

Author's draft. Please cite as:

Miles, C. (2018). Service-Dominant Logic: the evolution of a universal marketing rhetoric. In M. Tadajewski, M. Higgins, J. Denegri-Knott, R. Varman (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Critical Marketing*. Routledge: London. 241-258

Service-Dominant Logic: the evolution of a universal marketing rhetoric

Chris Miles

Introduction

Vargo and Lusch's (2004a) *Journal of Marketing* paper, "Evolving to a New Dominant Logic of Marketing", has had a profound influence upon the discourse of academic marketing. At the time of writing it has gathered over 7900 citations indexed by Google Scholar putting it far ahead of any other paper published in the discipline's foremost organ of dissemination.

In this chapter I examine the way that Service-Dominant logic has evolved and explore the dynamic between the perspective's authors and its critics. In doing so I position Vargo and Lusch's (hereafter V&L) formulations of their self-described "pre-theoretic" perspective (Vargo, 2011, p. 218; Lusch and Vargo, 2011, p. 1299) as outstanding examples of rhetorical and persuasive narrative technique perfectly pitched for a discipline beset by self-doubt and accusations of irrelevance. I will argue that the quite substantial transformation that S-D logic has undergone since its introduction is a function of a complex rhetorical approach to dealing with oppositional readings. Consequently, this chapter investigates the way in which academic marketing knowledge is itself marketed through a detailed account of the journey of the ideas contained in the foundational Vargo and Lusch (2004a) paper. Brownlie and Saren (1995) have called for a greater appreciation of the ways in which academic marketing is losing out to other "competing voices" (p. 623) in the provision of (usually re-purposed or re-hashed) marketing knowledge. They note that the "final authority" of the marketing scholar has been eroded away and we find ourselves instead in a busy marketplace having to

compete with a host of other knowledge brokers and using “the new armoury of persuasion technologies” (ibid.). The story of S-D logic can be seen as an instance of marketing scholarship’s internal reaction to this erosion of authority, an attempt to generate an authoritative discourse that might bind marketing academics together in a united perspective that offers insights not just into problems in contemporary marketing but also into wider issues effecting society and so offer a competitive package in the wider market for marketing knowledge. That this is largely accomplished with the well-established ‘persuasion technologies’ of rhetoric is indicative of just how fundamental such discourse strategies remain to the contemporary generation of authority in the knowledge marketplace.

The chapter opens with a detailed reading of V&L’s (2004a) *urtext*. Although the premises and emphases of S-D logic have constantly evolved I argue that the 2004a *Journal of Marketing* paper can be seen as a deliberately provocative piece of rhetoric through which all the later revisions should be interpreted. I then move on to a discussion of early reactions to S-D logic, particularly those contained in the commentaries printed alongside the 2004a article and the various contributions to the Lusch and Vargo (2006b) edited collection. In examining the evolution of S-D logic I have chosen to focus upon the most significant critical voices and the key texts by V&L that have marked the various revisions of the core perspective. As I will show, while there has been a tremendous scholarly activity around S-D logic, its evolution has been firmly in the hands of V&L. I close the chapter with a discussion of the ways that V&L have recently been extending S-D logic and how these transformations loop all the way back to Kiel et al (1992) and point towards an even more audacious vision of the logic’s future.

The Foundational Paper

As briefly recounted by the article's final editor (Bolton, 2006), the publication of V&L (2004a) in the pages of the *Journal of Marketing* was preceded by "an unusually lengthy review and revision process that spanned five years and the tenure of two *Journal* editors" (p. ix). Lusch and Vargo (2006b) state that there were a total of five revisions during this period, indicating the level of debate their perspective sparked even before its publication. This debate was made public, to some extent, through the commentaries invited by Ruth Bolton to accompany the paper and "stimulate discussion and debate" (Bolton, 2004, p.18). This frames the article as something worth talking about by presenting elders of the discipline publicly discussing it. This is a lesson in discourse building that was then repeated in even more dramatic form in the 2006 edited collection that I will discuss a little further below.

The foundational paper by V&L can be broken down into three principal sections. Firstly, the authors provide a history of marketing thought that allows them to illuminate the existence of an emerging "paradigm shift" in contemporary marketing theory. Secondly, the foundational premises of this paradigm are delineated. Finally, the implications of these premises are discussed, with reference to the form of future marketing research, practice, and education. I will now deal with each of these sections in some depth.

The Persuasive Power of Historical Narrative

One of the ramifications of the emergent logic that V&L (2004a) outline is a reframing of the idea of 'service' to include the manufacturing of goods and a reframing of the concept of 'transactions' in order to include it within the larger category of 'exchange'. In this sense the project of the paper is an entirely rhetorical one, re-defining the meaning of words and their contexts in order to change attitudes and practices within a discipline. In order to make this gambit as persuasive as possible, however, the reframing is presented within a particular

(re-)telling of the history of marketing. Central to V&L's construction of this historical narrative is their use of the concept of the "paradigm shift" as a frame for their history. Before the reader is presented with a historical schema of marketing thought they are first primed to think of this history as following the form of a procession of paradigms. At the same time, the authors instill this procession with a clear teleological focus – "the purpose of this article is to illuminate the evolution of marketing thought toward a new dominant logic" (p. 2).

The language of *paradigm shift* is drawn from Kuhn's (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, a work which had already received much attention from marketing scholars and was generally received as an explanation of how science advances – through the supplanting of one dominant paradigm with a newer one incommensurable with the terms of the older one. V&L (2004a) cast paradigm shift as evolutionary – and so inevitable and beneficial (for the health of the discipline). Through this frame, their history of marketing thought becomes an evolutionary arc, from humble beginnings as an offshoot of economics to a "continuous social and economic process in which operant resources are paramount" (p. 3).

The four eras of marketing thought that they identify are portrayed as an initial period rooted in Classical and Neoclassical economics, followed by the formative years of marketing proper (with a descriptive, transaction-oriented focus on institutions and commodities), shifting into the era of Marketing Management where value is understood to be determined in the marketplace and the focus becomes satisfying the consumer's need or desire for fulfillment. The final era is entitled "Marketing as a Social and Economic Process" and it is here that the authors describe the emergence of a "new dominant logic" which unifies a number of perspectives (such as resource management, relationship marketing, and service marketing) that had emerged during the later Marketing Management era.

The periodization is presented both in prose (briefly) and in then in tabulated and figured forms. The verbal and visual language used in the table and figure implies a sense of gradual movement from one period to another. So, in the Formative Marketing era we are told that “a focus on functions is the beginning of the recognition of operant resources” (p. 3), and in the Marketing Management era we read that “Identification of the functional responses to the changing environment that provide competitive advantage through differentiation begins to shift toward value in use” (ibid.) which lays the ground for the final period’s focus on the co-production of value. From a Kuhnian point of view this progression does not depict paradigm shifts. The types of scientific discoveries that lead to paradigm revolutions are made through “paradigm destruction” where a new way of thinking ‘displaces’ the older one which is no longer “logically compatible” with the new one (Kuhn, 1962, p. 97). The bringing together of “disparate literature streams” (V&L, 2004a, p. 3) into a meta-theory is not a particularly revolutionary method (in Kuhnian terms), especially when the authors point out that key aspects of the “new paradigm” have been clearly foreshadowed in the previous two periods. Indeed, further consideration might cause us to remember that Arthur Frederick Sheldon had promulgated the idea of service as the fundamental perspective of business in his highly popular correspondence courses in the early decades of the twentieth century (Tadajewski, 2011). The prefigurings might be seen to be so great, in fact, that they effectively undercut the reality of the periodization. What is important, however, is not the historical veracity of the periodization but its persuasive effectiveness as a narrative. What V&L’s (2004a) periodization delineates is a process of gradual expansion and refinement guided by refocusing and redefinitions (which have tended to be inclusive rather than exclusive). In the Kuhnian sense, then, the periods of marketing thought are not a procession of paradigms at all. The language of Kuhnian paradigms is taken advantage of but it is being used to describe something that might be more appropriately labelled as *gently evolutionary*.

