

Troubled Waters: The Transformation of Marketing in a Digital World

Quinn, L, Dibb, S, Simkin, L, Canhoto, A & Analogbei, M

Author post-print (accepted) deposited by Coventry University's Repository

Original citation & hyperlink:

Quinn, L, Dibb, S, Simkin, L, Canhoto, A & Analogbei, M 2016, 'Troubled Waters: The Transformation of Marketing in a Digital World' *European Journal of Marketing*, vol 50, no. 12, pp. 2103-2133

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EJM-08-2015-0537>

DOI 10.1108/EJM-08-2015-0537

ISSN 0309-0566

Publisher: Emerald

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author's post-print version, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.



European Journal
of Marketing

**Troubled Waters: The Transformation of Marketing in a
Digital World**

Journal:	<i>European Journal of Marketing</i>
Manuscript ID	EJM-08-2015-0537.R3
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Big Data, Digitalization, Target-Market Strategy, Analytics

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Troubled Waters: The Transformation of Marketing in a Digital World

Abstract

Purpose

We establish how strategic target-market selection decisions are shaped, challenged and driven in response to the rapidly-evolving technological landscape. We critically evaluate the implications of these changes for: (a) the role of marketers, and (b) the organizational function of marketing.

Design/methodology/approach

The research uses qualitative methods. Key-informant interviews are conducted among senior organizational practitioners within client-side organizations, digital agencies and strategic marketing consultancies, seeking to contrast their views.

Findings

The findings reveal an erosion of responsibility for the integrated strategic role of marketing decision-making. In particular, we reveal that the evolving digital landscape has precipitated a sense of crisis for marketers, and the role of marketing within the firm. This extends beyond simply remedying a skills-gap and is triggering a transformation that has repercussions for the future of marketing and its practice, thus diminishing functional accountability.

Research limitations/implications

The findings have long-term implications for marketing as a strategic organizational function of the firm and for marketing as a practice.

Originality/value

The study considers an increasingly digitalized marketplace and the associated impact of big data for the function of marketing. It reveals the changing scope of strategic marketing practice and functional accountability.

Key Words: Big Data; Digitalization; Target-Market Strategy; Analytics

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge the financial support of the Economic and Social Research Council, Digital Social Research programme in funding this project.

Introduction

The rapidly-evolving digital marketing landscape has far-reaching managerial and strategic consequences. While studies have long supported the marketing function's central role in connecting customers to products (Moorman and Rust, 1999), a broadening range of problems has undermined credibility in the marketer's role, threatening marketing's distinct organizational capability (Rust *et al.*, 2004). Although the changing role of marketing has resurfaced for debate from institutional (Webster, 1992; Deshpande and Webster, 1989) and operational (Walsh and Lipinski, 2009) perspectives throughout the past sixty years (Bund and Carroll, 1957; Webster, 1981; Moorman and Rust, 1999; Rust *et al.*, 2004), compelling evidence confirms that marketing "must be an integral part of the organization's decision-making framework" (Kumar, 2015, p. 4; see also: Homburg *et al.*, 2015). However, despite considerable research attention, little consideration has been given to the impact of data proliferation and advances in data analytics on functional or strategic responsibilities (Chari *et al.*, 2012), or on the varied nature of marketing practice within the firm (cf. Wensley, 1995; Thorpe and Morgan, 2007; Roberts *et al.*, 2014). A central aim in our study is, therefore, to reveal ways in which the strategic role of marketing is changing as a consequence of the many challenges presented by an evolving technological landscape. In addressing this concern, we reveal that the advancing digital landscape has precipitated a managerial sense of crisis for marketing, triggering a transformation that has repercussions for the future of the discipline and its practice.

The Evolving Marketing Landscape

Following Drucker's (1954) articulation of the marketing concept, the discipline quickly attracted attention as a distinct organizational function (Webster, 2005). Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, research attention switched from conceptual concerns of managing the

1
2
3 marketing function to the strategic pursuit for competitive advantage (Porter, 1985). In
4
5 particular, researchers in the fields of strategic management and strategic marketing (e.g.
6
7 Anderson, 1982; Day and Wensley, 1983) increasingly emphasised the managerial role of
8
9 strategy formulation, while strategy implementation notably served as an “invariable
10
11 consequence of planning” (Thorpe and Morgan, 2007, p. 660). Fortunately, as Thorpe and
12
13 Morgan (2007, p. 660) continue, insights have since “tempered our knowledge of developing
14
15 marketing strategy with the realities of executing it”. While strategic planning fell out of
16
17 vogue in the 1980s (Webster, 2005), debates concerning marketing’s central role in strategy
18
19 formulation (e.g. Browne, 2014; Davies & Ardley, 2012; Engelen, 2011; McDonald, 2009;
20
21 Palmer & Simmons, 2010; Varadarajan, 1992) and implementation (e.g. Bonoma, 1984;
22
23 Chebat, 1999; Chimanzhi and Morgan, 2005; Homburg *et al.*, 2004; Miller *et al.*, 2004;
24
25 Noble, 1999; Noble, and Mokwa, 1999; Olson *et al.*, 2005; Piercy, 2002; Qi, 2005;
26
27 Ramaseshan *et al.*, 2012; Varadarajan *et al.* 2001; Wind and Robertson, 1983) continue to
28
29 elicit strong interest today (Kumar, 2015; Morgan, 2012).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The reasons for this interest are clear but by no means straightforward to address within
39
40 empirical research inquiry, not least because the breadth of debate has fragmented the
41
42 research agenda (Browne, 2014). For example, Varadarajan (2010, p. 119) views the
43
44 evolution of the field of strategic marketing as “a confluence of perspectives, paradigms,
45
46 theories, concepts, frameworks, principles, methods, models and metrics from a number of
47
48 related fields of study”. While he suggests that this cumulative body of literature is indicative
49
50 of substantive, theoretical and methodological advances, concerns that have been repeated over
51
52 a number of decades are widely evident (e.g. Bartels, 1974; Wind and Robertson, 1983; Day,
53
54 1992; Reibstein *et al.*, 2009), triggering the feared realization of an irretrievable disciplinary
55
56 collapse. In highlighting the fundamental research challenges, we particularly note the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 following themes, which have precipitated the current sense of urgency. These include: (a)
4 marketing strategy research fragmentation; (b) marketing's inability to communicate
5 organizational performance and a return on investment; and (c) the increasing dispersion of
6 marketing activities.
7
8
9
10

11 12 13 **(a) Marketing strategy research fragmentation**

14 While recent evidence supports the argument that marketing benefits an organization
15 (Homburg *et al.*, 2015), debates around marketing's influence on strategic decision-making in
16 the firm have become prominent. This is, perhaps, unsurprising as it has long been
17 recognized that, "conflicting empirical results founded upon contrasting theoretical premises
18 indicate that marketing strategy implementation is a complex phenomenon" (Thorpe and
19 Morgan, 2007, p. 660). Consequently, Reibstein *et al.* (2009, p. 1) reinforce the pragmatic
20 view that, "we need to ensure that the concepts and methods employed are appropriate for
21 generating valid insights into critical research questions, not whether the methods are the
22 most advanced". Closely aligned to this issue, the dominant methodological nature of
23 scholarly research attention in the discipline (cf. Homburg *et al.*, 2000) leads us to recognize
24 that, "the growing balkanization of academic marketing into quantitative modelling and
25 consumer behaviour [is diminishing] research on strategic marketing issues" (Reibstein *et al.*,
26 2009, p. 1). This trend is an important consideration for the design and scope of any
27 marketing research inquiry which probes managerial implementation challenges across
28 sectors and industries. It remains a particular managerial concern, not least because of Thorpe
29 and Morgan's (2007, p. 660) widely-held view that, "a critical determinant in the success and
30 survival of the firm lies the successful implementation of marketing strategies".
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **(b) The inability to communicate organizational performance and return on** 54 **investment** 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 The second issue highlights marketing's apparent inability to demonstrate its value (Boyd *et*
4 *al.*, 2010; Rust *et al.*, 2004; Verhoef & Leeflang, 2009; Webster *et al.*, 2005), thus
5
6 undermining its influence within the firm (Homburg *et al.*, 2015). Although evidence
7
8 suggests that, "an influential marketing department makes the greatest contribution to
9
10 company performance" (Homburg *et al.*, 2015, p. 1), marketing's loss of influence within the
11
12 firm can substantially be blamed on its lack of financial accountability (Boyd *et al.*, 2010;
13
14 O'Sullivan *et al.*, 2009; Tavassoli *et al.*, 2014). Consequently, the degree to which
15
16 "marketing can evidence proof of its contribution to company performance" (Tollin and
17
18 Schmidt, 2012, p. 509) remains limited. This particular challenge raises immediate concerns
19
20 for the longer-term strategic role of marketing within the firm.
21
22
23
24
25

26 (c) The dispersion of marketing activities

27
28 An increasing dispersion of marketing activities coupled with marketing's subsequent loss of
29
30 influence within the firm has become an overarching research priority over the past decade.
31
32 As Webster *et al.* (2005, p. 36) note, "many elements of the central marketing function have
33
34 been 'centrifuged', [thus framing the marketing department] as a diaspora of skills and
35
36 capabilities spread across and even outside the organization". This raises important questions
37
38 about the degree of influence that marketing has upon strategic decision-making and the
39
40 extent to which strategic decisions are being shaped and challenged in marketing practice
41
42 (Krohmer *et al.*, 2002). For Homburg *et al.* (2000) this poses an interesting proposition for
43
44 researchers, especially in terms of the perennial question as to whether such changes are
45
46 initiated within the firm, or as a reaction to environmental transformation.
47
48
49
50

51 In this sense, Homburg *et al.* (2000) recognize that, "organizations should structure
52
53 themselves in order to be more market-oriented and responsive to changing customer needs
54
55 and market conditions" (p. 475). However, understanding the complex and evolving
56
57 managerial nature of this strategic problem remains a central to informing understanding of
58
59
60

1
2
3 how marketing responsibilities impact upon strategic capabilities in the selection of target-
4
5 markets. As Webster *et al.* (2005) explain:
6
7

8 *“Absent a vocal champion for reinforcement and development of marketing skills*
9 *across the company - without a corporate marketing ‘centre of excellence,’ in effect -*
10 *the company is less able to identify and isolate future customers and customer needs*
11 *and will be less efficient at creating, communicating and delivering value to them.”*
12
13
14
15
16

17
18 Browne *et al.* (2014) raise an additional concern in response to marketing’s increasing
19
20 marginalization. Following Skålén & Hackley (2011) they highlight a lack of research which
21
22 explores how marketing practice actually influences top management strategy making. If
23
24 marketing managers wish to re-establish their organizational influence, research studies
25
26 addressing this concern are an immediate priority (Browne *et al.*, 2014).
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Environmental change and the impact on target market strategy**

