CS/D&CB AT THE CONFLUENCE OF ENTREPRENEURIAL MARKETING, SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, COMMERCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND PSYCHOSOCIAL CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

Linden Dalecki
Pittsburg State University, USA

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to introduce and integrate key aspects of entrepreneurial marketing into the field of consumer satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and complaining behavior. The paper combines elements of a scoping review with a personal perspective approach. Various sub-literatures are explored, including entrepreneurial consumer behavior, commercial entrepreneurial marketing, effectual entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship, and psychosocial consumer behavior. We find that H. Keith Hunt's early contributions to entrepreneurial marketing, particularly his explanation of entrepreneurial consumer behavior, are likely more relevant today than when he first introduced the concept in the 1980s. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to connect Hunt's entrepreneurial marketing research to the domain of consumer satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and complaining behavior.

"*Just as with Freud all things are sexual, so with some business scholars all things are business.*" — (Huefner & Hunt, 1994, p. 62)

"*It's not business, Sonny—it's strictly personal*." — (Puzo and Coppola, 1971, in Jones 2021 p. 114, adapted)

INTRODUCTION

This paper combines elements of a scoping review with aspects of a personal perspective piece. In a recent *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior* (JCS/D&CB hereafter) article, Nowak, Dahl, and Peltier (2023) appraise the service failure-recovery literature. They delineate a scoping review as a method that deploys "a rapid mapping process to provide a high-level overview of a topic" (Nowak et al., 2023, p. 128). Nowak et al. (2023) emphasize that "unlike a systematic review or meta-analysis, scoping reviews take a more descriptive approach" (Nowak et al., 2023, p. 128). They note that scoping reviews are "particularly useful for synthesizing diverse research streams related to a broad topic" (Nowak et al., 2023, p. 128). Shelby D. Hunt's (S.D. Hunt hereafter, to differentiate him from H. Keith Hunt) 2011 paper *On the Founding of the Journal of Macromarketing* represents the exemplar par excellence for the retrospective strand used in this paper. Looking back with three-and-a-half decades of hindsight, the late S.D. Hunt's account chronicled the birth of that journal a few years after the inaugural Macro-Marketing Seminar in 1976. Evidence germane to S.D. Hunt's paper included "recollections of the events and some documents retained in a manila folder" (S.D. Hunt, 2011, p. 199).

Given Nowak et al.'s (2023) underscoring of the value of "synthesizing diverse research streams," it is worth identifying key subliteratures of interest with respect to the current paper's consumer-centric perspective. Major strands will include traditional commercial entrepreneurial marketing, marketing approaches typical of effectual entrepreneurs, marketing in the context of social entrepreneurship, the concept of entrepreneurial consumer behavior, and the notion of psychosocial consumer behavior, which we will articulate later in this paper. While conducting research for this paper, we discovered that H. Keith Hunt participated in the inaugural 1987 Global Research Conference on Marketing and Entrepreneurship (GRCME hereafter), as well as in their 1988 and 1989 symposia (Hunt, 1987; Hunt et al., 1988; Hunt et al., 1990). Remarkably, H. Keith Hunt was at the forefront of the entrepreneurial marketing concept. While Hunt is best known for his work in consumer satisfaction, dissatisfaction and complaining behavior, it is worth noting that some of his work regarding "entrepreneurship is also well known" (Egan & Aron, 2022, p. 202).

However, from an entrepreneurial-marketing-specific standpoint, H. Keith Hunt's early contributions to the entrepreneurship literature have been effectively cloistered/ensconced/sequestered until now. In large part, this is given that his earliest entrepreneurial marketing contributions exist as a very limited number of hard copies of GRCME proceedings. Or, to continue the hydrologic metaphor and borrow from Australia, it is as if the original entrepreneurial marketing stream of Hunt—and his GRCME coauthors—has until now been cut off from the main entrepreneurial marketing research stream. It has existed apart in a billabong: "an isolated crescentic pond left behind after a river loop is cut off when the river channel changes course" (Billabong, 2023). One may draw additional inspiration from Australians, who more frequently than any other anglophone population, use the hydrologic term anabranch: "a diverging branch of a river which reenters the mainstream, or which loses itself in sandy soil" (Anabranch, 2023; Merriam-Webster, 2023). A major rationale for the current paper is to ensure that Hunt's early entrepreneurial marketing-related insights are an anabranch of the former type and are not lost to the sandy soil.

HUNT AT THE ENTREPRENEURIAL MARKETING FOUNTAINHEAD

Kotler and associates recently published a book titled *Entrepreneurial Marketing* (Kotler et al., 2023), which ostensibly articulates the titular area of practice. Unfortunately, the book incorporates very little from scholars who cofounded and codeveloped the entrepreneurial marketing subfield from 1987 onwards. For example, chapter two of the book is titled "From Professional to Entrepreneurial Marketing" and posits that traditional big corporate marketers would do well to incorporate creative entrepreneurial-style marketing across their initiatives (Kotler et al., 2023, pp. 7-16). Here, Kotler and his coauthors reverse the typical sequence observed in actual entrepreneurial marketing. Startups usually attempt to scale using entrepreneurial marketing first, then incorporate professional marketing strategies after scaling.

