



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Australasian Marketing Journal

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/ausmj](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/ausmj)

# Revisiting contemporary issues in B2B marketing: It's not just about artificial intelligence<sup>☆</sup>

Daniel D. Prior<sup>a,\*</sup>, Joonas Keränen<sup>b,c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Centre for Strategic Marketing and Sales, Cranfield University, Bedford, MK43 0AL, United Kingdom

<sup>b</sup> RMIT University, Graduate School of Business & Law, 379-405 Russell St, Melbourne, VIC 3000, Australia

<sup>c</sup> LUT University, School of Business & Management, Yliopistonkatu 34, 53850, Lappeenranta, Finland

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 2 September 2019

Accepted 2 September 2019

Available online xxx

## Keywords:

Buyer–supplier

Solutions

Knowledge intensive

Capital goods

## ABSTRACT

In this paper, we offer critical reflections on several contemporary issues in B2B marketing research. Specifically, we consider value, customer solutions, temporary organizations, governance models and sustainability within this literature. Our reflections lead us to suggest that further B2B marketing research is necessary in terms of four main areas (i) integrating complex offers for solutions, (ii) integrating functional activities, (iii) understanding the inter-related societal effects of B2B marketing, and (iv) understanding B2B marketing in information-poor environments. We develop an agenda that could serve to motivate further B2B marketing research while also reminding scholars that 'it's not just about Artificial Intelligence (AI)' or Information Technology (IT).

© 2019 Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

The recent business press offers many predictions as to the future of B2B marketing. These mostly relate to the effects of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and information technology (IT).<sup>1</sup> The emerging buzz word is 'personalization', or the ability for new technologies to create personalized customer experience through the clever combination and use of data (Shriber, 2017). Scope now exists to develop specific content for users while also automating its targeted release (Barac et al., 2017; Järvinen and Taiminen, 2016). In effect, AI allows suppliers to simulate rich, engaging customer relationships without having to invest in significant human capital (Huang and Rust, 2018). Despite the considerable media attention, we contend that AI and IT are only one domain of a broader set of contemporary issues facing B2B marketing. If we consider that buyer–supplier relationships have a much longer and deeper history as a research area (Palmatier et al., 2007),

we also need to acknowledge their importance as a fundamental context that requires closer examination in the wake of current developments.

Recent B2B marketing research encompasses a suite of trends affecting buyer–supplier relationships in broader terms than the impact of AI and IT. Perhaps the single biggest issue is value management (Eggert et al., 2018; Keränen, 2017). Research in this area is now manifest, with this primarily demonstrating the ambiguities of the 'value' concept and its continued importance to B2B marketing. Other areas of interest include customer solutions, the implications of temporary organizational forms, the governance of a broader set of loose network ties, and the sustainability of B2B relationships. The current state of B2B marketing research suggests that a reminder of a broader set of emergent trends requires attention at the present time. In noting the foci of previous reviews, we selected a series of issues that are particularly relevant at the present time, some of which previous reviews do not address.

## 2. Contemporary issues in B2B marketing – beyond AI and IT

### 2.1. 'Value'

'Value' is now one of the most pervasive concepts in contemporary B2B marketing research. The use of the term is broad, largely due to its multiple interpretations in the marketing literature (Kumar and Reinartz, 2016; Payne and Holt, 1999). From a customer perspective, B2B marketing studies tend to focus on value as either an input (desired value), as benefits from resources utiliza-

<sup>☆</sup> The authors would like to thank Sue Holt, Javier Marcos, Mark Davies, Malcolm MacDonald, Richard Vincent, Anne Blackie, Stan Maklan, Raj Jobanputra, Richard Brooks, Richard Daniel and members of the Key Account Management Forum at Cranfield University, UK.

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: [daniel.prior@cranfield.ac.uk](mailto:daniel.prior@cranfield.ac.uk) (D.D. Prior), [joona.keranen@rmit.edu.au](mailto:joona.keranen@rmit.edu.au) (J. Keränen).

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbescommunicationscouncil/2019/01/03/b2b-marketing-trends-you-need-to-know-for-2019/#390aeb5c6399>, <http://www.squaredot.eu/blog/b2b-marketing-trends-2019>, <https://marketingland.com/5-predictions-for-b2b-marketing-in-2019-252623>.

tion (value-in-use), and/or as an outcome (perceived value/value-in-exchange). From a supplier perspective, B2B marketing studies largely focus on creating customer perceptions of value and engaging customers in value creation. Recent studies suggest that both perspectives are relevant to a variety of stakeholders (Eggert et al., 2019), with the traditional definitions of 'supplier' and 'customer' roles now blurring (Grönroos and Voima, 2013; Pires et al., 2015; Rönberg Sjödin, Parida, and Wincent, 2016). In short, the use of the 'value' concept is a double-edged sword. In one sense, it offers some additional substance to understanding benefits. In another sense, the 'value' concept introduces additional ambiguities in a range of ways, thus making it necessary to re-examine long-held interpretations of established ideas. The following sub-sections attempt to summarize the vast B2B value literature.

### 2.1.1. How and when to engage customers

Engagement between the supplier and the customer is essential to the creation and realization of value (Conduit et al., 2019). Of interest in B2B markets is value co-creation. Defining value co-creation has become increasingly difficult due to the proliferation of interpretations in the literature (Ranjan and Read, 2016). The essential components involve participation from the customer in value creation activities and the focus on value-in-use (Ranjan and Read, 2016). Customer participation can take many forms. B2B marketing studies typically focus on task completion and problem-solving (Aarikka-Stenroos and Jaakkola, 2012; Petri and Jacob, 2016; Powers et al., 2016), with knowledge or information exchange holding common interest (Petri and Jacob, 2016; Prior et al., 2019).

How and when to engage customers is a perennial challenge. Where value co-creation is necessary, customer involvement is crucial. However, individual customer representatives may engage differently, making value co-creation a fickle and difficult-to-manage process (Prior et al., 2019; Prior and Marcos-Cuevas, 2016). There is a need to develop and implement a series of capabilities that support value co-creation (Kohtamäki et al., 2013; O'Cass and Ngo, 2012; Ramaswamy and Ozcan, 2018). B2B interactions also reduce the scope for automation of customer experiences through systems and technology (Prior et al., 2019). Yet, emergent studies show that customer engagement is a broad concept and one worth investing in, despite its challenges (Prior, 2016a; Steward et al., 2018; van Doorn et al., 2010). With this in mind, studies now consider B2B customer experience as a long-term phenomenon that evolves symbiotically and involves multiple touchpoints across the buyer-supplier dyad (Jaakkola and Aarikka-Stenroos, 2018; Wilson, 2019).