34

35
36 While environmental forces continue to pressure the marketing function (Webster *et al.*,
37
38 2005), in recent years some of these have rapidly and dynamically altered the traditional
39
40 ways in which managers identify market opportunities and shape strategy (Dibb and Simkin,
41
42 2009; Quinn and Dibb, 2010). For example, the transformational socio-economic effects
43
44 triggered by the recent global financial crisis (ONS, 2008; 2009), the ever-present
45
46 requirement for enhanced marketing accountability (Goodell and Martin, 1992; Shama, 1993;
47
48 Roberts, 2003; Srinivasan *et al.*, 2005), and an increased emphasis on the strategic role of
49
50 customer insight are prominent issues in the identification of target markets as organizations
51
52 struggle to adapt to destabilising patterns of consumption (Bainbridge, 2009; ESRC, 2009;
53
54 MSI, 2014). At the same time, the proliferation of data, particularly data from electronic
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sources, and advanced analytics (Brady *et al.*, 2002) are providing an opportunity to enrich
4 market insight, leading to enhanced strategic planning forecasts and operational efficiencies
5 (Srinivasan *et al.*, 2005). These developments are shaping the disciplinary imagination of
6 marketing practice to an unparalleled degree. However, some commentators express a
7 concern that the traditional strategic underpinnings of marketing may be cast aside (Leeflang
8 *et al.*, 2014) in favour of a new agenda underpinned by the digital landscape (Durkin, 2013)
9 and couched in an alternative managerial language of reach, acquisition and conversion
10 targets (Han *et al.*, 2012). Indeed, 'digital marketing' has emerged as a panacea (Kiani, 1998;
11 Parsons and Waitman, 1998; Wind and Mahajan, 2001), reshaping the commercial agenda,
12 transforming the research landscape, and promising a new dimension in the strategic
13 management of markets (Germann *et al.*, 2012). Mass surveillance and data capture are held
14 as key managerial facilitators in pursuit of understanding and benefiting from the complex
15 and seemingly irrational consumption patterns of today's consumers. Big data, emerging
16 visualisation techniques, and enhanced computing power, promise rich and actionable
17 customer insights of the kind that are fundamental to firms' strategic decision-making (Day,
18 2011). Those who champion a digital revolution see this as an exciting opportunity for the
19 discipline (Baker, 2009; Barwise and Farley, 2005; Day and Bens, 2005; Kietzmann *et al.*,
20 2012), and argue for marketing to reshape itself in order to survive.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 Marketing as a domain is inescapably driven by advances in technology, where every
45 electronically-enabled consumer becomes a research participant, driving the realisation of a
46 digitally-encoded Orwellian society (Berger, 2010; Slettemeås, 2009). Yet few authors have
47 considered the managerial and functional consequences of this rapidly evolving, increasingly
48 digitalized agenda. The implications for marketing, and how to reframe and integrate the
49 conceptual underpinnings of marketing strategy creation and implementation, have been
50 overlooked from the marketing practitioner's perspective. This omission presents an
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 important question central to the current study as those concerns implicated by the changing
4 technological and social environment have become increasingly exposed in the marketing
5 literature. For example, managers have often struggled to keep pace with the impact of
6 technological change and a widening gap has been noted between what is technologically
7 possible and what occurs in practice (Day, 2011; Wymbs, 2011; Finch *et al.*, 2013). Indeed,
8 the practices of many marketers are far removed from considering customers at the granular
9 level that e-technology enables (Feit *et al.*, 2013). Furthermore, although consumer concerns
10 about privacy are increasing resistance to intrusive tracking and monitoring initiatives (Lyon,
11 2004; Ball and Haggerty, 2005), the widespread acceptance and consumption of digital and
12 social media suggests that consumer paranoia may have been misjudged. The extent to which
13 this apparent contradiction is a consequence of the gap between the tracking and monitoring
14 possibilities espoused in theory, and the profiling initiatives implemented in practice, is
15 unclear. Despite calls for researchers to keep pace with the corollary of these developments
16 (e.g. Sheth and Sisodia, 2015; Wind, 2014), there is a paucity of research examining the ways
17 in which marketing responsibilities are delineated and strategic opportunities are being
18 shaped or compromised in the digital era. The first research question (*RQ 1a & RQ1b*) for our
19 study focuses on both aspects of this issue:
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 ***RQ 1(a):** How are strategic decisions being shaped and challenged in marketing*
42 *practice?*
43
44

45
46
47 ***RQ 1(b):** Who are the key internal decision-makers driving the strategic direction and*
48 *accountability of marketing activities within organizations?*
49
50

51
52
53 While some debate exists around the opportunities and barriers that digitalization presents for
54 organizations operating in hyper-competitive business environments (Simmons, 2008; Boyd
55 and Crawford, 2012; Walker and Fung, 2013; Stone and Woodcock, 2014), few studies have
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 specifically examined the role of digitalization alongside the noted managerial drivers which
4 are shifting, or outsourcing, marketing's functional responsibilities and diminishing its
5 influence within the firm (e.g. Homburg *et al.*, 2015; Krohmer *et al.*, 2002; Tollin and
6 Schmidt, 2012; Webster *et al.* 2005; Homburg *et al.*, 2000). Accordingly, the consequences
7 for the role of marketers or the function of marketing as a result of these disciplinary
8 developments remain unclear. While external agencies (e.g. digital consultancies) or
9 customer insight teams within the firm may in some instances be leveraging customer insight
10 and acquisition responsibilities away from client-side marketing teams (Leeflang *et al.*,
11 2014), there is less clarity as to which marketing actors are accountable for strategic
12 marketing decisions. A compounding factor is that many studies concerning the
13 organizational response to the commercial opportunities promised by advancing technology
14 and big data are conceptual or quantitative (Reibstein *et al.*, 2009). They seldom engage
15 discursively with the key marketing actors facing these challenges in their day-to-day roles.
16 For example, as Tollin and Schmidt (2002, pp. 509) argue, "although top marketing managers
17 are regularly asked to characterise their company's market orientation, capability, structure,
18 innovation orientation and so on, their ideas principles and doings are rarely the primary
19 object of study (Boyd *et al.*, 2010; Lamberti and Nocia, 2009)". While research has focused
20 on the technological barriers arising from digital data, new metrics and advanced analytics
21 (Sorescu *et al.*, 2011; Snijders *et al.*, 2012; Humby *et al.*, 2008), little attention has been
22 given to the impact of advancing technology and data proliferation on how marketing is
23 practiced. Therefore, a more substantive question concerns how such developments might be
24 shaping functional contours.

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 This leads to the final two research questions:
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *RQ 2: How is strategic target market identification decision-making evolving in*
4 *response to the increasing prevalence of data, new metrics and advanced analytics?*
5
6

7
8 *RQ 3: What disciplinary pressures and implications are presented as a consequence*
9 *of marketing's changing technological landscape?*
10
11

12 **Methodology**

13
14
15
16
17
18 Qualitative research inquiry was the means to critically evaluate perspectives across different
19 organizations and industry types and to inform a detailed understanding of the issues raised.
20
21 Participant organizations were selected for inclusion on the basis that they would enable
22 exposure to a substantial depth of insight across a broad range of industry types. While the
23 objective of this study is not to generalize across organizations or industries, we aim to
24 empirically evaluate a range of marketing-related problems and challenges, allowing us to
25 comment upon sensitive issues that may be impacting upon functional responsibilities. The
26 intended theoretical contribution is a substantive one in that it lies central to identifying the
27 changing disciplinary nature of marketing as an organizational function.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 *Key-informant selection*

38
39
40 Given the aim was to examine a range of managerial issues, a convenience sampling design
41 and a key-informant interviewing method (Mitchell, 1993; 1994) were appropriate (Gill and
42 Johnson, 2002). The research team used personal networks to identify and obtain access to a
43 number of UK-based, globally-represented firms. Taking advantage of snowball sampling
44 (Noy, 2008), informants from twenty organizations were interviewed, representing specialist
45 data and research consultancies, manufacturing and service organizations, as well as digital
46 marketing agencies. Managerial exposure to high-level strategic decision-making was a
47 primary driver for sample selection and many informants possessed significant experience
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 within high-level strategic marketing contexts (e.g. Global Heads of Digital, Innovation and
4 Cloud-based Marketing, and Marketing Directors). We chose not to limit the empirical scope
5 of our inquiry to the functional context (usually located within client-side organizations)
6 because there is no evidence that the challenges identified are wholly located within
7 functional marketing teams. Furthermore, as many organizations' strategic marketing
8 activities are not limited to the functional domain, we did not want to limit the scope of our
9 findings. Half of our informants were employed within specialist marketing strategy
10 consultancies and digital marketing agencies, operating on a global scale among the leading
11 firms in their respective sectors. On the client-side, the following retail and service sectors
12 were represented: mobile telecommunications; air travel; FMCG manufacturing;
13 petrochemical; betting and gaming; and financial services. A key strength of our study is the
14 access we achieved to this senior level of informant. Such insights are seldom documented in
15 empirical marketing studies, despite evidence suggesting that higher-ranking informants tend
16 to be "more reliable sources of information than their lower status counterparts" (Phillips,
17 1981, p. 412). Table 1 details the range of organizations taking part in the research along with
18 the key-informants' roles. In order to retain a necessary degree of ethical integrity and to
19 protect each organization's commercial interests (Kirkup and Carrigan, 2000), the names of
20 organizations and key-informants are disguised.

21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 *Data collection and analysis*

46 Key-informant interviews took place between April 2013 and December 2014. The
47 interviews were guided by a semi-structured checklist of issues (Appendix 1) informed by
48 our three central research questions. In common with many qualitative studies, it was
49 important to allow respondents to talk openly about the issues; in particular, marketing's role
50 in shaping and accounting for the strategic direction of the organization. The semi-structured
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 interview template supported this aim, allowing us to explore the key issues freely and
4
5 without prejudice (Irvine *et al.*, 2013). All interviews were audio-recorded and subsequently
6
7 transcribed verbatim. Each interview lasted between 90 and 150 minutes, allowing us to
8
9 access over 40-hours of interview material. Internal company documentation was also
10
11 provided by interviewees, allowing detailed operational overviews of case organizations.
12
13 Some of the organizations were known to members of the research team through previous
14
15 research and consultancy exercises, some going back over a thirty-year period. This
16
17 experience enabled a fuller and broader exposure to the research context, something not
18
19 easily established by qualitative researchers when gaining organizational access (Easterby-
20
21 Smith *et al.*, 2012). The depth of insight drawn from the empirical aspect of the inquiry
22
23 enables us to assert a substantial degree of qualitative credibility (Tracy, 2010) to the data
24
25 gathered.
26
27
28
29
30

31 Following an established inductive process (Corbin and Strauss, 2008; Strauss and Corbin,
32
33 1998) of applied thematic analysis (Guest *et al.*, 2012) the interview transcripts, which were
34
35 our primary data source, were initially freely coded as possible interpretations and themes
36
37 were explored. The analysis began with four members of the research team reading the
38
39 transcripts, then sharing their notes, allowing the core themes to emerge iteratively (Spiggle,
40
41 1994). The core themes were subsequently refined by one member of the research team,
42
43 before being independently assessed by the others (Campbell *et al.*, 2013). During this
44
45 process the text was systematically ordered to establish a number of “categories, types and
46
47 relationships of meaning” (cf. Guest *et al.*, 2012, p. 52). Consequently, we use the
48
49 terminology of Corbin and Strauss (2008) when we refer to our themes as core categories
50
51 (core themes) and concepts (sub-themes). This does not alter the interpretivist
52
53 epistemological basis of our claims but does provide a level of consistency in our reporting of
54
55 them.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The validity of the research process reflects the degree to which we captured the views and
4 experiences of those we interviewed (Easterby-Smith *et al.*, 2012) and the extent to which the
5 method and analysis robustly address the research questions. The sampling of senior
6 informants with a high level of expertise added to the face validity of the data, while
7 sampling from a range of organisation types and sectors increased the credibility of the
8 findings (Miles *et al.*, 2014), albeit within the limits of the scale of the study. This approach
9 also allows for 'maximum variation' within the sample (Miles and Huberman, 1994),
10 exposing us to a greater breadth of contextual insight without losing focus on the central
11 research questions concerning disciplinary and organisational change (Pettigrew, 1985).
12 Involving four members of the research team in the data gathering and coding process helped
13 to minimise bias. This investigator triangulation (Denzin, 1989) also helped to corroborate
14 the emerging themes and to increase confidence in the validity of the findings.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 As the analysis evolved, many themes were reviewed and revised, to reveal a number of core
31 categories and concepts across the data set. At this stage in the analysis, NVivo was used to
32 help organise the data, so that interview quotes relating to the themes and sub-themes that are
33 used to support the plausibility of the findings could be readily identified. In total, three core
34 categories (*crisis, transformation and vision*) and eight concepts (*complexity, role, tradition,*
35 *power, interpretation, integration, collaboration and control*) were established, respectively
36 forming the structural and discursive basis of our subsequent presentation of findings.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 ***INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE***