Thus, it is ironic that over three-and-a-half decades ago at the inaugural (1987) GRCME, Hunt quotes Kotler and stresses that "marketing is a social process by which individuals and groups obtain what they need and want through creating and exchanging" (Hunt, 1987, p. 96). Hunt continues, "We are concerned with marketing and entrepreneurship. That is, we are concerned with the relationship between (1) the social process by which individuals and groups obtain what they need and want through creating and exchanging products and value with others and (2) the dynamic process of creating incremental wealth through the building of an enterprise" (Hunt, 1987, pp. 97-98). The social and dynamic processes emphasized by Hunt at entrepreneurial marketing's inception in 1987 are worth highlighting, given their relevance to the current paper. Relatedly, from the outset, GRCME's principal founder, Gerald Hills (1987), emphasizes the "important societal role" played by entrepreneurs engaged in marketing and that entrepreneurial marketing, which leverages innovation diffusion, is "clearly important to American society" (Hills, 1987, pp. 3-4). Nevertheless, Hills mentions that contemporaneous scholarly research focused on entrepreneurial marketing was scant.

At the second GRCME (1988) Hunt states, "marketing is the exchange interaction between seller and buyer. Previous discussions of entrepreneurship and marketing have focused on the seller side of the interaction. On the buyer side are personal consumers and business buyers" (Hunt et al., 1988). Hunt and associates' observations here are astute, precocious and countercurrent to the dominant stream of early entrepreneurial marketing research. Hunt et al. point out that early emergent entrepreneurial marketing research focused on the seller side (that is, on entrepreneurs engaged in marketing rather than on buyers and prospective buyers of entrepreneurs' offerings). Hunt then describes conducting a convenience-sample survey with undergraduate Brigham Young University students in his Consumer Behavior course, asking if any could come up with an example of engaging in entrepreneurial activity as a buyer and user. He quotes one student respondent as follows: "'I go to the last class session of the semester and try to buy my books from students just completing the class. And I go to the first class session the next semester and try to sell my books to students just starting the class. That way I buy my books for less [use them for a semester] and sell my books for more.' This 'Aha' experience led me [Hunt] to consider the possibility of some consumer behavior being entrepreneurial in nature and started me looking for other examples of entrepreneurial consumer behavior" (Hunt et al., 1988, pp. 175-176).

Later in the semester, Hunt asked students from the same Brigham Young University Consumer Behavior course to collect and submit examples of entrepreneurial consumer behavior. Colorful Consumer Behavior student responses include the following:

> "I organized a group ski class once. I got 8 people to sign up for $5 each. The fixed fee for group ski lessons was $30 at the time. We had a great time, but the best part was that I took the class for free and made a $5 profit" (participant "A" quoted in Hunt et al. 1988 p. 179).
>
> "Last week my sister purchased a broken Blaupunkt car stereo from a junkyard. She paid $50 for it, then had it repaired for $30. But instead of paying the repairman she gave him her old car stereo in trade for the repair bill. So she ended up with a super premium Blaupunkt stereo worth $250 for a $50 total" (participant "B" quoted in Hunt et al. 1988 p. 179).
>
> "Steve bought a color television and he now charges his roommates a monthly payment for it. So, in a couple of months he could break even and then make a profit from his purchase" (participant "1" quoted in Hunt et al. 1988 p. 178).

At the third (1989) GRCME, Hunt et al. (1990) state, "Entrepreneurial consumer behavior was introduced conceptually at the 1988 [GRCME] symposium ... We proposed that business entrepreneurs and consumer entrepreneurs are two manifestations of the same entrepreneurial spirit... All the [other] papers at the 1988 Symposium focused either on the seller side of the exchange or not on the exchange at all. We have chosen a continued interest in the entrepreneurial aspects of the buyer side of the exchange" (Hunt et al. 1990 p. 227-228). Hunt et al. (1990) then share an example from a student whose mother—originally from Hong Kong—would return there annually to shop for Christmas gifts. Her trip expenses were more than covered by the holiday shopping savings (Hunt et al., 1990, p. 231). "We worked and resided in Hong Kong prior to as well as following the 1997 handover and frequently observed Japanese luxury brand consumers engaged in a similar strategy to "travel internationally to shop and save on net."

In addition to reporting examples of entrepreneurial consumer behavior, Hunt et al.'s 1990 GRCME paper also categorizes and codes instances of entrepreneurial consumer behavior by type. They affirm that the "categorization and examples [of entrepreneurial consumer behavior] support the validity of applying entrepreneurial constructs to consumer behavior" (Hunt et al., 1990, p. 227). Hunt et al. (1990) continue, "We have also come to recognize that in entrepreneurial consumer behavior, we can come up with analogs of lifestyle ventures and smaller profitable ventures, but we have not found any example of a high growth firm. Perhaps as an individual's entrepreneurial activity moves beyond the small individual actions of a lifestyle venture or small profitable venture, the actions turn into [large/scaled] commercial ventures" (Hunt et al., 1990, p. 229). Thus, in addition to crafting a preliminary entrepreneurial consumer behavior schema, Hunt et al. (1990) put forth the notion that individuals engaged in entrepreneurial consumer behavior can form lifestyle ventures and may grow them until they evolve and achieve scale.

