



Service-dominant logic: a necessary step

Robert F. Lusch

Department of Marketing, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, USA, and

Stephen L. Vargo

*Shidler College of Business, University of Hawaii at Manoa,
Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*

1298

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to respond to the criticism O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy made of service-dominant logic in *EJM*, on behalf of both the paper and the worldwide community of scholars that have embraced S-D logic as historically informed, integrative, transcending and rich in its potential to generate theoretical and practical contributions.

Design/methodology/approach – The paper is a critical, conceptual analysis of the fallacious arguments that O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy developed to argue against the emerging and rapidly developing service-dominant logic.

Findings – The paper shows that, contrary to the claims of O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy, S-D logic: is neither regressive nor intended to displace all other marketing perspectives; is not advocating technology at the expense of explanatory theory; and is pre-theoretic and intended to be soundly grounded in a manner to assist theory construction.

Research limitations/implications – Theory advancement is critical to marketing and S-D logic puts special emphasis on the development of theory. It begins to do this by proposing ten foundational premises, which some may wish to refer to as axioms. From these axioms, considerable theoretical work and related empirical research can develop.

Practical implications – O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy wish to prevent marketing scholars from adopting, advocating, and supporting service-dominant logic and, as they suggest, taking a backward step. They view the S-D logic movement as primarily USA-dominated (which it is not) and are firmly anti-S-D logic. The available evidence from around the world suggests that the S-D logic movement has profound implications for the advancement of both marketing science and marketing practice.

Originality/value – It is critical that S-D logic should not be viewed as being represented by a single paper but as a body of work that Lusch and Vargo have developed since their initial publication and also the work of a community of scholars working collaboratively to co-create S-D logic.

Keywords Service-dominant logic, Resources, Co-creation, Value, United States of America

Paper type Viewpoint

The traditional economists’ view still forms the core perspective in marketing (John O’Shaughnessy, 1997).

Vargo and Lusch (2004a) “deserves a careful read and thoughtful evaluation, not a quick skim and hasty judgment” (Shelby D. Hunt, 2004).

In a recent article, “The service-dominant perspective: a backward step?” O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009, p. 784) position Vargo and Lusch (2004a) as “radicals” and “evangelists” who, along with other scholars, urge for the adoption of



a “new perspective to replace the perspective suggested by the 4 Ps framework”. They also characterize our work as “regressive” (p. 785). We appreciate the acknowledgement by O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009) of the potential impact of our work and have no particular problem with their characterization of it (and, by implication, us) as either radical or evangelistic, though we suspect the terms were intended pejoratively. We do, however, take exception with the suggestion that service-dominant (S-D) logic is regressive – whatever the notion of radically regressive means – and have issues with the logic and evidence for both their general position and several of the specific arguments offered in support of their position.

O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009), as suggested in the title of their article, argue that S-D logic is a backward step for the marketing discipline. More specifically, they suggest that S-D logic:

[...] is neither logically sound nor a perspective to displace others in marketing (p. 784),

reflects an “[...] indifference to theoretical considerations” (p. 784),

has had a “considerable impact among marketing scholars, particularly in the USA” (p. 785),

and its promotion “as the single best perspective for marketing is regressive” (p. 785),

represents a “wrong-headed advocacy of technology at the expense of explanatory theory” (p. 791).

In this confutation, we demonstrate that S-D logic:

- is neither regressive nor intended to displace all other marketing perspectives;
- is not advocating technology at the expense of explanatory theory; and
- is pre-theoretic and intended to be soundly grounded in a manner to assist theory construction.

Before we address these specific issues, however, it is appropriate to review the more-general and foundational, and arguably fatal, errors we find in O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy’s (2009) article.

