

## WHAT BEYOND MARKETING 3.0: THE 4Ss MARKETING MIX STRATEGY FOR SUSTAINABILITY

Rapeeporn Srijumpa<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Economics, Kasetsart University, ChonBuri 20230, Thailand

### ABSTRACT

Marketing concepts have developed eventually to serve and satisfy not only for customers as consumers but also for community and society as human spirit, well-known as Marketing 3.0 (Kotler's terminology). By investigating marketing literature and conducting documentary research on the sustainability reports of both production and service corporations in Thailand, the author proposed the forthcoming step of marketing mix strategy: 4Ss strategy for sustainability. This conceptual strategy is beyond the marketing 3.0 since it broadly responses to stakeholder as human-centric approach also the solar system as nonhuman-centric oriented. The 4Ss sustainable marketing mix strategy; Solutions, Sacrifice, Serviceability, Synergy, is innovated for both academia and practical implications. The fundamental concepts of 4Ss are based on both traditionally 4Ps (product, price, place, promotion) and contemporary 4Cs (customer solutions, customer cost, convenience, communication). However, the further extensive research is needed to strengthen this sustainable strategy.

**Keywords:** Marketing mix, marketing 3.0, sustainable marketing, 4S sustainable marketing mix strategy, Thailand,

สำนักหอสมุด มหาวิทยาลัยบูรพา  
วารสารใช้ภายในหอสมุด  
27 ต.ค. 2559

## INTRODUCTION

The marketing concept was originally inside the economics field prior to the formal beginnings of the marketing field as seen as the concepts of markets and competition (Dixon, 2002; Shaw, 1995). Before 1900 the marketing concept is not distinguishing field, only embedded within the field of economics so-called "Pre-Marketing" period. Subsequently, the first era of marketing evolution in the United States started during 1900-1920 named "Founding the Field of Marketing" which mainly seen marketing as distribution (Wilkie and Moore, 2003). Though, Hollander et al (2005) defined the first era of marketing differently as the classic Marketing thought (1900-1960) following by the Marketing Management era (1950-1985) and the management services era (1975 to present).

In the United States, the development of generally accepted marketing foundations or "principles of marketing" was in the second era called "Formalizing the Field" (1920-1950). Then moved to the third era titled "A Paradigm Shift in the Marketing Mainstream: Marketing, Management, and the Sciences" (1950-1980). When new challenges arise in business world, for example short-term financial focus, downsizing, re-engineering and globalization the marketing have moved forward to the fourth era, which extends from 1980 to the present, named "The Shift Intensifies-A Fragmentation of the Mainstream" (Wilkie and Moore, 2003). Later, Wilkie and Moore (2012) presented the flows of attention to marketing in society topics during these 4 Eras.

On the other hand, throughout the Production Era (1870-1930) firms focused their consideration mostly on physical production, not much concentrated in advanced marketing since there was little competition in each product market. Firms concerned secondary on distribution to independent wholesalers and retailers, who did not have to develop superior methods since products "sold themselves". In the 1930s, the Production Era was followed by the Sales Era, where enthusiastic personal selling was supported by research and advertising and in 1950 followed by the Marketing Era of sophisticated customer orientation (Keith, 1960).

Conversely, Fullerton (1988) showed several cases in Britain, Germany, and the United States that against previous model of marketing's evolution, the Production Era, the Sales Era and Marketing Era. A new model of marketing's evolution was proposed by Fullerton (1988) as a more accurate periodization of modern marketing's development, the Era of Antecedents (before 1850), the Era of Institutional Development (1850-1929) and the Era of Refinement and Formalization (1930 -1988).

However, in the beginning of the Marketing Management era as cited in Hollander et al. (2005) during 1950-1960, marketing mix strategy has proposed differently from twelve to four mixes of strategies (Borden, 1964; McCarthy, 1960 and 1964). The famous marketing mix strategy among academics and practitioners since that era until now is still 4Ps (product, price, place, promotion). Later several marketing scholars have proposed additional P to the 4Ps for modernizing marketing mix strategy since the idea of the marketing mix was originated by James Culliton in 1948 (Borden, 1964). Though, marketing academics usually cited Borden as the initiated source of the mix because Neil Borden promoted extensively the concept of the twelve marketing mix than James Culliton. However, Jerome McCarthy refined Borden's concept into the 4Ps marketing mix (McCarthy, 1960 and 1964). Later in 1990, the 4Cs (customer solution, customer cost, convenience, communication) marketing mix strategy was proposed as a more customer-oriented version of the 4Ps (Lauterborn, 1990).