Hunt et al. (1990) share the following example of a Bringham Young University student concurrently engaged in entrepreneurial consumer behavior and lifestyle venture activities: "Kevin was into vintage clothing and finds most of his clothes in various shops. Since he enjoys this kind of clothing so much, he started a little shop called Truman Edsel's, which sells fine vintage clothing that he uses himself as well as sells" (Hunt et al., 1990, p. 232). Though Hunt is not focused on social and/or environmental impact, Kevin likely saved some clothing that would have otherwise been destined to become landfill. He might have also hired fellow students part-time at his small store in Provo, Utah - gig workers who could not work full-time. Thus, on a minor level, Kevin may represent something of a social entrepreneur. Recall Hunt et al.'s (1990) notion that "business entrepreneurs and consumer entrepreneurs are two manifestations of the same entrepreneurial spirit" (Hunt et al., 1990, p. 227). One might just as aptly replace "consumer" with "social," as follows: "business entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurs are two manifestations of the same entrepreneurial spirit."

Hunt et al.'s 1988 GRCME paper immediately precedes a paper focused on social entrepreneurship that posits, "Social entrepreneurs are those who view their business as an extension of their social values. Social entrepreneurs include those who believe marketing activities need to be evaluated against the usual standards of effectiveness and efficiency, and also against social vision" (File et al., 1988, p. 185). File et al. reference research by Kotler (and associates) and posit that "Because a focus on the needs of the customers will include the social context, it is possible to integrate social responsibility and marketing and create a model for appropriate social change" (File et al., 1988, p. 186).

We were curious to know how contemporary Consumer Behavior students would respond to the idea of entrepreneurial consumer behavior. Thus, during a face-to-face Consumer Behavior class in the Fall of 2023, we presented Hunt et al.'s (1990) descriptions of entrepreneurial consumer behavior and requested that students submit their own examples. One student reported buying used books from different online sellers rather than purchasing new books at full price to fill a new shelf. We code this as alternate-sources: second-hand using the Hunt et al. entrepreneurial consumer behavior schema (1990, p. 230). Other students submitted similar examples that we also coded as alternate-source: second-hand. See Table 1 below for Hunt et al.'s (1990) entrepreneurial consumer behavior schema.

Table 1
Entrepreneurial Consumer Behavior Coding Schema

Primary Entrepreneurial Consumer Behavior Category	Overall Description	Entrepreneurial Consumer Behavior Subcategories (if any)
1. Alternate Source	The use of a product source not typically used by consumers.	a. Second-hand b. Junkyard c. Pawn shop d. Do it yourself e. Out-of-the-way discount
2. Alternate Payment	The use of an alternate way of paying.	a. Charge roommate(s) b. Organize a group c. Trade for a service d. Share cost e. Employee discount f. Tax reduction
3. Cost Avoidance	The avoidance of payment at full price.	N/A
4. Alternate Maintenance	The use of an alternate form of product maintenance.	a. Buy and repair used items b. Hand made things c. Repair damaged items one already owns
5. Alternate Product	The purchase of an alternate product from standard-issue.	a. Vintage products b. Damaged goods
6. Quantity	Buying in unusual quantities	N/A
7. Disposal	Selling or trading products in an unusual way.	N/A
8. Negotiation	Proactively bargaining.	a. Playing one seller off against another. b. Haggling over price.
9. Information Seeking	Greater than usual effort seeking product information.	a. Research
10. Opportunistic	Deviation from usual buying pattern.	N/A
11. Charge Rent	Charge acquaintances for product use.	N/A
12. Buy/Use/Sell (at no Net Cost)	Buy product, use it, then sell it at or above cost paid.	N/A

Adapted from Hunt et al. (1990 pp. 230-234)

One student described friends making dinner for parents, in exchange for the parents having bought the ingredients. This is an instance that we coded as alternate payment: trade-for-a-service. Another student described Ultimate Fighting Championship watch parties where the host requires guests to contribute food or drinks in exchange for entry. Though a form of alternate payment, we could not fully code this instance using Hunt et al.'s 1990 schema. Another vibrant example, with quotes from the student: "When you are a freshman in Greek life you get a 'big' [a fraternity mentor] and you get gifts like shirts. So, when 'big/little' [mentor/mentee pairings] comes around the next year you can sell the gifts you got previously in the [fraternity's] group chat to make money." In our opinion, this example represents a previously unknown type of value-exchange activity—as well as a combination of physical products combined with a digitally enabled sales platform. It also does not cleanly fit into any of the categories of the Hunt et al. (1990 pp. 230-234) entrepreneurial consumer behavior schema, which was further developed and used by Huefner and Hunt (1994).

An additional instance that does not fit cleanly into Hunt et al.'s (1990) entrepreneurial consumer behavior coding schema was shared by another student in our course: "When I worked at Goodwill there was a customer that would come in and buy cartfuls of random items, and I always wondered what he was doing with them. One day, I asked him, and he said that he ran an online business. He would go around to various thrift stores, purchasing items in bulk at very low prices. He would then take these items and sell them on eBay to make a profit." To ensure he fully engages in entrepreneurial consumer behavior, confirmation would be needed that he used at least some product before resale. As with Kevin above, it is likely that this thrift store regularly delays some percentage of pre-owned products on their journey to becoming landfill, given that secondhand stores eventually remove products that do not sell after a certain time on the shelf. It is also likely that this buyer exerts a positive, if minor, impact in terms of local thrift store employment, and that he is essentially engaged in a form of bricks-to-clicks arbitrage. Thus—as with Hunt's student Kevin above—the regular Goodwill customer here can be viewed as something of a minor social entrepreneur. This is counterintuitive given that the social "good" associated with Goodwill's mission was historically—and currently still is—about beneficial outcomes for their employees.