### 2.1.2. Communicating 'Value'

Realizing benefits is often difficult to understand in B2B contexts. Creating a perception for customers that they receive value is difficult due to the varied nature of their roles (Eggert et al., 2018). The subjective nature of value perceptions also requires customer judgements as to whether they feel they receive benefits from supplier activities (Macdonald et al., 2016; Pinnington et al., 2016). The advent of value co-creation as an activity in which supplier firms wish to engage has led to different dynamics when considering customer perceived value. The collaborative nature of value co-creation complicates the nature of customer perceptions by increasing information flows (Zhu and Zolkiewski, 2015). Customers face increasing information processing burdens that shape their ability to understand value, and this makes it more difficult to communicate value successfully, thus reducing customers' abilities to understand the nature of value (Hultén, 2012; Lynch and de Chernatony, 2007; Pinnington et al., 2016). In summary, value is difficult to communicate since it relies on subjective interpretations of multiple actors with heterogeneous interests who face increasing demands on their information processing capabilities.

## 2.2. Customer solutions

There is growing recognition that designing and implementing customer solutions is desirable for supplier firms (Ulaga, 2018). The potential to capture greater share of customer spend while also creating stronger customer relationships has led to considerable interest in customer solutions (Hakanen and Jaakkola, 2012; Jaakkola and Hakanen, 2013; Restuccia and Legoux, 2019). To create a genuine customer solution, a supplier firm engages with a buyer firm to design and customize a unique set of products and services (often from multiple vendors), to implement them, and to provide post-sales support (Biggemann et al., 2013; Tuli et al., 2007). This contrasts with the simple provision of products and services. The supplier firm must develop a set of capabilities that enable customer solutions, customer firms must have capabilities that allow them to engage with this process (Petri and Jacob, 2016; Powers et al., 2016; Storbacka, 2011).

Customer solutions research has begun to mature. There are now questions as to the viability of developing true customer solutions. In a recent study, Worm et al. (2017) suggest that providing customer solutions has positive associations with profitability for firms that have strong sales capabilities and in industries with strong buyer power, but not necessarily in technology intensive industries. Many firms have taken a somewhat skeptical approach to customer solutions provision, instead opting for mass customization since this accommodates fragmented market contexts better than true customer solutions provision (Kowalkowski et al., 2015; Salonen et al., 2018). For many B2B markets, the importance of customer solutions is likely to continue, particularly since there are many industries that have strong buyer power. The ability to develop customer solutions is still inherently attractive due to the competitive advantage on offer to successful supplier firms. Therefore, many supplier firms continue to ask how they might develop customer solutions efficiently, how they develop the appropriate capabilities, and how they align their efforts with buyer firms productively (Panagopoulos et al., 2017; Ulaga and Kohli, 2018).

## 2.3. Temporary organizations

Many B2B engagements involve a temporary set of employees. First recognized in the B2B literature in the context of buying center decision-making (Dawes et al., 1998; Jackson et al., 1984), temporary employees perform discrete tasks that are time-bound, generally on fixed employment contracts. Buying center members are often necessary for specific inputs, particularly those that relate to the use of their expertise (Ghingold and Johnson, 1997). Buying centers themselves are temporary organizations since they are time bound, they control discrete resources, and they focus on a specific task. Recognition of temporary organizations, as a broader concept, has a longer history, particularly in contexts such as feature film production (DeFillippi and Arthur, 1999). More recent studies use the term 'project-based organization' for much the same purpose (Bechky, 2006; Burke and Morley, 2016; Lindkvist et al., 1998).

Current studies suggest that temporality has important effects. Several studies highlight 'citizenship' as in the degree of physical and emotional investment an employee chooses to invest in project completion as potentially problematic (Blatt, 2008; Braun et al., 2013). The finite engagement of an employee in a given project highlights important questions as to the quality of their work and its timeliness. Temporary organizations also have important implications for knowledge creation and dissemination. The retention of information becomes more difficult in the absence of information-sharing systems or processes, particularly when employees do not have an incentive for sharing (Bakker et al., 2013, 2011; Tempest and Starkey, 2004).

Temporary organizations are important in B2B marketing, particularly when considering solutions implementation processes (Biggemann et al., 2013; Brady et al., 2005; Prior, 2016a). There are important implications for buyer-supplier relationships beyond the purchase decision that the buying center makes. Buying center members are often part of an implementation team. Where traditional B2B marketing research largely considers the relevance and involvement of buying center members to conclude once when the buying decision is final, understanding their impacts beyond this point is an emerging area of interest in B2B marketing research. There has been some consideration on the impact of conflict between temporary workers (Ojansivu and Alajoutsijärvi, 2015), and there is also evidence to suggest post-project effects of implementation team dynamics that have important implications for the buyer-supplier relationship as a whole (Ojansivu et al., 2013, 2015).

#### 2.4. Governance models

An ongoing concern in the B2B marketing literature is the prevention of opportunistic behaviors by relationship partners (Heide et al., 2007; Wathne and Heide, 2000). Opportunism emerges when one partner firm decides to act in its own self-interest to the detriment of the other partner. The substantial investments necessary by each partner to engage with their counterparts are often idiosyncratic, which adds to the difficulty in relationship breakdowns (Samaha et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2010). Research in this area tends to focus on the interplay between the contractual forms that govern B2B relationships. On one extreme, formal governance mechanisms (explicit contracts) can influence the relationship by clearly specifying the terms of engagement and by articulating the expectations that each partner holds regarding the relationship (Ryall and Sampson, 2009; Wuyts and Geyskens, 2005). On the opposite extreme, relational governance mechanisms are largely implicit. By considering a relationship in terms of an ongoing revision in partner expectations, communication and consent to a longer-term vision, mechanisms such as trust and commitment become more effective (Mahapatra et al., 2010; Stephen and Cote, 2007). The net outcome of research in this domain highlights the need to adopt plural forms of governance to accommodate explicit outcomes while also overcoming emergent, unforeseen challenges (Cannon et al., 2000; Heide, 2003).

The crux of B2B governance research is how partners can ultimately control the activities of each other. In a recent meta-analytic review, Crosno and Brown (2015) suggest that process and output controls can enhance relationship quality, but increase opportunism, and, that using both forms of control in unison can have positive performance effects. Importantly, control mechanisms need to account for the nuances that shape the relationship. This observation is important since there has been no real attempt to understand how control mechanisms interact with temporary organizational forms, with multiple partner arrangement that are necessary in assembling and implementing customer solutions and when considering the emergence of technologies that automate some of the functions that contracts normally fulfill (e.g. such as automating procurement decisions). Part of this issue is the need to control service-related elements which are inherently difficult to cater for in traditional performance metrics (Prior, 2016b). Hence, there is a clear need for research into B2B governance in the wake of several emerging factors.