This conceptual paper aims to provide the coming up step of marketing mix named as 4Ss (Solutions, Sacrifice, Serviceability, Synergy) strategy for sustainability. According to Wilkie and Moore (2012), the new era of marketing should emphasis on marketing in society as well. The society and marketing were composed of an ultimate transition from human-centric paradigm to a nature-centric one (Fuller 1999). While "Marketing 1.0" was named as a product-centric approach, and "Marketing 2.0" was a customer-centric oriented, Kotler et al. (2010) proposed the marketing's latest "Marketing 3.0" as a values-driven or human-centric concept. However, Achrol and Kotler (2012) provided

an explanation of the emerging field of marketing particularly the “superphenomena” which are focused on sustainability and development. The 4Ss marketing mix strategy has innovated for developing sustainability which aims not only a human-centric marketing approach but also nonhuman-centric approach. Therefore, it is significant to investigate the proposed sustainable marketing mix strategy in the real circumstance for more understanding of this conceptual strategy.

However, it is more beneficial to investigate the marketing concept from the previous point of views and the present concept to the prospect one. The foundation of 4Ss marketing mix strategy is also needed to explore and find out some practical implications in both production and service corporations, particularly in Thailand during 2010-2012.

### **MARKETING 3.0 AND BEYOND**

The concept of Marketing 1.0 is familiar to the “product-centric era,” where marketers responded to their customers’ minds through products that offering functional benefits (Kotler et al., 2010). The major goal of production during technology-driven period was to standardize the products for reduction product costs. Therefore, firms were able to sell low price products for gaining widespread market. The companies viewed markets as mass buyers with physical needs hence; they mainly focused on product development. The marketing was primarily dedicated on selling products to a target market without considering much the needs and wants of their customers.

The increasing pressure on firms to improve marketing productivity, increasing market diversity in household and business markets, and technology applicability since 2000 have forced firms to apply customer-centric marketing in their marketing function to seeks and fulfill the needs and wants of each individual customer, consequently improving customer loyalty and marketing efficiency (Sheth et al., 2000).

Later customers have becoming as the most important role of the business performance, the marketing concept shift to Marketing 2.0 which in the “customer-centric era” (Kotler et al., 2010). Thus, marketers interested more in their customer’s emotions.

Marketing 3.0 is the “values-driven era,” where marketers attempt to make a deeper connection with their customers spirit (Kotler et al., 2010). The concept of Marketing 3.0 pays attention to issues concerning human values and spirit. The Marketing 3.0 proposed the marketers to satisfy customers not simply as consumers, rather to approach them as whole human beings with minds, hearts and spirits (Kotler et al., 2010). In the time of uncertainty, consumers are looking for wisely solutions that solved and satisfied their deepest needs. Thus, the purpose of companies should further focus on human spirit to satisfy not only the functional needs but also the deeper needs through product or service, which is finally expected to meet the human spiritual needs. Sequentially, customers are selecting products of firms that fulfill insightful needs for their co-creation with companies and participation in their community.

In summary, Marketing 1.0 was the “product-centric era,” where marketers attracted to their customers’ minds; Marketing 2.0 was the “customer-centric era,” where marketers fascinated to their customer’s emotions; and Marketing 3.0 is the “values-driven era,” where marketers challenge to make a sympathetic linking with their customers spirits (Kotler et al., 2010). In practice, marketers have viewed customers as consumers who purchasing on the basis of functional (Marketing 1.0) and emotional (Marketing 2.0) criteria. However, recently consumers are becoming good citizens by caring the world. Inevitably, marketers need to response to customer values (Marketing 3.0). Therefore, Marketing 3.0 proposed the move of marketing concepts from mainly satisfying and retaining individual consumers to activate addressing customer values towards marketing concepts that making the world a better place (Kotler et al., 2010). Customers are becoming sophisticated and searching for products and services to meet the spiritual needs beyond for serving their own basic needs. Marketing 3.0 has provided some crucial thought for marketers that the rapid social, economic and environmental change and turbulence have becoming intensifying influence on marketing concepts. The organizations are better to go beyond mere customer satisfaction and regain trust and to become values-driven and

human-centric organization (Kotler et al., 2010). Firms practicing Marketing 3.0 can distinguish themselves by serving consumers or society at large about these values issues.

Recently, the ecological issue is becoming a vital and more complex than social problems that forcing the marketing transformation. Morrone (2012) have proposed a further step, coming from transactional marketing concept to relational ecology one, where contemporary marketing aims at the individual's spirit and beyond intimate compassion titled "green conscience" era, in which completely captured in the context of values-driven one stating by Kotler et al. (2010).

In real estate business, companies need to implement green marketing to achieve the right of sustainable development, particularly in low-carbon economy where low energy consumption, low pollution, and low-emissions (Zhang, 2010).

Furthermore, new challenges for marketing scholars are coping with sustainable marketing practices that providing a favorable way for marketing practitioners as well (Kotler, 2011).