50 51 52 53 54 **Research Findings**

1
2
3 A striking feature of the findings is that all informants drew upon the metaphor of ‘change’ to
4 explain their experiences, the challenges they faced and their views about how marketing’s
5 preoccupation with the generation and analysis of customer insight is shaping the trajectory
6 of their professional activities. These arguments are meaningful in relation to the research
7 questions outlined. We use three core categories of *crisis*, *transformation* and *vision* to frame
8 an instrumental narrative to capture and make sense of the ways in which managers shape
9 marketing strategy and identify target market opportunities within a changing technological
10 and digital landscape. In the following discussion we evaluate arguments raised in the
11 marketing literature, presenting excerpts from the transcripts which support our thematic
12 interpretation of the data (Alvesson, 2003). Table 2 provides an overview of our findings,
13 summarising the core categories (in columns) and indicative concepts (illustrated in
14 brackets). The purpose is to supplement our discussion, aiding in the transparency of our
15 “thick” description (Ryle, 1971) of organizational cultures across the data set. This approach
16 enhances the plausibility of our interpretive construction as we attempt to establish “the
17 significance of an experience, or the sequence of events, for the person or persons in
18 question” (Denzin, 1989, p. 83).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 ***INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE***

42 *Marketing: Towards a Disciplinary Crisis*

43
44
45 Although the measurement of marketing productivity is not a new concern for the discipline
46 (e.g. Rust *et al.*, 2004), understanding this challenge within the context of big data and digital
47 reinforces and elucidates some of the difficulties that arise. Identifying how increasing
48 digitalization may influence and shape strategic marketing practice also becomes pivotal to
49 comprehending how managers respond to the dynamic technological environment.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Informants articulated that the rapid pace of economic and technological change and the
4 immediacy of big data and digital insight is driving a volatile period of disciplinary
5 uncertainty. Those we interviewed remained sensitive to a changing commercial climate,
6 framing the beginnings of an intense period of transition following the recent global
7 recession. Those we interviewed remained sensitive to a changing commercial climate,
8 framing the beginnings of an intense period of transition following the recent global
9 recession. As one digital agency informant commented:
10
11
12

13
14
15 *“[Our clients] realised that they didn’t know who their customer was any more. The*
16 *period of progressive growth that they’d been through throughout the nineties and the*
17 *noughties meant that they hadn’t really spent much time investing in working out who*
18 *their customer was or what their customer profile was; they didn’t need to. We’d also*
19 *moved into the period where, for many, your customer could age from 15 to 95, it*
20 *didn’t really matter; you could target them all with exactly the same method and with*
21 *the same message. [Clients] suddenly looked around and because the consumer was*
22 *no longer behaving in the way that they were supposed to, according to marketing*
23 *metrics which had defined growth for that 20-year period: ‘I don’t know who my*
24 *customer is any more. I have no idea how they behave. I have no idea what they’re*
25 *interested in. I’ve really lost sight of who they are.’” (Informant, Digital Agency C)*
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Researchers have for many decades been preoccupied with the evolution of target-market
42 identification in response to increasing data and enhanced analytic capability (e.g. Wind,
43 1978; Wedel and Kamakura, 2002). The challenge of integrating digitally-sourced data
44 within the strategic planning process (Peltier *et al.*, 2012) is therefore not new. Managers
45 have always sought quicker and greater access to data as a route to more sophisticated
46 insights. However, recent developments have transformed the potential of marketing into the
47 realms of science fiction. The following comments illustrate the novel ways in which those
48 we interviewed from each of the three groups explain the significance of this evolution:
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *“Big data means enormous complexity. It means very sophisticated methods. It means*
4
5 *more powerful algorithms, and computer hardware to crunch the data, than we ever*
6
7 *used before. The NASA guys get nervous when they look at the hardware that*
8
9 *marketing people are using nowadays because it’s better than what they used for their*
10
11 *missions to the moon ten years ago.” (Informant, Strategy Consultant B)*

12
13
14 *“It’s much easier executionally to refine what we’re doing: we have more data, we’ve*
15
16 *got better tools, we can make decisions based on bigger, better data-sets more quickly*
17
18 *than we could do. And because we can now look at attribution modelling, we can look*
19
20 *at it across channels. We can say: ‘Okay, so what this tells us is that if we create more*
21
22 *visibility at this part of a user journey we’re going to sell more stuff for you.’ Five*
23
24 *years ago that would have been science fiction.” (Informant, Digital Agency D)*

25
26
27 *“Social media has changed marketing a lot and one thing that is new is definitely*
28
29 *targeting: we can target people much better and have to target people much better, so*
30
31 *that you are relevant to your audience if you’re not relevant you’re just*
32
33 *annoying.” (Informant, Client A)*

34
35
36
37
38
39 However, while the potential of recent technological advances is significant, other informants
40
41 emphasized that unlimited access to data alone is not the solution. One client saw it as *“...a*
42
43 *plus and a negative”*, and went on to explain that *“It really depends which curve you’re*
44
45 *riding at that time so... if things are going bad then the digital world doesn’t help you.”*
46
47 (Informant, Client J). Another informant commented:

48
49
50 *“If you look at some of the High Street big names that have gone under. They’ve gone*
51
52 *with data that was maybe not their own, or they’ve gone with an approach where*
53
54 *they’ve built something a long time ago and they’ve not refreshed it, or they’ve not*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *adjusted to the fact that the marketplace is different and a completely different*
4
5 *dynamic.” (Informant, Strategy Consultant C)*
6
7

8 As in the ‘pre-big data era’ (Dibb and Simkin, 2001; Dibb and Simkin, 2009), a number of
9
10 barriers to marketing strategy are associated with the ability to source meaningful and
11
12 actionable insights from data. Informants in each of the groups we interviewed recognised the
13
14 difficulties clients are facing in managing these issues, as this consultant explains:
15
16

17
18 *“There aren’t enough people and businesses that understand how to use data... The*
19
20 *single biggest problem is that they’re focused on 1980s principles: you need a data*
21
22 *warehouse; it needs to have all of your data in it and it needs to be accurate; it needs*
23
24 *to be robust; it needs to be absolutely 100% trustable. Today’s world doesn’t work*
25
26 *that way ... the data that we’ve got is emerging, it’s proliferating, it’s huge,*
27
28 *voluminous; it comes from new sources every day. The corporates are struggling to*
29
30 *keep pace with the marketplace that’s going on around them.” (Informant, Strategy*
31
32 *Consultant C)*
33
34

35
36 These concerns were also articulated by the client informants, many of whom express
37
38 concerns about generating good quality insights from the mast amount of available data. One
39
40 pointed out that, *“...there is more and more data in this day and age, but that doesn’t mean*
41
42 *there is more insight” (Informant, Client E)*; while another explained that, *“In our experience,*
43
44 *you always end up having more data and research than you need and the tricky question is to*
45
46 *see which we use and how we actually digest it” (Informant, Client C).*
47
48

49
50 This argument supports the view that meeting the demands of a data-driven marketplace has
51
52 placed increasing pressure on managers to either develop new skills, or to attract suitably
53
54 qualified and experienced personnel (Day, 2011; Ready and Conger, 2007). Client informant
55
56 C spoke about the pressure of *“...putting the right kind of people in the right roles, who can*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *analyse the data, who can work with us on getting the insights*"; while another talked about
4
5 the marketing department needing to be *"knowledge experts"* (Informant, Client J).
6
7 However, this call for external resource (Ernst, 2003) is not instigated from within
8
9 established marketing teams as it might have been in the past; instead it originates from
10
11 higher up in the organization:
12

13
14
15 *"It was very clear through the way we were being approached that it was coming*
16
17 *from very high up, it would have been from COOs, from FDs, and from CEOs who*
18
19 *were turning to their teams, asking the questions and getting lots of shrugged*
20
21 *shoulders. So, while we would have been approached traditionally through brand*
22
23 *managers and marketing directors, there was clearly a different type of imperative in*
24
25 *the sort of work that we saw and the scale and the scope of what we were being asked*
26
27 *to do."* (Informant, Digital Agency C)
28
29

30
31 The increasingly complex nature of marketing as an organizational function is clearly
32
33 apparent. For many informants, particularly on the client side, a combination of tighter
34
35 budgets, pressures to provide actionable insights, data proliferation from a broader range of
36
37 sources, the increasingly sophisticated technological focus, and the demand for new skills
38
39 signposts what we label a moment of *crisis*. The role of others from outside the marketing
40
41 department – and often from outside the company – in providing the new skills and
42
43 addressing the knowledge gap – presents a new challenge; one which infringes on the scope
44
45 and contribution of the marketing department and potentially diminishes its role.
46
47

48
49 Furthermore, the increasingly digitalized marketing landscape is compounding the troubled
50
51 situation, and uncertainty prevails. For example, one area of uncertainty highlighted by all of
52
53 the informant groups concerns the ability to harness the benefits of social media:
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *“We dabbled into it [social media] ... mainly Twitter ... and mainly as a channel to*
4
5 *leverage or to distribute thought leadership on an ongoing basis. What we discovered*
6
7 *was that it wasn't necessarily reaching the decision makers that we needed to get the*
8
9 *information in front of. So, social media for us tended to be a less effective channel.*
10
11 *But worse than that, and more importantly, what it did create was an awful lot of low*
12
13 *value noise.” (Informant, Client F)*
14
15

16
17 *“There are a lot of questions at the moment being asked of social media in general,*
18
19 *the effectiveness of it and are people really engaging with my brand, the cost to them*
20
21 *of just liking something is very trivial. So what do I get for it?” (Informant, Strategy*
22
23 *Consultant A)*
24
25

26
27 For many marketing practitioners, the emergence of these issues suggests a significant period
28
29 of *transformation* for the discipline.
30
31

32 33 *Marketing: A Functional Transformation* 34

35 Since the widely accepted origins of the market segmentation debate (Smith, 1956), key
36
37 developments in the segmentation literature have reinforced the view that access to more
38
39 robust data offers greater opportunities to enhance target propositions (e.g. Quinn *et al.*, 2007,
40
41 p. 442). However, all of those interviewed suggest that interpretation, rather than access to
42
43 data, is now the real concern:
44
45

46
47 *“There is more and more data in this day and age but that doesn't necessarily mean*
48
49 *there is more insight. You get drowned in numbers.” (Informant, Client C)*
50
51

52 *“We frequently come across situations where there are big variances in data ...*
53
54 *sometimes the ability to measure and refine does create a level of strategic blindness*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *to actually just making the right decision and doing things.” (Informant, Digital*
4
5 *Agency D)*

6
7
8
9 The implication is that decision-making is impeded by what Langley (1995) describes as
10 ‘paralysis by analysis’. This inability to draw meaningful and actionable insights has long
11 been recognized as a difficulty for managers implementing market segmentation solutions
12 (Piercy and Morgan, 1993) central to the strategic planning process. These circumstances
13 encourage a reversion to simpler, more usable, schemes as one of the digital agency
14 informants explains:
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22
23
24 *“Say you have six or seven groups, about 15% in each group, or whatever it is.*
25 *That's fine because mentally I can get my head around that but actually in truth*
26 *there's 36, 100 different segments. I can't get my head around that, so I'm not going to*
27 *use that.” (Informant, Digital Agency B)*
28
29
30
31
32

33 However, while conceptual and methodological concerns prevail among some agencies - and
34 clients in particular - the strategy consultancies are embracing the opportunities that this
35 situation offers. For these informants:
36
37
38
39

