



Continuing the manifesto conversation: Toward building a renewal capability for the marketing discipline

Sreedhar Madhavaram¹ · Hunter N. Hatfield¹

Accepted: 24 November 2022 / Published online: 26 December 2022
© Academy of Marketing Science 2022

Abstract

The six commentaries on Hunt, Madhavaram, and Hatfield (hereafter, HMM, *AMS Review*, 2022, in this issue) and “the manifesto conversation” (hereafter, TMC) deeply reflected on HMM and TMC; assessed, among other things, the value of borrowed theories, doctoral programs, fragmentation, indigenous theory development, mainstream central focus, middle-range theories, and stakeholder relevance/engagement; and provided further foundations and put forward several opportunities for continuing TMC toward *renewing* the marketing discipline. In response, we develop a new conceptualization for *renewal capability*, and elaborate that *renewal capability building* (for the marketing discipline) entails policies, activities, and decisions for bringing together human (e.g., its scholars and stakeholders) and institutional resources (e.g., its journals and professional associations) to produce proactive and reactive innovations (for the marketing discipline). Overall, HMM, TMC, the six commentaries, and this response cumulatively provide foundations for continuing the TMC toward building a robust *renewal capability* for the marketing discipline.

Keywords Marketing discipline · Marketing history · Central focus · Marketing's stakeholders · Marketing theory · Marketing manifesto · Renewal capability · Renewal capability building

Labeling the numerous commentaries on the marketing discipline's fifth era of evolutionary development as “the manifesto conversation” (hereafter, TMC), Hunt, Madhavaram, and Hatfield (hereafter, HMM, 2022 in this issue) summarize the evolutionary developments that led to marketing's troubled trajectory: marketing discipline's fragmentation and the resulting loss of a mainstream, central focus and sense of community; the siloed evolution of the discipline's subfields of study; reliance on borrowed concepts, frameworks, and theories; and focus of the discipline's doctoral programs on nonmarketing subjects. Next, drawing from TMC and based on key aspects and foundational lessons from the marketing discipline's preceding stages of evolutionary development, HMM: (1) argue that the marketing discipline is still needed by for-profit and nonprofit firms, students, business

schools, and society, (2) observe TMC's identification of the deleterious effects of focusing on research topics that are not well linked to marketing practice, marketing institutions, and societal welfare, and (3) lay out an initial road map that complements the “return to fundamentals” advocated by TMC and calls for research on and/or regarding four areas that are *not* mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive: comprehensive theoretical frameworks, stakeholder relevance/engagement, organizing/integrative frameworks for marketing knowledge, and theory development for marketing phenomena.

Further, HMM elaborate on the three major frameworks that TMC has proposed for the marketing discipline's mainstream, central focus: service-dominant logic (Akaka et al., 2021), general framework for integrative marketing (Parvatiyar & Sheth, 2021), and resource-advantage (R-A) theory (Hunt, 2013), and call for TMC to carefully and extensively evaluate these three and other viable candidates for the marketing discipline's central focus. Finally, HMM conclude that “the marketing discipline did not become troubled because it followed a faulty master plan,” and observe that “Its evolutionary reversal will be scholar-by-scholar, reviewer-by-reviewer, editor-by-editor, journal-by-journal, doctoral program-by-doctoral program,

✉ Sreedhar Madhavaram
s.madhavaram@ttu.edu

Hunter N. Hatfield
hunter.hatfield@ttu.edu

¹ Area of Marketing and Supply Chain Management, Rawls College of Business, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409, USA

and professional association-by-professional association.” For HMH, the marketing discipline “has the capability to renew itself” and the “renewal capability springs from its human resources (e.g., its scholars and stakeholders) and institutional resources (e.g., its journals and professional associations).” Indeed, HMH call on all marketing academics, practitioners, journals, and professional associations to contribute to TMC.