There is also a supplementary periodization scheme advanced by V&L (2004a). This is the presentation of a change in marketing thought from a “goods-dominant view” to a “service-dominant view” (p. 2). This sits on top, as it were, of the fourfold historical periodization and is not given a clear historical boundary but rather emerges from changes across the 100 years of marketing evolution. This also marks it out as *not* a Kuhnian paradigm revolution.

Furthermore, the service-dominant view effectively subsumes the goods-dominant view rather than overturning it. V&L (2004a) simply redefine goods as “distribution mechanisms for service provision” (ibid.) – we have not destroyed the idea of goods but rather brought them into an expanded vision of services.

What is the significance of V&L’s (2004a) use of the *language* of Kuhnian paradigms while avoiding the Kuhnian sense? We can perhaps best understand the answer to this question by observing the reaction (or lack of it) displayed by Shelby Hunt towards V&L’s use of Kuhn. Hunt had been loudly and publicly criticising acceptance of Kuhnian concepts since 1991. His aversion to Kuhn’s work is best summed up in a phrase from Hunt and Morgan (1997) where the authors describe Kuhn’s work as “one of the most thoroughly discredited epistemologies of the 20th century” (p. 1997). It is striking that V&L were not aware of Hunt’s longstanding distrust of Kuhn -- not because all marketing academics should have read everything written by Hunt, but rather because Hunt is expressly thanked in the acknowledgements of V&L (2004a) as a reader of a draft of the paper. Additionally, Hunt was one of Bolton’s invited commentators for the 2004 *Journal of Marketing* (hereafter *JoM*) publication and even there he makes no objection to the use of Kuhnian “jargon”. Indeed, he manages to not use the word ‘paradigm’ at all throughout his contribution.

I would argue that the reason Hunt does not question the use of the dominant paradigm framework is twofold - firstly, he recognises it as rhetorical strategy rather than a constituent

of V&L's (pre-)theory and, secondly, he sees that the presentation of S-D logic itself does not depend upon a *displacement* of G-D logic but rather an enfolding, or subsuming, of the latter into the former. As we shall see, Hunt himself uses this argumentative strategy when positioning S-D logic as a subset of Resource-Advantage theory.

V&L (2004a) make reference to the revolutionary, discipline-changing drama of the Kuhnian paradigm shift whilst never actually adopting the proof that would be required to claim such a displacing shift. Instead, they offer a narrative of steady, evolutionary change in the discipline that finds important earlier concepts either redefined, refocused, or subsumed into later ones. So, the rhetoric says dramatic revolution but the details of the actual argument revolve around gradual, reasoned progression. Indeed, as V&L (2004a) state, the new logic functions to “refocus perspective through reorientation rather than reinvention” (p. 14).

Yet, the fact remains that the use of such phrasing as ‘paradigm shift’ and ‘dominant paradigm’ carries with it the resonance (and rhetorical association) of a scientific *revolution* overthrowing an older worldview that is no longer fit for purpose. V&L are taking advantage of their audience’s familiarity with what Malone (1993) has called the “standard reading” (p. 69) of Kuhn in order to produce this rhetorical association, yet prevent it from being highlighted as argumentation by erasing the trace of formal citation.

Foundational Premises

The presentation of the “foundational premises” reflects a number of significant rhetorical strategies. Firstly, we should note the contextual baggage that a ‘premise’ brings to any party. It immediately calls to mind the schema of the syllogism, with major and minor premises leading to a conclusion. Because V&L (2004a) frame their new perspective as a *logic* (the

word is used 44 times in the paper) it would seem reasonable to expect that a word so rooted in the mechanics of logic would be used in its logical sense. Yet, the eight foundational premises of the “new dominant logic” (p. 1) do not seem to lead to a particular conclusion. In fact, the premises are conclusions themselves. In a neat display of confirmation bias, each premise is first stated and then, in the section that follows, provided with reasons for its acceptance. While this might run counter to the usual formal syllogistic presentation, this reversal of structure is an acceptable mode of *rhetorical* argumentation. But the mislabeling is not. If the premises are indeed premises – what is the conclusion that they lead to?

So, the premises look like premises but aren't -- in the same way that V&L's (2004a) use of the Kuhnian lexicon makes it look like they are arguing for a revolutionary paradigm shift even though they aren't. They are rhetorically useful *allusions*.

A careful look at the foundational premises will give us an opportunity to further examine the way in which historical narrative is used to construct the emotional appeal of S-D logic.

Foundational premise 1 (FP₁) states “the application of specialized skills and knowledge is the fundamental unit of exchange” (p. 6). Here they seek to prove the legitimacy of their claim that marketing has “moved from” (p. 2) its product orientation. While reminding us that “the relationships between specialized skills and exchange have been recongnized as far back as Plato's time” (ibid.) they cite Marcel Mauss to point out that way in which “clans and tribes” use gift giving to tender “total services” (p. 6). Even the early scholars of economics, they note, held that use value was at the heart of all exchange. Yet, something happened which served to derail this universal understanding. Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations*, while containing an appreciation of the division of labour and so fundamentally recognising the importance of the value in use orientation, nevertheless focused on a very narrow aspect of skill, namely, labour that resulted in the production of tangible goods. Services were

superfluous to Smith's vision of "social well-being" which was defined as national wealth, which was in turn understood in terms of "exportable things". From this point onwards, despite much historical thinking to the contrary, most economists have tended to acquiesce to the view that exchange value was to be found in tangible goods.

This narrative makes it natural for marketing to have laboured under the impression that value resides in goods because, as V&L have already made clear, marketing was born from economics. Indeed, the authors demonstrate through reference to passages from Alderson, Shostack, and Levi, that insightful marketing academics had already been re-asserting the dominance of a services understanding of value since the 1950s. This salvational narrative trope crops up throughout the paper. It plays powerfully to an audience of marketing academics who are worried about the direction and relevance of their discipline. We see this approach again in the way that V&L reveal the "fragmented" (p. 1) marketing thought of 1980s and 90s as, in fact, possessing an underlying unity.

FP₂ follows from FP₁ in that it seeks to provide an explanation of why a goods-dominant view has been so prevalent for so long. It states that, "Indirect Exchange Masks the Fundamental Unit of Exchange" (p. 8). Once more, the historical narrative is designed to appeal to the marketing audience. Here, V&L tell how, over time, the customer became lost to business. Increasing microspecialisations in the workforce meant that fewer people involved in a business ever interacted with a customer or even had knowledge of them. And so firms began to forget about the customer. The authors caution us that this is "not unique to manufacturing organizations" (p. 8). Of course, the reader will be aware that it is marketing that has been sounding this alarm all along.

