
THE EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION OF MARKETING MIX FROM 4P TO 4C TO 4E TO E-MARKETING MIX: A LITERATURE OVERVIEW

Yudhi Prasetya Mada

Faculty of Economics and Business, Trunojoyo University

Article History: Received on: 25/06/2024

Accepted on: 17/08/2024



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26662/ijiert.v11i8.pp37-47>

Abstract

Marketing mix is an important concept in the world of marketing that was first introduced by an academic named Jerome McCarthy in the 1960s. The marketing mix was created in the early days of the marketing concept when physical products, physical distribution and mass communication were dominant. The marketing mix paradigm, in its famous version of the 4 Ps, went all the way through the evolution of marketing theory being object of discussion both in academic literature as well as in managerial practice. In today's era of revolutionary change, the digital business represents the more recent of the business contexts and the one with the greater need for a differentiation and upgradation of the mix. Throughout this evolutionary process, researchers have given their views who think the 4 Ps paradigms is able to adapt to the environmental changes by including new elements inside each "P", and some affirmed that the 4 Ps paradigm is obsolete and propose new paradigms. This paper aims to clarify these two different approaches to marketing mix evolution through a review of the main literature regarding e-marketing mix and its constituents which provides an up gradation to the existing elements of marketing mix as well as focusing on the development of marketing mix theory for the digital context. . In the context of the wars between the upstart internet retailers and the existing brick and mortar retailers, this study would pave the way to consider E-marketing as an innovated way to customer delight. The evolution of 'Product,' 'Price,' 'Place,' and 'Promotion' in the digital era requires a holistic understanding of consumer behavior, technological advancements, and the interconnected nature of the online world.

Keywords: E-marketing, Marketing mix, E-marketing mix, digital context

INTRODUCTION

Electronic trading transactions or e-commerce including through the local pasar platform still can grow after the lifting of social restriction. In Indonesia, the ecommerce market is driven by local market it will continue to grow. The trend occurs in many developing countries because the portion of online shopping to total retail sales is still relatively small and there is still a lot of potential for increasing digital adoption in most people in developing countries, including Indonesia. The growth of e-commerce transactions, including those from the Lokal pasar platform, will continue to occur through penetration in ties two and tier three cities that still have great potential for e-commerce.

It is now more than a decade since the commercialization of the internet, and its adoption by marketers and consumers. The environment of business markets has faced many revolutionary changes with the advent of new concepts since the inception of the word Marketing mix by Neil Borden and since McCarthy (1964)

defined the 4 Ps marketing mix as a combination of all the factors which managers may leverage to satisfy market needs. The integration of technology will lead to an overall shift in the behavior and competition strategy of market participants. It is interesting to discuss whether established marketing models can serve for digital products while great changes happen in market environment and in product's characteristics. In this paper, analyzed the basic content of ecommerce and emarketing, and analyzed the internal relationships of them. This paper attempts to contrast elements of e-marketing with traditional brick and–mortar marketing mix by proposing the other mixes of e-marketing .The intention of this paper is to provide a reference for enterprises in selecting marketing mix model according to product's categories and specifications whether online or physically.

1. Theoretical framework of Marketing Mix.

In McCarthy's version, the marketing mix is composed of: product, price, place and promotion. Each of these Ps comprise a number of the twelve managerial policies described by Borden (1964), thus including other sub-mixes within each P. As noted by Kalyanam & McIntyre (2002), the marketing mix is a collection of thousands of microelements clustered together in order to simplify managerial activity. The validity or the exclusion of the traditional mix in the digital context is a matter of if and how it is possible and convenient to extend the number of elements it includes or to dismiss it and create a new one.