From its inception, Goodwill represented an instance of social entrepreneurship in practice and mission-focus, if not in name. In Boston in 1902, Methodist minister Edgar Helms founded what would come to be named Goodwill Industries, describing it as an "industrial program as well as a social service enterprise… a provider of employment, training and rehabilitation for people of limited employability, and a source of temporary assistance for individuals whose resources were depleted" (Cardoni 2009, quoting Helms). We were interested to know what becomes of Goodwill products that do not sell in a timely fashion. We visited a Goodwill retail store in the United States Midwest and were told by employees that all products are marked in batches with specific varieties of colored tape. After a given color expires, employees pull the items from the shelf and send the unsold products to Goodwill Outlet facilities where consumers can buy the products even more cheaply by the pound. Products that are not bought at Goodwill Outlets are broken-down, then product components are sorted and recycled where possible, or sent to landfill in when product components are not recyclable (Anonymized Goodwill Employees, 2023). Green practices and doing social good are themes that will be developed further below. In concluding this section, we would emphasize that long before social entrepreneurship became a term, S.D. Hunt, Kotler, and other marketing scholars were engaged in social entrepreneurship adjacent research. They used terms such as social marketing and societal issues (S.D. Hunt 1976, p. 10). Likewise, Minister

Helms, Andrew Carnegie (the Carnegie Libraries), and others engaged in forms of social entrepreneurship long before the term was coined and popularized.

EFFECTUATION IN RELATION TO ENTREPRENEURIAL MARKETING, COMMERCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Rindova, Barry, and Ketchen (2009) suggest that researchers “do away with the now institutionalized distinction between regular and social entrepreneurship” and that “such a distinction is detrimental” (Rindova et al., 2009, p. 483). Rindova et al. (2009) argue that the downside to distinguishing between commercial entrepreneurship social entrepreneurship is that it “overlooks how dreaming up ‘brave new worlds’ and the entrepreneurial efforts this inspires can result in large fortunes (such as Starbucks, Yahoo!, and Google, to name a few). It also couches social change efforts as inherently lacking in profit potential and, therefore, potentially less legitimate in the eyes of many stakeholders” (Rindova et al., 2009, p. 483). Although, on balance, we disagree with Rindova et al.’s position for reasons that will be explored later, the principles of so-called entrepreneurial effectuation apply to both commercial entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship. Saras Sarasvathy (2008) found that expert (commercial) entrepreneurs are what she termed “effectual entrepreneurs,” and the type most likely to produce the sort of commercial unicorns mentioned above by Rindova et al. (2009).

Sarasvathy discovered that effectual commercial entrepreneurs tend to cocreate the future in partnership with prospective value recipients rather than simply attempting to predict it. The same might be said of effectual social entrepreneurs. Thus, teaching Sarasvathy’s effectual principles to students of social entrepreneurship can be just as valuable as teaching her framework to students of commercial entrepreneurship. The view that social entrepreneurship education can benefit greatly by leveraging insights gleaned from commercial entrepreneurship research and practice is echoed by Tonia Warnecke (Warnecke, 2023). We also agree with Warnecke that the overarching distinction between commercial entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship should be preserved (Warnecke, 2023).

In a *Journal of Marketing* article titled “Marketing under Uncertainty: The Logic of an Effectual Approach,” Sarasvathy collaborated with several other researchers to expand on her own initial findings regarding effectual entrepreneurs (Read, Dew, Sarasvathy, Song and Wiltbank 2009). Their findings replicate those of Sarasvathy’s (2008) in that effectual entrepreneurs in their study were “more likely to be skeptical about market data, while those lower in entrepreneurial expertise are more likely to take market data as given and credible” (Read et al. 2009, p. 6). This is consistent with Saravathy’s earlier finding that effectual entrepreneurs put more stock in face-to-face interactions with prospects than in traditional marketing research. Relatedly, an effectual participant in their study said, “Because I figured since I’m here in Boston and we have a really fantastic environment ... to create feedback, where I personally can be involved ... rather than have to get it translated through some kind of representative” (Read et al. 2009, p. 13). They also found that effectual entrepreneurs “are [more] likely to price on the basis of the highest level of value they have uncovered through interactions with individual customers” (Read et al. 2009, p. 7-8). Effectual entrepreneurs’ penchant to interact personally with customers and prospective customers aligns with similar findings across the entrepreneurial marketing literature.

For instance, entrepreneurial marketing research by Stokes (2000) found that entrepreneurs "seek conversational relationships in which they can listen to, and respond to, the voice of the customer, rather than undertake formal market research to understand the marketplace" (Stokes, 2000, p. 5). Gilmore (2011) found that the networking dynamics exhibited by entrepreneurs vary and "can be informal, interactive, spontaneous, individualistic and opportunistic. However, it can also be disjointed and haphazard, consisting of one-to-one interactions with a few individuals in some circumstances" (Gilmore, 2011, p. 139). Entrepreneurial marketing research by Jones and Rowley (2011) posits that "a small firm's marketing advantage is precisely linked to the close relationships between the entrepreneur and the customers, in contrast to larger firms where it is much more difficult to embed entrepreneurship and a customer orientation into its organizational culture" (Jones & Rowley 2011 p. 28). Intriguingly, Morris, Schindehutte and LaForge (2002) found that "The relative importance of entrepreneurial marketing may also be tied to the nature of the customer base, such that more innovative, risk-taking customers are less likely to form relationships with non-innovative, risk-averse marketers" (Morris et al., 2002, p. 14).