Fundamental and fatal errors

O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009) make several fundamental errors in their assessment. Individually these errors misrepresent S-D logic and highlight O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy’s (2009) misunderstanding of it; cumulatively, they undermine the credibility of their entire critique. The primary errors are:

- viewing S-D logic as represented by a single article, rather than a body of work, not only by Lusch and Vargo but a growing community of scholars around the world;
- viewing the S-D logic impact as primarily the USA, rather than globally, based; and
- viewing S-D logic as based in and on what has been referred to as the growth in the services economy, primarily in western economies.

S-D logic is a research stream and a community effort

Curiously, O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009) suggest S-D logic represents an academic backward step but fail to review, much less incorporate the large literature

on S-D logic, much of which deals with specific points raised in their critique. Rather, they develop their entire assessment of S-D logic on our 2004 *Journal of Marketing* article (Vargo and Lusch, 2004a): “Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing” – though in many cases, they misrepresent even that one article. A more extended, though still non-comprehensive, representation of the S-D logic literature available at the time of acceptance of the O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009) manuscript is provided in the appendix and a number of these articles are discussed in the following sections. We submit that a critique based on a clearly incomplete, if not careless review of the relevant S-D logic literature is unfortunate and misleading, at best; worse, it could be considered inconsistent with the generally accepted norms of good scholarship. Perhaps it was for these reasons that David Ballantyne (University of Otago) started the chain of events that led to this commentary by immediately alerting us to the article and pointing out its fatal flaws to the current editor of *EJM* (who it must be noted was not the editor at the time of accepting the original O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009) manuscript). For us, it is this complete disregard for the extensive follow-on work, not just by us but also by a large community of participating scholars, which motivates this reply, more than the critical nature of the analysis itself.

It is perhaps instructive to mention that the initial “Evolving . . .” article (Vargo and Lusch, 2004a) referred to “a new dominant logic for marketing” rather than a “service-dominant logic”[1]. The use of the term service-dominant logic (or S-D logic) came afterward, as we discussed[2] among ourselves the long-term problems associated with the term “new dominant logic”, as our work was being referred to by others.

The initial public unveiling of the “service-dominant logic” labeling (other than the casual mention in Vargo and Lusch, 2004a) of the “new” logic was at the Otago Forum (2005) on Service-Dominant Logic, in New Zealand (note, not in North America). Not long thereafter, the publishing of a collection of original essays by 51 marketing scholars in 2006, *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions* (Lusch and Vargo, 2006a), resulted in the S-D logic label becoming more predominant. The fact that O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009) mention S-D logic, both in their title and throughout their critique, demonstrates that they were aware of additional articles by us (and others), which further elaborated, developed, and refined S-D logic. This of course begs the question: why did they decide to ignore these other contributions, especially since, as noted, they address many of the points of criticism offered by O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009). Regardless of the reason, this apparently intentional omission calls into question both the validity of their critique and their intent.

The non-USA support for service-dominant logic

O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009) claim that the support for S-D logic is particularly strong in the USA, though they do not cite any evidence for this assertion, perhaps because the evidence does not support it. While we do not have access to the data that were current at the time of the acceptance of O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy’s (2009) paper, there is no reason to think they are different in pattern from current data. According to the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) at the time we are writing this, of the 420 journal articles citing Vargo and Lusch (2004a), approximately half (59.0 percent) had non-US affiliations. Furthermore, of the journals with the most citations, two were European based (*Industrial Marketing Management*

and *European Journal of Marketing*, with 38 and 21 citations, respectively), whereas three were US based (*Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *Journal of Marketing* and *Journal Service Research*, with 28, 22 and 21 citations, respectively). Overall, the citations were in 108 journals and had lead authors associated with 41 countries – hardly, predominantly US based. Ironically, if anything, we have been somewhat disappointed that the support in the USA has not been more prevalent.