McCarthy's marketing mix has been widely adopted through time by managers and academics, becoming a key element of marketing theory and practice. This wide diffusion may be justified on the basis of its simplicity of use and understanding which makes it a useful tool both for marketing decisions and teaching. The interaction with the customer and the communication capabilities of Internet were unimaginable in the 1960's. The question which this paper aims to underscore is: "Is it possible to create a new list of elements that can adequately modify the traditional mix to fit in new digital contexts? The 4 Ps were created for a manufacturer context. The main reasons the marketing mix is a powerful concept are It makes marketing seem easy to handle, allows the separation of marketing from other activities of the firm and the delegation of marketing tasks to specialists; and – The components of the marketing mix can change a firm's competitive position .The value propositions of products and services offered in the physical world are essentially limited "point solutions" that meet only part of a consumer's need or want. Researchers asserted that the 4 Ps may continue to be the dominant paradigm of marketing mix in digital contexts, since it is sufficient to change the sub-mixes within each P adding and/or deleting some factors in order to adapt to the new scenario.

As the MSM evolved through various stages in time, from the marketing concept of the 1970's, through the introduction of Total Quality Management in the 1980's (Yudelson, 1999), and relationship marketing in the 1990's, to today's adaptation to the digital context, the marketing mix has always been matter of discussion, both between managers and academics. There is no doubt that the changes in the social and economic environment, and the consequent transformation of the competitive arena, have a strong impact on the marketing mix. The digital context, in particular, is where the original version of marketing mix shows major limitations. The interaction with the customer and the communication capabilities of Internet were unimaginable in the 1960's. The 4 Ps were created for a manufacturer context. Nevertheless, the adaptive capability of the 4Ps allow their application in competitive contexts that are significantly different from those for which they were created. The question which this paper aims to underscore is: "Is it possible to create a new list of elements that can adequately modify the traditional mix to fit in new digital contexts?"

In the formulation of his twelve elements Borden (1964) pointed out that it is necessary to create: «1) a list of the important elements or ingredients that make up marketing programs; 2) a list of the forces that bear on the

marketing operation of a firm and to which the marketing manager must adjust in his search for a mix or program that can be successful». McCarthy's marketing mix has been widely adopted through time by managers and academics, becoming a key element of marketing theory and practice. This wide diffusion may be justified on the basis of its simplicity of use and understanding which makes it a useful tool both for marketing decisions and teaching. (Grönroos, 1994; Yudelsohn, 1999; Jobber, 2001). The concept of marketing mix is considered in the Managerial School of Marketing (MSM) (Sheth et al., 1988) as an operative tool to achieve marketing objectives, in particular as a formula for those marketing factors that can be controlled by the enterprise in an uncontrollable competitive environment (Varaldo, 1996). As the MSM evolved through various stages in time, from the marketing concept of the 1970's, through the introduction of Total Quality Management in the 1980's (Yudelsohn, 1999), and relationship marketing in the 1990's, to today's adaptation to the digital context, the marketing mix has always been matter of discussion, both between managers and academics.

The evolution of the marketing strategies has seen a dynamic time period in which the traditional 4Ps of marketing transformed into modern-day 10Ps which now include Product, Price, Place, Promotion, Process, Physical evidence, Positioning, Packaging, People, and Personalization.

The 4Ps are pricing, product, place, and promotion. The 4Cs are customer relationship management, customer communications, customer experience, and customer support. The 7Ps are engagement, passion points, purpose, perception, price, pain points, and pull.

In 1981, the 4Ps were built upon by two modern academics, B.H. Booms and M.J. Bitner, who identified three additional elements they saw as key to the marketing mix: Physical Evidence, People, and Process, thus providing us with what we now know as the 7Ps of the marketing mix.

In the online world, even a simple banner advertisement can be both an advertisement and a direct marketing service. The banner raises the passive consumer's awareness of a product. Yet it also encourages the consumer to pursue action by clicking on it. E-marketing must be defined to include the management of the consumer's online experience of the product, from first encounter through purchase to delivery and beyond. Digital marketers should care about the consumer's online experiences for the simple reason that all of them -- good, bad, or indifferent -- influence consumer perceptions of a product or a brand. The web offers companies' ownership and control of all interactions with customers and thus creates both the ability and the need to improve their overall experience.