FP₃ is effectively a re-wording of the second. "Goods", it runs, "are Distribution Mechanisms fo/r Service Provisions" (p.8). Here, products are recast as embodiments of knowledge and

skill. As in the explications for the previous two premises, historical narrative and academic precedent are used in order to generate a sense of inevitable, gradual evolution rather than *revolution*. Of interest here is the metaphor that V&L embed in the premise. To portray products as “distribution mechanisms” constructs a sense of the resulting marketing system as predictable, controllable, repairable. The range of descriptors that are used in the explanation of this premise all revolve around the same mechanistic/engineering metaphor (“platforms”, “appliance”). This serves to position the knowledge and skills that marketers (both academic and practitioner) offer – they can ‘encapsulate’ abstract knowledge into concrete platforms and appliances, serving as knowledge engineers who cross the divide between the tangible and intangible. This is a reminder that the engineering metaphors that Scully (1996) finds populating early writing on marketing remain as resonant with marketing scholars and practitioners as ever.

FP₄ takes the idea central to the previous three premises (that knowledge is at the heart of all exchange) and introduces to it the trope of competitive advantage. The full premise runs, “Knowledge is the Fundamental Source of Competitive Advantage” (p. 9). V&L build the explanation for this on a mixture of references drawn from marketing and economics scholars (again underlining the evolutionary nature of their framework), but it is fair to say that the bulk of their reasoning rests upon the Hayek-inspired theorising of Hunt’s (2000) Resource-Advantage Theory. Of particular significance is their paraphrasing of Hunt’s (2000, p. 146) line, “competition, as Hayek (1945) puts it, is a *knowledge-discovery* process”. This leads them to argue that the marketing value chain should recognise that the “primary flow” in the chain is the “provision of the information to (or use of the information for) a consumer who desires it, with or without an accompanying appliance” (p. 9) – and it is this provision that characterizes a *service*. A service, then, will thrive or fail on its ability to provide useful information to consumers who desire it. This further buttresses the vision of marketer as

‘knowledge engineer’ embedded in the third premise, but it also raises an issue regarding communication and manipulation which the authors will begin to address later, namely, how can a marketer go about their normal practice if they can only provide information to those who desire it? Does it not make the marketing organisation an entirely *reactive* one?

FP₅ seeks to broaden the reach of the service-orientation, making it clear that “All Economies are Service Economies” (p. 10). The explanation for this premise looks back to the point that V&L had already made regarding Adam Smith’s narrowing of “concern with manufacturing output” as a measurement of national wealth. V&L are concerned to build a model of intellectual evolution that focuses on models of explanation as points on a continuum rather than mutually exclusive worldviews. So, while they are happy to use Kuhnian rhetoric in order to amplify the significance of their thesis they are careful to construct an argument that works hard to demonstrate how a goods-orientation can still be *contained within* a service approach. S-D logic is a determinedly *conservative* programme.

FP₆ has become perhaps the most famous: “The Customer is Always a Coproducer” (2004, p.10). As V&L see it, coproduction is a consequence of that “in using a product, the customer is continuing the marketing, consumption, and value-creation and delivery process” (p. 11.). So, the customer contributes their own knowledge and skill alongside those of the firm. V&L quote Normann and Ramirez’s (1993, p. 69) dictum that “the key to creating value is to coproduce offerings that mobilize customers”. What exactly is involved in the process of “mobilization” is an issue that has beset the theoretical development of cocreation. Normann and Ramirez (1993) go on to use a telling metaphor to depict the way in which the firm manages the customers’ coproduction we get an interesting insight. To “win” (in the struggle for competitive advantage) “a company must write the script, mobilize and train the players, and make the customer the final arbiter of success or failure” (p. 69). The firm takes on the

role of the theatrical impresario -- customers become part of its operant resources assortment, actors to be directed. While the customer is (of course) the final arbiter of success, the strategy of coproduction brings the customer into the firm in order to *use* them – they are mobilized. They are *allowed* to be the final arbiter of success – as if this is part of the role they are scripted to have by the firm.

The literature on coproduction and cocreation has certainly been mired in confusion and illogic around the issue of how customers are managed by marketers into being coproducers (Miles, 2017). Normann and Ramirez’s metaphor of the firm as impresario or auteur seems to be enmeshed in the G-D logic of thinking about the customer as someone to control. While V&L choose not to reproduce that metaphor, the equally metaphorical depiction of the customer as a *resource for the firm* will inevitably raise the prospect of the customer being exploited by the firm. Yet, V&L (2004) ignore such implications.

FP₇ states “The Enterprise Can Only Make Value Propositions” (p. 11). The authors explain that northern European service marketers like Christian Grönroos and Evert Gummesson have persuasively argued that value is created by consumers during the act of consumption. Consequently, the firm cannot be seen as producing value – it can only be described as creating “value propositions”. Marketing is no longer to be considered the activity of creating value and then distributing it to the customer but should instead be about creating offerings which are judged to have value by consumers. The question still remains, though – if value creation lies outside the firm, what does FP₇ really mean? The answer is hinted at in the very last line of V&L’s (2004) explication of the premise: “the enterprise can only make value propositions that strive to be better or more compelling than those of competitors” (p. 11). So, the firm’s marketing function is the construction of more compelling, more attractive, *promises* of value to consumers. Here, the trope of coproduction appears to come into sharper

focus. The firm promises value and the consumer creates it; sometimes a firm's promise of value is particularly compelling and this persuades a consumer to patronise the firm and so create value in their consumption. If that created value is useful or pleasing to the consumer then the firm has a happy customer. The principal marketing job, however, is the creation of compelling, superior *promises* of value. The ramifications of this vision have not been very well examined in the resulting literature but it is perhaps the most important of all the premises, not least because it seems to characterise marketing as essentially a communications job (the presentation of propositions) but also because it places persuasion (those propositions have to be *compelling*) at the center of the marketing skillset.

FP₈ reads: "A Service-Centered View is Customer-Oriented and Relational" (p. 11). The authors' goal here is to build to an argument that all encounters between firm and consumer, even simple one-off transactions, are necessarily relational. This allows V&L's logic to function more convincingly as a broad theory of contemporary marketing rather than as just a framework appropriate to a subset of the marketing endeavour. It should be noted, again, that V&L's argumentation here is based upon a mix of appeal to academic authority (Gummesson, Grönroos, Berry, et al.) and assertion. They then go on to argue that even simple, "discrete transactions" carry "social, if not legal, contracts (often relatively extended) and implied, if not expressed, warranties" (p. 12). This curious assertion does not come with any grounding citation or explication. It relies upon the audience nodding their heads at the seeming 'rightness' of the claim, comforted as they already are with the appeals to academic authority that sandwich it.

Ramifications

The premises are followed by a ‘discussion’ section which attempts to pull out some of the broader implications of the premises. So, for example, V&L argue that the university marketing curriculum should go through a process of “reorientation rather than revision”, which “would subordinate goods to service provision”. Yet, in keeping with V&L’s conservatism, the new curriculum “would not necessitate the abandonment of most of the traditional core concepts, such as the marketing mix, target marketing, market segmentation, but rather it would complement these with a framework based on the eight FPs we have discussed” (ibid.).