Accordingly, we thank Professor Stephen L. Vargo – Editor-in-Chief, *AMS Review* – for inviting commentaries on HMH’s perspective on the marketing discipline’s troubled trajectory and Professors Clark, Key, and Azab (hereafter, CKA), Gustafsson and Ghanbarpour (hereafter, GG), Helkkula and Arnould (hereafter, HA), Suvi Nenonen (hereafter, SN), Linda L. Price (hereafter, LLP), and Rajan Varadarajan (hereafter, RV). We are pleased that—through these six exceptional commentaries—*AMS Review* is continuing TMC and stimulating the efforts toward renewing the marketing discipline in Era V (2020-?). The six commentaries raise several important issues, which we group into four categories: (1) central foci for TMC (2) points of convergence (3) points of divergence (4) conclusion(s)/recommendation(s) (please see Table 1). Next, on the foundations of HMH and the six commentaries, we detail how the marketing discipline’s human resources (e.g., its scholars and stakeholders) and institutional resources (e.g., its journals and professional associations) can work toward building a renewal capability for the marketing discipline. Finally, we conclude with a discussion of the implications of the contributions of HMH and the commentaries for continuing the TMC toward building a robust *renewal capability* for the marketing discipline.

Central foci

The commentaries deeply engage with the contributions of HMH and the TMC and focus on different perspectives on and reasons for the marketing discipline’s troubled trajectory, and the role of theories, approaches to theory building, and marketing phenomena.

Alternate and complementary perspectives

While most if not all of the commentaries agree on the troubled state of the marketing discipline, the commentaries also explore alternate perspectives and complementary perspectives to HMH’s take on the fundamental issues that have contributed to the marketing discipline’s troubled trajectory. Specifically, while GG, HA, and LLP detail alternate perspectives, CKA, SN, and RV elaborate on perspectives that are arguably complementary. In detailing their alternate perspective, GG—acknowledging that the marketing discipline does have some challenges—opine that “it is essentially in a

good position to add value to society and organizations due to its focus on understanding customers and transforming this information into action.”

Similarly, HA also acknowledge that marketing does have some real challenges that are different than those that worry HMH. Indeed, for HA, “marketing should reconsider what its fundamentals should be” and “the potential of marketing discipline lies in the diversity of intertwined and divergent research streams.” Lastly, LLP, in a commentary intended as another possible perspective, elaborates alternative perspectives on the history of the marketing discipline, nature and consequences of fragmentation in the marketing field, and society, consumers, and consumer research as the primary stakeholders in marketing systems. As to complementary perspectives, drawing on Goldstein’s (1999, p. 49) notion of emergence as “arising of novel and coherent structures, patterns, and properties during the process of self-organization in complex systems,” CKA propose that “the field of marketing is, and always has been, an *emergent* discipline.” SN offers complementary perspectives on assessing the evolution of marketing in the context of other marketing disciplines, assessing the evolution of marketing against impact on society and the planet, and focusing on marketing phenomena for an enduring and fruitful sense of community. In the last complementary perspective, RV—while arguing that “fragmentation is an inevitable consequence of specialization and a normal phenomenon in the evolutionary trajectory of academic disciplines,” focuses on “resource-advantage theory as a foundation for developing a general theory of marketing from the perspective of Hunt’s fundamental explananda of marketing.”

Role of theories, approaches to theory building/ adoption, and marketing phenomena

All of the commentaries emphasize the critical role that theories and approaches to theory building can play in the marketing discipline. While some commentaries address the issue of general theories/theoretical frameworks for the marketing discipline’s mainstream, central focus, others address approaches to theory building/adoption, and marketing phenomena. Specific to general theories/theoretical frameworks: (i) HA propose service-dominant logic and (ii) RV focuses on R-A theory as a foundation for developing a general theory of marketing from the perspective of fundamental explananda of marketing. As to approaches to theory building/adoption: (i) GG see value in borrowed concepts, theories, and frameworks, but recommend following proper procedures for theory borrowing to explain marketing phenomena, (ii) HA recommend discovery-oriented research for indigenous theory development, (iii) LLP encourages promiscuous theory shopping in other disciplines in a way that encourages theory development, and (iv) SN, on the

Table 1 Commentaries on HMH and TMC: Central foci, points of convergence and divergence, and conclusions/recommendations