Although, the meaning of sustainable marketing has been defined since 1999 covering process of marketing management to satisfy customer needs and organizational goals that compatible with ecosystem (Fuller, 1999) the sustainable marketing strategy is still inaugurated among firms, particularly in Thailand.

In order to appreciate the marketing concept for sustainability, the author proposed sustainable marketing definition simplicity as "what is marketing is equal to what is love". The meaning of love is beyond love for his/herself, which means further to love and care for others both human and nonhuman. Therefore, the marketing definition created by the author since 2010 as follows: The "marketing" is equal to "love" of the giver who willing to serve and sacrifice something valuable to target customers, community, society, stakeholders and the solar system by providing solutions that meet their aspiration and compassion to make them happy. Generating their cheerfulness and satisfying their consciousness by creative communication, building relationships continuously and sincerely delivering solutions

consistency with their desire is ultimately gaining their impression, trust, engagement and devotion in sustainable love ones (Srijumpa, 2010). According to the marketing definition for creating sustainability, marketers and non-marketers could support the social, stakeholders and the solar system to be sustained for the next generation since all love and care and share for others. However, the marketing mix strategy in the era of sustainable development is also needed to review and reform as discussing in the next section.

### **THE 4Ss MARKETING MIX STRATEGY FOR SUSTAINABILITY**

The conceptual marketing mix strategy for developing sustainability is proposed in the sustainable marketing track based on the fundamental concepts of both traditionally 4Ps and contemporary 4Cs. In order to have profoundly understanding of the 4Ss sustainable marketing mix strategy (Solutions, Sacrifice, Serviceability, and Synergy), it is better to review both of 4Ps and 4Cs as follows.

Although, the marketing mix's 4Ps, product, price, place, and promotion, have been the foundation of marketing for several decades since Bordon's and McCarthy's proposed in the 1960s, Usui (2011) reviewed that the 4Ps idea did not suddenly appear in the 1950s, but had precedents that could be traced back to the 1910s.

While some academics argued that the marketing mix approach is considered too limited and needed to shift to relationship one (Grnroos, 1994), in practice some of five Scandinavian companies were merely utilizing the traditional marketing concept of 4Ps while others were blending a relationship and transactional marketing mix whereas no company exclusively used the relationship marketing approach (Zineldin and Philipson, 2007).

The 4Ps remain a primary of the marketing mix though the concept of 4Ps has been criticized by several of studies (Grnroos, 1994, Constantinides, 2006, Goi, 2009), also the later Ps have not replaced the agreement of suitability among the practical application yet (Kent and Brown, 2006).

However, the 4Ps mix was originally developed as a concept seemly for marketing of consumer products

in the mass-oriented manufacturing sector in the US during the 60's era of product-centric that firms paid more attention to product development than focused on customer's voice and needs. The Marketing in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the service and the personalized client approach have become necessities thus marketers should expect that customers will become not only more sophisticated but also much more interactive communication and individual needs (Constantinides, 2006).

Since the 4Ps marketing mix elements have generated from the product's point of view with have not well understood customer needs (Lauterborn,1990). Thus, Professor Robert F. Lauterborn proposed 4Cs (Customer needs, Cost, Convenience and Communication) in 1990 as a replacement for the traditional 4Ps marketing mix. The 4Cs marketing mix strategy is a more consumer-oriented version of the 4Ps since it recognizes consumer wants and needs and realizes the cost to satisfy the consumer also considers convenience of customer to buy and then communicates with customers by creating dialogue (Lauterborn,1990). The shift of marketing perception from producer as selling products to the customers' side as providing value or solutions of customer problems so called "Customers Solutions".

In fact, customers concerned in their total cost calling "Customers Cost" that represents the real cost in which customers willing to pay rather than price of product, such as cost of ordering, gaining, and consuming or even disposing the products. Comparing to customer cost or cost to satisfy customer, price is only one aspect of cost to satisfy. There are also several costs like cost of image or possibly a cost of integrity. Customers take all the cost factors into consideration.

When customers need products they actually want the products and services as conveniently as possible so marketers should apply strategy named as "Customers Convenience" rather than place strategy from the firms perspective.

Unquestionably customers not only want promotion but they would like to have two way communications with the firms, so the "Customers Communication" is essential in the customer-centric era. Therefore,

firms should place the customers in the center of the marketing thought to have the successful marketing plan. Recently, some empirical study investigated mutual fund retail investors from 4Cs dimension of marketing mix, in respect of mutual fund products as a customer solution of their investment needs, customer cost associated with investment in mutual fund, their convenience to buy and sell of the mutual fund investment and lastly the communication involved in mutual fund investment (Paul, 2013).

Lombardi (2010) also presented the importance of focusing on the value of the customers and on the purchase that they make. He further paid attention to the importance of providing convenience to customers and in creating good relationship with them.