The strongest support we have witnessed has been from New Zealand, Australia, and Northern and Western Europe, where, in the last several years we have jointly and separately been invited to make well over a dozen keynote presentations at conferences (as well as numerous other academic and industry presentations). Interestingly, given O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy's (2009) claim of S-D logic's impact among marketing scholars, "particularly in the USA" (p. 785), it is noteworthy that Kotler (e.g. Achrol and Kotler, 2006), whose name is synonymous with the US grounded marketing-management philosophy, has arguably been one of S-D logic's biggest critics.

The growing services economy vs all economies are service economy

In their opening paragraph, O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy (2009) make a glaring and indefensible error about S-D logic when they state, "Since services are estimated to be over 60 percent of the gross national product in the western democracies, the inference is that service marketing is paramount and should be recognized as such" (p.784). We have never claimed this; in fact, it is:

- a claim that we have argued is based on the goods-dominant (G-D) logic to which S-D logic runs counter; and
- contrary to one of the foundational tenets on which S-D logic rests.

Not only have we never claimed that S-D logic is justified because many parts of the world are transitioning from an agricultural and industrial era to a services era, we have stipulated on numerous occasions (e.g. Vargo and Lusch, 2006) that such a claim is invalid. This point was made quite clear in our initial contribution (Vargo and Lusch, 2004a), in which foundational premise six (FP6) stated "all economies are services economies". It is difficult to imagine that we could be more transparent about S-D logic not being based on the traditional dichotomy of economies into various economic eras. As we have stated repeatedly in our writings, the S-D logic position is that the economic eras are a function of a G-D logic grounded classification schema, based on units of output (production of operand resource), rather than on service provision (application of operand resources), which we see as more fundamental. That is, traditional economic classifications have focused on the output that firms produced, either tangible or intangible, rather than the competences and resources they use to develop service offerings. This often results in arbitrary, if not meaningless, classifications. For instance if a tailor makes a custom suit he is classified as providing tailoring services but if a person works in a cut-and-sew, suit-making factory, then he or she is considered a manufacturing employee. If an employee works in a company owned cafeteria in a manufacturing firm then employment in manufacturing rises but if he or she works for a food-service company to which the manufacturer outsources, then service employment appears to rise.

Perhaps O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy (2009) partially reject (actually, fail to even acknowledge) our rationale that economic activity is fundamentally concerned

with service provision because they disagree with our definition of service[3]: “the application of specialized competences (knowledge and skills) through deeds, processes, and performances for the benefit of another entity or the entity itself” (Vargo and Lusch, 2004a, p. 2). “Service” is not a term we invented and the definition we use is actually quite consistent with normal English usage. In everyday use, service is usually viewed as assisting or helping or aiding someone and this can be done through activities, tasks, processes and performances. This can be done directly through another actor (“I received excellent service from my physician”) or indirectly, through a good (i.e. “I received excellent service through my lawn mower”).

It is, however, different from how economists and marketers have defined the term “services” as:

- intangible products;
- the absence of primary or extractive industry (fishing, timber, mining, agriculture) or secondary or manufacturing (of tangible products); or
- residually, as what goods are not.

We dealt extensively with these definitional issues in Vargo and Lusch, 2004b).

The notion that service is foundational to economic exchange is also not novel to S-D logic. Bastiat (1860) recognized the foundation of economics as service-for-service exchange; Kitson (1922) recognized that durable goods are service-provisioning appliances; Penrose (1959) referred to the service that capital provides; and Mauss (1950) referred to the total exchange of service among early civilizations. Even in biology, the concept of mutualism (Bronstein, 1994) recognizes service-for-service exchange, as well as several other types of resource exchanges. More recently Gummesson (1995) reasoned that “Customers do not buy goods or services: [T]hey buy offerings which render services which create value”. Håkanson and Prenekert (2004) argue that “business exchange is seen as stemming from the realization of potential services in resources”. Even Kotler (1977, p. 8) notes that the “importance of physical products lies not so much in owning them as in obtaining the services they render”. We deal additionally and extensively with the appropriateness of the term “service” in S-D logic and as the basis for understanding economic exchange in “Why service?” (Vargo and Lusch, 2008b), which was available online when O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009) submitted their last revision.