The world of marketing has undergone a remarkable transformation over the years, adapting to changing consumer behaviors, preferences, and the digital landscape. One significant evolution that has shaped modern marketing strategies is the transition from the traditional 4Ps (Product, Price, Place, Promotion) marketing mix to the customer-centric 4Cs (Customer, Cost, Convenience, Communication), and finally, to the experiential 4Es (Experience, Exchange, Evangelism, Everyplace). This paradigm shift reflects the profound impact of customer empowerment and the need to create meaningful and engaging interactions in today's competitive and evolving marketplace.

Maintaining the 4 Ps in digital contexts

As it has been earlier stressed that bases of marketing mix cannot be changed but it can be redefined in a broader aspect with respect to digital world. While it is not possible to ignore the need to adjust the marketing mix to the changes in the society and the market produced by the diffusion of digital technologies, Internet in particular, a less numerous, but theoretically consistent, part of the literature on the topic asserts that the 4 Ps' model is perfectly able to adapt and to continue to be the dominant paradigm in these new contexts. Among

the changes brought to each of the 4 Ps by the digital technologies, the following are the most relevant: Product: all the benefits through time that the user obtains from the exchange. The interactive and connective potential of Internet leads to a new product concept: the “virtual product” The virtual product is seen as the union of tangible and intangible aspects, which is adapted and personalized according to the variety and variability of individuals’ preferences by customizing the product with the active help of consumers. Price: everything given by the acquirer in terms of money, time and effort given to obtain the product Place. Everything that is done and necessary to smooth the process of exchange. The physical place becomes virtual and includes intangible aspects of transaction. Promotion: all of the information that is transmitted among parties. It also involves the interactive aspects of digital communication. The aim of online communication is not just to advertise a product, but to built a purchase relation and creates a perception of trust in the customer. Interaction, multimedia and relationship should be included as elements of the P of promotion.

Maintaining the 4 Ps in digital contexts: the conservatives’ view.

While it is not possible to ignore the need to adjust the marketing mix to the changes in the society and the market produced by the diffusion of digital technologies, Internet in particular, a less numerous, but theoretically consistent, part of the literature on the topic asserts that the 4 Ps’ model is perfectly able to adapt and to continue to be the dominant paradigm in these new contexts (Aldridge et al., 1997; Peattie, 1997; O’Connor & Galvin, 1997; Bhatt & Emdad, 2001; Allen & Fjermestad, 2001; Möller, 2006). Möller (2006) points out how the “internal orientation” criticism regards the 4 Ps is based on a misconception of the relation between the marketing mix and the marketing concept. For Möller the 4 Ps paradigm is perfectly coherent with the marketing concept which states that “marketing activities should be based on identification of customer needs and wants”, also implying the selection of the explicit information to be gathered from the customers in order to be able to fulfil their needs, through segmentation, product differentiation and positioning. Peattie (1997) pointed out how the new communicative capabilities supplied by the digital technologies are radically changing marketing in several sectors, but the marketing mix approach is able to adapt to the new needs: product, with the introduction of co-design with customers; price, with higher levels of transparency; place, with the creation of new ways to reach customers; and promotion, thanks to the new interactive capabilities. Bhatt & Emdad (2001) see the empowerment of the 4 Ps since the virtual value chain is internally transforming each P by adding new dimensions: personalized information in the Product, transparency and personalization of Price, direct delivery for Place, improved flexibility for Promotion. O’Connor & Galvin (1997), while assuming that the traditional marketing mix paradigm needs to evolve, propose that digital technologies can be useful to improve the mix’s functionality maintaining the 4 Ps as the basic instrument for Internet marketing. Among the changes brought to each of the 4 Ps by the digital technologies, the following are the most relevant: – Product. The product should nowadays be redefined as: all the benefits through time that the user obtains from the exchange (Yudelson, 1999); this definition applies to the digital context. From the supply side, product policies can gain great benefits from the capability of Internet to engage the consumer in long term relationships that lead to the development of new products. The interactive and connective potential of Internet leads to a new product concept: the “virtual product” (Valdani, 2000; Pastore & Vernuccio, 2004). The virtual product is seen as the union of tangible and intangible aspects, which is adapted and personalized according to the variety and variability of individuals’ preferences by customizing the product with the active help of consumers (von Hippel, 2005; Dominici, 2008b). A product can be delivered from producer to consumer in digital form (mp3 for music, avi for movies, pdf for books and magazines, and so on) thus contextualizing their fruition in the digital framework (Pastore & Vagnani, 2000).