#### 2.5. Sustainability in B2B

There is growing recognition that buyer-supplier relationships have important social and environmental impacts (Lacoste, 2016; Sharma et al., 2010), and sustainability has emerged as one of the

key themes in contemporary B2B scholarship (Johnsen et al., 2017; Kumar and Christodoulou, 2014). Consequently, B2B actors are increasingly encouraged to demonstrate environmental and social responsibility, and go beyond economic profitability to contribute to long-term societal well-being (Kotler, 2011; Nailor et al., 2019). However, two key issues appear to hamper this at present.

First, understanding 'sustainability' in B2B contexts is challenging. As research in the supply chain discipline highlights, understanding whose responsibility it is to engage in sustainability is difficult, particularly since it is challenging to influence supplier and customer relationships beyond respective dyads (Chen et al., 2017; Huq et al., 2016; Meqdadi et al., 2017). Institutional norms at the ecosystem or network level could offer an important means to improving B2B sustainability (Nakamba et al., 2017; Selviaridis and Wynstra, 2015; Wu and Jia, 2018).

Second, adopting sustainability practices requires firms usually to absorb immediate costs and momentarily weakened competitive positions (Tura et al., 2019), while the potential benefits are only realized long into the future. Hence, investments into sustainability are often seen as risky proposition (Ramirez et al., 2014), and understanding and communicating how different environmental and social practices translate into business impacts to different stakeholders remains a key challenge to many suppliers (Keränen, 2017; Patala et al., 2016).

### 3. Discussion

It is interesting to note that we are largely sympathetic with the idea that many of the fundamental issues remain the same (Meyer, 2018). AI and IT are likely to offer the greatest benefit is by improving information accessibility and by presenting it in real-time. AI and IT can enable greater efficacy of inputs to automated behaviors such as order taking and fulfillment. B2B marketing, as a subset of the broader marketing discipline however, faces bigger challenges that largely relate to the acceleration of information flows and the need to accommodate new developments such as sustainability (Kumar, 2018). There is also higher uncertainty that emerges from increasingly complex B2B relationships that involve temporary employees and loose coupling between exchange partners. We argue that the current state of B2B marketing research suggests a need for additional consideration of a range of issues in future studies (see Table 1 for a summary of these).

#### 3.1. Problem # 1: integrating complex offers for solutions

For supplier firms that wish to present customer solutions, an initial challenge exists in conceptualizing the nature of the solution. At one level, there is a need to understand the value proposition. Recent research suggests this involves in-depth communications with target customers and, in B2B markets, this even involves co-creating value propositions (Cova and Salle, 2008; Frow and Payne, 2011; Pires et al., 2015). This contrasts with the traditional notion of value propositions as a didactic notion whereby a supplier 'delivers' the solution to the customer (Payne et al., 2017). While there is some recognition that value propositions are co-created and that this requires a set of organizational capabilities (Baumann et al., 2017), there is a need to also understand the implications of communicative, co-created value propositions.

Communications practices are at the heart of the issue. Where value propositions resemble a product (or combination thereof), there is little scope to vary its composition. This is particularly the case when products are already in their final form. Where value propositions are co-created, there is much greater scope for variation. All dimensions of the value proposition are 'on the table'

**Table 1**  
Future research directions for B2B marketing research.

Issue	Specific challenges	Questions for Future Research
1. Integrating complex offers for solutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing a clear vision for customer solutions</li> <li>Integrating diverse offers to deliver seamless customer experience</li> <li>Sourcing at the global level</li> <li>Managing co-opetition</li> <li>Determining when to pursue customer solutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How can supplier firms engage productively with buyer firms to develop a clear vision for customer solutions development and delivery?</li> <li>How can supplier firms develop the necessary capabilities to lead customer solutions development and delivery?</li> <li>How can supplier firms integrate diverse offerings from multiple suppliers for innovative, future-oriented customer solutions?</li> <li>How can supplier firms determine when to engage in customer solutions development?</li> </ul>
2. Integrating functional activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrating functional team activities</li> <li>Managing temporality, including citizenship, knowledge management and governance</li> <li>Developing appropriate linking mechanisms across diverse teams</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What contractual forms are most likely to create cross-functional integration to affect a seamless customer experience?</li> <li>How can supplier firms address the need for customer alignment as both a strategic and interpersonal phenomenon?</li> <li>How can suppliers use processes, procedures and other infrastructure to support cross-functional alignment, noting the fluidity of functional definitions?</li> </ul>
3. Understanding the inter-related societal effects of B2B marketing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Societal impacts</li> <li>Conceptualizing and understanding accountability</li> <li>Conceptualizing and understanding transparency</li> <li>Encouraging circularity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How can B2B relationships serve as a platform for addressing societal problems?</li> <li>How can agency problems be overcome to encourage a societal-level awareness of B2B relationships?</li> <li>What are the appropriate societal mechanisms (e.g. regulation) that could encourage more responsible B2B relationships?</li> <li>How can we conceptualize sustainability performance at the service ecosystem/ network level?</li> <li>How can zero waste production, transport and exchange processes integrate into B2B relationships?</li> </ul>
4. Understanding B2B marketing in information-poor environments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information asymmetries</li> <li>Capability asymmetries</li> <li>Imperfect linkages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How can B2B firms develop customer solutions for customers that operate in different market contexts, noting the challenges above?</li> <li>How can B2B relationships promote strong linkages with customers in emerging markets?</li> <li>How can B2B collate, analyze and understand diverse information and distribute it to appropriate stakeholders seamlessly?</li> </ul>

and, in this case, the supplier faces new challenges. Many B2B value propositions have the potential to introduce substantial innovation in the customer firm (Coviello and Joseph, 2012; Leek and Christodoulides, 2012). Understanding how additional value creation can occur is unclear to the customer firm and this often leads to difficulties in conveying the potential of a product/ service combination (customer solution).

Several scholars argue that designing, developing and implementing customer solutions requires a set of new capabilities (Eisenhardt et al., 2010; Ulaga and Reinartz, 2011; Wang et al., 2013; Worm et al., 2017). Existing studies highlight the importance of boundary-spanning to integrate resources from multiple sources (Hong and Snell, 2013; Skålén et al., 2014). Despite progress in this research, there is little consideration of the need for a clear direction or sense of purpose in negotiating or developing co-created value propositions and/ or the customer solutions that relate to these.