Commentary by:	Central foci	Points of convergence	Points of divergence	Conclusions/recommendations
Clark et al. (2022, in this issue)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marketing as an emergent discipline that is better served by self-organization Doctoral program reforms for healing the ailing marketing discipline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The marketing discipline is ailing Doctoral programs need reform A central focus is needed for the discipline's future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagree with attempts at holistic acceptance and adoption of a central focus Preparing a generation of doctoral students to engage the complex emergent marketing system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four-fold approach with doctoral programs: (1) consensus on standards, (2) increase number of literature-based seminars, (3) increase requirements of literature-based seminars, and (4) increase electives from other disciplines Focus on balance between relevance and rigor, research and education, and across the sub-disciplines Focus on the contributions to society through research, teaching, and reforming of doctoral programs
Gustafsson and Ghanbarpour (2022, in this issue)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasons for the troubled state of the marketing discipline and pertinent solutions The value of theory borrowing for the marketing discipline Re-balancing doctoral programs to facilitate closer connections with organizations and society 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research tends to be siloed, and the silos need to be broken up The balance between Stakeholder relevance/engagement necessary for the marketing discipline's evolution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reliance on borrowed concepts, frameworks, and theories is not a major problem for the marketing discipline Limited value in specific frameworks to solve marketing-related problems 	
Heikkula and Armoild (2022, in this issue)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenges that the marketing discipline faces Alternative explanations for and suggestions regarding the troubled trajectory of the marketing discipline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marketing discipline faces major challenges Marketing discipline evolved to its current, troubled state Doctoral programs should prioritize theory construction and incorporate the substantive richness of the marketing field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lack of respect for discovery-oriented research is the reason for the marketing discipline's reliance on borrowed concepts Courses in theory construction should dig into the ontological and epistemological foundations of theories The recommendations of the roadmap are too generic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest Service-Dominant logic as a path forward while rejecting that an organizing framework is the only path forward
Nenonen (2022, in this issue)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complementary perspectives on the marketing discipline's troubled trajectory Sense of community from embracing marketing phenomena 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Return to the roots of macromarketing as a domain in which marketing impacts society Stronger sense of community for marketing as an academic discipline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Theory borrowing is a positive practice for marketing Fostering a sense of community around marketing phenomena 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on macromarketing research that considers marketing's impact on the biosphere Collaborate with other disciplines to pursue meaningful research on marketing phenomena
Price (2022, in this issue)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different perspective on marketing history for theory building and disciplinary change Nature and consequences of fragmentation in the marketing discipline Stakeholder relevance/engagement for impacting society and the roles of consumers and consumer research in marketing systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The marketing field is increasingly siloed Primary stakeholder relevance for/engagement in marketing systems Promise of scholars immersed in the substantive richness of our field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Time as folds" approach to the history of the marketing discipline Promiscuous theory shopping for indigenous theory development Interdisciplinary, problem-focused research can drive fragmentation that is vital to innovation and growth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need a disciplinary re-invention for marketing Focus on "complex, networked, important problems with a multiple stakeholder perspective"

Table 1 (continued)

Commentary by:	Central foci	Points of convergence	Points of divergence	Conclusions/recommendations
Varadarajan (2022, in this issue)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fragmentation as inevitable in the evolutionary trajectory of academic disciplines Resource-advantage (R-A) theory as a foundation for a general theory of marketing (GTM) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fragmentation of the field and the subsequent loss of community Assessment of potential candidates for the mainstream focus of the marketing discipline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fragmentation is a normal occurrence in all disciplines, Reservations about the marketing discipline being troubled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Empirical research on diverse marketing problems is likely to result in a multitude of middle-range theories

basis that marketing is cross-disciplinary, bats for theory borrowing, but recommends fostering a sense of community around marketing phenomena.

Points of convergence

Despite approaching the contributions of HMH and the TMC from different perspectives, the commentaries—more or less—converge on four major themes: the troubled/ailing state of the marketing discipline, stakeholder relevance/engagement necessary for the evolution of the marketing discipline, sense of community in the marketing discipline, and the importance of reforming marketing doctoral programs.