40
41 *“In the past, we were extremely worried about within segment heterogeneity. It was a*
42 *methodological problem. Nowadays ... you look for it ... and you try to use it. The*
43 *segments are rough patterns that you apply, but within these patterns your algorithm,*
44 *then, is using the heterogeneity to fine-tune the value proposition.” (Informant,*
45 *Strategy Consultant B)*
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 The changing nature of the digital marketplace, arguably driven by online business models,
54 has completely destroyed traditional marketing understandings for some organizations. The
55 online retailer, Amazon, was frequently cited as a leading driver of this transformation:
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *“Amazon has an enormous potential to individualize the value proposition. There’s*
4 *the one big target segment and that’s people who buy products or services online.*
5
6
7 *That’s it. Within that target segment, they try to develop an almost completely*
8 *individualized proposition. And now they even translate it into local deals. They know*
9 *where you’re living; they know what you like. The algorithms might still need some*
10 *tweaking, but they’re getting there.” (Informant, Strategy Consultant B)*
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 The Amazon model, however, is not necessarily a generalizable solution. Not every
18 organization can or needs to individualize the value proposition. While there is very little, if
19 any, available cross-sectional evidence, informants suggested that in many organizations
20 traditional segmentation solutions still have an important role to play:
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 *“If you’re buying media in the old fashioned sense of buying media - TV slots, radio -*
28 *you’re going to need some sort of demographic, some sort of target segmentation*
29 *profile; because otherwise you’re really flying blind. But equally you would think that*
30 *most brands would be interested in things like lifetime customer value, but for some*
31 *brands that’s got no relevance whatsoever ... you’ve got a lot of diversity there.”*
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 *(Informant, Digital Agency D)*
39
40

41 Differences in opinion were evident in relation to how the targeting process should be
42 operationalized according to specific circumstances. In this sense, the digital revolution
43 (Wind and Mahajan, 2002; Charlesworth, 2009) compounds the problem and reinforces a
44 substantial degree of misunderstanding:
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 *“There’s almost a new attitude amongst young marketing people, or the ones that*
52 *grew up in the digital era, that everything has to be instant, everything has to be real*
53 *time or nearly real time; that all data sources have to be linked and so on, that it’s not*
54 *applicable to all channels and all sources. The more seasoned marketing people say*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *we can only do that for digital, and they almost don't embrace it, because to them this*
4 *is still a niche phenomenon that only applies to the digital world.” (Informant,*
5 *Strategy Consultant B)*
6
7
8

9
10 More importantly, informants offered insights to suggest that these tensions were beginning
11 to fragment the role of marketing as an organizational function:
12

13
14
15
16 *“Marketing's almost at the point of being commoditised ... and what I observe and*
17 *hear from a lot from my colleagues as well, is that traditional marketing is ... being*
18 *alienated. So the traditional marketing guys - the ones who plan the TV campaign ...*
19 *print campaigns ... promotional activities and whatever, and the digital marketing*
20 *guys, are separate. And that's a very unhealthy set-up.” (Informant, Strategy*
21 *Consultant B)*
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29
30 *“The procurement function is dominating, the finance function is dominating and*
31 *even the HR function is dominating. As the environment's become more pressured,*
32 *marketing has got pushed down the pecking order. Most of the marketing expertise*
33 *sits in activation and delivery, not in actually answering some of those harder to*
34 *answer questions like: How much shall I spend? Where shall I spend it? Those core*
35 *questions, if you like.” (Informant, Digital Agency B)*
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 For many organizations, outsourcing digital and analytic components of the marketing
45 function has become the norm, something that exposes a skills gap among practitioners and
46 fractures the consistency of strategy formulation and implementation:
47
48

49
50
51
52 *“So many clients still don't have analytics departments; still don't have the ability to*
53 *do stuff in-house, so they rely on third parties.” (Informant, Strategy Consultant C)*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *“In the business to business world I think it’s a little bit more challenging. I’m not*
4
5 *sure I’ve really been able to identify an organization that’s really been cutting edge in*
6
7 *terms of how they go to market.” (Informant, Client G)*
8
9

10 *“We totally have influence because most companies are in a panic about what they’re*
11 *going to do.” (Informant, Digital Agency A)*
12
13

14
15
16 As the last of these three informants reveal, this situation has presented a lucrative
17
18 commercial opening, especially for digital marketing agencies. Digital agencies are fully
19
20 aware of the client-side *crisis* and, as these informants observe, appear more than happy to
21
22 exploit the opportunity:
23

24
25 *“The challenge always is to go more senior... get into the boardroom, if you can, and*
26 *have a sponsor for the work. You really need to have a top-down buy-in and I think*
27 *it’s hard to do this without that because what tends to happen is it affects most things*
28 *across the business. It can change internal agendas as much as external agendas; in*
29 *that sense, the more senior the better.” (Informant, Digital Agency B)*
30
31
32

33 *“If clients are prepared to share their own data with the agency, the agencies will*
34 *create their own performance dashboards. They’ll take clicks, sales, whatever*
35 *measures they’ve mapped out. Typically, it goes to the agency to create that capability*
36 *on behalf of clients. And marketing people need to do that for themselves to be able to*
37 *have control over their businesses and understand what’s happening. (Informant,*
38 *Digital Agency B)*
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51
52 Without the necessary skillset, there is a real danger for client organizations seeking to
53
54 identify beneficial collaborative relationships. Consequently, functional dangers for the role
55
56 of marketing are exposed within the client-agency relationship as a result of this situation:
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *“Big data is a wonderful thing and yes, it's amazing all the fantastic things we can do*
4
5 *with that data. But as a data analytics person, I have to say that you'd better know*
6
7 *what to do with your big data. You better know how to get rid of the noise. You better*
8
9 *know how to extract real relationships, real causal relationships from that data, and*
10
11 *these are enormous challenges.” (Informant, Strategy Consultant B)*

12
13
14 *“Skills, processes, structures need to realign... Digital is part of doing business. It's*
15
16 *now in the mainstream. So, by having digital experts, you're marginalizing other*
17
18 *people in the organization. It's got to be in the mainstream of everyone's title and job*
19
20 *spec, regardless of age. [Get it] integrated and the word digital disappears. It just*
21
22 *becomes part of doing business, digital cuts through everything ... organizational*
23
24 *design has to deal with that reality.” (Informant, Digital Agency B)*

25
26
27
28
29 The growth in digital has been accompanied by a proliferation in digital agencies, big data
30
31 experts and social media analysts. At best, this represents a growing complexity to manage;
32
33 but at worst, there is potential for these diverse stakeholders to compete with the incumbent
34
35 marketing function for the ear of senior executives, for budgets and to shape marketing
36
37 strategy and programmes. Failure to develop the necessary skills and capabilities compounds
38
39 this threat to the traditional role of marketing. In terms of the growing complexity, one client
40
41 commented, *“And now we have to make all these external partners communicate with each*
42
43 *other and sometimes that is not very easy!”* (Informant, Client A). The risk posed by having
44
45 to manage additional stakeholders, some of which are external to the organisation, is captured
46
47 in the words of one senior marketing executive:

48
49
50
51
52 *“We weren't really identified specifically on any of the management teams... it was a*
53
54 *feeling of floating and trying (sic) to have an influence. We're trying to know who the*
55
56 *customers are, but what has changed is the amount of other people who are involved*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *in the decision-making, or potentially have an influence on the end result.”*

4
5 *(Informant, Client B)*

6
7
8 Outsourcing the digital and/or analytic resource is creating other problems, too. The
9 requirement for organizations to remain compliant with constantly changing legislative
10 requirements expands the functional role of marketing teams and also impacts on the
11 operational possibilities in practice:
12
13
14
15

16
17
18 *“Quite often there is also a compliance unit that sits external of marketing that then*
19 *has to be engaged through marketing and the processes. If that compliance side*
20 *doesn't exist in the client – because often it doesn't – does that present an opportunity*
21 *that underpins the role of the agency, the consultant?” (Informant, Strategy*
22 *Consultant C)*
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 In addition to the compounding pressures of legislation, barriers to implementing effective
31 target-market strategy (Dibb and Simkin, 2001) also resurface. Such barriers are especially
32 prevalent in larger, more inflexible, client-side organizations. As one informant explained,
33
34 *“Big organizations have a massive challenge in joining those things up, because they're*
35 *organizationally very siloed ... they just don't talk to each other very much.”* (Informant,
36 Digital Agency D). Those that outsource various aspects of their strategic planning also face
37 difficulties:
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46
47 *“The other observation I have is some of the big strategic segmentations that are*
48 *done early on in the process are rarely applied effectively ... segmentations are used*
49 *to help thinking when you're trying to develop a strategy, then they're abandoned and*
50 *at different stages, reinvented by different parties further down the line.”* (Informant,
51 Digital Agency B)
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *“A business needs to have a hierarchy to understand what the KPIs are at every level*
4 *of business. That rarely happens... measuring impact and so on at different levels,*
5 *businesses have not really embraced that. They will not all get the most out of this*
6 *more complex world until they do that.” (Informant, Digital Agency D)*
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 These issues portray a transformational period for the role of the marketing function, driven
17 by changes in technology, the financial climate, resourcing costs, legislation and the
18 provision of outsourced services. Furthermore, client-side marketers are under increasing
19 pressure to maximize organizational returns on investment; as one informant explained,
20 *“[Marketing] has to find the right language for itself that is accountable”* (Informant, Digital
21 Agency B). All of this, at a time when key planning and analytic processes are often
22 conceded to external agents. Ultimately, the marketing function has to evidence its
23 contribution to organizational performance (Tollin and Schmidt, 2012), while hindered by
24 digital developments that cannot, due to inflexible organizational structures, be seamlessly
25 integrated within planning processes. This is an important finding in our study, as subsequent
26 conflation of strategic planning with tactical implementation is also altering the strategic role
27 of marketing within the firm:
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 *“... in terms of the selection of those markets that’s, obviously, that’s a decision that*
44 *involves marketing, legal, ... within [Client H we have] the corporate development*
45 *office who focus very, very strategically around potential opportunities for growth,*
46 *and mergers and acquisitions within any given market; but ultimately the decision is*
47 *made by the Chief Exec.” (Informant, Client H)*
48
49
50
51
52

53
54
55 *“If you [deliver] that message across six channels and they [the customer] start off on*
56 *their phone, they decide they want to switch halfway through that to a call centre and*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *then they need to complete via a postal application... Who gets the credit for that*
4 *sale? Is that through the third party that it sold through on an app? Is it the website*
5 *that they also researched on before they went on the app? The ability to measure and*
6 *track and hone your performance metrics need to be that much more evolved.”*
7
8
9
10
11
12 *(Informant, Strategy Consultant C)*

13
14
15 This period of *transformation* suggests that the future role of marketing as a function is
16 uncertain. Its place within the strategic planning process has become tenuous, a vulnerability
17 that signposts a period of opportunity and further growth for those organizations with the
18 capabilities to take advantage. This future is being shaped, at least in the short-term, by those
19 with vested interests, particularly by managers who are more familiar with the language and
20 practices that digital specialists use. Consequently, the following section frames our final core
21 category to provide a disciplinary *vision* of how managers across industry types are shaping
22 that future.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 34 35 *Marketing: A Disciplinary Vision*

36
37 Strategy consultants and digital agencies highlight two contradictory trends shaping the
38 future for client-side marketing teams; both revolving around the utilization and integration
39 of ‘big data’. These trends reveal that while seeking to embrace and capitalize on data, client
40 organizations also expect simplicity in how the solutions are presented:
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 *“One trend is that the CMO wants a dashboard in his office that aggregates*
48 *everything that’s happening with the brand and the product and so on, to whatever*
49 *three KPIs. And he wants them in real time, nice pie chart, nice bar chart, and maybe*
50 *a word cloud ... the most dramatic simplification. At the same time, you have the big*
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *data phenomenon, and big data means enormous complexity.” (Informant, Strategy*
4
5 *Consultant B)*