Perhaps the simplest way to convey the nature of this problem is that a supplier firm needs to have capabilities that allow it to navigate the development and co-creation of a value proposition, which leads to a customer solution, which normally requires the integration of a diverse set of complementary offerings. So, there is a need for purpose, for clarity in the scoping of a customer solution, and a need for a network of actors to engage productively in the development and implementation of the customer solution. Some of the ability to do this depends on the composition of the network or service ecosystem and the supplier firm's ability to access disparate parts of networks that are often global in their geography (Friend and Malshe, 2015; Meynhardt et al., 2016; Nenonen et al., 2019; Vargo et al., 2015).

### 3.2. Problem # 2: integrating functional activities

The need to present a coherent and seamless customer experience suggests a need for coherent integration across multiple parts of the supplier firm. Indeed, there is considerable research in this area, particularly in understanding the role of marketing (Moorman and Day, 2016) and how it relates to other functions, particularly sales (Liinamaa et al., 2016; Piercy, 2009). Studies suggest that boundary-spanning also is important at the intra-firm level to ensure coordination of activities and to promote knowledge exchange (Panagopoulos et al., 2017; Piercy, 2009; Zhang et al., 2011). In the age of the temporary organization, however, the meaning of cross-functional integration is adopting new meaning.

At the interpersonal level, the limited citizenship behaviors of individuals probably reduces their inclination to engage productively across internal functions. The nature of internal functions themselves are also more fluid, with several studies highlighting sales as a profession that experiences high churn rates (Grewal et al., 2010; Román, 2014; Sand and Miyazaki, 2000). At the firm level, cross-functional integration may be an important objective, but it is often difficult to reconcile this with the experiences of individual employees and individual customers (Laurie and Mortimer, 2019; Moorman and Day, 2016; Skålén et al., 2014).

Attempts to address the disconnect between corporate and interpersonal perspectives through the alignment of the firm's activities and functions have generally focused on contractual forms in B2B marketing research. The most apparent example is performance-based or output-based contracting (Howard et al., 2016; Nullmeier et al., 2016; Sumo et al., 2016). This approach serves as an impetus that catalyzes the supplier firm's various functions to pursue a common goal,

rather than focusing on process alone. Performance-based contracting involves the simplification of contractual arrangements by focusing on discrete targets that buyer firms assess at predetermined points throughout the contract life. Other cross-functional integration in B2B marketing include collaborative new product design (Bonner, 2010; Raddats and Easingwood, 2010).

It is fair to say that cross-functional integration is a strategic concern for many firms. There is a current need to understand how alignment can take place in modern B2B engagements. This not only relates to traditional notions of functional alignment, but also to strategic/ interpersonal alignment. Noting the growing fluidity of organizational forms and the temporality of employee engagement, there is a need for a better understanding as to how the multiple layers of complexity interact. There are some broad notions of 'capabilities' and 'contracting' that may be useful in the further exploration of these concepts (Barac et al., 2017; Guo et al., 2018; O'Casey and Ngo, 2012). There are additional needs to understand the role of processes and procedures, integrating infrastructure and even culture, all of which are likely to help develop greater depth in cross-functional integration as a meaningful concept for B2B marketing.

### 3.3. Problem # 3: understanding the inter-related societal effects of B2B marketing

There is a growing awareness of the societal impacts of marketing. Whether this be through ethical conduct in product or service failures (Zhu and Zolkiewski, 2015), targeting vulnerable consumers (Craig Smith and Cooper-Martin, 1997; Silvera et al., 2012) or ethical advertising (Milton-Smith, 2002), it is clear that marketing activities have broad implications. In B2B marketing, there are a set of more profound implications than those that current marketing research currently recognizes. B2B interactions constitute part of the service ecosystem or network, hence multiple stakeholders face impacts (Hoejmose et al., 2012; Laczko et al., 2019). This perspective highlights some important challenges. The interdependence of actors across the service ecosystem or network suggests there is scope for influence. Indeed, this is a core tenet of power-dependence theory (Berthon et al., 2003; Kumar et al., 1995; McFarland et al., 2008).

### 3.4. Problem # 4: understanding B2B marketing in information-poor environments

B2B marketing studies recognize the importance of information creation, sharing and dissemination to the success of B2B relationships (Biong, 2013; Kim et al., 2005; Lanzolla and Frankort, 2016; Son and Benbasat, 2007). Problems in information management are, however, acute in certain B2B contexts (Lilien, 2016). This relates to complex B2B engagements that generally involve customer solutions, and, when considering emerging markets. As we have discussed, B2B customer solutions require the integration of a diverse suite of actors. Understanding employee preferences, their perceptions and coordinating their behaviors is challenging due to the quantity of individuals that this involves. These individuals are also knowledge workers, meaning the content of their jobs is often technically sophisticated and specialized (Forman et al., 2007). This increases the difficulty in coordination since it is often the case that specialist knowledge is necessary and relatively few individuals possess the necessary knowledge (Ahern et al., 2014; Franklin and Marshall, 2019).

The emerging world is also an environment with significant information management challenges. The dearth of available infrastructure to collect, collate and transmit information to decision-makers is acute in many developing countries (Luo et al., 2012). Given the importance of information exchange to B2B relationships

(Pimentel Claro and Oliveira Claro, 2010), identifying means to overcome the challenges in emerging markets is essential. This is noteworthy given the expected population growth in many African, South American and South Pacific countries over the next twenty years. Poor information availability can also hamper accountability, so there is also a need to understand system-level impacts on the world's supply chains, with countries in the developing world most likely to experience the consequences of poorly managed global supply chains (Kalaigianam and Varadarajan, 2012; Luzzini et al., 2014).

## 4. Conclusion

In this paper, we reflect on a series of contemporary B2B marketing issues in the current literature. We take a somewhat provocative view, that AI and IT are indeed important issues, but that they overshadow other more profound issues that are at the heart of B2B marketing. Our review builds on recent reviews of B2B marketing research (Grewal et al., 2015; Keränen et al., 2012; Leek and Christodoulides, 2011; Lilien, 2016; Lilien et al., 2010; Nordin and Kowalkowski, 2010) that tend to focus on a single domain only, such as B2B branding, customer value and customer solutions. We generally concur with Lilien's (2016) notions that B2B marketing research faces limitations in terms of data availability for complex phenomenon, and that this is particularly acute in emerging markets. In noting the foci of previous reviews, we selected a series of issues that are particularly relevant at the present time, some of which previous reviews do not address.

We can see that AI and IT will continue to emerge as important phenomena for B2B scholars. Current trends suggest that AI and IT will aid in reducing the difficulty of information intensive tasks. Managing customer data, for instance, should become more straightforward with AI leading to easier data input, processing and analysis (Hsieh et al., 2011; Krasnikov et al., 2009; Moutot and Bascoul, 2008). Understanding customers will continue to pose challenges though, particularly since customer values are often implicit and the nature of value is ambiguous. The growing complexity of implementation processes poses an opportunity for AI and IT in terms of centralizing and streamlining knowledge flows, which then facilitate easier coordination between a set of temporary, disparate employees. AI and IT may also help to coordinate diverse resources and manage data flows more efficiently in information poor environments, which implies it may help improve accountability.