Troubled/ailing state of the marketing discipline

All of the commentaries, albeit with different rationale and corresponding root causes, agree that the marketing discipline is troubled/ailing or facing major challenges. For CKA, the fracturing of the marketing discipline into “marketing management, macromarketing, consumer behavior and advanced methods, and mathematical modeling,” “along with concomitant strategic choices to reform marketing doctoral programs,” “set marketing on its current troubled trajectory.” Despite noting that this taxonomy is neither exclusive nor exhaustive, HA still agree that the marketing discipline faces major challenges and that it evolved to its current, troubled state for *not* reconsidering its fundamentals couched in managerial marketing, *not* questioning its ontological, epistemological, and axiological premises, *not* focusing on discovery-oriented research, *isolating* itself from the study of markets in a historical and comparative perspective, and finally, for its *inability* to be an open platform for innovation. Finally, for RV, “fragmentation is an inevitable consequence of specialization and a normal phenomenon in the evolutionary trajectory of academic disciplines.”

Stakeholder relevance/engagement necessary for the evolution of the marketing discipline

Throughout its evolutionary development, stakeholder relevance and/or engagement has/have been important for the marketing discipline. Among the six commentaries, the authors cumulatively and explicitly establish that marketing and the following stakeholders need each other: buyers, consumers, firms, institutions, marketers, marketing academia, society, and students. For example, for SN, “a comprehensive analysis of marketing as an academic discipline should include an explicit and honest account of the impact we have had to society and to the Earth.” In addition to society as a primary stakeholder, LLP also emphasizes the “the roles of

consumers and consumer research as drivers and primary stakeholders in marketing systems.”

Sense of community in the marketing discipline

On the one hand, sense of community appears explicitly as a major challenge for the marketing discipline. Specifically, for GG, “Research tends to be siloed (vs. collaborative) into the different sub-disciplines, limiting the impact and relevance of marketing. Again, there have been some efforts to break up these silos and call for more multidisciplinary research; however, this may need to be a bit louder to be heard.” Similarly, LLP struggles “with reconciling to a field increasingly “siloed,” but at the same time, hopes that “bridging discourses and resource interdependencies can create positive resource exchanges across heterogeneous participants in a community (Chalmers Thomas et al., 2013).” Lastly, for SN, “an enduring and fruitful sense of community for marketing scholars could be found from marketing phenomena instead of the always contested theoretical perspectives.” On the other hand, for RV, loss of community is—implicitly—a transient phenomenon. In particular, RV points out that “fragmentation is a normal phenomenon in the evolutionary trajectory of numerous academic disciplines, and conjectures that” upheavals (e.g., loss of community) “if any, may be transient.”

Reforming marketing doctoral programs

Issues related to marketing doctoral programs has been a recurring theme in TMC. Therefore, it is unsurprising that reforming marketing doctoral programs assumes significant importance in the commentaries. In particular, for CKA, GG, and HA, marketing doctoral program reforms are central to resolving the challenges facing/ailments of the marketing discipline. Conceptualizing the field of marketing as an emergent discipline, CKA note that: “A very promising place to encourage and then to capture the unguided forces of emergence lies in a thoughtful broadening of our doctoral programs. ... Doctoral programs are the wellsprings for the future of any discipline. Changes made at these sources determine subsequent development.” GG, drawing inspiration from engineering schools, note that doctoral programs might need to re-balance and be closely connected to organizations and society, and “doctoral students should, in part, be recruited to solve real-life and practice-oriented problems.” Lastly, for HA, “doctoral programs should indeed prioritize well-designed courses on theory construction,” and “Courses in theory construction should dig into the ontological and epistemological foundations of theory to enable doctoral students to create substantial contributions.”

Points of divergence

Often, well-reasoned and deeply reflective commentaries result in points of divergence that ultimately benefit the issues at hand and therefore, the marketing discipline. Accordingly, the six commentaries on HMH and TMC articulate collective divergences on the following that we believe can benefit the marketing discipline’s evolutionary development in Era V (2020-?): (i) HMH’s suggestions regarding a mainstream central focus for the marketing discipline, (ii) reliance on borrowed concepts, frameworks, and theories, (iii) theory development issues, and (iv) alternate perspectives on fragmentation. However, despite being positioned as points of divergence, many are not divergent from the perspective of HMH. Lastly, LLP’s alternate perspective on the history of the marketing discipline and HA’s notion that HMH’s recommendations are too generic to implement bookend the aforementioned points of divergence.