From the demand side, the capability of retrieving information plays a key role (Smith & Chaffey, 2001). Andreini (2006) underlines the effectiveness of Nelson's classification (1970) which divides products in two categories: "search", when it is possible to obtain complete information before the purchase and "experience", when it is not possible, or too expensive, to gather information before the use of the product. Internet has been of great help for the purchasing process of "search" products, thanks to the easiness and affordability of retrieving information online, that, together with the increasing quantity of information and the interactivity of Web 2.0, has made it also possible to transform experience products into search products (Klein, 1998; Andreini, 2006). – Price. The price should be redefined as everything given by the acquirer in terms of money, time and effort given to obtain the product (Yudelson, 1999). From the consumer's perspective, the main benefits of the Web concern the reduction of information asymmetries that allow the consumer to compare prices in real time and gain more transparency (Bhatt & Emdad, 2001). Moreover, the implementation of Artificial Intelligent Agents enable to make automatic and tailored comparisons of prices and features, reducing the price in terms of time and effort (Dominici, 2008a). From the producer's point of view, Internet makes it possible to modify prices in real time; this could lead to dangerous price competitions (Allen & Fjermestad, 2001) with the consequent reduction of profit margins. To avoid this, online communication must be directed towards qualitative aspects and differentiation attributes of the product. – Place. Can be defined today as: everything that is done and necessary to smooth the process of exchange (Yudelson 1999). The application of this definition to the digital context urges to add the element of purchasing process as a key feature of place within the mix. The process must be smooth and easy, while building relations with customers at the same time. The physical place becomes virtual and includes intangible aspects of transaction. Bhatt & Emdad (2001) underline that the main contribution of Internet to business is not the mere possibility of selling products online, rather its capability of building relations with customers. The interactive capabilities of Internet allow the implementation of more efficient and effective systems of digital Customer Relationship Management (e-CRM). Internet enables to obtain information which can be used to manage customers, thanks to the data gathered through the registration of users to the company's Web page and the online purchase data for each customer. This helps to maintain the service level and improve the management of the customer portfolio (Fjermestad & Romano, 2003; O'Learly et al., 2004). – Promotion. Can be redefined in order to include: all of the information that is transmitted among parties (Yudelson, 1999). This definition includes also the interactive aspects of digital communication. The Internet is different from other mass communication media (Morris & Ogan, 1996). Infact, while it is surely a medium which can reach a numerous and dispersed audience, it differentiates itself from the other media regards interactive and multimedia features. Hoffman & Novak (1997) point out that, in the Web environment, the one-to-many concept loses its cogency, while the new many-to-many paradigm takes its place. Personal interaction allows to issue messages directed to a specific individual with a degree of flexibility which no other media can be capable of (Bhatt & Emdad). This also makes it possible to hit the target while he/she is in a situation of relax and confidence (defined as "low involvement" by Krugman, 1965) similar to that of television, but with higher informative capability, due to the multimedia features of the Web communication. The aim of online communication is not just to advertise a product, but to built a purchase relation and create a perception of trust in the customer. Interaction, multimedia and relationship should be included as elements of the P of promotion.

The Evolution: 4Ps to 4Cs

The traditional marketing mix, often referred to as the 4Ps, focused on the company's perspective and the features of the product. However, as markets became more dynamic and consumer-centric, a new framework

emerged: the 4Cs. This shift was a response to the changing relationship between brands and consumers, placing greater emphasis on customer needs and experiences.

1. Customer (Product): The focus shifted from the product itself to the customer's wants and needs. Marketers began to ask: How does the product solve a problem for the customer? What benefits does it offer? This change in perspective led to products being tailored to meet specific customer demands.