## References

- Aarikka-Stenroos, L., Jaakkola, E., 2012. Value co-creation in knowledge intensive business services: a dyadic perspective on the joint problem solving process. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 41 (1), 15–26.
- Ahern, T., Leavy, B., Byrne, P.J., 2014. Complex project management as complex problem solving: a distributed knowledge management perspective. *Int. J. Project Manag.* 32 (8), 1371–1381.
- Bakker, R.M., Boros, S., Kenis, P., Oerlemans, L.A., 2013. It's only temporary: time frame and the dynamics of creative project teams. *Br. J. Manag.* 24 (3), 383–397.
- Bakker, R.M., Cambré, B., Korlaar, L., Raab, J., 2011. Managing the project learning paradox: a set-theoretic approach toward project knowledge transfer. *Int. J. Project Manag.* 29 (5), 494–503.
- Barac, D., Ratkovic-Zivanovic, V., Labus, M., Milinovic, S., Labus, A., 2017. Fostering partner relationship management in B2B ecosystems of electronic media. *J. Bus. Ind. Mark.* 32 (8), 1203–1216.
- Baumann, J., Le Meunier-FitzHugh, K., Wilson, H.N., 2017. The challenge of communicating reciprocal value promises: buyer-seller value proposition disparity in professional services. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 64, 107–121.
- Bechky, B.A., 2006. Gaffers, gofers, and grips: role-based coordination in temporary organizations. *Org. Sci.* 17 (1), 3–21.
- Berthon, P., Pitt, L.F., Ewing, M.T., Bakkeland, G., 2003. Norms and power in marketing relationships: alternative theories and empirical evidence. *J. Bus. Res.* 56 (9), 699–709.
- Biggemann, S., Kowalkowski, C., Maley, J., Brege, S., 2013. Development and implementation of customer solutions: a study of process dynamics and market shaping. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 42 (7), 1083–1092.