In the practice of customer-centric marketing, the marketing function seeks to fulfill the needs and wants of each individual customer. Still, the combination of 4Cs and 5Ps (product, price, place, promotion, and people) in marketing mix strategy establishes good relationships between banks and customers in the wealth management market (Lin et al, 2013).

Furthermore, to improve the overall effectiveness of the organization, welfare of consumers and society as a whole are needed to responsible for (Wilkie and Moore, 2006). Recently, the social marketing mix was proposed as a step of designing marketing tool for sustainability as well. Though, in social marketing mix, Gordon (2012) debated that the traditional 4Ps mix requirement for re-thinking and re-tooling based on customer-centric marketing and relational marketing to the proposed mix as consumer, cost, circumstance, channel/strategies, organization and competition, process.

According to World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) the definition of sustainability as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" social marketing mix is still incomplete to develop sustainability since mainly focusing on people in society not much attention to nonhuman issues. Subsequently, Chabowski et al. (2011) provided an agenda for sustainability research that pave the way for creating a substantial contribution to mainstream marketing theory. Some recommendation of

the future research is to explore the external (stakeholder activities, stakeholder-driven strategies) -environmental (environmental orientation)-discretionary (institutional actions, charitable donations, corporate philanthropy) position influencing on specific marketing assets (brand equity, corporate reputation, customer satisfaction, corporate social performance, corporate environmental performance) or not (Chabowski et al., 2011).

Marketing in the sustainable concept has becoming a new marketing trend since sustainable marketing has designed to protect environmental issues and secure a socially fair, and gain economically benefit of existing and future generations of customers, employees and society at large (Emery, 2012).

Consistency with the marketing definition as "equal to love and care for others both human and nonhuman" (Srijumpa, 2010) as defined by the author with mentioned earlier for creating sustainability, Martin and Schouten (2012) defined sustainable marketing as the process of marketing with preserving and enhancing both natural and human capital through creating, communicating, and delivering value to customers. Thus, marketers should support the social, stakeholders and the solar system for sustainability by implementing the 4Ss sustainable marketing mix strategy (Solutions, Sacrifice, Serviceability, and Synergy).

"Solutions" stand for not only customer solutions but also social and stakeholders solutions and even for solving and sustaining environment in the solar system. The social and stakeholders and the solar system solutions is a marketing strategy focusing on satisfying and serving impression for creating trust and loyalty of community, social and stakeholders or even the environment in the solar system. Thus, "Solutions" strategy is a holistic view of solutions for target of either human or nonhuman in the solar system comparing to customer solutions proposed by Lauterborn (1990) in which specific designed for customers. However, the "Solutions" strategy is innovated form the fundamental of both "Product" and "Customer Solutions" strategies. Therefore, the first marketing mix strategy for sustainability aims to serve the target of both human and nonhuman in the solar system as a whole with products that able to solve their problems of sustainable development.

The "Solutions" strategy is proposed for both academia and marketers for creating products and solutions then serving sustainably by constructing all marketing functions performed well to increase or maintain the worthy health of the humanity and non-humanity in the solar system for an equitable benefit as well.

"Sacrifice" is innovated from the author's concept of the more you give, the more you get, and the more you gain. This "Sacrifice" strategy is beyond previous concept of sacrifice. Although, some empirical study in the past found that price level is positively related to perceived sacrifice (Teas and Agarwal, 2000), the researchers recommended that future research should incorporate with nonmonetary sacrifices such as time, effort, and search costs by developing a formalized definition of perceived sacrifice and by empirically testing the model using measures based on the formalized definition as well (Teas and Agarwal, 2000). Thus, the holistic views of "Sacrifice" strategy is conceptualized to consist of either monetary aspects toward customers such as price as a measure of sacrifice (Vlckner, et al., 2012) and perceived risk as sacrifice as well (Shukla, 2010) or nonmonetary sacrifices such as time, effort, and search costs (Teas and Agarwal, 2000).

The "Sacrifice" or "Sacrifice for sustainability" strategy is defined to broadly cover "Price" and "Customer Cost" and even to take account for the nonmonetary sacrifices as giving up from having something that might hurt the needs of next generations. This strategy supports the concept of sustainability since marketers not only set pricing strategy from their own benefit in short-run but also understanding needs of sustainable development. Therefore, marketers should design sacrifice strategy in which reflexing all value of having sustainable price and cost of customers, community, social, stakeholders and the solar system which takes into account the long-term view of the profit, people and planet development of future generations. As previous empirical found that perceived sacrifice, service quality, value, and satisfaction directly related to behavioral intentions consecutively (Shukla, 2010). "Serviceability" strategy is conceptualized beyond convenience of customers to serving both goods and services for all people (customers, community,

social, and stakeholders) and all the time even when crisis, disaster or turbulent periods. Although, term of serviceability has been used in construction manufacturing (Kassem et al., 2011) and engineering design (Rotundo and Colton, 1999, Sodhi, et al., 2004) for decades, this term is still applied very few in marketing concept as seen in Clarke (1998). However, "Serviceability" strategy is defined in a holistic perspective in which not meaning only as service ability of firms for their target customers but also as service available and ability for serving their target customers, community, social, stakeholders when they really needs without hurt the needs of next generations.