6
7
8 *“Big data is not the solution. Big data is actually the problem. What clients really*
9
10 *want is small data which is simple; it’s the needle in the haystack. It’s not the big data*
11
12 *they want.” (Informant, Strategy Consultant A)*

13
14
15
16 Many clients share this view. As one client informant explained, *“We still have a lot of*
17
18 *agency data that we don’t have time to digest, sometimes less data is better than more data”*
19
20 (Informant, Client C). Another mentioned that, *“Data overload doesn’t mean quality of*
21
22 *insight is improving” (Informant, Client E), continuing to explain that, “Today you’ve got a*
23
24 *huge amount of data but not necessarily more insight... unless you try very hard”.*

25
26
27
28
29 In practice, because these client organizations often lack the capabilities to capture a holistic
30
31 view of their markets, they find themselves exposed to shifting consumer behaviours,
32
33 vulnerable to everyday marketplace uncertainties, and at a distinct competitive disadvantage.
34
35 Worse still, our findings reveal that many such organizations may never be able to integrate
36
37 their strategic vision across multiple channels. They simply do not have the organizational
38
39 infrastructures or the degree of accountability that will enable them to achieve this aim as the
40
41 following comment illustrates:
42
43

44
45
46 *“The power will be with the organizations that have these ecosystems. And the big*
47
48 *ecosystems are Google, Amazon... Amazon has a huge ecosystem, nobody really*
49
50 *realises it. And then I guess the logical conclusion is that brands will kind of buy from*
51
52 *these ecosystems or work with them. That’s where the data is going to be because*
53
54 *they’ve got the unifying view; they’re not just looking at my shop or your shop or*
55
56 *another shop, they’re looking at behaviour on a much larger scale than any single*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *retailer can do but Google will have a single customer view.” (Informant, Digital*
4
5 *Agency D)*
6
7

8 Undoubtedly, some of the client organization interviewees are aware of the need to evolve,
9
10 with some evidence pointing towards the development of a collaborative model of knowledge
11
12 transfer (Hansen and Nohria, 2004). Such a model, would involve a more iterative way of
13
14 working, in which clients and agencies pool their resources to co-create systems for gathering
15
16 and exploiting customer insight as the following informants expose:
17
18

19
20
21 *“Increasingly ... the parent company is encouraging people across different brands to*
22
23 *work with each other, learn from each other, but also, in terms of career development*
24
25 *as well, so there’s lots of encouragement to actually try and keep the right people, or*
26
27 *the people that the organization want to keep. So that’s encouraged quite a lot ... it’s*
28
29 *interaction on a daily basis in terms of work but also in terms of moving across*
30
31 *businesses.” (Informant, Client J)*
32
33

34
35 *“We’ll increasingly work in a more collaborative kind of way. I don’t think it will be*
36
37 *feasible to have agency [plus] client relationships; I think it will be much more*
38
39 *collaborative. We’ll spend more time with clients and they’ll spend more time with us.*
40
41 *And if we can invest them with the skills that we have it’s kind of a win-win situation:*
42
43 *it makes them look good; it means they can be advocates in their business about*
44
45 *digital marketing and what that really means.” (Informant, Digital Agency D)*
46
47
48
49

50 **Evaluative Discussion of Findings**

51

52 While this study was motivated by the need to better understand how the role and activities of
53
54 marketing within the firm are changing as a consequence of technological advance associated
55
56 with the digital era, it also contributes to ongoing debates concerning the functional influence
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of marketing (Homburg *et al.*, 2015) and its inability to demonstrate a return on
4
5 organizational performance (Boyd *et al.*, 2010; Rust *et al.*, 2004; Verhoef & Leeflang, 2009;
6
7 Webster *et al.*, 2005). Furthermore, our findings begin to remedy the lack of research which
8
9 explores how marketing practice influences top management strategy making (Skålén &
10
11 Hackley, 2011). In addressing these issues, we have investigated how marketing
12
13 responsibilities are delineated and strategic opportunities are formulated. Our findings
14
15 highlight changes in how marketing is practised, as a consequence of the evolving
16
17 technological landscape, and show the implications for marketing within the firm. In
18
19 particular, we reveal how rapid technological change has precipitated a functional
20
21 transformation, which is having repercussions for the future of marketing and its practice.
22
23 The following discussion frames these findings in relation to the three research questions that
24
25 guided the study and, in each case, pinpoints proposals for further research.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 *Strategic decision-making and the accountability of marketing*

33

34 The recent proliferation in data and developments in data analytics bring huge opportunities
35
36 in relation to market insight and the identification of target markets, as well as providing
37
38 broader insights which can inform marketing strategy. Paradoxically, many managers now
39
40 have more data than they can realistically manage; a situation that continues to raise
41
42 difficulties of its own (Langley, 1995). Just as in the past, when many organizations lacked
43
44 the necessary in-house skills to manipulate and model customer data (Dibb and Simkin,
45
46 2001), technological knowledge gaps are proving to be a major challenge. Senior marketing
47
48 managers, who have not ‘grown up’ in a digital environment, find themselves technically ill-
49
50 equipped; a lack of understanding that is limiting how creatively the data can be used in
51
52 practice (Slater *et al.*, 2010).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Organizational responses to these skill shortfalls include outsourcing the manipulation of data
4
5 to agencies, or transferring the responsibility to insight managers or data officers who may
6
7 not be located within the marketing team. This is creating a new type of a crisis for marketing
8
9 than previously has been described in the literature (e.g. Bartels, 1974; Wind and Robertson,
10
11 1983; Day, 1992; Reibstein *et al.*, 2009). The growing role of insight teams not located
12
13 within the marketing function and the use of external digital agencies which often have the
14
15 ear of the client's leadership team risk marginalising and subordinating the marketing
16
17 function. Both the richness of the data and sophistication of the routines available for its
18
19 manipulation, enable segmentation projects and market assessments to be completed more
20
21 quickly and at lower cost than in the past. Where there is a separation of data handling from
22
23 the marketing team there are, however, several consequences. A principle concern is the
24
25 extent to which marketers have control over the market insights that arise from digital data;
26
27 insights which are an essential input to strategic decision making. This issue of control is
28
29 compounded by the fact that other senior stakeholders recognise the valuable insights that
30
31 digital data can offer and increasingly go direct to those handling the data. Consequently,
32
33 while the availability of this data is crucial in helping firms become more market-led, it is not
34
35 necessarily marketers who are leading the charge. Accountability for marketing strategy
36
37 decision-making is also more ambiguous, often falling outside of the sole control of senior
38
39 marketers.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 We find that in sectors such as retailing and FMCG manufacturing these changes are
48
49 affecting the perceived currency of fundamental concepts such as market segmentation and
50
51 market strategy development. In other areas, for example, in B2B or the financial services
52
53 sector, where media placement decisions utilize traditional marketing channels (e.g.
54
55 television, print, etc.), we find that traditional strategic marketing practices remain an
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 essential element of managers' decision making. These contradictions are partly reconciled in
4
5 consumer markets by the fact that 'one-to-one' and 'micro segments' - which are enabled by
6
7 big data - can often be generated by breaking down more traditional market segments. In
8
9 other words, the 'one-to-one' digital vision is effectively delivered alongside or within
10
11 traditional segmentation approaches. In B2B settings, particularly those typified by high
12
13 customer contact and customer adaptation, while the strategic value of these fundamental
14
15 practices is well recognized, we also find evidence of social media and other digital insight
16
17 supporting targeting activities and relationship building.
18
19

20
21
22 Overall, our findings suggest that digital solutions are an additional management tool to be
23
24 integrated within strategic and tactical processes (Brodie *et al.*, 2007). However, ambiguity
25
26 over which organizational functions own and use these data obfuscates the measurement and
27
28 assessment of marketing's contribution. Even so, we find mixed results in the extent to which
29
30 this is being achieved. Consequently, in the absence of convenient shorthand metrics,
31
32 operational decision-making at all levels within the organization is compromised. In
33
34 particular, the extent to which marketers can demonstrate accountability for the firm's
35
36 strategic marketing activity is diminished; an essential requirement if the functional role of
37
38 marketing is to be represented at the highest organizational level (Walsh and Lipinski, 2009).
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Future research should examine the differing impacts of digital across sectors, so that a
46
47 clearer picture of the interplay between traditional marketing approaches, and those inspired
48
49 by digital, can be developed. A more nuanced understanding is needed of the extent to which
50
51 the traditional and the new sit alongside each other, the relationship between them, and the
52
53 degree to which they mutually reinforce or are integrated. In light of the variations we found
54
55 across firms, the extent to which this interplay is influenced by factors such as industry
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 context, firm size, the nature of the customer base, and the type of strategic or tactical
4 projects that are supported, also needs to be investigated.
5
6
7
8

9
10 *The evolution of marketing decision-making*

11 The situation we have described has consequences for how marketing decision-making is
12 evolving. In particular, we note a reduction in the voice of marketers in driving organizational
13 strategic direction. Instead, we find an increasingly divisive remit for the marketing function
14 and those who practice marketing within the firm, elevating a new agenda revolving around
15 the tactical implementation of digital metrics aligned to consumer response and social media.
16 To be clear, we do not see a lessening in the extent to which firms are market-led; rather we
17 see changes in which stakeholders are central to bringing this about. In this regard, there is
18 further evidence of a threat to marketing's distinct organizational capability (Rust, *et al.*,
19 2004). For some of the interviewed client organizations, the situation is both volatile and
20 fluid; as other organizational stakeholders deepen their engagement with digital data, using it
21 to strengthen their influence over strategic decision-making.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 A central theme in this evolution of marketing decision-making has been the extent to which
39 marketing channel integration has been achieved. We report mixed findings in this regard.
40 Whereas the agencies we interviewed perceived such integration as a barrier for clients still to
41 overcome and were critical of what has been achieved, we also found examples of good
42 practice among clients and confidence that effective progress is being made. The strategic
43 integration of other organizational functions including sales, distribution and customer
44 service has also been exposed as a major difficulty in many organizations, further serving to
45 diminish the strategic nature of marketing practice (Chari *et al.*, 2012).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Further research should unpack the relationship between data proliferation and
4 functional/strategic responsibilities within the firm. Longitudinal case studies could help to
5 pinpoint the changing roles of different organizational stakeholders. Studies which focus on
6 strategic marketing projects as the unit of analysis could provide valuable insights into how
7 these responsibilities are shared through the life of an initiative. Researchers should also
8 consider how responsibility for marketing decisions is dispersed and the extent to which
9 digital advances are altering where in the firm and how these decisions are made. These
10 concerns are intertwined with the issue of accountability; as only through a more nuanced
11 understanding of the changing ownership of marketing decisions will it be possible for
12 marketing to demonstrate its accountability.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Studies are also needed which explore the extent to which marketing decision-making is
28 being affected by the erosion of control over data insight and analytics that is evident in many
29 organizations. In instances where market insights are gathered at a distance from those who
30 are responsible for strategic and tactical decisions, more needs to be known about the short-
31 term impacts on measures such as customer relationship management, customer satisfaction
32 and marketing control; and about how these changes affect competitiveness and business
33 performance in the long term.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 *A changing role for marketing in the evolving technological landscape*