Research conducted by Alqahtani and Uslay in 2022 highlighted the significance of product and service co-creation in the field of entrepreneurial marketing. They emphasized the importance of understanding how entrepreneurial marketing can influence the customer experience and customer journey. Additionally, they underscored the need to explore the differences between entrepreneurial marketing in business-to-business and business-to-consumer contexts. The research also emphasized the relevance of investigating how entrepreneurial marketing contributes to sustainability, its relationship with green marketing, and its connection to social entrepreneurship (Alqahtani & Uslay, 2022, p. 414).

Before concluding this section, it is worth noting that Read et al. (2009) do not discuss social entrepreneurship per se. Yet they do mention that challenges faced by entrepreneurs include adapting to "new customer tastes (e.g., various kinds of ideological concerns, such as those for 'green' products and services)" (Read et al., 2009, p. 1). Obviously, consumer desire for green products and services is in social entrepreneurship's neighborhood. It is also worth quoting the following from Read et al. (2009): "Marketing scholars tend to ignore or, in some cases, assume away the notion that customers may play multiple or ambiguous roles (i.e., they may also be investors or suppliers or may not themselves know if they are or want to be customers at all)" (Read et al., 2009, p. 14). Customer-related complexities alluded to by Read et al. (2009) here that may emerge in a commercial entrepreneurship context are compounded by the complexities that may emerge in a social entrepreneurship context, as will be explored in the section that follows.

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP'S SPLIT CHALLENGE: BENEFICIARIES AND CUSTOMERS

Tina Saebi and her colleagues argue that there is increasing scholarly interest in social entrepreneurs and social enterprises (Saebi et al., 2019, p. 70). They noted that social entrepreneurs face two challenges at the same time: creating social value and making profits (Saebi et al., 2019, p. 74). In some cases, the customers who support the initiative are also the ones who benefit from the social value created, as seen in the example of the Grameen Bank, which provides collateral-free microcredits to the impoverished and sustains its operations through collected interest (Saebi et al., 2019, p. 75). However, in the majority of cases, beneficiaries and customers are two separate groups. This more common model results in conflicting institutional logics and tensions between social and economic activities (Saebi et al., 2019, p. 74). The rapid growth of interest in and research on social entrepreneurship draws on various disciplines and has led to a fragmented literature without dominant frameworks (Saebi et al., 2019, p. 70). While there is emerging literature at the intersection of social entrepreneurship and marketing, there is limited focus on the specific challenges associated with paying consumers. This section covers a study that addresses this gap, and the following section focuses on the connections between social entrepreneurship and the CS/D&CB literature.

To the best of our knowledge, the article that most explicitly researches issues that overlap social entrepreneurship, commercial entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial marketing is "'Doing Good' While Serving Customers: Charting the Social Entrepreneurship and Marketing Interface" by Philip Roundy (2017), published in the *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurial Research*. Roundy conducted depth-interviews with over three dozen social entrepreneurs and found that "social entrepreneurs cannot neglect marketing issues because social ventures face distinct issues interacting with consumers" (Roundy, 2017, p. 107). It is worth underscoring that in contrast to Rindova et al. (2009), Roundy found that social entrepreneurs need to pay attention to more than simply traditional marketing. Social ventures face "distinct issues interacting with consumers" (Roundy, 2017, p. 107). Roundy posits that although research and practitioner interest in social entrepreneurship has grown rapidly, consumers themselves have been largely ignored to date in the literature. He also notes that "social entrepreneurs must design organizations that are able to generate value for both beneficiaries and customers" (Roundy, 2017, p. 106). Reiterating the point, Roundy stresses that many social entrepreneurs need to satisfy two demand-side stakeholders: "beneficiaries, the group receiving the social value produced by the venture, and customers, who purchase a social venture's goods and services" (Roundy, 2017, p. 106).

Providing an illustrative example, Roundy describes Mad Priest Coffee Roasters: "a venture that seeks to create social value through two mechanisms: employing and advocating for refugees (their primary beneficiaries) … the venture also seeks to provide consumers with a superior product" (Roundy, 2017, p. 106). Thus, "social entrepreneurs face a complex set of demands, which involve crafting a business model that allows them to create value not only for their target beneficiaries, but also serve consumers" (Roundy, 2017, p. 106). Roundy highlights that "social entrepreneurs' focus on creating social value and 'doing good' does not make them immune to, or allow them to ignore, traditional marketing issues. This realization was described as a surprise to some of the social entrepreneurs. They claimed that before engaging in social entrepreneurship, they believed their primary activity would be interacting with beneficiaries while addressing social problems (Roundy, 2017, p. 112). Roundy shares the example of a founder-participant of a "for-profit apparel venture that works with and seeks to benefit economically disadvantaged farmers in the developing world" (Roundy, 2017, p. 112). This interviewee explains "how marketing-oriented issues dominate his day-to-day concerns as a social entrepreneur now that his venture is beyond the early, start-up stage" (Roundy, 2017, p. 112). Roundy quotes this founder as follows:

> "The problems now are very, very traditional business problems, where it's like channels to market, [developing] products that resonate with consumers—marketing, you know? … really trying to find what gets consumers jazzed, what's going to really connect with them..." (Roundy quoting a study participant 2017 p. 112).

