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1. Methodological pluralism in marketing scholarship

There have historically been competing paradigms in marketing research. The dominant paradigm has been called 'functionalist' (Ardt, 1985; Burton, 2001; Hanson and Grimmer, 2007; Hunt, 2002; Tadajewski, 2004, 2008, 2009; Tadajewski and Hewer, 2012), but many advocates of 'interpretivist' research are also evident (e.g. Belk, Sherry, and Wallendorf, 1988; Brown, Bell, and Carson, 1996; Egan, 2009; Gumnessson, 2003; Mathysseens and Vandebempp, 2003). It has been argued that research published in leading industrial marketing journals demonstrates a better balance between these paradigms than within the marketing academy more broadly (Beverland and Lindgreen, 2010; Möller, 2013).

The above paradigmatic research communities make different philosophical, theoretical and methodological assumptions, which flow into their views on what kinds of methods they consider valid or legitimate. Broadly speaking, functionalists advocate the use of quantitative methods focused on observable phenomena, while interpretivists prefer qualitative methods that explore meanings from different human perspectives (Hanson and Grimmer, 2007). As a reaction against the splitting of the marketing research community into these competing camps, a small but growing group of researchers has spoken against notions of paradigm incommensurability (the idea that the paradigms are utterly irreconcilable) and has advocated, in various different ways, the adoption of a pluralist approach to marketing scholarship (Anderson, 1986, 1988a, 1988b; Davies and Fitchett, 2005; Hunt, 1990, 1991; Hunt, 1992; Hunt, 1994; Levy and Kellstadt, 2012; Lewis and Grimes, 1999; LaPlaca and Lindgreen, 2016; Lowe, Carr, and Thomas, 2004; Lowe, Carr, Thomas, and Watkins-Mathys, 2005; Möller, 2013; Nicholson, Brennan, and Midgley, 2014; Peters, Pressley, Vanharanta, and Johnston, 2013; Tadajewski, 2008, 2009; Tadajewski et al., 2014; Tadajewski and Hewer, 2012). These approaches to pluralism include the proposal of meta-theories that sit above and govern the use of ideas from the different paradigms (Hunt, 2013; Möller, 2013; Vargo and Lusch, 2004, 2008); the creation of paradigm interplay (Davies and Fitchett, 2005; Lowe et al., 2004; Lowe et al., 2005; Peters et al., 2013); and the deployment of integrative theories and frameworks (Nicholson, Brennan and Midgley, 2014), drawing most popularly in industrial marketing on the lenses of critical realism (Easton, 2002, 2010; Ehret,
2. Two levels of pluralism and their value

To answer the first question above, it is vital to understand the difference between ‘method’ and ‘methodology’. While methodology refers to the theory that justifies the use of particular methods, a method is a set of techniques operated in a sequence to achieve a given purpose (Checkland, 1981; Jackson, 2000; Midgley, 2000). When we talk of methodological pluralism, we mean embracing the possibility of engagement at two levels: at the level of methodology, where we can acknowledge others’ methodological ideas and thereby allow their insights to inform our own methodology (either temporarily, during a particular study, or on a longer-term basis as continual reference points); and also at the level of method, where we can use a wide range of methods in support of particular purposes.

When a methodology is prescriptive, refusing validity or legitimacy to the majority of methods, it can be called ‘isolationism’ (Jackson, 1987b). Most methodologies produced during the 20th Century, whichever paradigms they had origins in, are isolationist: they prescribe what their creators believe is the ‘one best way’ of doing things (Burrell and Morgan, 1979; Jackson, 1987b). In contrast, a pluralist can use the full range of available methods, but they are reinterpreted through the theoretical lens of a researcher’s own methodology.

As there are different rationales for pluralism at the levels of methodology and method, they are dealt with separately below.

2.1. The value of learning from other methodologies

The essential value of being aware of, and learning from, a variety of methodological positions comes from the knowledge that no one theory, or set of theories — whether or not they have been codified into a methodology — can ever be comprehensive (Francescato, 1992; Midgley, 2011; Morgan, 1986; Romm, 1996). Therefore, it is bound to be the case that others will have different insights to us. While we may disagree with and want to challenge some of their assumptions, it may also be the case that one or more of their ideas could usefully be incorporated into a methodology of our own. The purpose of learning from other methodologies is therefore that reflections on the similarities with, and differences from, one’s own ideas can enable the ongoing evolution of one’s own methodology (Gregory, 1992; Romm, 1996). The key to this learning is to welcome the insights of fellow researchers without taking on any idea to the exclusion of all others (Midgley, 2011). Therefore, to say that (for example) marketing research requires a certain set of experimental methods should not lead to the conclusion that only these methods are valid. Those aspects of scientific methodology that promote a worldview which invalidates other methods need to be opened to challenge, but an experimental method (and indeed any other method which may have originally been derived from a prescriptive/isolacionist methodology) can still be seen through the lens of a pluralist methodology. Of course, this raises the thorny issue of the nature of learning across paradigm boundaries, and we will look more closely at different authors’ views on cross-paradigm learning later in the paper.

2.2. The value of a plurality of methods

The value of pluralism at the level of methods comes from observations of what happens if only a very narrow set of methods is used — indeed, it has been known for some people to specialize in the use of just one. With an armory of just one or two methods, three significant, interlinked problems arise:

First, in an applied research setting, the researcher may not be able to deal effectively with situations where the theoretical assumptions flowing into their favorite method are at odds with the assumptions being made by key stakeholders. This kind of situation can create significant stakeholder dissatisfaction. If this dissatisfaction is experienced by powerful decision makers, and the chosen method contradicts their assumptions without opening up a dialogue with them, then it is likely that the research will be ignored or even actively undermined. This point is alluded to by Tadajewski (2008:280) when he comments that
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