46
47 Finally, we sought to identify the implications of this period of *crisis, transformation* and
48 *vision*, for marketing's role within the firm. We argue that it is not technology *per se* that is
49 changing the way that marketing activities are conducted but how, where and by whom, these
50 activities are being carried out. It is, therefore, the discourse surrounding technology and
51 organizational change that is shaping these shifting functional responsibilities (Postman,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2011). Once seen as essential to business insight and commercial survival, more sophisticated
4 data analytics are increasingly being exposed for their inability to address strategic questions.
5
6
7 Managers' interpretations of data, particularly digital data, are changing the ways in which
8 organizations communicate and integrate strategic decisions. Among digital agencies and
9 some consultancies, we observed a denial of the relevance of fundamental strategic marketing
10 principles, such as the multi-layered organizational integration of KPIs, channel cohesion and
11 marketing accountability, in favour of a narrative premised on what Arndt (1985) previously
12 labelled as managerial *control*. On a positive note, most of the client organizations continue
13 to recognise the value of traditional marketing practices and strategic marketing principles.
14 For example, we found that normative segmentation practices maintain both a strategic and a
15 tactical role in management practice.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Even so, we uncovered a range of operational barriers that impede both the strategic
30 integration and functional accountability of marketing. Curiously, while the digital agenda
31 that is creating these problems is in its infancy, the resulting implementation barriers are not
32 new. Neither are they confined to the marketing discipline. For over twenty years, problems
33 associated with internal communications, sharing of the strategic vision and data quality,
34 have impeded the development of strategy in organizations (cf. Wensley, 1995). Ultimately,
35 while the digital agenda is changing the ways in which strategic solutions deliver measurable
36 outcomes, the managerial implementation barriers remain the same. Old stories, but new
37 narratives nonetheless. A more detailed understanding is needed of the nature and impacts of
38 the barriers that impede strategic and tactical marketing activities; which barriers are the
39 same as in the past, which are new, and which are being expressed in new ways to reflect the
40 changing technological environment. If practitioners can improve their understanding of
41 these challenges, they will be much better placed both to anticipate and overcome them.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Concluding Remarks

We conclude that the changing digital environment has potentially serious consequences for how marketing is practiced and for the marketing function as a subordinate domain of management. Our research findings contribute a current perspective to ongoing debates concerning the evolving and increasingly troubled nature of marketing's role within the firm. In a managerial sense, client-side organizations are authoring marketing's destiny by placing it in the hands of intermediaries such as digital agencies; agencies with their own commercial agendas. Furthermore, while a digital marketing skills gap is clearly exposed within this changing technological climate (cf. Day, 2011), the gap is widening - particularly within client organizations as internal and external relationships continue to change - and especially because efforts to integrate new insights are so far removed from strategic planning processes. Consequently, while our findings suggest that a limited group of sophisticated practitioners are adopting innovative approaches that involve detailed analysis of large datasets (Roberts *et al.*, 2014), this is not necessarily true of most, who are either not adopting such approaches or are out-sourcing to independent specialist companies. This situation raises the question as to whether there are: (a) important contextual factors behind this difference or, rather, another example of (b) the phenomenon of limited absorptive capacity (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990) among the majority of businesses in this domain. Further research is therefore needed to align the strategic focus of academic research in marketing with the requirements of business and government research policy. The volatile period of social, economic and technological change, continues to have a significant impact on the function of marketing, as well as on the economy, society and the teaching of marketing as an academic discipline.

References

Alvesson, M. (2003) "Beyond Neopositivists, Romantics, and Localists: A reflexive approach to interviews in organizational research", *Academy of Management Review*, 28 (1), pp. 13-33.

Anderson, P. (1982) "Marketing, strategic planning, and the theory of the firm", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 46 No. 2 (Spring), pp. 15-26.

Arndt, J. (1985) 'The tyranny of paradigms: the case for paradigmatic pluralism in marketing'. In Dholakia, N. and Arndt, J. (eds) *Changing the Course of Marketing: Alternative Paradigms for Widening Marketing Theory*, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, pp. 3-25.

Bainbridge, J. (2009) "No time wasters", *The Marketer*, April, pp. 29-33.

Baker, S. (2009) "Learning, and profiting, from online friendships", *Bloomberg Businessweek Magazine*, New York, available at: http://www.bloomberg.com/bw/magazine/content/09_22/b4133032573293.htm (accessed 11 August 2015).

Ball, K. and Haggerty, K. (2005) "Editorial: Doing surveillance studies", *Surveillance and Society*, 3 (2/3), pp. 129-138.

Bartels, R. (1974) "The identity crisis in marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 38 No. 4, pp. 73-76.

Barwise, P. and Farley, J. (2005) "The state of interactive marketing in seven countries: Interactive marketing comes of age", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 19 (3), pp. 67-80.
doi: 10.1002/dir.20044

Berger, D. (2010) "Balancing consumer privacy with behavioural targeting", *Santa Clara High Technology Law Journal*, 27 (1), pp. 3-61.

1
2
3 Bonoma, T. V. (1984) "Making your marketing strategy work", *Harvard Business Review*,
4
5 Vol. 62 No. 2, pp. 69-76.
6

7
8
9 Boyd, D. and Crawford, K. (2012) "Big questions for big data: provocations for a cultural,
10
11 technological, and scholarly phenomenon", *Information, Communication and Society*, 15 (5),
12
13 pp. 662-679. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2012.678878
14

15
16 Boyd, E. D., Chandy, R. K. and Cunha, M. (2010) "When do chief marketing officers affect
17
18 firm value?", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 47 No. 6, pp. 1162-1176.
19

20
21 Brady, M., Saren, M. and Tzokas, N. (2002) "Integrating information technology into
22
23 marketing practice – The IT reality of contemporary marketing practice", *Journal of*
24
25 *Marketing Management*, 18 (5/6), pp. 555-577.
26

27
28 Brodie, R. J., Winklhofer, H., Coviello, N. E. and Johnston, W. J. (2007), "Is e-marketing
29
30 coming of age? An examination of the penetration of e-marketing and firm performance",
31
32 *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 21 (1) 2–21. doi: 10.1002/dir.20071
33

34
35
36 Browne, S., Sharkey-Scott, P., Mangematin, V., Lawlor, K. & Cuddihy, L. (2014) "Adapting
37
38 a book to make a film: how strategy is adapted through professional practices of marketing
39
40 middle managers", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 30 No. 9/10, pp. 949-973.
41

42
43 Bund, H. and Carroll, J. (1957) 'The changing role of the marketing function', *Journal of*
44
45 *Marketing*, 21, 268-325.
46

47
48
49 Campbell, J. L., Quincy, C., Osserman, J. and Pedersen, O. (2013) "Coding in-depth semi-
50
51 structured interviews. Problems of unitization and inter-coder reliability and agreement",
52
53 *Sociological Methods Research*, 42 (3), pp. 294-320.
54

55
56 Charlesworth, A. (2009) *The digital revolution*, Dorling Kindersley: London.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Chari, S., Katsikeas, C., Balabanis, G. and Robson, M. (2012) 'Emergent marketing strategies
4 and performance: The effects of market uncertainty and strategic feedback systems', *British*
5
6
7 *Journal of Management*, 25, pp. 145-165.
8

9
10 Chebat, J. C. (1999) "Introduction: Special Issue on strategy implementation and assessment
11 research – research on implementation deserves as much attention as strategy formulation",
12
13 *Journal of Business Research*, Vol 64 No. 2, pp. 107-110.
14

15
16
17
18 Chimanzhi, J. and Morgan, R. E. (2005) "Explanation from the marketing/human resources
19 dyad for marketing strategy effectiveness in service firms", *Journal of Business Research*,
20
21
22 Vol. 58 No. 6, pp. 787-796.
23

24
25
26
27 Cohen, W. M. and Levinthal, D. A. (1990) "Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on
28 learning and innovation", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, pp. 128-152.
29

30
31
32
33 Corbin, J., and Strauss, A. (2008) *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures*
34
35 *for developing grounded theory*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

36
37
38
39 Davies, M. A. P. and Ardley, B. C. (2012) "Denial at the top table: status attributions and
40 implications for marketing", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 20 Issue 2, pp. 113-126.
41

42
43
44
45 Day, G. S. (2011) "Closing the marketing capabilities gap, *Journal of Marketing*, 74 (5), pp.
46
47 183-195.
48

49
50
51
52 Day, G. S. (1992) "Marketing's contribution to the strategy dialogue", *Journal of the*
53
54 *Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 323-329.
55

56
57
58
59
60 Day, G. and Bens, K. (2005) "Capitalizing on the internet opportunity", *Journal of Business*
& *Industrial Marketing*, 20 (4/5), pp. 160 – 168.

1
2
3 Day, G. S. and Wensley, R. (1983) "Marketing theory with strategic orientation", *Journal of*
4
5 *Marketing*, Vol. 47 No. 4, pp. 79-89.

6
7
8 Denzin, N. K. (1989) *Interpretive interactionism*, Sage: Newbury Park, CA.

9
10
11 Deshpande, R. and Webster, F. (1989) 'Organizational culture and marketing: Defining the
12
13 research agenda', *Journal of Marketing*, 53, pp. 3-15.

14
15
16 Dibb, S. and Simkin, L. (2009) "Editorial: Bridging the segmentation theory/practice divide",
17
18 *Journal of Marketing Management*, 25 (4), pp. 219-226.

19
20
21 Dibb, S. and Simkin, L. (2001) "Market segmentation: diagnosing and treating the barriers",
22
23 *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 30 (8), pp. 609-625.

24
25
26 Drucker, P. F. (1954) *The Practice of Management*, New York: Harper and Brothers.

27
28
29 Durkin, M. (2013) "Tweet me cruel: Perspectives on battling digital marketing myopia", *The*
30
31 *Marketing Review*, 13 (10), pp. 51-63.

32
33
34 Easterby-Smith, M. Thorpe, R. and Jackson, P. (2012) *Management Research*, (4th ed.)
35
36 London: Sage.

37
38
39 Engelen, A. and Brettel, M. (2011) "A cross-cultural perspective of marketing departments'
40
41 influence tactics", *Journal of International Marketing*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 73-94.

42
43
44 Ernst, D. (2003) "Digital information systems and global flagship networks: how mobile is
45
46 knowledge in the global network economy?" In: Christensen, J.F., Maskell, P. (Eds.), *The*
47
48 *Industrial Dynamics of the New Digital Economy*, Edward Elgar Publishers: Cheltenham, pp.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
151-176.

1
2
3 ESRC (2009) *Economic and Social Research Council, Economic Performance and*
4
5 *Development* [<http://www.esrcsocietytoday.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/research/Economic>
6
7 [Performance Development/](http://www.esrcsocietytoday.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/research/Economic)] [accessed May 12th].

8
9
10 Feit , E., Wang, P., Bradlow, E. and Fader, P. (2013) “Fusing aggregate and disaggregate data
11
12 with an application to multiplatform media consumption”, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 50
13
14 (3), pp. 348-364.

15
16
17 Finch, D., Nadeau, J. and O’Reilly, N. (2013) “The future of marketing education: A
18
19 practitioner’s perspective”, *Journal of Marketing Education*, 35 (1), pp. 54-67.

20
21
22 Germann, F., Lilien, G. & Rangaswamy, A. (2012) “Performance implications of deploying
23
24 marketing analytics”, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 30 (2), pp. 114-128.

25
26
27 Gill, J. and Johnson, P. (2002) *Research Methods for Managers*, Sage: London.

28
29
30 Goodell, P. and Martin, C. (1992) “Marketing strategies for recession survival”, *Journal of*
31
32 *Business and Industrial Marketing*, 7 (4), pp. 301-311.

33
34
35 Green, P. E., and Abba M. (1992) "An application of a product positioning model to
36
37 pharmaceutical products", *Marketing Science* Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 117-132.

38
39
40 Guest, G., MacQueen, K. and Namey, E. (2012) *Applied Thematic Analysis*, Sage: Thousand
41
42 Oaks, CA.

43
44
45 Han, J., Kamber, M. and Pei, J. (2012). *Data mining: Concepts and strategies*, (3rd ed.),
46
47 Morgann Kaufman Publishers: Waltham, MA.