- Biong, H., 2013. Choice of subcontractor in markets with asymmetric information: reputation and price effects. *J. Bus. Ind. Mark.* 28 (1), 60–71.
- Blatt, R., 2008. Organizational citizenship behavior of temporary knowledge employees. *Org. Stud.* 29 (6), 849–866.
- Bonner, J.M., 2010. Customer interactivity and new product performance: moderating effects of product newness and product embeddedness. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 39 (3), 485–492.
- Brady, T., Davies, A., Gann, D.M., 2005. Creating value by delivering integrated solutions. *Int. J. Project Manag.* 23 (5 SPEC. ISS.), 360–365.
- Braun, T., Ferreira, A.I., Sydow, J., 2013. Citizenship behavior and effectiveness in temporary organizations. *Int. J. Project Manag.* 31 (6), 862–876.
- Burke, C.M., Morley, M.J., 2016. On temporary organizations: a review, synthesis and research agenda. *Hum. Relat.* 69 (6), 1235–1258.
- Cannon, J.P., Achrol, R.S., Gundlach, G.T., 2000. Contracts, norms, and plural form governance. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* 28 (2), 180–194.
- Chen, L., Zhao, X., Tang, O., Price, L., Zhang, S., Zhu, W., 2017. Supply chain collaboration for sustainability: a literature review and future research agenda. *Int. J. Prod. Econ.* 194, 73–87.
- Conduit, J., Karpen, I.O., Plewa, C., Kleinaltenkamp, M., 2019. Editorial: Business actor engagement: Foundations, developments and opportunities. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 80, 1–3.
- Cova, B., Salle, R., 2008. Marketing solutions in accordance with the s-d logic: co-creating value with customer network actors. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 37 (3), 270–277.
- Coviello, N.E., Joseph, R.M., 2012. Creating major innovations with customers: insights from small and young technology firms. *J. Mark.* 76 (6), 87–104.
- Craig Smith, N., Cooper-Martin, E., 1997. Ethics and target marketing: the role of product harm and consumer vulnerability. *J. Mark.* 61 (3), 1–20.
- Crosno, J.L., Brown, J.R., 2015. A meta-analytic review of the effects of organizational control in marketing exchange relationships. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* 43 (3), 297–314.
- Dawes, P.L., Lee, D.Y., Dowling, G.R., 1998. Information control and influence in emergent buying centers. *J. Mark.* 62 (July), 55–68.
- DeFillippi, R.J., Arthur, M.B., 1999. Paradox revisited: a reply to Phelan and Lewis. *Calif. Manag. Rev.* 42 (1), 186–191.
- Eggert, A., Kleinaltenkamp, M., Kashyap, V., 2019. Mapping value in business markets: an integrative framework. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 79 (March), 13–20.
- Eggert, A., Ulaga, W., Frow, P., Payne, A., 2018. Conceptualizing and communicating value in business markets: from value in exchange to value in use. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 69, 80–90.
- Eisenhardt, K.M., Furr, N.R., Bingham, C.B., 2010. Crossroads—Microfoundations of performance: balancing efficiency and flexibility in dynamic environments. *Org. Sci.* 21 (6), 1263–1273.
- Forman, H., Lippert, S.K., Kothandaraman, P., 2007. Understanding users' performance evaluation of it solutions. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 36 (6), 745–756.
- Franklin, D., Marshall, R., 2019. Adding co-creation as an antecedent condition leading to trust in business-to-business relationships. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 77 (October 2018), 170–181.
- Friend, S.B., Malshe, A., 2015. Key skills for crafting customer solutions within an ecosystem: a theories-in-use perspective. *J. Serv. Res.* 19 (2), 174–191.
- Frow, P., Payne, A., 2011. A stakeholder perspective of the value proposition concept. *Eur. J. Mark.* 45 (1/2), 223–240.
- Ghingold, M., Johnson, B., 1997. Technical knowledge as value added in business markets implications for procurement and marketing. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 26 (3), 271–280.
- Grewal, R., Chandrashekar, M., Citrin, A.V., 2010. Customer satisfaction heterogeneity and shareholder value. *J. Mark. Res.* 47 (4), 612–626.
- Grewal, R., Lilien, G.L., Bharadwaj, S., Jindal, P., Kayande, U., Lusch, R.F., ... Sridhar, S., 2015. Business-to-business buying: challenges and opportunities. *Cust. Needs Sol.* 2 (3), 193–208.
- Grönroos, C., Voima, P., 2013. Critical service logic: making sense of value creation and co-creation. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* 41 (2), 133–150.
- Guo, H., Xu, H., Tang, C., Liu-Thompkins, Y., Guo, Z., Dong, B., 2018. Comparing the impact of different marketing capabilities: empirical evidence from B2B firms in China. *J. Bus. Res.* 93, 79–89.
- Hakanen, T., Jaakkola, E., 2012. Co-creating customer-focused solutions within business networks: a service perspective. *J. Serv. Manag.* 23 (4), 593–611.
- Heide, J.B., 2003. Plural governance in industrial purchasing. *J. Mark.* 67 (4), 18–29.
- Heide, J.B., Wathne, K.H., Rokkan, A.L., 2007. Interfirm monitoring, social contracts, and relationship outcomes. *J. Mark. Res.* 44 (3), 425–433.
- Hoejmoose, S., Brammer, S., Millington, A., 2012. "Green" supply chain management: the role of trust and top management in B2B and B2C markets. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 41 (4), 609–620.
- Hong, J.F.L., Snell, R.S., 2013. Developing new capabilities across a supplier network through boundary crossing: a case study of a China-based MNC subsidiary and its local suppliers. *Org. Stud.* 34 (3), 377–406.
- Howard, M., Wu, Z., Caldwell, N., Jia, F., König, C., 2016. Performance-based contracting in the defence industry: exploring triadic dynamics between government, OEMs and suppliers. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 59, 63–75.
- Hsieh, J.J.P.-A., Rai, A., Xu, S.X., 2011. Extracting business value from IT: a sensemaking perspective of post-adoptive use. *Manag. Sci.* 57 (11), 2018–2039.
- Huang, M.H., Rust, R.T., 2018. Artificial intelligence in service. *J. Serv. Res.* 21 (2), 155–172.
- Hultén, P., 2012. Value creation by "muddling" in the B2B sector. *J. Bus. Res.* 65 (6), 781–787.
- Huq, F.A., Chowdhury, I.N., Klassen, R.D., 2016. Social management capabilities of multinational buying firms and their emerging market suppliers: an exploratory study of the clothing industry. *J. Oper. Manag.* 46, 19–37.