Mainstream central focus for the marketing discipline

Both CKA and HA disagree with HMH’s suggestions regarding a central focus for the marketing discipline. CKA argue that (i) HMH suggest candidates for holistic acceptance and adoption, and (ii) it is unlikely that scholars would agree with HMH’s (or anyone’s) suggestions for a central focus for marketing and that it will have implementation issues owing to choice-enforcement challenges, treatment of dissenting research efforts, and myriad factors that could impact the marketing discipline’s future development. CKA then go on to propose a four-fold approach to preparing a generation of marketing doctoral students to engage the complex emergent marketing system: seeking consensus; increasing number of literature-based, marketing-specific seminars; increasing requirements for literature-based, management-specific seminars; and increasing electives from other disciplines. We do not see this as a point of divergence for two reasons: (1) HMH only propose three viable candidates from TMC, invite and provide suggestions for evaluation, and certainly do not recommend holistic acceptance and adoption, and (2) the implementation of the four-fold approach to marketing doctoral programs is likely to have the same implementation hurdles that CKA articulate for the holistic acceptance and adoption of a central focus. Similarly, out of the three viable candidates that HMH propose for the marketing discipline’s mainstream, central focus, HA reject R-A theory, are silent on Parvatiyar and Sheth (2021) “general framework of integrative marketing,” and “support the proposition that S-D logic can provide one path forward.” However, again, it is impossible to accept this as a point

of divergence when none of the three candidates are evaluated against meaningful criteria.

Reliance on borrowed concepts, frameworks, and theories

Three out of the six commentaries—GG, SN, and LLP—argue for reliance on borrowed concepts, frameworks, and theories as a point of divergence from HMH. In particular, (1) GG “believe that reliance on borrowed theories is not a major problem for the marketing discipline”; (2) SN argues that “our tendency to borrow concepts, theories, and frameworks from other fields might, in fact, be a major silver lining,” for orchestrating “cross-disciplinary research teams ... to tackle the truly meaningful research questions”; and (3) for LLP, “Rather than discouraging theory borrowing, perhaps we should encourage promiscuous theory shopping” for indigenous theory development. Once again, we do not see this as a point of divergence. Indeed, HMH have an issue with (over) reliance on borrowed concepts, frameworks, and theories *at the expense* of organic/indigenous concepts, frameworks, and theories, but not with borrowing from other fields. In fact, HMH—in Table 2 and the roadmap for Era V (2020-?)—note that research should: (1) Customize and add value to the borrowed concepts, frameworks, and theories for unambiguous explanation and prediction of marketing phenomena; and (2) Engage the different marketing stakeholders and/or theory and concept evaluation tools (e.g., metaphor) to critically evaluate borrowed concepts, frameworks, and theories to derive specific insights for the marketing discipline.

Theory development issues

A closely related issue to the borrowing concepts, frameworks, and theories, is theory development. The commentaries articulate four distinct issues with reference to theory development as (potential) points of divergence. First, for HA, (i) a lack of respect for discovery-oriented research negatively impacts indigenous theory development, and (ii) marketing isolating itself from the study of markets and marketing is another reason for the lack of indigenous theories. As HMH are in strong support of discovery-oriented research (e.g., theories-in-use approach) and propose service-dominant logic—which is “toward a general theory of markets” (Akaka et al., 2021)—as a potential candidate for marketing discipline’s mainstream, central focus, we do not see this as a point of divergence. Second, for SN, for an enduring and fruitful sense of community, marketing scholars should focus on marketing phenomena instead of the always contested theoretical perspectives. Again, as theory is inseparable from the explanation and prediction of marketing phenomena, we do not believe that it is possible to focus on one over the other and,

therefore, this is not a point of divergence. Third, HA agree with HMH’s reference to Yadav (2020, p. 60, 61) that noted that doctoral programs lack an “immersion in the substantive richness in our field” and that “doctoral programs should prioritize the addition of a well-designed course on theory construction,” but note that they will “probably disagree with what” HMH would incorporate in the “substantive richness.” It is not possible for us to conceive this as a point of divergence. Fourth, RV, after evaluating R-A theory as a general theory of marketing against the fundamental explananda of marketing, conclude that “the quest for developing a general theory of marketing is likely to endure. However, empirical research focusing on diverse marketing problems is likely to evidence a pluralism of middle-range theories—theories developed in basic disciplines and adaptations and extensions, and conceivably, indigenous theories.” Again, we welcome the quest for a general theory of marketing and middle-range marketing theories that explain and predict important marketing phenomena and do not see this as a (potential) point of divergence.