The authors do not want anything from marketing’s intellectual legacy to be consigned to the dustbin of history. Yes, some economists might have misled marketers in the past (and even that was the result of some entirely understandable exigencies of argumentation), but the overall message of the paper is that we, as marketing academics, have in fact been doing very well in rectifying the results of those misdirections.

Framing the Debate: The *JoM* Commentaries

The selection of short responses invited from celebrated marketing academics that accompany the 2004 paper has a powerful framing effect (Brown, 2007).

In Hunt’s contribution, we get a hint of the direction that Bolton provided. Hunt (2004) writes that his “commentary does not nitpick their argument but, at the editor’s suggestion, amplifies and extends it” (p.22). However, some of the commentators are subtly obstructive of this remit. Evert Gummesson’s (2004) contribution notes that “marketers need to do as V&L advocate: reinvent marketing theory to fit the present and the future” (p. 21). The phrasing here implies that what we should be learning from V&L is the necessity for reinventing

marketing – it is *not* stating that V&L’s reinvention is something we should adopt. His tangential approach and closing remarks betray little engagement with the terms of V&L’s article. Deighton and Narayanda’s (2004) commentary argues that the dicta of service-dominant logic might be applicable in *certain* particular market conditions but not necessarily *all* of them. A context-led approach rather than a theory-led approach should be preferable.

Whilst V&L make much use of Resource-Advantage theory, Hunt’s (2004) commentary positions V&L’s logic as R-A theory *lite*. The only point of uniqueness he allows them is the distinction between operant and operand (which, of course, is not unique to V&L, 2004a, but originates in Constantin and Lusch, 1994). Even here, Hunt demonstrates he had already made the distinction in Hunt (2000), concluding that “resource-advantage theory both conceptualizes ‘resource’ and explicates the kind of resources that can be operand and operant” (Hunt, 2004, p. 22). Hunt continues in this vein demonstrating how the V&L paper partially suggests things which are fully explicated in the R-A literature.

Framing the Debate: The Edited Collection

V&L clearly learned the lessons of the JoM invited commentaries. In their preface to the 2006 collection they claim that “only an open-source, collaborative effort can ‘get right’ a fully developed theoretical framework that can serve the long-term needs of the discipline” (2006b, p. xviii). They also note how this approach is entirely consistent with the “S-D logic’s advocacy of co-production and the co-creation of value” (ibid.). This is powerful rhetoric. While the evolution of the logic can sometimes *look* like it is co-created Vargo and Lusch have kept a very firm hand on the tiller of its evolution.

The 2006b collection refines or articulates ideas that were either only partially developed or had been overlooked by V&L in the 2004 paper. It thus allows V&L to employ outsourced academic labour flesh their theory out. Secondly, the 2006b book consolidates the S-D logic brand. Finally, the collection also allows for the airing of controlled critique of the emerging logic. This serves a number of strategic purposes. Rhetorically, it amplifies the *ethos* of the logic itself – the logic does not need to suppress dissenting voices, instead it generously seeks to include them. Furthermore, when surrounded by a supportive majority who are seen to apply the logic to their areas of specialisation, criticisms are inevitably reduced in effectiveness.

The two most critical chapters in the book are those by Sidney Levy (2006) and Achrol and Kotler (2006) who are also arguably the three heaviest hitters in the roll call of the collection's contributors.

Levy's (2006) chapter begins by demonstrating that the four ages historical structure that V&L (2004a) have used lacks subtlety and reminds readers that much of the new service perspective has been prefigured in earlier writing. V&L have never denied this point. It is argumentatively important to them to ground S-D logic in the writings of earlier marketing authors and perspectives as it helps generate a sense of legitimacy and inevitability for their pre-theory. At its core, however, Levy's criticism of S-D logic is that it is something that only scholars will appreciate. The distinction between operant and operand, for example, "probably will not help managers" (Levy, 2006, p. 62). For Levy, if a logic is to become dominant in marketing it must be found useful by both scholars and managers. Levy concedes that V&L's assertion that everything is a service might be interesting to academics who can "enjoy dialog about it" (p. 61). Managers, however, will find their older product-orientation still far too useful to throw away.

Finally, Levy makes reference to the “superior” (p. 62) promotional skill of V&L. So, S-D logic is not particularly new, nor dominant, but has been promoted particularly well among scholars. It could become dominant by broadening this promotional effort to managers.

Achrol and Kotler’s (2006) chapter is subheaded “a critique” and is openly sceptical of S-D logic’s originality and significance. They echo Levy’s point that while the language games of S-D logic might find an audience amongst “marketing scientists” the same cannot be said of “practicing managers”, who can never be expected to “think of a six-pack of beer in terms of a six-server: a six-server vehicle of thirst-quenching, bitter-flavorful, pleasure-inducing, social-intoxicant” (p. 331). It is interesting that Achrol and Kotler, as well as Levy, attempt to argue against S-D logic’s fitness by constructing a depiction of the practitioner/manager as a composite of simple-minded boob and pragmatic bean counter. In addition, Achrol and Kotler argue that the premise that “services are exchanged for services” “trivializes everything that has happened in between” (2006, p. 332), particularly the “enormous creative energy and technological progress represented by the tangible means of delivering services invented by the industrial revolution” (ibid.). The growth of S-D logic, consequently, represents a real danger to the future of marketing. Not only is V&L’s framework “not based on a fundamental logic system” (p. 323), its principal distinction (between goods and services) is “merely stylistic and rhetorical” (p.322). Yet, it threatens to transform the variegated perspectives of a thriving marketing discipline into a unified, unhealthy monoculture.

While there are a number of other critical entries in the edited collection most contributions take S-D logic at face value and seek to either extend it or place their own work within its framework.

S-D logic is an attractive perspective to align with, it seems. It exhibits impressive momentum and lofty goals so it makes perfect sense even for well-established scholars to

consider how they can position their own work within it (or alongside it) so that it has the most exposure and an increased chance of survival in the market for marketing knowledge. Other researchers can look at some of the promising but under-developed areas of the pre-theory and mine them for their scholarly value, secure in the knowledge that, for the moment, such topics are *en vogue*.

Even when invited authors end up largely side-stepping the terms of S-D logic, V&L can use the section introductions in order to argue for the compatibility of a rival formulation with their own understanding of S-D logic. For example, Gummesson (2006) seizes the opportunity to provide an account of his own emerging logic, which he dubs “many-to-many marketing”. This perspective is based upon a valorisation of the network as the principal trope of contemporary marketing. In their section introduction, Lusch and Vargo (2006b) take a page out of Shelby Hunt’s playbook and state that they “believe that S-D logic provides the justification for network formation: mutual service exchange” and therefore they find “Gummesson’s position very consistent with S-D logic” (p. 335).

Lusch and Vargo’s (2006b) collection is, consequently, a fascinating exercise in ideology consolidation and defence. The directly critical voices to be found in the collection are deflated by V&L’s initial three chapters which include significant arguments against the charges brought by Levy (2006) and Achrol and Kotler (2006). In particular, they set straight a series of “misstatements about the underlying thesis of S-D logic” that have dogged their project since the “receipt of our initial reviews of the first submission” (p. 44) of the 2004 article. V&L attempt to correct ten of the “most consistent misconceptions and misunderstandings” (p. 45). While we might wonder at the existence of so many regular failures of understanding around something that is meant to be indicative of an already emerging paradigm in marketing scholarship, V&L make the argument that such

misconceptions are “likely a reflection of the paradigmatic strength of G-D logic” (ibid.). V&L hold that “S-D logic inverts a paradigm that has served as the foundation” for economics as well as marketing and so its presentation is bound to lead to misconceptions in the minds of those still mired in the old, G-D logic. Yet, this radically undercuts the substance of the argumentation in their 2004a article, which is careful to build the impression that the emerging logic evolves from the old logic and has been present in major marketing scholarship since the early 1950s.