- Jaakkola, E., Aarikka-Stenroos, L., 2018. Customer referencing as business actor engagement behavior – creating value in and beyond triadic settings. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 10 (December), 1–16.
- Jaakkola, E., Hakanen, T., 2013. Value co-creation in solution networks. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 42 (1), 47–58.
- Jackson Jr., D.W., Keith, J.E., Burdick, R.K., 1984. Purchasing agents' perceptions of industrial buying center influence: a situational approach. *J. Mark.* 48 (4), 75–83.
- Järvinen, J., Taiminen, H., 2016. Harnessing marketing automation for B2B content marketing. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 54, 164–175.
- Johnsen, T.E., Miemczyk, J., Howard, M., 2017. A systematic literature review of sustainable purchasing and supply research: Theoretical perspectives and opportunities for IMP-based research. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 61, 130–143.
- Kalaiganam, K., Varadarajan, R., 2012. Offshore outsourcing of customer relationship management: conceptual model and propositions. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* 40 (2), 347–363.
- Keränen, J., 2017. Towards a broader value discourse: understanding sustainable and public value potential. *J. Creat. Value* 3 (2), 193–199.
- Keränen, J., Piirainen, K.A., Salminen, R.T., 2012. Systematic review on B2B branding: research issues and avenues for future research. *J. Product Brand Manag.* 21 (6), 404–417.
- Kim, K.K., Umanath, N.S., Kim, B.H., 2005. An assessment of electronic information transfer in B2B supply-channel relationships. *J. Manag. Inf. Syst.* 22 (3), 294–320.
- Kohtamäki, M., Partanen, J., Möller, K., 2013. Making a profit with R&D services – the critical role of relational capital. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 42 (1), 71–81.
- Kotler, P., 2011. Reinventing marketing to manage the environmental imperative. *J. Mark.* 75 (4), 132–135.
- Kowalkowski, C., Windahl, C., Kindström, D., Gebauer, H., 2015. What service transition? Rethinking established assumptions about manufacturers' service-led growth strategies. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 45 (1), 59–69.
- Krasnikov, A., Jayachandran, S., Kumar, V., 2009. The impact of customer relationship management implementation on cost and profit efficiencies: evidence from the U.S. commercial banking industry. *J. Mark.* 73 (6), 61–76.
- Kumar, N., Scheer, L.K., Steenkamp, J.-B.E.M., 1995. The effects of perceived interdependence on dealer attitudes. *J. Mark. Res.* 32 (3), 348–356.
- Kumar, V., 2018. Transformative marketing: the next 20 years. *J. Mark.* 82 (4), 1–12. doi:10.1509/jm.82.41.
- Kumar, V., Christodoulou, A., 2014. Sustainability and branding: an integrated perspective. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 43 (1), 6–15.
- Kumar, V., Reinartz, W., 2016. Creating enduring customer value. *J. Mark.* 80 (6), 36–68. doi:10.1509/jm.15.0414.
- Lacoste, S., 2016. Sustainable value co-creation in business networks. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 52, 151–162.
- Laczko, P., Hullova, D., Needham, A., Rossiter, A.M., Battisti, M., 2019. The role of a central actor in increasing platform stickiness and stakeholder profitability: bridging the gap between value creation and value capture in the sharing economy. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 76 (July), 214–230.
- Lanzolla, G., Frankort, H.T.W., 2016. The online shadow of offline signals: which sellers get contacted in online B2B marketplaces. *Acad. Manag. J.* 59 (1), 207–231.
- Laurie, S., Mortimer, K., 2019. How to achieve true integration: the impact of integrated marketing communication on the client/agency relationship. *J. Mark. Manag.* 35 (3–4), 231–252.
- Leek, S., Christodoulides, G., 2011. A literature review and future agenda for B2B branding: challenges of branding in a B2B context. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 40 (6), 830–837.
- Leek, S., Christodoulides, G., 2012. A framework of brand value in B2B markets: the contributing role of functional and emotional components. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 41 (1), 106–114.
- Liinamaa, J., Viljanen, M., Hurmerinta, A., Ivanova-Gongne, M., Luotola, H., Gustafsson, M., 2016. Performance-based and functional contracting in value-based solution selling. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 59, 37–49.
- Lilien, G.L., 2016. The B2B knowledge gap. *Int. J. Res. Mark.* 33 (3), 543–556.
- Lilien, G.L., Grewal, R., Bowman, D., Ding, M., Griffin, A., Kumar, V., 2010. Calculating, creating, and claiming value in business markets: status and research agenda. *Mark. Lett.* 21 (3), 287–299.
- Lindkvist, L., Soderlund, J., Tell, F., 1998. Managing product development projects: on the significance of fountains and deadlines. *Org. Stud.* 19 (6), 931–951.
- Luo, Y., Wang, S.L., Zheng, Q., Jayaraman, V., 2012. Task attributes and process integration in business process offshoring: a perspective of service providers from India and China. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 43 (5), 498–524.
- Luzzini, D., Longoni, A., Moretto, A., Ciani, F., Brun, A., 2014. Organizing it purchases: evidence from a global study. *J. Purch. Supply Manag.* 20 (3), 143–155.
- Lynch, J., de Chernatony, L., 2007. Winning hearts and minds: business-to-business branding and the role of the salesperson. *J. Mark. Manag.* 23 (1–2), 123–135.
- Macdonald, E.K., Kleinaltenkamp, M., Wilson, H.N., 2016. How business customers judge solutions: solution quality and value in use. *J. Mark.* 80 (3), 96–120.
- Mahapatra, S.K., Narasimhan, R., Barbieri, P., 2010. Strategic interdependence, governance effectiveness and supplier performance: a dyadic case study investigation and theory development. *J. Oper. Manag.* 28 (6), 537–552.
- McFarland, R.G., Bloodgood, J.M., Payan, J.M., 2008. Supply chain contagion. *J. Mark.* 72 (2), 63–79.
- Meqdad, O., Johnsen, T.E., Johnsen, R.E., 2017. The role of power and trust in spreading sustainability initiatives across supply networks: a case study in the biochemical industry. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 62, 61–76.