2. Cost (Price): Instead of solely concentrating on the price, the 4Cs framework considered the overall cost to the customer, including time and effort spent acquiring the product. Marketers started evaluating value in terms of the customer's perception of benefits relative to costs.

3. Convenience (Place): Placing the product where customers could easily access it became vital. This could be physical stores, online platforms, or any touch-point that facilitated customer convenience and accessibility.

4. Communication (Promotion): Communication evolved from one-way advertising to engaging conversations. The 4Cs approach emphasized building relationships through open dialogue, active listening, and addressing customer feedback.

The Revolution: 4Cs to 4Es

As the digital age brought about a new era of connectivity and engagement, marketing took yet another leap, giving rise to the 4Es framework. This approach shifted the focus from transactions to experiences, highlighting the importance of emotional connections and long-term relationships.

1. Experience (Product and Customer): Products were no longer mere commodities; they became vehicles for delivering memorable experiences. Brands began to focus on creating emotional connections, understanding that a positive experience could lead to customer loyalty and advocacy.

2. Exchange (Price and Cost): The concept of exchange extended beyond monetary transactions. It encompassed the value a customer receives, not just from the product but from the entire interaction. This value could come in the form of information, entertainment, or personal fulfillment.

3. Evangelism (Place and Convenience): Customer satisfaction evolved into customer evangelism. Satisfied customers became brand advocates, sharing their positive experiences with others, thereby contributing to brand awareness and growth.

4. Everyplace (Promotion and Communication): With the proliferation of digital channels, promotion and communication became ubiquitous. Brands were required to be present and engaged across various platforms, creating a seamless and consistent experience for customers.

The evolution of the marketing mix from 4Ps to 4Cs to 4Es reflects a profound shift in how businesses engage with customers. This journey underscores the importance of understanding customer needs, delivering exceptional experiences, and building lasting relationships. In today's hyper-connected world, successful marketing is about more than just selling a product; it's about creating meaningful connections that resonate

with customers on a personal level. As the marketing landscape continues to evolve, embracing the 4Es framework is essential for businesses aiming to thrive in an era defined by customer empowerment and experience-driven interactions.

Now, Indonesian e-commerce is very advanced. Many local and international e-commerce platforms are present and competing fiercely to attract buyers. Technological developments have also made the online shopping process easier, from payment to delivery of goods. The marketing mix strategy implemented plays a very important role in increasing sales volume, one of which is increasing the number of customers and generating profits. Apart from that, it can improve product quality, competitive prices and sales promotions

New marketing mix for the digital business environment: the revisionists' view.

There is a wide range of studies and research which stems from the need to find a new paradigm for operative marketing which, surpassing the 4 Ps, can define more specifically the marketing levers. This stream of research, which we call "revisionist", asserts the need for a radical reconceptualization. The main argument against the 4 Ps is that the model is internally oriented; this limitation leads to the lack of customer orientation and the insufficient attention to the relationship with customers (Möller, 2006; Popovic, 2006, Constantinides, 2002 a, b). Schultz (2001) points out that in today's marketplaces there is the need for a new externally oriented paradigm which considers the network system view. A common factor in all the "revisionist" e-marketing mix literature examined is the perception of the need for a more explicit customer orientation. This limitation includes all the aspects of today's marketing, nevertheless it has a particularly strong repercussion in Internet marketing, where interactivity is regarded as a crucial aspect. It is interesting to notice that, in spite of these criticisms, the majority of the "revisionists" authors reviewed agree to include the 4 Ps in their marketing mix models, with few exceptions. Lawrence et al. (2000) proposes to add to the traditional 4 Ps' mix other two Ps, which have been debated in the marketing mix literature since several decades: people and packaging; this mix is then included in a 5 Ps marketing concept: paradox, perspective, paradigm, persuasion and passion. In the Italian literature, Prandelli and Verona (2006) propose a 3 Cs model, where each C contains some key elements: content (Web site and platform), community (interaction platform and relational capability), commerce (including the 4 Ps: product, price, place and promotion); while Pastore and Vernuccio suggest a 3C+I (interface) model where the 4 Ps are integrated and recontextualized in the on-line environment as described in figure 2. Kalyanam & McIntyre (2002) include the 4 Ps inside their 4P+ P2+C2+S3 model in a wider operative context which, thanks to the three-dimensional representation, can give a more complete taxonomy of the elements forming the mix, as represented in figure 3. Chen (2006) highlights the importance accorded to the environment and interaction in the model proposed by the Chinese researchers of National Taiwan University (1999), which considers 8 Ps, four of which are the traditional Ps (figure 4). In the 8 Ps' model:

- Precision refers to the increased accuracy of the selection process of the target segment and to market positioning in digital contexts, thanks principally to database management systems;
- Payment systems must be secure and easy for customers to use;
- Personalization concerns the possibility to create a flexible interface, which is able to adapt to customers' needs and wills;
- Push and Pull regards the choice of trade-off among active communication policies (push) and communication on users' demand (pull). While these models include the traditional 4 Ps as their core elements, other authors propose entirely different mixes. Chaffey et al. (2000) assert that the Internet calls for a change of the traditional marketing mix and spot eight critical issues to be considered in marketing planning at the

strategic level: audience, integration, marketing support, brand migration, strategic partnership, organization structure and budget. Also the Web Marketing Mix Model of Constantinides (2002a) extends the mix to strategic and business organization levels and suggests a 4S model including the following elements:

- Scope, of strategic relevance includes: strategic objectives, market analysis and potential, stage of e-commerce maturity, strategic role of e-commerce for the organization;
- Site, has operational value and involves interface issues;
- Synergy, has organizational significance including the integration among bricks and clicks aspects of the company's business model;
- System, concerns the management of the Web platform, the data warehouse and the security systems

Conclusions and Further Research

The 4 Ps marketing mix was created in the early days of the marketing concept when physical products, physical distribution and mass communication were dominant. Today, with the new business environment created by the different and empowered capabilities of digital contexts, the marketing mix paradigm increasingly becomes object of criticisms. The search for a new dominant paradigm for operative decisions in digital environments is still in progress. When e-marketing research and practice will arrive to a deeper comprehension and maturity in the digital environment, we will probably see a new marketing mix paradigm which will definitely put to the traditional 4 Ps to rest and give light to a new widely accepted paradigm for marketing operations. There is an interesting finding that the less trialability a digital product is, the more promotional tools it needs. Although the mix has the capacity to include a wide set of variables in order to adapt to a large range of mutations in the business environment, many authors believe it is obsolete and inadequate for the 21st Century. The search for a new dominant paradigm for operative decisions in digital environments is still in progress. We are still far from finding a new widely accepted standard able to fully substitute the 4 Ps' mix after almost half century. The reason underlying this lack of a new universally accepted model is probably the imperfect comprehension of the full potential of the new digital technologies for business and the insufficient emphasis given to case study research on marketing operations. On-line companies have still to reach their full maturity, which industrial enterprises had reached when McCarthy formulated the 4 Ps. Until now, after almost fifty years, it is apparent that, despite the controversies between "conservatives" and "revisionists", the basic construction of 4 Ps is still valid and, with some extension and adjustment, is still the core of operative decisions. The conservatives' view described is based on the possibility to change the elements inside each P of the traditional mix. As Borden (1964) formulated twelve elements through evidence emerging from empirical practices and case histories in the 1960's, there is a need for research on this topic also today. When e-marketing research and practice will arrive to a deeper comprehension and maturity in the digital environment, we will probably see a new marketing mix paradigm which will definitely put to the traditional 4 Ps to rest and give light to a new widely accepted paradigm for marketing operations.

REFERENCES

1. Andreini D. (2006). The Evolution of the Theory and Practice of Marketing in Light of Information Technology, in Krishnamurthy S. Contemporary Research in E-Marketing, Vol.2, pp. 168-215.
2. Borden N.H. (1964). The Concept of the Marketing Mix. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 24 (4): 7-12.
3. Bruner G. C. (1988). The marketing mix: A retrospective and evaluation. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 10: 29-33.