The Great Reversal

Related to the tension between evolution and revolution is the question of “paradigm shift”. In a strategic move, V&L deal with the issue of whether S-D logic is a “fundamental shift in worldview” (2004a, p. 2) not under the rubric of “What It Is Not”, but under the section entitled “What It Might Be”. They re-assert the claim that G-D logic is paradigmatic. Yet, in the final paragraph the authors raise the far more central question, “does S-D logic represent a paradigm shift?” (p. 52). Their answer is “we do not think it does, at least presently” because it does not “reflect the values and interests of the dominant researchers in the science of marketing as a whole and does not reflect a worldview” (ibid.). This flatly contradicts the principal argument of the 2004a paper, namely that “marketing has moved from a goods-dominant view, in which tangible output and discrete transactions were central, to a service-dominant view, in which intangibility, exchange processes, and relationships are central” (V&L, 2004, p. 2).

This is a *significant* reversal of position yet it is hidden away from the reader in the subtlest of ways. V&L then go on to surround this reversal with defensively modal equivocations. The S-D logic “*could* have emerged as the basis of the guiding paradigm of economics and thus

for marketing” if not for an historical accident (2006, p. 52). And, just to keep the paradigm metaphor in the back pocket, in the future S- D logic “*might* be a candidate for the foundation for the paradigmatic shift that has been called for by a number of marketing scholars” (ibid.).

So, once the rhetoric of paradigm shift had served its persuasive purpose and threatened to become more of a liability than a boon, V&L are careful for the rest of their output to use the wording only when describing the goods-dominant perspective (i.e. Lusch and Vargo, 2006a, 2014; V&L, 2008b, 2011a). Instead, adopting another metaphor, the logic is “a mindset, a lens through which to look at social and exchange phenomena so they can potentially be seen more clearly” (ibid.). This is a far cry from the rhetorical thrust of the 2004a foundational article.

The O’Shaughnessy Affair

One further instance of criticism of the S-D logic needs attention. A heated exchange between V&L and John and Nicholas O’Shaughnessy occurred between 2009 and 2011. The sequence starts with an article by O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009). One of their unique assertions is that S-D logic is solely concerned with a technologically oriented search for service-based “techniques” or “principles”. O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009) demonstrate that the search for management or marketing principles is a misguided one. Principles, they argue, need to be balanced with “explanatory theory” otherwise they become “ritualised answers to perplexing situations” (p. 788). They also question the status of S-D logic as a theory or a paradigm, concluding that it is a “perspective” (p. 791). In this they are echoing V&L’s (2008a) backpedalling because they are not aware of the ways in which the terms of S-D logic have already been defended, re-positioned, and re-defined. This is, indeed, one of the central points that Lusch and Vargo (2011) make in their reply to the

O'Shaughnessys. Printed alongside this reply are two more pieces – a rejoinder to the response by O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy (2011) and a 'rejoinder to the rejoinder' by V&L (2011b). The substance of this back and forth revolves around whether it is defensible to base a critique of a perspective upon only a consideration of the original article that introduces that perspective. Lusch and Vargo (2011) argue that to ignore the literature around S-D logic published since 2004 “could be considered inconsistent with the generally accepted norms of good scholarship” (p. 1300). Many of the issues that O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy (2009) raise have already been addressed in the literature. However, the O'Shaughnessys argue that there is no need to consider this literature: “the authors describe their perspective as logic, not a piece of empirical work, and we treated it as such, claiming the logic was defective” (O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy, 2011, p. 1310). If the “base” of the S-D logic is “contestable” then there is “no advantage” in reading the supplemental literature that builds upon it as it, too, must be flawed.

This is sensible, if one starts from the assumption that V&L (2004a) is indeed the foundational edifice upon which all the following work is *logically* built. However, the V&L (2004a) article does not present a logic. It constructs a rhetorical argument. And rhetorical arguments do indeed change their terms, tropes and enthymemes over time. Rhetoric must change with the audience and the seasons – this is the essence of rhetorical *kairos*, the improvisatory necessity to respond persuasively to the moment (Kinneavy and Eskin, 2000). One of the recurring motifs deployed by V&L is the portrayal of their intellectual journey. S-D logic is now a “pre-theory”, a collaborative, “open-source” movement. This has enabled it to maintain an aura of intellectual vitality. It also enables them to quite confidently avoid the O'Shaughnessys' complaints (V&L, 2011b). The fact that they have refined and extended their perspective demonstrates their ability to be reflective upon weaknesses in the logic and repair them. The fact that they “have authored approximately three dozen service-dominant

(S-D) logic publications, which have received almost 2,500 total citations (Google Scholar), and have made several dozen keynote, and over 100 total, S-D logic presentations on five continents” (V&L, 2011b, p. 1319) also demonstrates that the community of marketing scholars are interested in following this journey. The *argumentum ad populum* is clear in V&L’s defence but it is difficult to counter.

Logic or Rhetoric

Much of the substance of the O’Shaughnessy affair seems to center around the power of the single word “logic”. It is the one word that V&L have consistently retained. Its rhetorical intention is clear – the word’s associations with mathematical precision, argumentative purity, and foundational importance are strong and V&L appreciate this. Yet, the word can also be used quite vaguely. Williams (2012) has unravelled the ‘classical’ logical relationships between the S-D logic premises and concludes that there should only really be *two* fundamental premises to S-D logic. Yet, even Williams fails to explain to the reader why exactly the word *logic* is appropriate for this whole enterprise! V&L have never offered an explanation themselves. The ‘logic’ seems to be more of a ‘rhetoric’.

Brown (2007) was quick to note the rhetorical nature of S-D logic, arguing that the perspective’s success is down to its rhetorical presentation and its evocation of a “golden age that never actually existed” which has been able to serve as a “conceptual comfort blanket, something that helps marketers face the reality of mounting marginalization and ever-increasing irrelevance” (p. 296). The pseudo mathematico-logical language and structuring of the foundational article has served as part of that rhetorical “comfort blanket”, touching on the aspiration for scientific respectability within the discipline that still haunts so many marketing scholars.

A History of Revisions

As mentioned above, V&L like to revise and tweak S-D logic. The first tweak was to the name itself, which changed from a “new emerging logic” to “Service-Dominant logic” in less than one year. The adoption of the name (lifted from the final line of V&L, 2004b), was a result of their “need to brand this new logic” (Lusch and Vargo , 2006b, p. xvii) as the dialogue and debate that it was generating so quickly was using a number of different names “with variously nuanced connotations” (ibid.). The branding is aimed at unifying the debate around a clear core concept and a clear brand owner.

Some of the changes to V&L’s presentation of S-D logic have been dealt with above, however there are a series of revisions to the FPs as well as significant conceptual extensions that are public instances of the foundational text being reworked and it is to these that I now turn.