Alternate perspectives on fragmentation

LLP and RV both propose benefits that fragmentation can bring forth. LLP, despite struggling “with reconciling to a field increasingly ‘siloeed’,” drawing from Dogan and Pahre (2019), notes that fragmentation is necessary for innovation and growth in the marketing discipline. Taking a slightly different perspective, RV argues: “fragmentation is an inevitable consequence of specialization and a normal phenomenon in the evolutionary trajectory of academic disciplines. Upheavals due to fragmentation, if any, are likely to be transient.” While HMH only focused on the perils of fragmentation, we do not think that transient upheavals are inconsistent with their arguments and they would welcome positive outcomes of fragmentation that can contribute to the renewal capability of the marketing discipline. However, for HMH, fragmentation’s positive benefits arguably accrue only through a central, mainstream focus for the marketing discipline. That is, innovative outcomes of fragmentation should be relevant to marketing in order to be meaningful and effective for the marketing discipline.

Alternate perspective on the history of the marketing discipline and the issue of generic recommendations

LLP introduce a fascinating, alternative take on narrating the history of marketing discipline using the “time as folds” metaphor. For LLP, “Drawing on this metaphor we can think of any moment in the history of marketing as a sheet of paper made up of all time divided into many folds that retains a certain coherence but that moves and bends responsive to its surroundings. Concurrently, this helps us to conceptualize how differences

and coherence co-exist, and how long absences are revealed.” However, space restrictions stop LLP from unpacking the complex and far-reaching concept of *fold*. Accordingly, it is difficult for us to see an unpacked concept as a point of divergence yet. We hope to see this explored further in TMC. Finally, viewing HMH’s roadmap for the marketing discipline’s renewal in Era V (2020-?) as a set of generic recommendations that are impossible to disagree with, HA recommend “that a cocreational approach, where top scholars, schools, and institutions (e.g., MSI, AMA, AMS) encourage different streams to critique and integrate concepts, methods, and theories, is more likely to produce marketing solutions to wicked social problems, such as climate change and global inequality.” Just like HA, we do not think that we can disagree with this recommendation. However, we do wholeheartedly agree with HA that reasoned debate should be at the heart of all scholarship.

Conclusion(s)/recommendation(s)

Cumulatively, the six commentaries provide conclusions/recommendations that can further stimulate and continue TMC and can be organized around: (i) doctoral program reforms, (ii) theoretical frameworks, indigenous and borrowed theory development, and academic reforms, (iii) renewed focus on macromarketing, and (iv) multiple stakeholder perspective. While many of the conclusions/recommendations are consistent with the roadmap laid out by HMH, the commentaries forward several opportunities for *renewing* and building the *renewal capability* of the marketing discipline. Before elaborating further, it is important to clarify the meaning of renewal. In HMH, we did not mean to convey a “renewal” of a past form, as interpreted by LLP. Rather, drawing from Gardner (1964), we meant the process of bringing the results of *continuous innovation* and *change* into line with marketing’s purposes for the future.