"Synergy" marketing mix strategy for sustainability is very significant since this strategy will stimulate and support the well understanding of marketers and others in order to be successful in developing sustainability in marketing field. Since the basis of 4Ss marketing mix strategy is 4Ps and 4Cs, "Synergy" strategy is rooted from "Promotion" and "Communication". However, the "Synergy" is not only as marketing promotion mix or integrated marketing communication with customers but also as collaboration of firms and customers, community, social, stakeholders that positively impact on sustainable development.

According to the previous definition of synergy in marketing communication as "the linkages that are created in a receiver's mind as a result of messages that connect to create impact beyond the power of any one message on its own" (Moriarty, 1996, p. 333), the "Synergy" strategy for creating sustainability is defined as "comprehensively integrated and collaborative marketing activities among the whole stakeholders in which created impact beyond the power of any one could do alone" (Srijumpa, 2010).

Previously, Assael (2011) reviewed the transfer from silos to synergy over a 50-year period, mostly in the Journal of Advertising Research and proposed that concept of synergy came to be increasingly identified with interactive media effects since 1994. Though, interactive media research has focused merely on some paired media comparisons. Although synergy can occur through simultaneous or sequential media consumption, there were few studies exploring on synergistic effects such as the distinction between

sequential and simultaneous media exposure (Assael, 2011). The 4Ss strategy is conceptualized for creating sustainability thus further study of practical implications specifically in developing country like Thailand is needed to fortify this theoretical strategy.

## IMPLICATIONS IN THAILAND

According to the investigation of the sustainability reports of both production (Siam Cement Group: SCG) and service (Krung Thai Bank: KTB) corporations in Thailand during 2010-2012, the author found that both corporations aim to develop sustainability as stating in the sustainability report. Though, the service corporation is still learning from experiences of performing sustainable development since launching the first sustainability report in 2009. While the production corporation has more experience of creating sustainability since having the first sustainable report in 2005.

However, this study has explored the implications of the 4Ss marketing mix strategy from the sustainability reports of both corporations during the past three years (2012-2010).

SCG established in 1913 to produce cement and the main building material for infrastructure projects, currently the SCG Group has diversified into five core businesses which include SCG Chemicals, SCG Paper, SCG Cement, SCG Building Materials, and SCG Distribution.

Krung Thai Bank (KTB) is the State-Owned financial institution supervised by Ministry of Finance and the company listed in the Stock Exchange Market. The Bank has contributed to the significance of the quality-service guarantee, human rights, and the credit policy that aware of the customers, society and environment. Also, SCG has been diligently inventing products, services, businesses, and work environments with balancing of profit, people, and planet environment in the solar system for sustainable development. "Solutions" strategy has been used extensively for creating sustainability as seen as mentioned in SCG Sustainability Report (2010) as "creating innovative and better quality products and services or the application of marketing strategies that responds better to the needs of consumers as called "solution provider" and in KTB Sustainability Report (2011) as "operate business

by supporting the awareness of environmental responsibility such as granting Green Loan”.

Furthermore, in 2009, SCG has firstly developed a self-declared eco-label of environmental products and services in Thailand named the SCG eco value. Then, SCG has innovated environmentally friendly products and services under the SCG eco value label. These products are both environmentally friendly and outperform other products in the same category by using lesser energy and reducing the amount of natural resources used and also being recyclable in which causing in lesser waste generation even dropping of greenhouse gas emissions (SCG, 2010).

In addition, SCG created High Value Added (HVA) products to meet customer needs and innovated solutions as Energy Conservation and Environmentally Friendly Buildings to response to environment in the solar system and provided Sustainable Building-Design Knowledge Center to share with the society and stakeholders (SCG, 2010). Continuously, SCG is innovating environmentally friendly products and services under the SCG eco value label (SCG, 2011). SCG has constantly developed products and services to respond to diverse needs and maintain manufacturing standards such as HVA Products and Services (SCG, 2012).

Moreover, SCG created solutions for social by having infrastructure investments and services provided primarily for public benefit and also conducted business with fairness and promoted quality of life and created benefit in communities where SCG operates (SCG, 2011).

Similarly, KTB has developed an effectiveness of programs and practices that assess and manage the impacts of operations on communities such as providing the Myanmar language on ATM screen of KTB Bank since 2010 (KTB, 2010).

All KTB staff members are ready to assist customers toward their problems, finding them appropriate solutions (KTB, 2011). KTB has focused on creating intellectual capital including art, religion, sports, and environment responsibility by organizing many products, projects and activities such as environmental loan and KTB-Energy saving for private sector (KTB, 2012).