Roundy points out that social entrepreneurs and traditional commercial entrepreneurs alike face challenges developing and scaling with limited resources. Yet, he found that “resources that can be dedicated to marketing are particularly scarce in early-stage social ventures for unique reasons” (Roundy, 2017, p. 114). This finding is in direct contrast to Rindova et al.’s (2009) suggestion that researchers jettison the distinction between commercial entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship. Another social entrepreneur interviewed by Roundy said “We basically have no marketing capital right now, so […] we’re leveraging partnerships. That’s our goal. Let’s get other companies that can use their tools, their resources to help us” (Roundy quoting a study participant, 2017 p. 114). It is worth recalling that leveraging partnerships is one of Saravathy’s core principles of effectual entrepreneurship (Sarasvathy, 2008). Detailing a form of consumer skepticism driven by unfamiliarity, Roundy states: “Although social entrepreneurship is a topic receiving heightened academic, practitioner, and policy-maker attention, statements of social entrepreneurs suggest [social-entrepreneurship-related] labels [are] conveying very little meaning to many segments of consumers. Adam, a social entrepreneur, explains this point. ‘The term “social enterprise” is a term that you know, and we [he and his cofounder] know, but really the truth is the average consumer doesn’t know the first thing about what ‘social enterprise’ means’” (Roundy, 2017, p. 115).

Compounding social entrepreneurship-related marketing challenges, Roundy points out that even consumers who fully understand social entrepreneurship are prone to question the authenticity of certain social entrepreneurship initiatives. Other consumers may not be skeptical regarding the authenticity of a given social entrepreneurial initiative, yet may still exhibit a “type of skepticism aimed at the quality of the goods and services offered by a social venture (Roundy, 2017, p. 118). Roundy quotes a female founder who observes that “sometimes people are surprised to see that Fair Trade [goods] can be attractive.” Roundy concludes that yet “another hurdle social entrepreneurs must overcome is that at least a segment of their customers may assume that they are sacrificing [trading off] a dimension of value (e.g., style, quality) when buying a product from a social venture” (Roundy, 2017, p. 116). To envision Mad Priest Coffee Roasters’ prospects in a buying situation along these lines: imagine their prospective consumers assuming a tradeoff between coffee quality versus social impact—with a presumed shopping heuristic, conscious or otherwise, along the lines of “tastes good or does good... pick one.”

Roundy found that even “social entrepreneurs themselves express skepticism about the authenticity of some of these [Fortune 500] corporate [social entrepreneurship mimicking] initiatives” (Roundy, 2017, p. 117). One of Roundy’s study participants cites big-box retailers cynically attempting to cash in on so-called green consumers: “I don’t know which [non-‘green’] customer walks in and wants a $30.00 hair dryer or a $10.00 hair dryer... [the big-box retailer] used to just sell the $30.00 [hair dryer] by making it look prettier... [now the big-box retailer] can call it ‘green.’ It’s a marketing piece’” (Roundy quoting a study participant, 2017 p. 117). Roundy also identifies and quotes several study participants who emphasize the rapid growth of what Roundy labels the “conscious consumer” segment across the US (Roundy, 2017, p. 118). Interviewees also attest that demand for sustainable products outstrips supply (Roundy, 2017, p. 118).

Roundy does not reference Rindova et al.’s (2009) recommendation that researchers “do away with the now institutionalized distinction between regular and social entrepreneurship (Rindova et al., 2009, p. 483).” But Roundy does share the following diametric perspective that one of his study’s main findings is: “that it cannot be assumed that insights generated from studying how conventional (i.e., ‘non-social’) entrepreneurs interact with their stakeholders can be directly applied to other forms of entrepreneurship, such as the creation of social ventures" (Roundy, 2017, p. 106). As mentioned earlier, Roundy (2017, p. 118) suggests that there is a rapidly growing segment of consumers in the US known as the "conscious consumer." This segment encompasses what others have referred to as green and/or fair-trade focused consumers. We propose using the term "conscientious consumer" instead, as high-involvement consumers are conscious in the psychodynamic sense. We will delve into the details of psychodynamics in a following section.

In addition to providing a view that contrasts with Rindova et al.'s (2009), Roundy's discussion of customer-centric challenges versus beneficiary-centric challenges is important. In rare cases, such as with the Grameen Bank mentioned above, a social entrepreneur's paying customers and social beneficiaries are the same. However, as Roundy discovered, in social initiatives where these groups are different, each group—customers and beneficiaries—requires distinct messaging and business models. This split challenge presents an opportunity to satisfy and delight each stakeholder group, but it also represents the risk of dissatisfying and potentially degrading stakeholders of the social initiative. Many of Roundy's social entrepreneur participants voiced frustration in dealing with customers who assumed a product tradeoff and whose beneficiaries required different messaging from customers. The section below explores instances from the consumer satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and complaining behavior literature that are related to social entrepreneurship and where similar challenges and risks are uncovered and explored.