Indeed, the commentaries provide specific guidance for marketing’s disciplinary renewal: (1) For CKA, the reforming of marketing doctoral programs will result in doctoral students producing and connecting phenomena, concepts, themes, and theories in *new* and *imaginative* ways for a *new* robust central focus to emerge; (2) GG argue that, for entities that are similar across disciplines, adoption and adaptation of existing theories from other disciplines is way to *renew* and *revitalize* the field of marketing; (3) For HA, discovery-oriented research can develop *new*, indigenous theory and doctoral courses can be used to inspire doctoral students to cocreate *new* knowledge; (4) SN notes the importance of invaluable and *ground-breaking* work done by numerous marketing scholars in the context of marketing’s impact on society; (5) For LLP, disciplinary fragmentation can have positive benefits through prompting *innovation* and informing *new* ways of thinking, and in turn, marketing as a boundary-spanning discipline is ideally positioned to assemble a

new world; and (6) For RV, fragmentation and specialization are followed by the convergence of certain specialties into *new* hybrid domains that can lead to shared, *new* concepts, theories, and methods. Overall, HMH, TMC (please see Table 2 in HMH), and the commentaries in this issue shed light on how the marketing discipline can continue to *renew* itself. Next, we turn to *renewal capability*.

Toward building a renewal capability for the marketing discipline

HMH, following Gardner’s (1964) lead, the works of Day and Moorman (2010), Moorman and Day (2016), and Hunt and Madhavaram (2020), argue that (i) just like individuals, organizations, and institutions, marketing discipline can have renewal capabilities, and (ii) marketing discipline’s renewal capability springs from its human resources (e.g., its scholars and stakeholders) and institutional resources (e.g., its journals and professional associations). Indeed, Stephen L. Vargo’s – Editor-in-Chief, *AMS Review* – invitations to eminent scholars for commentaries on HMH and TMC, and the scholars’ commentaries assessing the contributions of HMH and TMC provide preliminary evidence of the role that scholars and journals can play in marketing discipline’s renewal capability. However, what does a renewal capability entail and how does one go about building one for an academic discipline?

Following Hunt and Madhavaram (2020), this research adopts the label “renewal capability” and draws from Gardner’s (1964, p. 76) notion that “perhaps what every corporation ... needs is a department of continuous renewal that would view the organization as a system in need of continuing innovation.” Our notion of *renewal capability* also has as its parallels the notions of *relentless innovation* (Phillips, 2012) and *unrelenting innovation* (Tellis, 2013). Both Phillips (2012) and Tellis (2013) indicate that culture is the primary driver of innovation and, between them, propose the following for organizations (also applicable for academic disciplines) to relentlessly/unrelentingly innovate: incentives for enterprise, internal competition for developing innovations (e.g., grants, competitions, special issues), empowering innovation champions (e.g., journal editors) with a mandate to explore and develop innovations, strategic vision and communication (through journals, professional association, and conferences), adequate resourcing (for doctoral students, scholars, and professional associations), capability mindset for innovation, and hewing closely to core capabilities for innovation. Overall, a renewal capability entails focusing on monitoring and responding well to the changes in (i) the requirements of multiple stakeholders and (ii) internal resources/capabilities. Therefore, we define a renewal capability for an entity (e.g., individual, organization, society, or academic discipline) as *the ability to constantly bring about proactive and reactive innovations that create resources/capabilities/knowledge that respond*

well to the (internal and/or external) environment and potentially shape it. Next, drawing from Madhavaram et al. (2023), capability building involves policies, activities, and decisions for putting together existing resources in configurations to form new capabilities. Following HMH and the commentaries, *renewal capability building* (for the marketing discipline) entails policies, activities, and decisions for bringing together human (e.g., its scholars and stakeholders) and institutional resources (e.g., its journals and professional associations) to produce proactive and reactive innovations (for the marketing discipline). As HMH note, the renewal of the marketing discipline “will be scholar-by-scholar, reviewer-by-reviewer, editor-by-editor, journal-by-journal, doctoral program-by-doctoral program, and professional association-by-professional association.”