The first FP-related revision occurs in the Lusch and Vargo (2006b) edited collection, inside V&L’s (2006a) ‘clarification’ chapter. Here they restate the eight foundational premises but note one to the 2004a presentation – FP₆ now states that “the customer is always a co-creator of value” rather than “the customer is always a co-producer”. The reason for this change is that they believe the original formulation of “co-producer” is too heavily grounded in a “goods-dominant and production-oriented logic” (p. 44). This reasoning is expanded in V&L (2006b). Here they note that “several marketing scholars” had pointed out that “co-production implies making something, a unit of output” (p. 284) and was therefore an inappropriate term to be at the heart of the S-D logic. This underlines how difficult it is to eradicate G-D associations from S-D discourse. Yet, again, the concentration on word-choice

and the recognition of its power to influence discourse underlines the heavily rhetorical nature of S-D logic.

The second revision to the FPs, an additional premise, is also to be found in V&L (2006a). It is designed to highlight the way in which S-D logic “recognizes that there is an acceleration in the division of labor in society as individuals become increasingly microspecialized” (p. 52). The additional FP₉ states that: “Organizations exist to integrate and transform microspecialized competencies into complex services that are demanded in the marketplace” (p. 53). In a strong echo of Kiel et al (1992), this premise positions S-D logic as a possible “framework for a theory of the firm” (p. 53). This begins a pattern of influence broadening attempts that finds S-D logic being presented as far more than just a simple unification of the marketing discipline.

For a 2008 special issue of the *Journal the Academy of Marketing Science*, V&L contributed a ‘state of the logic’ paper which made several important alterations to the FPs. Here we learn that S-D logic is a “generalizable mindset from which a general theory of the market can be developed” (ibid.) – a theory which is not aimed at the manager specifically but which could instead function as a “revised theory of economics and society”. The widening of the ambition for what at this stage is still a “pre-theory” continues.

The most prominent revisions in V&L (2008a) are the severe re-wording of FP₉ and the addition of another premise, FP₁₀. Both of these revisions can be seen as efforts to avoid further misunderstandings and misstatements from others. FP₉ now becomes the far more elegant, “All social and economic actors are resource integrators” (p. 7), a formulation which harks back to the declamatory style of 2004a. The term “actors” indicates the start of the focus on actor-to-actor theory that has become prominent in V&L’s work in recent years (V&L, 2011a, 2016a, 2016b; Vargo, 2011; Lusch and Vargo, 2014). FP₁₀ adds the dictum that

“value is always uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary” (V&L, 2008a, p. 7) and is a direct attempt by the authors to clarify the “experiential nature of value”. Earlier in the 2008 article, they explain that they assumed their phenomenological position was inherent in their definition of “service”. However, they note that some have clearly not been able to infer this (particularly if they were only basing their understanding on the 2004a article). V&L cite Arnould (2006) approvingly, however, noting that those who have clearly conducted a “more extensive review of S-D logic literature” (V&L, 2008a, p. 4) do not find it difficult to tease out the experiential foundations of their logic. The additional FP₁₀, then, like so many of the other revisions, seems to be motivated by an attempt to slow the pace of misunderstanding.

Williams’ (2012) article on the logical structure of the foundational premises argues that only two of them are truly “fundamental” (i.e. cannot be derived from other FPs). These two are FP₃ (“Goods are distribution mechanisms for service provision”) and FP₁₀ (“Value is always uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary”). As Williams (2012) concludes, “FP3 and FP10 are axioms (premises) and the other FPs are conclusions” (p. 478). Whether Williams (2012) has influenced V&L or not is difficult to tell (I cannot find a citation of his analysis in V&L’s work) but what is definite is that V&L have recently begun to re-arrange the foundational premises in a way that recognises that some of them are more fundamental than others. So, in Lusch and Vargo (2014) we find that there are now four axioms alongside the 10 foundational premises. The authors explain that “there are four FPs in particular that capture the essence of S-D logic, and from these the other FPs could arguably be derived.” (p. 15). These four axioms are FP₁, FP₆, FP₉ and FP₁₀. They explain that FP₂, FP₃, FP₄, and FP₅ can all be derived from FP₁, while FP₇ and FP₈ can be derived from FP₆. FP₉ and FP₁₀ are ‘axiomatic’ but do not generate any further conclusions (or premises).

The Lusch and Vargo (2014) re-organisation seems to be moving towards a simplification on the one hand (there are only four *main* FPs) while significantly increasing the complexity of the core presentation of S-D logic on the other. More recently, it has seemed that things have been re-organised once again and in V&L (2016a; 2016b; 2016c) we find *five* axioms as the result of an *eleventh* foundational premise being added that now apparently has axiomatic status! This new axiom/premise states that “value co-creation is coordinated through actor-generated institutions and institutional arrangements” (V&L, 2016c, p. 8) and reflects an increasing move towards the service ecosystem perspective evidenced in V&L (2011a) onwards.

In addition to the new premise/axiom, V&L’s (2016c) paper also contains more re-wordings of the previous foundational premises. These changes are largely focused on clarifying how S-D logic sees the relationship between firm and consumer regarding the co-creation of value, particularly as it relates to the value proposition. FP₆, for example, has now been changed to “value is cocreated by multiple actors, always including the beneficiary” (p. 8) to reflect a far more network oriented perception of value cocreation though one cannot help but feel that the consumer has been rather downgraded in this re-wording. Indeed, the change from “consumer” to “beneficiary” although designed to help S-D logic escape from G-D language and assumptions does raise the question of who exactly benefits the most from any particular service provision? The term also (re)places the consumer in a decidedly passive position. FP₇ has also been significantly re-worded and now reads: “Actors cannot deliver value but can participate in the creation and offering of value propositions” (ibid.). The use of actors here means that the beneficiary (also an actor) becomes just another actor in the value co-creation. The idea that the “consumer must determine value” (V&L, 2004a, p. 11) has been gradually buried. This becomes all the more problematic given the new axiom/premise FP₁₁ that highlights the need for value cocreation to be coordinated by institutions.

S-D logic has changed considerably since its expression in V&L (2004a). The current formation of the axioms/premises as found in V&L (2016c) is more complex and more ambiguous. Gone is the bulk of the revolutionary paradigm-shifting rhetoric and in its place is a fascination with the structures of systems theory, actor-to-actor communication and practice theory. V&L have been engaging in much extension of the logic over the past few years and yet most of it is dependent upon linking S-D logic to other, pre-existing frameworks rather than relying upon empirical testing of S-D logic's premises or axioms.

Although there is a large body of scholarship by others around the terms of S-D logic (particularly the ideas of co-creation of value and the value proposition) what is most noticeable about V&L's journey from 2004 is the way in which they are keen to generate the evolution of their logic from within their own operant resources. The Otago Forums of 2005, 2008, and 2011, along with appearances at the Forums for Markets and Marketing and countless other presentations (see sdlogic.net for an exhaustive list), provides them with the opportunity to create a large network of discussion around the principles of the service perspective. Yet, the various revisions and evolutions of the S-D logic have been generated by a desire to avoid further misunderstandings or through the fruits of their own ruminations. Yet, given the increasingly Baroque nature of the structure of the axioms/premises it is hard to see how misunderstandings will subside. Perhaps one might even note here a future lesson for marketing scholars – the clearer your expression of your central argument, the fewer opportunities you will have to publish clarifications and elucidations. Perhaps being mired in the lexicon of G-D logic has its advantages? One further consequence of the complicated shifting of terms, premises, axioms, and foci that has occurred since the 2004a unveiling of S-D logic is that in order to competently comment upon the state of the logic a scholar needs to keep close tabs on the output of V&L. Inevitably, this means that only those who consider the framework to be (intellectually or professionally) valuable can engage with it. The increasing

complexity and rate of change in the foundational premises thus has a defensive effect around the substance of the discourse.