48
49
50 Hansen, M. and Nohria, N. (2004) “How to build collaborative advantage”, *Sloan*
51
52 *Management Review*, 46 (1), pp. 22-30.

1
2
3 Homburg, C., Vomburg, A., Enke, M. and Grimm, P. H. (2015) "The loss of the marketing
4 department's influence: is it really happening? And why worry?", *Journal of the Academy of*
5 *Marketing Science*, Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 1-13.
6
7

8
9
10 Homburg, C., Krohmer, H. and Workman, J. P. (2004) "A strategy implementation
11 perspective of market orientation", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 57 No. 12, pp. 1331-
12 1340.
13
14

15
16
17 Homburg, C., Workman, J. P. and Jensen, O. (2000) "Fundamental changes in marketing
18 organization: the movement toward a customer-focused organizational structure", *Journal of*
19 *the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 459-478.
20
21
22

23
24
25 Humby, C., Hunt, T. and Philips, T. (2008) *Scoring points: How Tesco continues to win*,
26 Kogan Page: London.
27
28

29
30 Irvine, A., Drew, P. and Sainsbury, R. (2013) "Am I not answering your questions
31 properly?" Clarification, adequacy and responsiveness in semi-structured telephone and face-
32 to-face interviews", *Qualitative Research*, 13 (1), pp. 87-106.
33
34
35

36
37
38 Kiani, G. R. (1998) "Marketing opportunities in the digital world", *Internet Research*, 8 (2),
39 pp. 185 – 194. doi: 10.1108/10662249810211656
40
41

42
43 Kietzmann, J., Silvestre, B., McCarthy, I. and Pitt, L. (2012) "Unpacking the social media
44 phenomenon: towards a research agenda", *Journal of Public Affairs*, 12 (2), pp. 109-119.
45
46

47
48 Kirkup, M. and Carrigan, M. (2000) "Video surveillance research in retailing: ethical issues",
49 *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 28 (11), pp. 470-480.
50
51
52

1
2
3 Krohmer, H., Homburg, C. and Workman, J. P. (2002) "Should marketing be cross-
4 functional? Conceptual development and international empirical evidence", *Journal of*
5 *Business Research*, Vol. 55 No. 6, pp. 451-465.

6
7
8
9
10 Kumar, V. (2015), "Evolution of marketing as a discipline: What has happened and what to
11 look out for," *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 79, No. 1, pp. 1-9.

12
13
14
15
16 Lamberti, L. and Nocia, G. (2009) "Marketing power and CMO power: Could market
17 orientation break the link? An exploratory case study", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol.
18 17 No. 5, pp. 327-343.

19
20
21
22
23 Langley, A. (1995) "Between 'paralysis by analysis' and 'extinction by instinct'", *Sloan*
24 *Management Review*, 36 (3), pp. 63-76.

25
26
27
28
29 Leeflang, P., Verhoef, P., Dahlstrom, P. and Freundt, T. (2014) Challenges and solutions for
30 marketing in a digital era", *European Management Review*, 32 (1), pp. 1-12.

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Lehmann, D. R. (2004) "Metrics for marketing matter", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 68 Vol. 4,
pp. 73-75.

Lyon, D. (2004) "Globalizing surveillance: Comparative and sociological perspectives,
International Sociology, 19 (2), pp. 135-149.

McDonald, M. (2009) "The future of marketing: brightest star in the firmament, or a fading
meteor? Some hypotheses and a research agenda", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol.
25 No. 5-6, 431-450. doi:10.1362/026725709X461786

Mitchell, V-W. (1994) "Using industrial key informants: some guidelines", *Journal of the*
Market Research Society, 36 (2), pp. 139-154.

1
2
3 Mitchell, V-W. (1993) "Industrial in-depth interviews: some considerations for first-time
4 users", *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 11 (4), pp. 25-29.
5
6

7
8 Miles, M.B and Huberman, A.M. (1994) *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*,
9 London: Sage.
10

11
12 Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M and Saldana, J. (2014) *Qualitative Data Analysis: A*
13 *Methods Sourcebook*, Sage: Thousand Oaks, California.
14
15

16
17 Miller, S., Wilson, D. and Hickson, D. (2004) "Beyond planning strategies for successfully
18 implementing strategic decisions", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 201-218.
19
20

21
22 Morgan, N. A. (2012) "Marketing and business performance," *Journal of the Academy of*
23 *Marketing Science*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 102-119
24
25

26
27 Moorman, C. and Rust, R. (1999) 'The role of marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, 63, pp. 180-
28 197.
29
30

31
32 MSI (2014) "MSI Research Priorities, Priority 7: Marketing Organizations and Capabilities",
33 *Marketing Science Institute*, [[http://www.msi.org/research/msi-research-priorities/priority-7-](http://www.msi.org/research/msi-research-priorities/priority-7-marketing-organizations-and-capabilities/)
34 [marketing-organizations-and-capabilities/](http://www.msi.org/research/msi-research-priorities/priority-7-marketing-organizations-and-capabilities/)] (accessed, March 20).
35
36

37
38 Noble, C. H. (1999) "The eclectic roots of strategy implementation research", *Journal of*
39 *Business Research*, Vol. 45 No. 2, pp. 119-135.
40
41

42
43 Noble, C. H. and Mokwa, M. P. (1999) "Implementing marketing strategies: developing and
44 testing a managerial theory", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 63 No. 4, pp. 57-73.
45
46

47
48 Noy, C. (2008) "Sampling knowledge: The hermeneutics of snowball sampling in qualitative
49 research", *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 11 (4), pp. 327-344.
50
51

1
2
3 O'Sullivan, D., Abela, A. V. and Hutchinson, M. (2009) "Marketing performance
4 measurement and firm performance", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 43 No. 5/6, pp.
5 843-862.
6
7

8
9
10 Olson, E. M, Slater, S. F. and Hult, G. T. M. (2005) "The importance of structure and process
11 to strategy implementation", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 48 No. 1, pp. 47-54.
12
13

14
15
16 ONS (2009) "Labour market statistics", *The Office for National Statistics*, (April) <
17 <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/pdfdir/lmsuk0409.pdf>> [accessed May 12th 2009].
18
19

20
21 ONS (2008) "Consumer Trends", The Office for National Statistics, (Quarter 4, 2008) <
22 http://www.statistics.gov.uk/downloads/theme_economy/CT2008q4_Final.pdf. [accessed
23 May 12th 2009].
24
25
26

27
28 Palmer, M. and Simmons, G. (2010) "Strategists' reactions and resistance towards forces of
29 inclusion: Soothing the anxiety of marketing (non-)influence", *Journal of Strategic*
30 *Marketing*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 317–336. doi:10.1080/09652540903537006
31
32
33

34
35
36 Parsons, M. and Waitman, R. (1998) "Organising today for the digital marketing of
37 tomorrow", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 12 (1), pp. 31-46.
38
39

40
41 Pettigrew, A.M. "Contextualist Research and the Study of Organizational Change Processes",
42 in Mumford E., Hirschheim R., Fitzgerald G. & Wood-Harper T. (eds.) *Research Methods in*
43 *Information Systems*, North-Holland: New York, pp. 53-78.
44
45
46

47
48 Piercy, N. and Morgan, N. (1993) "Strategic and operational market segmentation: A
49 managerial analysis", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 1 (2), pp. 123-140.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Peltier, J., Zahay, D. and Lehmann, D. (2012) "Organizational learning and CRM success: A
4 model for linking organizational practices, customer data quality and performance", *Journal*
5 *of Interactive Marketing*, 27 (1), pp. 1-13.
6
7

8
9
10 Phillips, L. W. (1981) "Assessing measurement error in key informant reports: a
11 methodological note on organizational analysis in marketing", *Journal of Marketing*
12 *Research*, 18 (4), pp. 395-415.
13
14

15
16
17 Piercy, N. (2002) *Market-led Strategic Change: A Guide to Transforming the Process of*
18 *Going to Market*, Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.
19
20

21
22
23 Porter, M. E. (1985) *Competitive advantage: creating and sustaining superior performance*,
24 New York: Free Press.
25
26

27
28 Postman, N. (2011) *Technopoly: the surrender of culture to technology*. New York: Knopf
29 Doubleday Publishing Group.
30
31

32
33 Qi, H. (2005) "Strategy implementation: the impact of demographic characteristics on the
34 level of support received by middle managers", *Management International Review*, Vol. 45
35 No. 1, pp. 45-70.
36
37
38

39
40
41 Quinn, L. and Dibb, S. (2010) Evaluating market segmentation research priorities: Targeting
42 re-emancipation", *Journal of Marketing Management*, 26 (13/14), pp. 1239-1255.
43
44

45
46 Quinn, L. Hines, T. and Bennis, D. (2007) "Making sense of market segmentation: A
47 fashion retailing case", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 41 No. 5-6, pp. 439-465.
48
49

50
51 Ready, D. and Conger, J. (2007) "Make your company a talent factory", *Harvard Business*
52 *Review*, 85 (6), pp. 68-77.
53
54
55

1
2
3 Reibstein, D. J., Day, G., and Wind, J. (2009) Guest editorial: Is marketing academia losing
4 its way?, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 1–3. doi:10.1509/jmkg.73.4.1
5
6

7
8 Roberts, J., Kayande, U. and Stremersch, S. (2014) ‘From academic research to marketing
9 practice: Exploring the marketing science value chain’, *International Journal of Research in
10 Marketing*, 31, pp. 127-140.
11
12

13
14
15 Roberts, K. (2003) “What strategic investments should you make during a recession to gain
16 competitive advantage in the recovery?”, *Strategy and Leadership*, 31 (4), pp. 31-39.
17
18

19
20
21 Rust, R., Ambler, T., Carpenter, G., Kumar, V. and Srivastava, R. (2004) ‘Measuring
22 marketing productivity: Current knowledge and future directions’, *Journal of Marketing*, 68,
23 pp. 76-89.
24
25
26

27
28 Ryle, G. (1971). *Collected papers. Volume II collected essays, 1929-1968*, London:
29 Hutchinson.
30
31

32
33 Shama, A. (1993) “Marketing strategies during Recession: A comparison of small and large
34 firms”, *Journal of Small Business Management*, 31 (3), pp. 62-73.
35
36

37
38 Sheth, J. and Sisodia, R. (2015) *Does Marketing Need Reform? Fresh Perspectives on the
39 Future*, Abingdon: Routledge.
40
41
42

43
44 Simmons, G. (2008) “Marketing to postmodern consumers: introducing the internet
45 chameleon”, *European Journal of Marketing*, 42 (3/4), pp. 299-310.
46
47

48
49 Skålén, P., and Hackley, C. (2011) “Marketing-as-practice. Introduction to the special issue,
50 *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 189–195.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
doi:10.1016/j.scaman.2011.03.004

1
2
3 Slater, S., Hult, G. and Olsen, E. (2010) 'Factors influencing the relative importance of
4 marketing strategy creativity and marketing strategy implementation effectiveness',
5
6
7 *Industrial Marketing Management*, 39, 551-9.
8

9
10 Sletteameås, D. (2009) "RFID—the 'Next step' in consumer-product relations or Orwellian
11 nightmare? Challenges for research and policy", *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 32 (3), pp.
12 219-244.
13
14
15

16
17
18 Smith, W. (1956) "Product differentiation and market segmentation as alternative marketing
19 strategies", *Journal of Marketing*, 21 (1), pp. 3-8.
20
21

22
23 Snijders, C., Matzat, U. and Reips, U. (2012) "Big data: Big gaps of knowledge in the field of
24 internet science", *Journal of Internet Science*, 7, pp. 1-5.
25
26