Conclusion

We again thank (i) Professor Stephen L. Vargo for inviting the commentaries and giving us the opportunity to respond to them and (ii) Professors Eric Arnould, Carol Azab, Terry Clark, Tohid Ghanbarpour, Anders Gustafsson, Anu Helkkula, Thomas Martin Key, Suvi Nenonen, Linda L. Price, and Rajan Varadarajan for taking the time to read, assess, and comment on our paper. It is heartening to note that the six commentaries deeply reflected on HMH and TMC; assessed, among other things, the value of borrowed theories, doctoral programs, fragmentation, indigenous theory development, mainstream central focus, middle-range theories, and stakeholder relevance/engagement; and provided further foundations for continuing TMC toward renewing the marketing discipline. We are deeply honored to have co-authored Dr. Hunt’s last journal article, and would like to acknowledge that Dr. Hunt was fully involved in the development and revision of HMH for meeting the conditions laid out for acceptance by the review process at *AMS Review*. However, any errors in this response to the six commentaries are completely our own. Lastly, keeping aside speculation on whether Dr. Hunt would agree with any or all of the issues raised by the commentaries, we can confidently say that he would have been delighted with the thoughtful and well-reasoned commentaries and the resulting foundations for continuing the TMC toward building a robust *renewal capability* for the marketing discipline.

Acknowledgements The authors thank Stephen L. Vargo for inviting commentaries on their article and for the opportunity to provide a response.

References

- Akaka, M. A., Koskela-Huotari, K., & Vargo, S. L. (2021). Formalizing service-dominant logic as a general theory of markets: Taking stock and moving forward. *AMS Review*, 11(3–4), 375–389.
- Chalmers Thomas, T., Price, L. L., & Jensen Schau, H. (2013). When differences unite: Resource dependence in heterogeneous consumption communities. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39(5), 1010–1033.
- Clark, T., Key, T. M., & Azab, C. (2022). Marketing as an emergent discipline: Commentary on Shelby Hunt’s final contribution to our field. *AMS Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-022-00239-x>
- Day, G. S., & Moorman, C. (2010). *Strategy from the outside in*. McGraw Hill.
- Dogan, M., & Pahre, R. (2019). *Creative marginality: Innovation at the intersections of social sciences*. Routledge.
- Gardner, J. W. (1964). *Self-renewal: The individual and the innovative society*. Harper & Row.
- Goldstein, J. (1999). Emergence as a construct: History and issues. *Emergence*, 1(1), 49–72.
- Gustafsson, A., & Ghanbarpour, T. (2022). Challenging the troubled status of the marketing discipline. *AMS Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-022-00242-2>
- Helkkula, A., & Arnould, E. (2022). Developing and renewing marketing as a scientific discipline through reflexive cocreation. *AMS Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-022-00244-0>
- Hunt, S. D. (2013). A general theory of business marketing: R-A theory, Alderson, the ISBM framework, and the IMP theoretical structure. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 42(3), 283–293.
- Hunt, S. D., & Madhavaram, S. (2020). Adaptive marketing capabilities, dynamic capabilities, and renewal competences: The “outside vs. inside” and “static vs. dynamic” controversies in strategy. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 89, 129–139.
- Hunt, S. D., Madhavaram, S., & Hatfield, H. N. (2022). The marketing discipline’s troubled trajectory: The manifesto conversation, candidates for central focus, and prognosis for renewal. *AMS Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-022-00238-y>
- Madhavaram, S., Manis, K. T., Rashidi-Sabet, S., & Taylor, D. (2023). Capability bundling for supply chain management effectiveness: An integrative framework and research agenda. *Journal of Business Logistics*.
- Moorman, C., & Day, G. S. (2016). Organizing for marketing excellence. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), 6–35.
- Nenonen, S. (2022). Resurrecting marketing: Focus on the phenomena! *AMS Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-022-00245-z>
- Parvatiyar, A., & Sheth, J. N. (2021). Toward an integrative theory of marketing. *AMS Review*, 11(3–4), 432–445.
- Phillips, J. (2012). *Relentless innovation: What works, what doesn’t—and what that means for your business*. McGraw Hill.
- Price, L. L. (2022). Folds in historical time and possible worlds for the marketing discipline: A commentary. *AMS Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-022-00243-1>
- Tellis, G. J. (2013). *Unrelenting innovation: How to build a culture for market dominance*. Jossey-Bass, An Imprint of Wiley.
- Varadarajan, R. (2022). A general theory of marketing: Conceivable, elusive, or illusive. *AMS Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-022-00246-y>
- Yadav, M. S. (2020). *Reimagining Marketing Doctoral Programs*. *AMS Review*, 10(1–2), 56–64.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Springer Nature or its licensor (e.g. a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.