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP ADJACENT RESEARCH IN THE CS/D&CB LITERATURE

The consumer satisfaction, dissatisfaction and complaining behavior (CS/D&CB) literature has no extant focus on social entrepreneurship per se. But there is a cluster of CS/D&CB research that resides in social entrepreneurship's neighborhood: some that explores philanthropic initiatives, some that investigates the dynamics of gifting, and some that touches on the recycling of post-consumer products. Some of the nomenclature used in the social entrepreneurship adjacent CS/D&CB literature is consistent with that deployed in social entrepreneurship research. For example, like Roundy (2017) above, Wright, Larsen, and Higgs (1995) use the term beneficiaries to designate the group receiving the value generated by a given initiative's mission focus. In the case of Wright et al.'s (1995) research, beneficiaries were low-income consumers in Appalachia in need of housing, which volunteers built on their behalf. Wright et al. (1995) found that "beneficiaries, who also attend organizational meetings and participate on work days, might feel degraded if their dependency and appreciation were constantly emphasized. So in the bi-weekly meetings, leaders spoke very little of the benefits the new home owner would receive. They focused, rather, on direct benefits to volunteers" (Wright et al., 1995, p. 191). Citing Richard Oliver (1980), Wright et al. (1995) also posit that "as in business, so in philanthropy, over-promising [to volunteers and prospective volunteers] can increase dissatisfaction and reduce long-term commitment to the organization" (Wright et al. 1995 p. 188 and p. 196).

CS/D&CB research by Lee and Thorelli (1989) focuses on public transportation in China. Of greater interest here is some of Thorelli's earlier research (Thorelli, 1967). Although Thorelli never invokes the term social entrepreneurship, he articulates the "social responsibility of the businessman" (Thorelli, 1967, p. 78). Likewise, he includes examples of organizations where "doing good" is their *raison d'être* rather than financial profitability. Given that mission-focus comprises the very core of social entrepreneurship, in the example that follows, it is worth noting that Thorelli emphasizes a certain tendency of do-good organizations to pivot their mission focus in the instance of accomplishing their initial mission. He notes that "as the [do-good] organization realizes an important objective it tends to redefine its mission, acting under the imperative of survival. As polio vaccines were developed, the March of Dimes [re]focused its attention on birth defects" (Thorelli, 1967, p. 78).

CS/D&CB research by Francis and Butler (1994) found that nearly three-quarters of their study's respondents "always or often disposed of their used clothing by giving it to a charitable organization" (Francis & Butler, 1994, p. 185). They also found widespread agreement among participants in their study that "commercial advertising should be forced to mention the ecological disadvantages of products" and that "manufacturers should be forced to use recycled materials in the manufacturing and processing operations" (Francis & Butler, 1994, p. 187). Though Francis and Butler—as well as their respondents—do not propose how marketers and manufacturers might be forced to comply with the study participants' force-related desires, a recent case study with decided entrepreneurial marketing, social entrepreneurship, and manufacturing threads explores the forcing function manifested by litigation targeting alleged greenwashing by leading apparel brands (Dalecki, 2023).

Before concluding this section, it is worth reviewing some of the CS/D&CB research that explores dynamics associated with gifting, and to note the relational similarities between philanthropic beneficiaries/volunteers and gift recipients/givers. Cárdenas (2012) articulates a schema that includes four gift conditions. The gift conditions are numbered and italicized, with typical feedback from gift-recipients to gift-givers upon gift receipt included in parentheticals: "1. *the gift as a common product* (sincere conversations, spontaneous and intentional use of the product); 2. *the gift as a special product* (sincere conversations, intentional use of the product); 3. *the gift as an awkward product* (lies, feigned use of the product); and 4. *the gift as an inadequate product* (silence, lies)" (Cárdenas, 2012, p. 142). Subsequent CS/D&CB research by Cohn (2016) discovered gifting as a form a virtue-signaling: "One respondent noted: Gifts are given for bragging rights. Like if you give to the homeless, right afterwards posting on FB (sic) how giving you are with an example" (Cohn, 2016, p. 85). Cohn also shares the following about a mother gifting her stay-at-home daughter a new business suit who "was telling her daughter she should not be a stay [at] home mom; she should go to work. Here is a suit. This is who I want you to be" (Cohn, 2016, p. 82). Cohn directly quotes the daughter-participant involved: "She [the mother of this participant] also passive aggressively buys me suits and work clothes every year... I'm a SAHM (Stay At Home Mom), she doesn't think that's a good choice though'" (Cohn, 2016, p. 82). This example's clear psychosocial and psychodynamic undercurrents serve as a good bridge to the next section.

PSYCHODYNAMIC PSYCHOSOCIAL UNDERCURRENTS IN THE CS/D&CB LITERATURE

The ostensibly passive-aggressive gifting behavior of the mother in Cohn's (2016 p. 82) example offers a clear case of psychosocial psychodynamics in a consumer behavior frame. The mother repeatedly uses a specific type of gift to send her daughter a judgmental, unverbalized message that is painful to receive while maintaining plausible deniability. The term "passive-aggressive" was coined by clinician William Menninger during WWII to describe indirect communications and behaviors that would be socially unacceptable and risky if deployed directly (Menninger, 1943, p. 175 and p. 182). Psychodynamic research and clinical approaches draw from classical Freudian psychoanalytic concepts without accepting the entirety of Freud's theoretical framework. William Menninger, a clinical practitioner and researcher well-versed in Freud, had formal psychoanalytic training with the Institute for Psychoanalysis in Chicago from 1933 to 1934 for didactic training and a personal analysis (Menninger, 2004, p. 278).

The text below explores early instances of psychodynamic and psychosocial constructs in consumer behavior literature. Rook and Levy's (1983) study "Psychosocial Themes in Consumer Grooming Rituals" combines Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytic approach with Erik Erikson's eight psychosocial life stages framework to evaluate consumer grooming rituals. Freud's emphasis is on psychosexual psychodynamic developmental stages before reaching adulthood, while Erikson's psychosocial stages cover non-sexual phases of personality maturation, such as initiative, identity, and generativity, extending through late adulthood. Levy's research suggests understanding respondents' psychosocial characteristics can benefit consumer research. Overall, this body of consumer behavior research using these constructs analyzes high-affect dynamics not typically associated with consumer research, drawing from both Freud's psychodynamic and Erikson's psychosocial frameworks.