O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009) further argue that our definition of service focuses on activities performed and not functions performed, as they prefer: “Even when referring to service industries, like transportation, we think in terms of function performed” (O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009). Their preference is based on their suggestion that “function is what distinguishes markets, not activities” (p. 785). In the face of their contention that we ignore function (and elsewhere), we cannot help but recall the advice of Shelby D. Hunt (2004, p. 22) regarding our “Evolving . . .” article, when he advised potential readers: “it deserves a careful read and thoughtful evaluation, not a quick skim and hasty judgment”.

Importantly, there are two parts to our definition of service: the first is that service comprises activities, deeds, processes and performances: the second is that it specifies that these activities provide the benefits, or functions performed, for the beneficiary. Thus, our definition includes both the means (activities) and the (ends) functions. In fact, as specifically noted in our initial article, it is consistent with the view of Gutman

(1982, p. 60) that products are “means” for reaching “end-states”, or “valued states of being, such as happiness, security, and accomplishment”. Consequently, it should be clear that we are not ignoring function; in fact, when combined with FP7, “the enterprise can only make value propositions” (Vargo and Lusch, 2004a), it should be clear that we were not advocating that the activities (or deeds, processes, or performances) *per se* create value; value creation occurs only if the intended beneficiary determines that there is benefit and thus experiences value, as captured in FP10: Value is always uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary (Vargo and Lusch, 2008a).

Again, these and related definitional issues were elaborated extensively in “The four service marketing myths” (Vargo and Lusch, 2004b) and in “Why service” (Vargo and Lusch, 2008b), both available at the time O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy’s (2009) final revision was submitted. In both articles, we note that the common denominator of many “traditional” definitions is that they are “activity” based and that what is lacking are the specifications of what these activities do: provide benefit – the function of service provision.

S-D logic is neither regressive nor singular in perspective

O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009) suggest that S-D logic and its promotion “as the single best perspective for marketing is regressive” (p. 785). They further argue that “advocating a single perspective is like assuming a ‘one best way’” (p. 791). It is very difficult for us to understand how our work can be seen as either regressive or singular. In fact, at least in the present case, these characterizations seem to run almost counter to each other. That is, if our “service perspective” has taken “center stage” as a “new perspective for marketing” (O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009, p. 784), how can it also be regressive?

S-D logic is intended to do two primary things:

- (1) To provide a transcending organizing framework for understanding economic phenomena.
- (2) To be inclusive.

To this end, the only thing that we are aware that we have rejected is the singularity of the traditional G-D logic framework that was inherited by marketing but, even in doing, we have tried to make it clear that we are neither rejecting the central, often critical, role of the “good” nor the potential usefulness of economic theory. Rather, we are suggesting that both goods and their usefulness make more sense and have more applicability in the context of the more inclusive logic of service provision and value co-creation than in the restricted logic of an output orientation, be it tangible or intangible.

One of the major sections of our 2006 book was on “Alternative logics” in which 14 authors wrote eight essays presenting multiple perspectives. The strongest criticism of S-D logic came from Achrol and Kotler (2006). Since the latter name is virtually synonymous with traditional marketing (the marketing-management model), this criticism provides fairly strong evidence that S-D logic challenges, rather than regresses toward, traditional marketing thought. Curiously, this challenge seems to be consistent with O’Shaughnessy (1997) who over 20 years ago was critical of mainstream thought when he lamented “The traditional economists’ view still forms the core perspective in marketing” (p. 8).

In discussing S-D logic, we actually intentionally make an effort to embrace different views in other ways. In our writings and presentations we have argued from the beginning that we do not own S-D logic; we view it as open-source, and ultimately it will need the active support of a community of scholars co-creating, refining and advancing it, if it is to move forward. As part of S-D logic's continuing development and evolution, we have modified various FPs and also added one FP in Vargo and Lusch (2006) and another FP in Vargo and Lusch (2008a), based on input from others. One of the FPs (FP10) is that "value is always uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary". This suggests that value is idiosyncratic, experiential, contextual and meaning laden. Certainly this embraces a multiple-perspective view.