- Meyer, R., 2018. Reflections on "Transformative marketing: the next 20 years". *J. Mark.* 82 (4), 13–14.
- Meynhardt, T., Chandler, J.D., Strathoff, P., 2016. Systemic principles of value co-creation: synergetics of value and service ecosystems. *J. Bus. Res.* 69 (8), 2981–2989.
- Milton-Smith, J., 2002. Ethics, the olympics and the search for global values. *J. Bus. Ethics* 35 (2), 131–142.
- Moorman, C., Day, G.S., 2016. Organizing for marketing excellence. *J. Mark.* 80 (6), 6–35.
- Moutou, J.-M., Bascoul, G., 2008. Effects of sales force automation use on sales force activities and customer relationship management processes. *J. Person. Sell. Sales Manag.* 28 (2), 167–184.
- Nailer, C., Prior, D.D., Keränen, J., 2019. A dynamic process theory of public value. In: Lindgreen, A., Koenig-Lewis, N., Kitchener, M., Brewer, J., Moore, M., Meynhardt, T. (Eds.), *Public Value: Deepening, Enriching, and Broadening the Theory and Practice*. Routledge, London.
- Nakamba, C.C., Chan, P.W., Sharmina, M., 2017. How does social sustainability feature in studies of supply chain management? a review and research agenda. *Supply Chain Manag.: Int. J.* 22 (6), 522–541.
- Neunen, S., Storbacka, K., Windahl, C., 2019. Capabilities for market-shaping: triggering and facilitating increased value creation. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* 617–639.
- Nordin, F., Kowalkowski, C., 2010. Solutions offerings: a critical review and reconceptualisation. *J. Serv. Manag.* 21 (4), 441–459.
- Nullmeier, F.M.E., Wynstra, F., van Raaij, E.M., 2016. Outcome attributability in performance-based contracting: roles and activities of the buying organization. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 59, 25–36.
- O'Casey, A., Ngo, L.V., 2012. Creating superior customer value for B2B firms through supplier firm capabilities. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 41 (1), 125–135.
- Ojansivu, I.T., Alajoutsijärvi, K., 2015. Inside service-intensive projects: analyzing in-built tensions. *Int. J. Project Manag.* 33 (4), 901–916.
- Ojansivu, I.T., Alajoutsijärvi, K., Salo, J., 2013. The development of post-project buyer-seller interaction in service-intensive projects. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 42 (8), 1318–1327.
- Ojansivu, I.T., Alajoutsijärvi, K., Salo, J., 2015. Business relationships during project afterlife: antecedents, processes, and outcomes. *J. Bus. Ind. Mark.* 30 (5), 572–583.
- Palmatier, R.W., Dant, R.P., Grewal, D., 2007. A comparative longitudinal analysis of theoretical perspectives of interorganizational relationship performance. *J. Mark.* 71 (October), 172–194.
- Panagopoulos, N.G., Rapp, A.A., Ogilvie, J.L., 2017. Salesperson solution involvement and sales performance: the contingent role of supplier firm and customer-supplier relationship characteristics. *J. Mark.* 81 (4), 144–164.
- Patala, S., Jalkala, A., Keränen, J., Väisänen, S., Tuominen, V., Soukka, R., 2016. Sustainable value propositions: framework and implications for technology suppliers. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 59, 144–156.
- Payne, A., Frow, P., Eggert, A., 2017. The customer value proposition: evolution, development, and application in marketing. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* 45, 467–489.
- Payne, A., Holt, S., 1999. A review of the 'value' literature and implications for relationship marketing. *Austral. Mark. J.* 7 (1), 41–51.
- Petri, J., Jacob, F., 2016. The customer as enabler of value (co)-creation in the solution business. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 56, 63–72.
- Piercy, N.F., 2009. Strategic relationships between boundary-spanning functions: aligning customer relationship management with supplier relationship management. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 38 (8), 857–864.
- Pimentel Claro, D., Oliveira Claro, P.B., 2010. Collaborative buyer-supplier relationships and downstream information in marketing channels. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 39 (2), 221–228.
- Pinnington, B.D., Meehan, J., Scanlon, T., 2016. A grounded theory of value dissonance in strategic relationships. *J. Purch. Supply Manag.* 22 (4), 278–288.
- Pires, G.D., Dean, A., Rehman, M., 2015. Using service logic to redefine exchange in terms of customer and supplier participation. *J. Bus. Res.* 68 (5), 925–932.
- Powers, T.L., Sheng, S., Li, J.J., 2016. Provider and relational determinants of customer solution performance. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 56, 14–23.
- Prior, D.D., 2016a. Boundary spanning and customer service styles in business solutions implementation. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 56, 120–129.
- Prior, D.D., 2016b. Incorporating exchange governance in service-dominant logic: lessons from transaction cost economics. *Mark. Theory* 16 (4), 553–560.
- Prior, D.D., Keränen, J., Koskela, S., 2019. Customer participation antecedents, profiles and value-in-use goals in complex B2B service exchange. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* In Press.
- Prior, D.D., Marcos-Cuevas, J., 2016. Value co-destruction in interfirm relationships: the impact of actor engagement styles. *Mark. Theory* 16 (4), 533–552.
- Raddats, C., Easingwood, C., 2010. Services growth options for B2B product-centric businesses. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 39 (8), 1334–1345.
- Ramaswamy, V., Ozcan, K., 2018. What is co-creation? An interactional creation framework and its implications for value creation. *J. Bus. Res.* 84, 196–205.
- Ramirez, E., Gonzalez, R.J., Moreira, G.J., 2014. Barriers and bridges to the adoption of environmentally-sustainable offerings. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 43 (1), 16–24.
- Ranjan, K.R., Read, S., 2016. Value co-creation: concept and measurement. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* 44 (3), 290–315.
- Restuccia, M., Legoux, R., 2019. B2B relationships on the fast track: an empirical investigation into the outcomes of solution provision. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 76, 203–213.
- Román, S., 2014. Salesperson's listening in buyer-seller service relationships. *Serv. Ind. J.* 34 (7), 630–644.
- Rönnerberg Sjödin, D., Parida, V., Wincent, J., 2016. Value co-creation process of integrated product-services: effect of role ambiguities and relational coping strategies. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 56, 108–119.
- Ryall, M.D., Sampson, R.C., 2009. Formal contracts in the presence of relational enforcement mechanisms: evidence from technology development projects. *Manag. Sci.* 55 (6), 906–925.
- Salonen, A., Rajala, R., Virtanen, A., 2018. Leveraging the benefits of modularity in the provision of integrated solutions: a strategic learning perspective. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 68, 13–24.
- Samaha, S.A., Palmatier, R.W., Dant, R.P., 2011. Poisoning relationships: perceived unfairness in channels of distribution. *J. Mark.* 75 (3), 99–117.
- Sand, G., Miyazaki, A.D., 2000. The impact of social support on salesperson burnout and burnout components. *Psychol. Mark.* 17 (1), 13–26.
- Selviaridus, K., Wynstra, F., 2015. Performance-based contracting: a literature review and future research directions. *Int. J. Prod. Res.* 53 (12), 3505–3540.
- Sharma, A., Iyer, G.R., Mehrotra, A., Krishnan, R., 2010. Sustainability and business-to-business marketing: a framework and implications. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 39 (2), 330–341.
- Shriber, J., 2017. How B2B sellers are offering personalization at scale. *Harvard Business Review*, <https://hbr.org/2017/07/how-b2b-sellers-are-offering-personalization-at-scale>, Access date 23 Sept 2019.
- Silvera, D.H., Meyer, T., Laufer, D., 2012. Age-related reactions to a product harm crisis. *J. Consum. Mark.* 29 (4), 302–309.
- Skälén, P., Gummerus, J., von Koskull, C., Magnusson, P.R., 2014. Exploring value propositions and service innovation: a service-dominant logic study. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* 43 (2), 137–158.
- Son, J.-Y., Benbasat, I., 2007. Organizational buyers' adoption and use of B2B electronic marketplaces: efficiency- and legitimacy-oriented perspectives. *J. Manag. Inf. Syst.* 24 (1), 55–99.
- Stephen, A.T., Coote, L.V., 2007. Interfirm behavior and goal alignment in relational exchanges. *J. Bus. Res.* 60 (4), 285–295.
- Steward, M.D., Narus, J.A., Roehm, M.L., 2018. An exploratory study of business-to-business online customer reviews: external online professional communities and internal vendor scorecards. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* 46 (2), 173–189.
- Storbacka, K., 2011. A solution business model: capabilities and management practices for integrated solutions. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 40 (5), 699–711.
- Sumo, R., van der Valk, W., Duysters, G., van Weele, A., 2016. Using performance-based contracts to foster innovation in outsourced service delivery. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 59, 12–24.
- Tempest, S., Starkey, K., 2004. The effects of liminality on individual and organizational learning. *Org. Stud.* 25 (4), 507–527.
- Tuli, K.R., Kohli, A.K., Bharadwaj, S.G., 2007. Rethinking customer solutions: from product bundles to relational processes. *J. Mark.* 71 (3), 1–17.
- Tura, N., Keränen, J., Patala, S., 2019. The darker side of sustainability: tensions from sustainable business practices in business networks. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 77, 221–231.
- Uлага, W., 2018. The journey towards customer centricity and service growth in B2B: a commentary and research directions. *AMS Rev.* 8 (1–2), 80–83.
- Uлага, W., Kohli, A.K., 2018. The role of a solutions salesperson: reducing uncertainty and fostering adaptiveness. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 69, 161–168.
- Uлага, W., Reinartz, W.J., 2011. Hybrid offerings: how manufacturing firms combine goods and services successfully. *J. Mark.* 75 (6), 5–23.
- van Doorn, J., Lemon, K.N., Mittal, V., Nass, S., Pick, D., Pirner, P., Verhoef, P.C., 2010. Customer engagement behavior: theoretical foundations and research directions. *J. Serv. Res.* 13 (3), 253–266.
- Vargo, S.L., Wieland, H., Akaka, M.A., 2015. Innovation through institutionalization: a service ecosystems perspective. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 44, 63–72.
- Wang, E.T., Tai, J.C.F., Grover, V., 2013. Examining the relational benefits of improved interfirm information processing capability in buyer-supplier dyads. *MIS Q.* 37 (1), 149–173.
- Wang, Q., Kayande, U., Jap, S., 2010. The seeds of dissolution: discrepancy and incoherence in buyer-supplier exchange. *Mark. Sci.* 29 (6), 1109–1124.
- Wathne, K.H., Heide, J.B., 2000. Opportunism in interfirm relationships: forms, outcomes, and solutions. *J. Mark.* 64 (4), 36–51.
- Wilson, H.N., 2019. Invited commentary: Collective engagement: Four thought-shackles and how to escape them. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 80, 24–26.
- Worm, S., Bharadwaj, S.G., Uлага, W., Reinartz, W.J., 2017. When and why do customer solutions pay off in business markets? *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* 45 (4), 490–512.
- Wu, Z., Jia, F., 2018. Toward a theory of supply chain fields – understanding the institutional process of supply chain localization. *J. Oper. Manag.* 58–59 (March), 27–41.
- Wuyts, S., Geyskens, I., 2005. The formation of buyer-supplier relationships: detailed contract drafting and close partner selection. *J. Mark.* 69 (4), 103–117.
- Zhang, C., Viswanathan, S., Henke, J.W., 2011. The boundary spanning capabilities of purchasing agents in buyer-supplier trust development. *J. Oper. Manag.* 29 (4), 318–328.
- Zhu, X., Zolkiewski, J., 2015. Exploring service failure in a business-to-business context. *J. Serv. Mark.* 29 (5), 367–379.