4. Chai Lee Goi Department of Marketing & Management, School of Business, Curtin University of Technology
5. Chaffey D., Mayer R., Johnston K., Ellis-Chadwick F. (2000). *Internet Marketing, Strategy, Implementation and Practice*, FT/Prentice Hall.
6. Comparative Study on Marketing Mix Models for Digital Products? KanLiang Wang1 Yuan Wang1 Jing Tao Yao,School of Management, Xi'an Jiao tong University, P.R. China, Department of Computer Science, University of Regina, Canada
7. Chen C-Y. (2006). The comparison of structure differences between internet marketing and traditional marketing. *International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development*, 3 (4): 397–417.
8. Constantinides E. (2006). The Marketing Mix Revisited: Towards the 21st Century Marketing. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 22 (3): 407-438.
9. Constantinides E. (2002a). The 4S Web-Marketing Mix model. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 1: 57-76.
10. Constantinides E. (2002b). From Physical Marketing to Web Marketing: The Web-Marketing Mix. atti della 35th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. Culliton J. W. (1948). *The Management of Marketing Costs*, Boston: Division of Research. Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.
11. Dixon D. F., Blois K. J. (1983). Some Limitations of the 4 Ps as a Paradigm of Marketing, in Blois K. J. (a cura di). *Proceedings of the Marketing Education Group*, pp. 92-107.
12. Dominici G. (2008a). Holonic Production System to Obtain Flexibility for Customer Satisfaction. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 1 (3): 251-254. Dominici G. (2008b). Demand Driven Supply Chain ed innovazione: il sistema logistico-produttivo per la soddisfazione dei bisogni del cliente in Purpura A. & Fazio G. (ed.), *Economia e gestione dell'innovazione nelle PMI. Percorsi tematici ed esperienze formative del Master EGI* , pp. 100-114, FrancoAngeli.
13. Dominici G. (2009). *E-marketing cosa cambia? Dai modelli di business al mix operativo*, Milan: FrancoAngeli. E-center of National Taiwan University of Science and Technology. (1999). *The Electronic Commerce*, TsangHai Book Co., pp.2–150.
14. Fjermestad J., Romano N. C. J. (2003). An Integrative Implementation Framework for Electronic Customer Relationship Management: Revisiting the General Principles of Usability and Resistance, proceedings of the 36th Hawaii International Conference on Systems Sciences.
15. Goi C.L. (2005). Marketing Mix: a Review of 'Ps'. *Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce*, 10 (2). [Online] Available: www.arraydev.com/commerce/JIBC/2005-08/goi.htm
16. Goi C. L. (2009). A review of Marketing Mix: 4Ps or More? *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 1 (1): 2-14.
17. Goldsmith R. E. (1999). The Personalized Marketplace: Beyond the 4Ps. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 17 (4): 178-185.
18. Goldsmith R. E. (2002). Explaining and Predicting Consumer Intention to Purchase over the Internet: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 10 (2): 22-28.
19. Grönroos C. (1994). Quo vadis marketing? Toward a relationship marketing paradigm. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 10 (5): 347- 360.
20. Grönroos C. (1994b). From Marketing Mix to Relationship Marketing: Towards a Paradigm Shift in Marketing. *AsiaAustralia Marketing Journal*, 2 (1): 9-30.