If O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy (2009) are criticizing us for attempting to develop a perspective or logic that is transcending, than we accept and also welcome that criticism; that is precisely what we are attempting to do. More importantly, if O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy (2009) truly embrace multiple perspectives, they should not only be tolerant of our effort; they should applaud it, since this is the process through which competing perspectives arise. In "Why service?" (Vargo and Lusch, 2008b), we state quite clearly that S-D logic addresses the fundamental subject matter of markets and marketing. Furthermore, we believe that many fragmented logics or plural views developed because the goods-dominant mindset, based on a neoclassical economics paradigm and a manufacturing logic was inadequate to the tasks at hand for either academia or practitioners. We believe that a logic, S-D or otherwise, can and should be developed that transcends these "midrange" logics and looks at how they converge and can be extended jointly. We contend that S-D logic can serve as an organizing conceptualization for extending, elaborating and synthesizing these logics. In "Why service" (Vargo and Lusch, 2008b) we suggested:

Service, or more precisely the service-for-service foundation of S-D logic, provides a common lens for viewing and perhaps linking a host of theories and logics. Importantly, we do not claim that S-D logic is a theory itself but, rather, as indicated, a logic, perhaps one that can unite other logics and form the foundation and lexicon for a unified theory.

Perhaps we are wrong but the fact that O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy (2009) disagree does not make our view either singular or regressive.

S-D logic and theory development

Perhaps no other argument in the O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy (2009) critique suggests academic insufficiency more than the criticism that we focus too much on technology, rather than theory. How can any reasonable, scholarly preparation miss our (separate and together) calls for theory? For example, in Lusch and Vargo (2006a, p. 245) we acknowledge and agree with Venkatesh *et al.*'s (2006) call for a theory of markets. More specifically, Vargo (2007a) pointed out the need for a "theory of the market" before an adequate theory of marketing could be realized and then suggested (Vargo, 2007b) that, since S-D logic is not a theory (though it is pre-theoretic), we should guard against premature normative application. These views were echoed in Vargo and Lusch (2008b). They have also been echoed and elaborated in countless presentations and, while O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy (2009) were likely not present, even a casual scholarly stroll through the presentations posted on the S-D logic web site (sdlogic.net) would have made our view of the centrality of this need for market (and marketing) theory evident. While we have received both praise and

criticism for S-D logic in the past, we have never before been criticized for "... indifference to theoretical considerations" (O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy (2009, p. 784). Ironically, on the other hand, we have been criticized (e.g. Brookes, 2007) for our call for a "grand theory," a theory of the market (Vargo, 2007a; Vargo and Lusch, 2008b).

The criticism of being theoretically indifferent also surprises us for a variety of other reasons. First the entire "Evolving..." article is built around eight foundational premises. Premises are also called axioms on which theory is built. This does not suggest that we feel that other methods of theory construction are not reasonable or to be embraced. In fact, in the spirit of logic of discovery, we fully embrace multiple methods and perspectives since no single method or approach to understanding is solely appropriate for theory construction. In addition, although premises or axioms are assumed to be "true", that does not mean that they cannot (should not) be subjected to verification. Our purpose was to provide a pre-theoretic foundation for a revised and transcending logic about exchange in society. It represented a logic that we saw emerging in marketing scholarly thought, practice, and education. However, the overriding purpose was to be fairly abstract and to begin to construct a lexicon to function as the foundation for theory building and eventually empirical testing.