Although, it is difficult to directly find the statement presenting the “Sacrifice” strategy form the both

sustainability reports during 2010-2012, some evidences reflexing the implications of “Sacrifice” strategy were “SCG has focused on maximum benefit and satisfaction to consumers of products and services, both in terms of quality and pricing, and aim to create Goodwill” (SCG, 2011) and “KTB determines to serve all customers willingly and eagerly and with equality and fairness” (KTB, 2012).

Likewise, the “Serviceability” strategy implications in marketing activities of both corporations were not stated explicitly only imply that they have planned to serve the target customers and communities economically and ecologically as stated that “SCG Paper has set up the distribution center and segmented its customers into several groups based on the plant and a customer’s location” and “SCG Distribution is promoting green logistics by distribution management and minimizing the backhaul of fleets, thereby helping to reduce fuel consumption” (SCG, 2010) also “SCG focuses not only to serve the immediate needs of the direct customer but also the people, social, and the environment around them (SCG, 2012).

However, during Thailand’s worst floods in many decades in 2011, SCG assisted for flood victims not only the employees and the customers but also communities by distributing flood prevention materials such as sandbags and providing immediate relief such as relief supply bags, paper toilets, floating toilets, free transportation, and even opening restoration projects after the flood crisis provided advice on self-home repair (SCG, 2011). These activities are spontaneous effects that showed the “Serviceability” strategy of SCG. The “Serviceability” strategy of KTB can be found from the statement that “staffs are ready to assist customers in any problem, find them appropriate solutions and keep confidentiality of their information (KTB, 2012). “Synergy” strategy has been used commonly among the two corporations for examples as follows; “SCG communicated with stakeholders to educate and monitor for improving high value added products and services performance regularly” (SCG, 2010) and “promoted safety standard to business partners with creating collaboration and extended the success to business partners” (SCG, 2012), while “KTB given priority to all stakeholders and concerned



for the impact toward the business operation of all stakeholders properly in terms of all matters relating to economy, social and environment" (KTB, 2012). SCG seems to view "Synergy" strategy as a vital factor in driving sustainable development effectively through collaboration from all stakeholders (SCG, 2012). Thus, SCG has increased stakeholders' awareness on environmental conservation and support SCG eco value with marketing mechanism by promoting and raising stakeholders' understanding and consumption of SCG eco value products (SCG, 2011).

Additionally, SCG has developed channels for receiving needs and creative ideas for product and service innovation then established communication channels and responding practices that could react to stakeholders appropriately (SCG, 2012). Thus, the "Synergy" strategy of SCG to develop appropriate activities based on results from the stakeholder engagement process is also important.

Example activities that SCG employed for creating "Synergy" are as follows; SCG has organized the "Thailand Sustainable Development Symposium 2010", the first of its kind in Thailand which included the participation of over 700 people, business executives, entrepreneurs and other relevant stakeholders, in order to promote awareness and provide information of sustainable development (SCG, 2010) and SCG also developed collaboration with external experts to establish learning center for biodiversity (SCG, 2012).

In case of KTB, the stakeholders also have rights to raise comments or suggestions about products and services. KTB has concentrated on customer's responses by gathering all comments to develop products and services to match with customer's need and long-term satisfaction of stakeholders (KTB, 2012).

## CONCLUSION

Although, marketing concepts has been developed and modified to several approaches in order to accomplish the marketing goals, the marketing world has changed dramatically until both academia and marketers need to readjust marketing strategy for gaining sustainability. This article presents the innovative 4Ss marketing mix strategy for creating sustainability in which

modify from the fundamental concepts of 4Ps (product-concentric in "Marketing 1.0") and 4Cs (customer-concentric in "Marketing 2.0").

Kotler et al. (2010) proposed "Marketing 3.0" as the human-centric approach that mainly focus on customers' values and spirit though the functional marketing mix strategy to align with this approach has not been commonly proposed yet since 2010. The 4Ss marketing mix strategy (Solutions, Sacrifice, Serviceability, and Synergy) for sustainability is proposed based on a holistic view of both the human-centric and non-human centric which is a further step of Marketing 3.0.

However, without the foundation of Marketing 3.0 that paves a way of human spirit toward values-driven approach, this theoretical strategy could not be easily recognized as the vigorous marketing mix for sustainable development.

It is still needed to validate this conceptual strategy in real context of developing country particularly in Thailand from the evidences presenting in sustainability reports of both production and service corporations. The documentary research results support that if the corporation has experiences in sustainable development; the implications of the 4Ss marketing mix strategy have been employed.