21. Grönroos C. (2000). Relationship Marketing: The Nordic School Perspective”, in Sheth J. N., Parvatiyar A. (a cura di), Handbook of Relationship Marketing, Sage.
22. Grönroos C. (2005). On defining marketing: finding a new roadmap for marketing. *Marketing Theory*, 6 (4): 395-417.
23. Grönroos C. (2008). In Search of a New Logic for Marketing: Foundations of Contemporary Theory, Wiley. Hoffman, D.L., & Novak, T.P. (1997). A New Marketing Paradigm for Electronic Commerce. *The Information Society: An International Journal*, 13: 43-54.
24. Jobber D. (2001). Principles and Practices of Marketing 3rd edition, McGraw Hill.
25. Kalyanam K., & McIntyre S. (2002). The E-marketing Mix: a Contribution of the E-Tailing Wars. *Academy of Marketing Science Journal*, 30 (4): 487-499.
26. Klein L. R. (1998). Evaluating the potential of interactive media through a new lens: Search versus experience goods. *Journal of Business Research*, 41: 195-203.
27. Lambin J. J. (1972). A Computer On-Line Marketing Mix Model. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 9: 119-126.
28. Lasswell H. D. (1948). The Structure and Function of Communication in Society, in Bryson L. (a cura di), *The Communication of Ideas*, Harper & Bro. Lawrence E., Corbitt B., Fisher J. A.,
29. Lawrence J., & Tidwell A., (2000). *Internet Commerce: Digital Models for Business* (2nd ed.), Wiley & Sons
30. Lauterborn R. (1990). New Marketing Litany: 4Ps Passes; C-Words Take Over, *Advertising Age*, ottobre, pp.26-28.
31. McCharty E.J. (1960). *Basic Marketing: A Managerial Approach*, Irwin.
32. McCharty E.J. (1964). *Basic Marketing: A Managerial Approach*, 2nd ed., Irwin. McCarthy E. J., Perreault W.D. Jr. (1987). *Basic Marketing: A Global Managerial Approach*, Irwin.
33. Möller K. E. (1994). Interorganizational Marketing Exchange: Metatheoretical Analysis of Current Research Approaches, in Laurent G. Lilien G, Pras B. (a cura di), *Research Traditions in Marketing*, pp. 348-382, Kluwer.
34. Möller K. E., & Halinen A. (2000). Relationship Marketing Theory: Its roots and directions. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 16 (1): 29-54.
35. Möller K. E. (2006). Comment on: The Marketing Mix Revisited: Towards the 21st Century Marketing? by E. Constantinides. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 22 (3): 439-450.
36. Morris M., & Ogan C. (1996). The Internet as Mass Medium. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 1 (4), [Online] Available: <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol1/issue4/morris.html>
37. Mosley-Matchett J. D. (1997). Include the Internet in marketing mix. *Marketing News*, 31 (25). Nelson P. (1974). Advertising Information. *Journal of Political Economy*, 83: 729-754.
38. O’Learly C., Rao S., Perry, C. (2004). Improving Customer Relationship Management through Database/Internet Marketing. A Theory-building Action Research Project. *European Journal of Marketing*, 38 (3/4): 238-254.
39. Pastore A., Vagnani G. (2000). Il ruolo dell’e-commerce nell’evoluzione dei sistemi distributivi. *Industria e Distribuzione*, 1: 33-46.
40. Pastore A., & Vernuccio M. (2004). *Marketing, Innovazione e Tecnologie Digitali. Una lettura in ottica sistemica*, Padua (IT): Cedam.

41. Pastore A., & Vernuccio M. (2008). *Impresa e comunicazione. Principi e strumenti per il management*. 2a ed., Milan: Apogeo.
- Popovic D. (2006). Modelling the marketing of high-tech start-ups. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing*, 14 (3): 260-276.
42. Prandelli E., & Verona G. (2006). *Marketing in Rete*, Milan: McGraw-Hill.
43. Robins F. (2000). The E-marketing mix. *The Marketing Review*, 1: 249-274.
44. Schultz D. E. (2001). Marketers: Bid Farewell to Strategy Based on Old 4Ps. *Marketing News*, 35 (2): 7.
45. Vignali C., Bavies B. J. (1994). The Marketing Mix Redefined and Mapped: Introducing the MIXMAP Model. *Management Decision*, 32 (8): 11-16.
46. Von Hippel E. (2005). *Democratizing innovation*, MIT Press.
47. Wang K.L., Wang Y., Yao J.T. (2005). A Comparative Study on Marketing Mix Models for Digital Products. *Internet and Network Economics Proceedings of First International Workshop, WINE 2005*, Hong Kong, China, 15-17 december, pp.660-669, Springer.
48. Yudelso J. (1999). Adapting McCarthy's Four P's for the Twenty-First Century. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 21 (1): 60-67.