Extensions and Returns

V&L have engaged in three, tightly interconnected, areas of extension for S-D logic: 1] the actor-to-actor framework 2] practice theory 3] service ecosystems (and connections to systems theory in general). In the case of practice theory some of the most significant work connecting it to S-D logic (and “service science”) has been performed by other scholars. We should also note the almost simultaneous appearance of Grönroos and Ravald (2011) that outlines the contribution of practice theory to service research. V&L themselves value practice theory for its elucidation of the interaction between actors and institutions (2016c) and, so, the dynamics of service ecosystems.

The actor-to-actor framework has become essential to V&L’s contemporary presentation of S-D logic. Lusch and Vargo’s (2014) long-awaited S-D logic monograph is entirely couched in actor-to-actor terms -- “It’s all actor-to-actor”, they write (p. 101). This goes hand-in-hand with the simultaneous (re-)turn towards a “systems orientation” that became clear in V&L (2011a, p. 182). They argue that “we must move toward a more macro, systemic view of generic actors in order to see more clearly how a single, specific actor (e.g. a firm) can participate more effectively” (ibid.). Moving away from identifying actors “in terms of discrete roles and functions” (Lusch and Vargo, 2014, p. 102) allows us to develop a logic “of human exchange systems that includes the economy and society and transcends academic disciplines” (ibid.). In other words, V&L want to develop a general theory of exchange at all levels of society. Marketing scholarship has not been greatly receptive to the general systems project historically. However, V&L’s re-focusing of the S-D logic towards a service

ecosystems perspective might serve to change this and there are indications that the service ecosystems perspective on S-D logic is attracting some interest (Layton, 2008, 2011; Frow et al., 2014).

It should also be noted that the increasing use of a systems theory perspective in the recent development of S-D Logic looks back to an early paper by Kiel, Lusch and Schumacher (1992). This rather extraordinary article, published in *Behavioral Science* and only rarely cited in the S-D Logic canon, gives a good indication of the way in which systems approaches have long been central to at least one of S-D Logic's co-founder's thinking about marketing. The article also prefigures the ambitious aims that S-D Logic has exhibited since its inception. Kiel et al. (1992) situate "marketing into a universal and evolutionary exchange paradigm that integrates human exchange with that of other living and nonliving systems" (p. 60). They attempt this by using a combination of general systems theory and Kuhnian concepts of paradigm shift and evolution. There are tantalizing similarities of structure and argumentation on display between Kiel et al (1992) and Vargo and Lusch (2004a) which hint at a greater significance for the earlier paper's ideas as a galvanizing influence on S-D Logic than has been hitherto realised. However, from the perspective of the current chapter, it is worth noting that recent work by Vargo and Lusch which advances S-D Logic as a potential theory of society looks back to Kiel et al.'s (1992) formulation of a theory of evolutionary exchange which sought to situate the building blocks of marketing deep within human society and, indeed, the universe. This perhaps indicates that the future direction of S-D Logic is even further outwards, towards an understanding of marketing as something which resonates with the universal forces of exchange and attraction. However, there are voices which seek to rein in such ambitions. A recent paper by Hietanen et al (2017) has argued that S-D logic is "ill-equipped to understand consumer culture" (p. 1) let alone be applied to wider social analysis, while Denegri-Knott and Tadajewski (2017) explain how S-D logic's assertion that

value is always co-created with the consumer is simply incorrect and allows for “questions of power and politics in market organization” to be downplayed if not ignored. Both pieces sound a warning bell for those wishing to build a theory of society upon S-D logic’s (shifting) foundational premises.

Conclusion

This chapter has sought to delineate the way in which a particular academic perspective has been ‘marketed’ by its authors to the wider academic marketing community through the utilisation of powerful rhetorical strategies and (counter-)argumentation. In many ways, Vargo and Lusch’s approach to the dissemination of Service-Dominant logic could be held up as a model for ambitious younger scholars and those seeking to promote a position in marketing academia. Key advice emerging from this chapter’s investigation would be to construct a perspective/model/theory/pre-theory that is conservative at its core but is then presented in ways which rhetorically proclaim its radical or revolutionary nature. Adopting language and structurings drawn from mathematics or the hard sciences, appealing to the authority of economics while at the same time appealing to the vanity of marketing scholars, and managing the inclusion of ‘celebrity’ contrarian voices in order to promote citation-generating dialogue all seem important components in the successful marketisation of marketing theorisation. At the centre of all these techniques, however, lies the fundamental strategy of re-definition. The re-definition of products as delivery mechanisms for services, of consumers as producers, and of value as ‘value in use’ are powerful examples of how a shift in perspective can serve as the basis for a persuasive performance of scholarly argument. Re-definition is, of course, a conservative developmental strategy for it always leaves the basic building blocks intact, just shifting the way they are framed.

Yet, S-D logic is remarkable not for its rhetorical strategies but for its mastery of them. As Hunt & Edison (1995) admit, “knowledge claims have always been marketed” (p. 635). The explication of knowledge claims across all academic disciplines is always accompanied by rhetorical strategies designed to persuade academic communities of their veracity, appropriateness, timeliness, and desirability (Billig, 1996; McCloskey, 1985; Nelson et al, 1987; Peter & Olsen 1983). S-D logic is a masterful example of this truth and, as such, an analysis of its persuasive components affords us insight into the language, the hopes, the fears, and the myths that resonate deeply with the global community of marketing academics. Successful rhetorical persuasion will always tell us more about the audience than the rhetor.

The untimely death of Robert Lusch during the writing of this chapter inevitably brings into stark relief a number of questions regarding the shape of S-D logic’s future evolution. This chapter has hopefully demonstrated just how dominating a force the two co-founders of S-D logic have been in the continuing development of the perspective. As a consequence, the direction this discourse will take under the navigation of just one of those co-founders is very much an unknown quantity. Given the evidence of some of Lusch’s pre-S-D logic scholarship it is possible that the systems theory emphasis that has become evident in the perspective might begin to take more of a backseat. However, given the trajectory since 2004, it would be surprising if S-D logic did not undergo further development into a precursor for a ‘general theory of society’, although the exact form of its argumentation and the frameworks that it might choose to use in this journey remain to be seen. One suspects, however, that rhetorical sophistication will continue to play an important part in the perspective’s evolution.

References

- Achrol, R. and Kotler, P. (2006). The Service-Dominant Logic for Marketing: A Critique. In R. Lusch & S. Vargo, (Eds.) (2006b). *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions*. M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY, 320-333.
- Arnould, E. J. (2006). Service-dominant logic and consumer culture theory: Natural allies in an emerging paradigm. *Marketing Theory*, 6(3), 293–298
- Billig, M. (1996). *Arguing and Thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bolton, R. (2004). Invited Commentaries on “Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing.” *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1), 18–27.
- Bolton, R. (2006). Foreword. In R. F. Lusch & S. L. Vargo (Eds.) *The Service- Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions*. M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY, ix-xi.
- Brown, S. (2007). Are we nearly there yet? On the retro-dominant logic of marketing. *Marketing Theory*, 7(3), 291–300.
- Brownlie, D., & Saren, M. (1995). On the Commodification of Marketing Knowledge: Opening Themes. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 11(7), 619–627.
- Constantin, J.A. and Lusch, R.F. (1994), *Understanding Resource Management*, The Planning Forum, Oxford, OH.
- Deighton, J., & Narayandas, D. (2004). Stories and Theories. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1), 19-20.