For example, SCG (Production Corporation) has committed to create value for customers, employees, and stakeholders and enhance quality of life and well-being of people in society and KTB (Service Corporation) has focused on the consideration of society and environment though the development of energy saving products, the implementation of renewable energy, and the conformity practices with the projects related to strengthening society and sustainable growth. The implications of "Solutions" and "Synergy" are found commonly used than "Sacrifice" and "Serviceability" evidences from both corporations' sustainability reports.

The limitations of this study are still occurred since only investigated in sustainability reports of two corporations in Thailand. However, both corporations are good representatives for the target populations of having sustainable development experiences for several years and covering both production and

service area in Thailand. Thus, this article contributes an innovative marketing mix strategy for sustainability: 4Ss to the marketing concepts in the new era of sustainable marketing. However, the additional widespread research is extremely needed to reinforce this conceptual strategy.

## References

- Achrol, R. S., & Kotler, P. (2012). Frontiers of the Marketing Paradigm in the Third Millennium. *Journal of the Academy Marketing Science*, 40(1), 35-52.
- Assael, H. (2011). From Silos to Synergy: A Fifty-year Review of Cross-media Research Shows Synergy Has Yet to Achieve its Full Potential. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 51(1), 42-58.
- Borden, N. (1964). The Concept of the Marketing Mix. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 24, 7-12.
- Chabowski, B. R., Mena, J. A., & Gonzalez-Padron, T. L. (2011). The Structure of Sustainability Research in Marketing, 1958-2008: A Basis for Future Research Opportunities. *Journal of the Academy Marketing Science*, 39(1), 55-70.
- Clarke, F. L. (1998). Deprivation Value and Optimized Deprivation Value in Australasian Public Sector Accounting: Unwarranted Drift and Contestable **Serviceability**. *Abacus*, 34(1), 8-17.
- Constantinides, E. (2006). The Marketing Mix Revisited: Towards the 21st Century Marketing. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 22(3-4), 407-438.
- Culliton, J. W. (1948). *The Management of Marketing Costs*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dixon, D. F. (2002). Emerging Macromarketing Concepts from Socrates to Alfred Marshall. *Journal of Business Research*, 55(2), 87-95.
- Emery, B. (2012). *Sustainable Marketing 1e*. Edinburgh: Pearson.
- Fuller, D. A. (1999). *Sustainable Marketing: Managerial-ecological Issues*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Fullerton, R. A. (1988). How Modern is Modern Marketing? Marketing's Evolution and the Myth of the "Production Era" *Journal of Marketing*, 52, 108-125.
- Grnroos, C. (1994). From Marketing Mix to Relationship Marketing: Towards a Paradigm. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 10(5), 347-360.
- Goi, C. L. (2009). A Review of Marketing Mix: 4Ps or More?. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 1(1), 2-15.
- Gordon, R. (2012). Re-thinking and Re-tooling the Social Marketing Mix. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 20(2), 122-126.
- Hollander, S., Rassuli, K., Jones, D., & Farlow Dix, L. (2005). Periodization in Marketing History. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 25(1), 32-41.
- Kassem, C., Farghaly, A. S., & Benmokrane, B. (2011). Evaluation of Flexural Behavior and Serviceability Performance of Concrete Beams Reinforced with FRP Bars. *Journal of Composites for Construction*, 15(5), 682-695.
- Keith, R. J. (1960). The Marketing Revolution. *Journal of Marketing*, 24, 35-38.
- Kent, T., & Brown, R. B. (2006). Erotic Retailing in the UK (1963-2003) - The View from the Marketing Mix. *Journal of Management History*, 12(2), 199-211.
- Kotler, P., Kartajaya, H., & Setiawan, I. (2010). *Marketing 3.0: From products to customers to the human spirit*. Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley.
- Kotler, P. (2011). Re-inventing Marketing to Manage the Environmental Imperative. *Journal of Marketing*, 75(4), 132-135.
- KTB (2012). *KTB Sustainability Report 2012 (Thai Version)*. Retrieved from [http://www.ktb.co.th/ktb/en/ktb-csr-operation.aspx?page=1&ddl\\_disp=10](http://www.ktb.co.th/ktb/en/ktb-csr-operation.aspx?page=1&ddl_disp=10) (accessed 1 September 2012)
- KTB (2011). *KTB Sustainability Report 2011 (Thai Version)*. Retrieved from [http://www.ktb.co.th/ktb/en/ktb-csr-operation.aspx?page=1&ddl\\_disp=10](http://www.ktb.co.th/ktb/en/ktb-csr-operation.aspx?page=1&ddl_disp=10) (accessed 1 September 2012)
- KTB (2010). *KTB Sustainability Report 2010 (Thai Version)*. Retrieved from [http://www.ktb.co.th/ktb/en/ktb-csr-operation.aspx?page=2&ddl\\_disp=10](http://www.ktb.co.th/ktb/en/ktb-csr-operation.aspx?page=2&ddl_disp=10) (accessed 1 September 2012)
- Lauterborn, R. (1990). New Marketing Litany: Four Ps Pass: C-words Take Over. *Advertising Age*, 61(41), 26-27.
- Lin, T. T., Lee, C.-C., & Lin, H.-C. (2013). Analysis of