Once again, we don't recall ever having been criticized for being anti-theoretical and find that claim by O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy (2009) surprising. In fact, the criticism seems somewhat at odds with their statement "the notion of knowledge, as the application of specialized competences, is too abstract or remote from the operational stage to offer much guidance" (pp. 785-6). It does not surprise us that they might argue that we are too abstract in "Evolving..." We were trying to transcend separate sub-disciplines of marketing that had developed over the last half century and much of economic thought, with an overarching framework which can hardly be described as indifferent to theoretical considerations.

There is also a certain irony to the criticism that we are anti-theoretical given that, shortly after "Evolving..." was published, it was selected as the recipient of the AMA Maynard Award for Theoretical Contributions to Marketing. Also shortly after the publication of "Evolving..." we published "Service-Dominant Logic as a Foundation for a General Theory" (Lusch and Vargo, 2006b) which should at least telegraph our intention about the theoretical role of S-D logic.

Furthermore, around the time of the publication of "Evolving..." a new scientific discipline started to emerge that became referred to as service science (Spohrer *et al.*, 2007). Quite early, S-D logic began to be viewed as foundational to the theory building in service science (Spohrer *et al.*, 2007; Maglio and Spohrer, 2008; see also Lusch *et al.*, 2008). This was nothing that we controlled and thus it implies that others saw the theoretical potential, if not intent, of S-D logic.

S-D logic is not technologically based

Likewise, and related, perhaps no other argument in the O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy (2009) critique reveals the "strawman" nature of their discourse as their criticism of supposed emphasis on technology. In their introductory sentence to the section "Marketing as technology" O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy (2009) state that "Vargo and Lusch put most weight on 'knowing how': an emphasis reflected in their claim that a service-centered college curriculum should be based on a course in principles of marketing, since principles are established rules. This approach to

marketing is a technological one since technology is about knowing-how” (p. 786). They then begin a three-page diatribe on our supposed position based solely on a single, incidental word in a speculation that we made on the next to last page (p. 14) of “Evolving . . .”, which said, precisely: “A service-centered college curriculum would be grounded by a course in principles of marketing, which would subordinate goods to service provision, emphasizing the former as distribution mechanisms for the latter”. That’s it; not a single additional shred of evidence is offered for their contention that our approach “is a technological one”. In fact, we are only mentioned twice, rather tangentially, in O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy’s (2009) pursuing discussion of technology and principles.

Clearly, we were not advocating that either the college curriculum or marketing knowledge is (should be) merely about technology. Rather we used the term “principles” consistent with the way that standard introductory college course is described across many disciplines; such as “principles of psychology,” “principles of biology”, or “principles of religion”. It was neither intended to suggest that the introductory course is about technology nor to reflect anything about how we think marketing should be approached. In fact separately and together (Lusch, 2007; Vargo and Lusch, 2006, 2008a) we have advocated theory and views considerably beyond the firm-centric connotations of a technological approach, inclusive of society and various other stakeholders, as key elements of marketing thought.

O’Shaughnessy (1997) has advocated previously that the search for governing principles in marketing management that must be empirically based is stultifying to the discipline. Perhaps that is why, at least in part, when we used the term “principles”, although, only once and incidentally, that O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009) overreacted to the term.

Though never explicitly stated, it also occurs to us that some of the O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009) confusion about our position might have occurred because, in S-D logic, service is defined as applied operant resources (knowledge and skills) for the benefit of another or oneself (self service) and some definitions of technology view it as applied useful knowledge (e.g. Mokyr, 2002). We stand by our definition of service and have elaborated the reasons here and elsewhere (e.g. Vargo and Lusch, 2008b). However, just because we define service in terms of the process of using skills and knowledge for another’s benefit and the use of knowledge can be construed as a technology, this does not imply that we are somehow advocating a technological foundation for marketing. In fact, we have argued that marketing started as an applied discipline, without a foundational, basic-science; therefore, theoretical understanding is needed, if not crucial (e.g. Vargo, 2007a).