Denegri Knott, J., & Tadajewski, M. (2017). Sanctioning value: The legal system, hyper-power and the legitimation of MP3. (Online preprint). *Marketing Theory*.

<http://doi.org/10.1177/1470593116677766>

Frow, P., McColl-Kennedy, J. R., Hilton, T., Davidson, A., Payne, A., & Brozovic, D. (2014). Value propositions: A service ecosystems perspective. *Marketing Theory*, 14(3), 327–351.

Gummesson, E. (2006). Many-to-Many Marketing as Grand Theory. In R. Lusch & S. Vargo, (Eds.) (2006b). *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions*. M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY, 339-353.

Grönroos, C., & Ravald, A. (2011). Service as business logic: implications for value creation and marketing. *Journal of Service Management*, 22(1), 5–22.

Hietanen, J., Andéhn, M., & Bradshaw, A. (2017). Against the implicit politics of service-dominant logic. (Online preprint). *Marketing Theory*.

<http://doi.org/10.1177/1470593117692023>

Hunt, S. (1991). *Modern Marketing Theory: Critical Issues in the Philosophy of Marketing Science*. South-Western Publishing Co., Cincinnati.

Hunt, S. (2000), *A General Theory of Competition: Resources, Competences, Productivity, Economic Growth*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Hunt, S. (2002). *Foundations of Marketing Theory: Towards a General Theory of Marketing*. M. E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY.

Hunt, S. (2004). On the Service-Centered Dominant Logic for Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1), 21-22.

- Hunt, S., & Edison, S. (1995). On the Marketing of Marketing Knowledge. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 11(7), 635–640.
- Hunt, S., & Goolsby, J. (1988). “The Rise and Fall of the The Functional Approach to Marketing: A Paradigm Displacement Perspective”. In T. Nevett and R. Fullerton (Eds.) *Historical Perspectives in Marketing: Essays in Honor of Stanley C. Hollander*. Lexington Books, Toronto, 35-51.
- Hunt, S., & Morgan, R. (1995). The Comparative Advantage Theory of Competition. *Journal of Marketing*, 59(April), 1–15.
- Hunt, S., & Morgan, R. (1997). Resource-advantage theory: A snake swallowing its tail or a general theory of competition? *Journal of Marketing*, 61(4), 74–82.
- Kiel, D., Lusch, R., & Schumacher, B. (1992). Toward a new paradigm for marketing: The evolutionary exchange paradigm. *Behavioral Science*, 37(1), 59–76.
- Kinneavy, J., & Eskin, C. (2000). Kairos in Aristotle’s Rhetoric. *Written Communication*, 17(3), 432–444.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 2nd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Layton, R. A. (2008). The Search for a Dominant Logic: A Macromarketing Perspective. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 28(3), 215–227.
- Layton, R. A. (2011). Towards a theory of marketing systems. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45(1/2), 259–276.

Levy, S. (2006). How New, How Dominant? In R. Lusch & S. Vargo, (Eds.) (2006b). *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions*. M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY, 57-64.

Lusch, R. F., & Vargo, S. L. (2006a). Service-dominant logic: reactions, reflections and refinements. *Marketing Theory*, 6(3), 281–288.

Lusch, R. F., & Vargo, S. L. (Eds.) (2006b). *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions*. M.E. Sharpe, Armonk NY.

Lusch, R. F., & Vargo, S. L. (2011). Service-dominant logic: a necessary step. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45(7/8), 1298–1309.

Lusch, R. F., & Vargo, S. L. (2014). *Service-Dominant Logic: Premises, Perspectives, Possibilities*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Malone, M. E. (1993). Kuhn reconstructed: Incommensurability without relativism. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, 24(1), 69–93.

McCloskey, D. (1985). *The Rhetoric of Economics*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, WI.

Miles, C. (2017). ‘The rhetoric of marketing co-creation’. In G. Siegert, M. Bjørn von Rimscha (eds.) *Commercial Communication in the Digital Age – Information or Disinformation?* Berlin: De Gruyter, 209-226.

Nelson, J., Megill, A., & McCloskey, D. (Eds.)(1986). *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences: Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, WI.

Normann, R., & Ramirez, R. (1993). From Value Chain to Value Constellation: Designing Interactive Strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 71(4), 65–77.

O'Shaughnessy, J., & O'Shaughnessy, N. J. (2009). The service-dominant perspective: a backward step? *European Journal of Marketing*, 43(5/6), 784–793.

O'Shaughnessy, J., & O'Shaughnessy, N. J. (2011). Service-dominant logic: a rejoinder to Lusch and Vargo's reply. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45(7/8), 1310–1318.

Peter, J. P., & Olson, J. C. (1983). Is Science Marketing? *Journal of Marketing*, 47(4), 111–125.

Scully, J. I. (1996). Machines Made of Words: The Influence of Engineering Metaphor on Marketing Thought and Practice, 1900 to 1929. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 16(2), 70–83.

Tadajewski, M. (2011). Correspondence sales education in the early twentieth century: The case of the Sheldon School (1902-39). *Business History*, 53(7), 1130-1151.

Vargo, S. L. (2011). Market systems, stakeholders and value propositions: Toward a service-dominant logic-based theory of the market. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45(1/2), 217–222.

Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2004a). Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1), 1–17.

Vargo, S., & Lusch, R. (2004b). The four service marketing myths: remnants of a goods-based, manufacturing model. *Journal of Service Research*, 6(4), 324–335.

Vargo, S. and Lusch, R. (2006a). Service-Dominant Logic: What It Is, What It Is Not, What It Might Be. In R. Lusch & S. Vargo, (Eds.) (2006b). *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions*. M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY, 43-56.

Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2008a). Service-dominant logic: continuing the evolution. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(1), 1–10.

Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2008b). Why “service”? *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(1), 25–38.

Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2011a). It’s all B2B. . . and beyond: Toward a systems perspective of the market. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40(February), 181–187.

Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2011b). Stepping aside and moving on: a rejoinder to a rejoinder. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45(7/8), 1319–1321.

Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2014). Inversions of service-dominant logic. *Marketing Theory*, 14(3), 239–248.

Vargo, S. L. & Lusch, R. F., (2016a) Service-dominant logic 2025, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, doi: 10.1016/j.ijresmar.2016.11.001

Vargo, S. L. & Lusch, R. F. (2016b). Service Dominant Logic: Status and Directions. Presentation slides delivered at the *Forum on Markets and Marketing*, WMG, Venice, Italy, June 2, 2016. Available at:
http://sdlogic.net/uploads/3/4/0/3/34033484/fmm_2016_pres.sh

Vargo, S.L., & Lusch, R. F. (2016c). “Institutions and axioms: an extension and update of service-dominant logic.” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44(1), 5-23.

Williams, J. (2012). The logical structure of the service-dominant logic of marketing.
Marketing Theory, 12(4), 471–483.