- Customer Profit Contribution for Banks with the Concept of Marketing Mix Strategy between 4Cs and 5Ps. *Service Business*, 7(1), 37-59.
- Lombardi, L. J. (2010). The 4 Cs of Marketing. *LIMRA's MarketFacts Quarterly*, 29(4), 71-90.
- Martin, D., & Schouten, J. (2012). *Sustainable Marketing*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- McCarthy, E. J. (1960). *Basic Marketing, A Managerial Approach*. IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- McCarthy, E. J. (1964). *Basic Marketing*. IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Morrone, E. (2012). The Influence of Sustainable Development on Marketing Theory. *Megatrend Review*, 9(4), 1-20.
- Moriarty, S. E. (1996). The Circle of Synergy: Theoretical Perspectives and an Evolving IMC Research Agenda. *Integrated Communication: Synergy of Persuasive Voices*, 333-354.
- Paul, T. (2013). Mental Accounting of Mutual Fund Investors and Marketing Mix – A Study from “4C” Marketing Mix Perspective. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing & Management Review*, 2(2), 12-22.
- Rotundo, V., & Colton, J. S. (1999). Serviceability Considerations for the Layout of Coiled Tubing Units. *Journal of Engineering Design*, 10(3), 259-275.
- SCG. (2010). *SCG Sustainability Report 2010* Retrieved from [http://www.scg.co.th/en/04investor\\_governance/07\\_annual\\_report\\_sustainability\\_report/tab2/files/2010.zip](http://www.scg.co.th/en/04investor_governance/07_annual_report_sustainability_report/tab2/files/2010.zip) (accessed 1 September 2012)
- SCG. (2011). *SCG Sustainability Report 2011* Retrieved from [http://www.scg.co.th/en/04investor\\_governance/07\\_annual\\_report\\_sustainability\\_report/tab2/files/2011.zip](http://www.scg.co.th/en/04investor_governance/07_annual_report_sustainability_report/tab2/files/2011.zip) (accessed 1 September 2012)
- SCG. (2012). *SCG Sustainability Report 2012* Retrieved from [http://www.scg.co.th/en/04investor\\_governance/07\\_annual\\_report\\_sustainability\\_report/tab2/files/2012.zip](http://www.scg.co.th/en/04investor_governance/07_annual_report_sustainability_report/tab2/files/2012.zip) (accessed 1 September 2012)
- Shaw, E. H. (1995). The First Dialogue on Macromarketing. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 15(1), 7-20.
- Sheth, J. N., Sisodia, R. S., & Sharma, A. (2000). The Antecedents and Consequences of Customer-Centric Marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(1), 55-66.
- Shukla, P. (2010). Effects of Perceived Sacrifice, Quality, Value, and Satisfaction on Behavioral Intentions in the Service Environment. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 31(4), 466-484.
- Sodhi, R., Sonnenberg, M., & Das, S. (2004). Evaluating the Unfastening Effort in Design for Disassembly and Serviceability. *Journal of Engineering Design*, 15(1), 69-90.
- Srijumpa, R. (2010). Innovative Marketing Strategy for Sustainability: 4Ss Marketing Strategy. *M.B.A. Magazine*, July. (Thai version)
- Teas, R. K., & Agarwal, S. (2000). The Effects of Extrinsic Product Cues on Consumers' Perceptions of Quality, Sacrifice, and Value. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(2), 278-290.
- Usui, K. (2011). Precedents for the 4Ps Idea in the USA: 1910s-1940s. *European Business Review*, 23(2), 136-153.
- Vlckner, F., Rhle, A., & Spann, M. (2012). To Divide or Not to Divide? The Impact of Partitioned Pricing on the Informational and Sacrifice Effects of Price. *Marketing Letter*, 23(3), 719-730.
- Wilkie, W. L., & Moore, E. S. (2003). Scholarly Research in Marketing: Exploring the “4 Eras” of Thought Development. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 22(2), 116-146.
- Wilkie, W. L., & Moore, E. S. (2006). Macromarketing as a Pillar of Marketing Thought. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 26(2), 224-232.
- Wilkie, W. L., & Moore, E. S. (2012). Expanding Our Understanding of Marketing in Society. *Journal of the Academy Marketing Science*, 40(1), 53-73.
- World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zhang, J. (2010). Green Marketing Strategy Analysis of Real Estate Based on Low-Carbon Economy. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 177-179.
- Zineldin, M. and Philipson, S. (2007). Kotler and Borden Are Not Dead: Myth of Relationship Marketing and Truth of the 4Ps. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 24(4), 229-241.