Ironically, we see the need for S-D logic driven by the fact that marketing is presently built on a normative foundation from economic science (Vargo and Lusch, 2006) and it is intended as a more robust theoretical perspective from which better basic theory (of the market) can be built. O’Shaughnessy and O’Shaughnessy (2009) are welcome to disagree with our view that S-D logic is the correct lens, but there simply is no basis for their claim that it or we are advocating a technological approach to marketing.

Concluding comments

Is service-dominant logic a backward step? All scientific disciplines have an evolutionary pathway, which can lead to extinction or irrelevance or can lead to growth

and relevance; sometimes the growth and relevance is a revival after a period of decline or dormancy. Formal marketing thought and subsequently marketing science began with a logic largely borrowed from neoclassical economics and this allowed the discipline to emerge and grow but soon problems emerged that could not be adequately solved. Therefore along marketing's evolutionary pathway many adjustments have been made to patch up the neoclassical-economics-grounded, and inspired, G-D logic of marketing. We do not believe that S-D logic takes us backward from G-D logic but rather forward, toward more robustness and relevance. Clearly O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy (2009) believe otherwise but it is neither for them nor us to decide. Only the discipline as a whole can decide and it will be up to the historians of marketing science far in the future to tell the complete story.

Notes

1. In the last sentence of the Vargo and Lusch (2004a) we use the term service-centered dominant logic; but this is the first time we come close to using the precise term S-D logic.
2. Stephen L. Vargo observed early that the use of the term "new" would not hold and had little meaning and thus initiated this change in labeling.
3. We initially used the term "services" but quickly moved in later writings to the singular service. We found services to be a goods-dominant concept where the focus was on units of output (although intangible) vs service where the focus is on the process of serving.

References

- Achrol, R.S. and Kotler, P. (2006), "The service-dominant logic for marketing: a critique", in Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (Eds), *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions*, M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, New York, NY, pp. 320-33.
- Bastiat, F. (1860), *Harmonies of Political Economy*, translated by Stirling, P.S., J. Murray, London.
- Bronstein, J.L. (1994), "Our current understanding of mutualism", *Quarterly Review of Biology*, Vol. 69 No. 1, pp. 31-51.
- Brookes, R. (2007), "The service-dominant logic of marketing: a logic and evidential case for multiple logics", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 89-96.
- Gummesson, E. (1995), "Relationship marketing: its role in the services economy", in Glynn, W.J. and Barnes, J.G. (Eds), *Understanding Services Management*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY, pp. 244-68.
- Gutman, J. (1982), "A means-end chain model based on consumer categorization processes", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 46, Spring, pp. 60-72.
- Håkanson, H. and Prenekert, F. (2004), "Exploring the exchange concept in marketing", in Håkanson, H., Harrison, D. and Waluszewski, A. (Eds), *Rethinking Marketing: Developing a New Understanding of Markets*, Wiley, Chichester.
- Hunt, S.D. (2004), "On the service-centered dominant logic for marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 68, pp. 21-2.
- Kitson, H.D. (1922), "The growth of the 'service idea' in selling", *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 30, June, pp. 417-19.
- Kotler, P. (1977), *Marketing Management: Analysis, Planning, Implementation, and Control*, 3rd ed., Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Lusch, R.F. (2007), "Marketing's evolving identity: defining our future", *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 261-8.

- Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (2006a), *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions*, M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, New York, NY.
- Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (2006b), "Service-dominant logic as a foundation for building a general theory", in Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (Eds), *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions*, M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, New York, NY, pp. 406-20.
- Lusch, R.F., Vargo, S.L. and Wessels, G. (2008), "Toward a conceptual foundation for service science: contributions from service-dominant logic", *IBM Systems Journal*, Vol. 47 No. 1, pp. 5-14.
- Maglio, P.P. and Spohrer, J. (2008), "Fundamentals of service science", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 18-20.
- Mauss, M. (1950), *The Gift*, Routledge, London, reprint.
- Mokyr, J. (2002), *The Gifts of Athena: Historical Origins of the Knowledge Economy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- O'Shaughnessy, J. (1997), "John Temerarious directions for marketing", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 31 Nos 9/10, pp. 677-705.
- O'Shaughnessy, J. and O'Shaughnessy, N. (2009), "The service-dominant perspective: a backward step?", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 43 Nos 5/6, pp. 784-93.
- Penrose, E.T. (1959), *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*, Basil Blackwell and Mott, London.
- Spohrer, J., Maglio, P.P., Bailey, J. and Gruhl, D. (2007), "Steps toward a science of service systems", *Computer*, Vol. 40, pp. 71-7.
- Vargo, S.L. (2007a), "On a theory of markets and marketing: from positively normative to normatively positive", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 53-60.
- Vargo, S.L. (2007b), "Paradigms, pluralisms, and peripheries: on the assessment of S-D logic", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 105-8.
- Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004a), "Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 68, January, pp. 1-17.
- Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004b), "The four services marketing myths: remnants from a manufacturing model", *Journal of Service Research*, May, pp. 324-35.
- Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2006), "Service-dominant logic: what it is, what it is not, what it might be", in Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (Eds), *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions*, M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, New York, NY, pp. 43-56.
- Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2008a), "Service-dominant logic: continuing the evolution", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 1-10.
- Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2008b), "Why service?", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 25-38.
- Venkatesh, A., Penaloza, L. and Fuat Firat, A. (2006), "The market as a sign system and the logic of the market", in Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (Eds), *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions*, M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, New York, NY, pp. 251-65.

Appendix

A partial list of S-D logic writings by Lusch and Vargo available at the time of final submission of O'Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy (2009) – (2004 to 2008) (some of the articles were not yet published in print form but were available online (e.g. SpringerLink):

- Lusch, R.F. (2007), "Marketing's evolving identity: defining our future", *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 261-8.

-
- Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (Eds) (2006a), *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions*, M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, New York, NY.
- Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (2006b) "Service-dominant logic as a foundation for building a general theory", in Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (Eds), *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions*, M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, New York, NY, pp. 406-20.
- Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (2006c), "The service-dominant logic of marketing: reactions, reflections, and refinements", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 281-8.
- Lusch, R.F., Vargo, S.L. and Malter, A. (2006), "Marketing as service-exchange: taking a leadership role in global marketing management", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 35 No. 3, pp. 264-78.
- Lusch, R.F., Vargo, S.L. and O'Brien, M. (2007), "Competing through service: insights from service-dominant logic", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 83 No. 1, pp. 5-18.
- Lusch, R.F., Vargo, S.L. and Wessels, G. (2008), "Toward a conceptual foundation for service science: contributions from service-dominant logic", *IBM Systems Journal*, Vol. 47 No. 1, pp. 5-14.
- Michel, S., Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2008), "Reconfiguration of the conceptual landscape: a tribute to the service logic of Richard Normann", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 152-155.
- Vargo, S.L. (2005), "Rethinking the logic of the customer orientation", *Marketing Research*, Vol. 17 No. 7, pp. 42-3.
- Vargo, S.L. (2007a), "On a theory of markets and marketing: from positively normative to normatively positive", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 53-60.
- Vargo, S.L. (2007b), "Paradigms, pluralisms, and peripheries: on the assessment of S-D logic", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 105-8.
- Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004a), "The four services marketing myths: remnants from a manufacturing model" *Journal of Service Research*, May, pp. 324-35.
- Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004b), "Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing" *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 68, January, pp. 1-17.
- Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2006), "Service-dominant logic: what it is, what it is not, what it might be", in Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (Eds), *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions*, M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, New York, NY, pp. 43-56.
- Vargo, S.L. and Morgan, F.W. (2005), "Services in society and academic thought: a historical perspective", *Journal of Macromarketing*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 42-53.

Corresponding author

Robert F Lusch can be contacted at: rlusch@eller.arizona.edu