, France.

T +33 4 91 82 73 48

F +33 4 91 82 79 83

E bernard.cova@euromed-marseille.com

© of *Journal of Marketing Management* is the property of *Westburn Publishers Ltd* or its licensors and its content may not be copied or e-mailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without first obtaining the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or e-mail articles for individual, non-commercial use only. This article has been reproduced by EBSCO under license from *Westburn Publishers Ltd*.