27
28 Sorescu, A., Frambach, R., Singh, J., Rangaswamy, A. and Bridges, C. (2011) "Innovation in
29 retail business models", *Journal of Retailing*, 87S (1), pp. 3-16.
30
31

32
33 Spiggle, S. (1994) "Analysis and interpretation of in qualitative data in consumer research",
34
35 *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21 (3), pp. 491-503
36
37

38
39 Srinivasan, R., Rangaswamy, A. and Lilien, G. (2005) "Turning adversity into advantage:
40 Does proactive marketing during a recession pay off?", *International Journal of Research in*
41 *Marketing*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 109-125.
42
43
44

45
46 Stone, M. and Woodcock, N. (2014) "Interactive, direct and digital marketing: A future that
47 depends on better use of business intelligence", *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*,
48 8 (1), pp. 4-17.
49
50

51
52
53 Strauss, A., and Corbin, J. (1998) *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures*
54 *for developing grounded theory*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Tavassoli, N. T., Sorescu, A., & Chandy, R. (2014) "Employee-based brand equity: Why
4 firms with strong brands pay their executives less", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 51
5
6
7 No. 6, pp. 676-690.
8

9
10 Thorpe, E. and Morgan, R. (2007) "In pursuit of the 'ideal approach' to successful marketing
11 strategy implementation", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 41 No. 5/6, pp. 659-677.
12

13
14 Tollin, K. and Schmidt, M. (2012) "Marketing logics, ambidexterity and influence", *Journal
15 of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 20 No. 6, pp. 509-534.
16
17

18
19 Tracey, S. (2010) "Qualitative quality: Eight 'big-tent' criteria for excellent qualitative
20 research", *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16 (10), pp. 837-851.
21
22

23
24 Varadarajan, P. R. (1992) "Marketing's contribution to strategy: the view from a different
25 looking glass", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 20 No. 4, p. 335-343.
26
27

28
29 Varadarajan, P. R. (2010) "Strategic marketing and marketing strategy: domain, definition,
30 fundamental issues and foundational premises", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing
31 Science*, Vol. 38 No. 2, p. 119-140.
32
33

34
35 Varadarajan, P. R., Jayachandran, S., and White, C. S. (2001) "Strategic interdependence in
36 organizations: deconglomeration and marketing strategy", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 65 No.
37 1, pp. 15-28.
38
39

40
41 Verhoef, P. & Leeflang, P. (2009), "Understanding marketing department's influence within
42 the firm", *Journal of Marketing*, 73 (2), pp. 14-37.
43
44

45
46 Walker, D. and Fung, K. (2013) 'Big data and big business: Should statisticians join in?',
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Significance, 10 (4), pp. 20-25. doi: 10.1111/j.1740-9713.2013.00679.x

1
2
3 Walsh, M. and Lipinski, J. (2009) 'The role of the marketing function in small and medium
4 sized enterprises', *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 16, pp. 569 – 585.

5
6
7
8 Webster, F. E., Malter, A. J. and Ganeshan, S. (2005) "The decline and dispersion of
9 marketing competence", *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 34-43.

10
11
12
13 Webster, F. (1992) 'The changing role of marketing in the corporation', *Journal of*
14 *Marketing*, 56, pp. 1-17.

15
16
17
18 Webster, F. (1981) 'Top management's concerns about marketing: Issues for the 1980s',
19 *Journal of Marketing*, 45, pp. 9-16.

20
21
22
23
24 Wedel, M. and Kamakura, W. (2002) Introduction to the Special Issue on market
25 segmentation, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 19 (3), pp. 181-183.

26
27
28
29 Wensley, R. (1995) 'A critical review of research in marketing', *British Journal of*
30 *Management*, 6, s63-82.

31
32
33
34
35 Wind, Y. (2014) "Toward a New Marketing Paradigm", In: Moutinho, L., Bigné, E. and
36 Manrai, A. (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to the Future of Marketing*, Abingdon:
37 Routledge, pp. 3-24.

38
39
40
41
42 Wind, Y. (1987) "Issues and advances in segmentation research", *Journal of Marketing*
43 *Research*, 15 (3), pp. 317-37.

44
45
46
47 Wind, Y. and Mahajan, V. (2001) *Digital Marketing: Global Strategies from the World's*
48 *Leading Experts*, New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc.

49
50
51
52
53 Wind, Y. and Robertson, T. S. (1983) "Marketing strategy: new directions for theory and
54 research", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 47 No. 2, pp. 12-25.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Wymbs, C. (2011) “Digital marketing: The time for a new ‘academic major’ has arrived”,
Journal of Marketing Education, 33 (1), pp. 93-106.

European Journal of Marketing

Appendix 1: Semi-Structured Key-Informant Interview Template

Aims

How are strategic priorities in relation to targeting decided? How and in what ways is this changing? Who are the key internal and external decision-makers and influencers? How does this impact on the strategic direction of the organization? And where does the 'power' lie in terms of this decision making?

How are these decisions implemented and what does the execution phase involve?

What has been the impact of the digital era in this decision-making?

1. Project background

- Informants to be given an explanation of the project, focusing on brief background and aims.

2. Respondent background

- Their current/previous roles/remits.
- Their Marketing interests/experiences.

3. Current target-market approach (RQ 1)

- Tell us about the markets your organization is currently targeting.
- How are decisions made about these target markets? Please talk us through the process that is followed. Feel free to talk about a specific target marketing example if that helps.
- What does the process involve?
- Who in the organization is involved; who owns/drives the process?
- What information is used in making targeting decisions?
- What other influences are there on the process?
- What is the role of metrics and how is success evaluated?

4. Rethinking targeting and target markets (RQ 2)

- How often does your organization rethink its targeting?
- What factors prompt such a rethink? Can you give us an example or two?

5. How targeting practice is changing (RQ 2)

- Compared with ten years ago, how has the organization's targeting approach changed?
- Who decides about the target markets? Where does the balance of power lie in the decision-making?
- In what ways have the insights used changed? For example, the types of data used, data providers, providers of analytics, and the parties involved in providing these insights.

6. Reflecting on the process (RQ 3)

- What problems does the organization face with its targeting process?
- How are these problems evolving in light of the changes described above?
- Are some aspects easier or more difficult than before? Which and why?
- What has been the impact of digital and social media on the process?
- Is the use of digital and social media accompanied by particular problems?
- How do you envisage targeting practice will change in the future?

7. Closing questions

- Which other organizations are driving the agenda in this area?
- Who else should we contact?

Table 1 – Research Informants and Respective Organizations

Case Organization Type	Case Organization Descriptor	Organization Details	Key-Informant Role
Strategy Consultants	Consultant A	\$60million turnover. 700 employees. Global US-head-quartered agency specialising in digital data collection, with expertise in online panels.	CEO
	Consultant B	€1.3 billion sales. Over 12,000 employees.	Global Head of Innovation and Digital
	Consultant C	\$90 billion annual revenue. 350,000 employees globally.	Head of Analytics/Director
	Consultant D	£1.6billion annual revenue. Over 10,000 employees (UK/Eire).	Global Head of Cloud Marketing and BD
	Consultant E	£7million annual turnover, 70 employees.	CEO
Digital Agencies	Agency A	Marketing and communications agency. Eur. 100m sales in 2014. Circa 100 employees.	Communications Consultant
	Agency B	Recent start-up behaviour change consultancy company.	Founding partner and Director of Marketing
	Agency C	Leading futurologists and trend forecasters in the UK, with operations in North America and Europe.	Founding Partner and Director of Insight
	Agency D	£25 million annual revenue, circa 200 employees. Fast growing UK-based global digital agency.	Head of Marketing (UK)
	Agency E	£5million turnover, circa 30 employees. Digital agency, specialising in social media management and data analytics.	Online Marketing Manager
Client Organizations	Client A	€2,500million annual turnover. Air travel business.	Social Media Manager
	Client B	kr23billion. Petrochemical business.	Head of Marketing for UK, Nordic and Continental Europe
	Client C	£6million annual revenue. Retail mobile telecommunications business.	Head of New Proposition
	Client D	Multi-billion turnover, top five European insurance business.	Senior VP Marketing
	Client E	£4million annual revenue. UK-based branded food company operating in 28 countries.	Head of Marketing
	Client F	£25 million annual turnover. Dynamic change management consultancy business.	Head of BD and Marketing
	Client G	Leading software supplier to the retail sector.	General Manager and Marketing Head
	Client H	£14,000 million annual turnover. Large gambling and gaming business.	Customer Engagement Director
	Client I	£60million annual turnover. Regional insurance brokers	Chairman and MD
	Client J	€40million global sales. Construction materials manufacturer.	Head of Marketing & Strategy

(Sources: Internal Company Documentation)

Table 2 - Summary of Research Findings

<i>Core Theme</i>	<i>Crisis</i>	<i>Transformation</i>	<i>Vision</i>
Case Organization			
Strategy Consultant A	Big data is the problem not the solution (complexity)	Channel integration is a key challenge (integration)	Tactical organizational role and USP limitations (control)
Strategy Consultant B	Decisions require simplicity, data creates complexity (interpretation)	Tension between strategic propositions and tactical implementation (integration)	Functional focus on ROI (role)
Strategy Consultant C	Sound judgment is required (interpretation)	Channel integration is key challenge (integration)	Functional focus on ROI (role)
Strategy Consultant D	Data is the problem, interpretation is the solution (interpretation)	Channel and strategy (integration) is the challenge.	Strategic opportunities only limited by a lack of creativity/skill (power)
Strategy Consultant E	Increasingly driven by COOs, CMOs, CFOs (role)	Channel integration is key challenge (integration)	Channel advantage increasingly held those with the ecosystems in place, e.g. Amazon (power)
Agency A	Uncertainty driving change (role)	Client collaboration is a priority (collaboration)	No strategic future for marketing function (role)
Agency B	Sound judgment is required (interpretation)	Channel integration is key challenge (integration)	No strategic future for marketing function (role & power)
Agency C	Uncertainty driving change (role)	Channel integration is key challenge (integration)	Analytics, innovation and logistics: re-engineering brands/products (collaboration)
Agency D	Data is not the solution (integration)	Primary focus on ROI (power)	The legislative situation (role)
Agency E	Sound judgment is required but ROI is critical (control)	Client collaboration is a priority (collaboration)	No strategic future for marketing function (role)
Client A	Sound judgment is required (interpretation)	Channel integration is key challenge (integration)	Blurring of strategy and tactics. (integration)
Client B	Access to data is often limited but seen as essential (power)	Primary focus on ROI (power)	Only beginning to grasp benefits of digital/focus on ROI (power)
Client C	Sound judgment is required (interpretation)	Decisions require simplicity, data creates complexity (interpretation)	Multi-platform opportunities (integration)
Client D	Opportunity to support marketing decision-making and ROI (integration)	Data was seen as the solution but now presents the problem (complexity)	Focus on ROI (power)
Client E	Big data is the problem not the solution (complexity)	Channel integration is key challenge (integration)	Retail power increasingly held those with the ecosystems in place (e.g. Amazon) (power)
Client F	Can now drive ROI and resourcing but needs clarity (interpretation)	Keeping activities and internal operations simple (integration)	Only just recognising the benefits of digital engagement (role)
Client G	Greater visibility and topicality than ever before (power)	Resourcing across channels/new media options (integration)	Still constrained by limited and patchy B2B client uptake (role)
Client H	Client-led micro-based engagement and experience around better ROI (role)	Internal channel integration, coordination, resourcing (integration)	Multi-platform opportunities to follow and own the customer (power)
Client I	ROI of micro campaigns (role)	Channel integration and migration (integration)	Constrained by patchy client uptake and speed to embrace (role)
Client J	Cost effective activities across far more audiences (integration)	Bandwidth to keep multiple channels aligned and topical (complexity)	Limited by resources, specialist expertise and creativity (role)