The CS/D&CB literature is surprisingly rich with affective instances such as the mother/daughter gifting scenario above, some of lesser and some of greater intensity. Some of this research draws directly on psychoanalytic constructs; some do so only obliquely. A high-intensity instance that draws directly on psychoanalytic constructs is David Aron’s 2001 article “Consumer Grudgeholding: Toward a Conceptual Model and Research Agenda” published in the *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior* (JCS/D&CB). Aron’s (2001) conceptual model focused on consumer grudgeholding and expanded on Hunt et al.’s original conceptualization of consumer grugdeholding, published in the first edition of the JCS/D&CB (Hunt et al., 1988). Aron states: “Vengeance, like redress-seeking, illustrates that while a consumer may be engaging in grudgeholding behavior, there may still remain interaction between the consumer and the marketer. Vengeance is a form of retaliation and is an extreme manifestation, which may be in the form of threats or lawsuits against the object of the grudge” (2001 Aron p. 115). “Holding the grudge might give one a feeling of power, in that by steadfastly refusing to do business with the offending marketer, the customer is denying income to the object of the grudge” (Aron, 2001, p. 113). Psychodynamically inclined analysts and researchers would likely categorize this sort of consumer behavior as an example of subclinical withholding.

Aron suggests that grudgeholding consumers may be driven by *schadenfreude*, and thus derive “pleasure from the suffering of others” (Aron, 2001, p. 113). If some of Aron’s thoughts strike the reader as Freudian it is only fitting. Freud articulated schadenfreude in a similar vein to Aron in *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious*. But Freud viewed schadenfreude as an exclusively childish form of pleasure-taking (Freud, 1905, p. 224). Aron quotes and adapts Burton Wixen’s (1971) *Psychoanalytic Review* article “Grudges: A Psychoanalytic Study,” which Aron posits as providing CS/D&CB researchers with “a psychoanalytic perspective, presenting grudgeholding as a phobic avoidance of the offending party, enacted to preserve the grudgeholder’s self-esteem” (Aron, 2001, p. 109). Aron continues: “The elements of this definition hold true for the adaptation of the concept of grudgeholding to the realm of consumer behavior” (Aron, 2001, p. 109).

We agree that Aron’s adaptation holds true in a consumer behavior context. In fact, we contend that in addition to grudgeholding, other attitudes and actions with clear psychodynamic and psychosocial dimensions will also hold true in a consumer behavior context. Stated differently: people’s core psychodynamic and psychosocial characteristics do not evaporate when people enter the consumer behavior realm. We believe that Aron’s research—and CS/D&CB research that takes a similar approach to his—might be labelled psychosocial consumer behavior research. More recent CS/D&CB research with elements of psychosocial and psychodynamic consumer behavior cites anecdotal evidence indicating that "Apple customers tend to express high online *schadenfreude* sentiments when misfortune befalls the company's chief rival, Microsoft, while at the same time revealing profound admiration towards Microsoft founder Bill Gates (Hornik & Rachamin, 2023). Somewhat paradoxically, these Apple customers appear to enjoy witnessing damage inflicted on the Microsoft brand, while simultaneously admiring the brand's founder. This corresponds with the psychodynamic construct of splitting.

Relatedly, FitzPatrick, Friend, and Costley's (2004) JCS/D&CB article "Dissatisfaction and Distrust" posits that "psychological contracts are transactional (with well-described terms of exchange), or relational (less defined and more abstract), or both" (FitzPatrick et al., 2004, p. 124). They state that "research from psychology shows that because a violation is experienced at 'a deep visceral level'... the breach may be followed by particularly intense negative emotions such as anger and response" (FitzPatrick et al., 2004, p. 124). Although FitzPatrick et al. (2004) neither invoke psychoanalytics nor psychosocial psychodynamics per se, many of their specific instances and descriptions of consumer behavior are very much in Freud's neighborhood.

Some entrepreneurial marketing-focused researchers criticize the relative dearth of literature dealing with high-affect brand/consumer dynamics. Morris et al. posit that it is the goal of entrepreneurs to establish "visceral relationships with the firm's customer base... where the firm identifies with the customer at a fundamental level, and the customer similarly identifies with the firm... largely ignored in marketing theory, and empirical research is an emotional aspect to successful market actions. Southwest Airlines is a case in point" (Morris et al., 2002, p. 7). Sharing an instance where Southwest Airlines used humor as part of their service-recovery response, a JCS/D&CB article by Naylor (2016) states, "SWA [Southwest Airlines Co.] responded to an online complaint (Dearswa.com) that used images from popular movies to describe damaged luggage, with their own humorous response. Resolution was promised in the response" (Naylor, 2016, p. 136). Freud—and subsequent psychodynamic and psychosocial clinicians and researchers—view humor as a mature/healthy form of defense.

Researchers in marketing found a strange phenomenon in the 1980s: when customers' complaints about products are handled well, they tend to be even more satisfied with the product than those with no issues. This was termed the "service-recovery paradox." Similarly, in 1986, clinician Lawrence Friedman observed a paradoxical dynamic in the clinical setting. He found that the relationship between the clinician and patient and the patient's therapeutic outcome improved after the therapist repaired the empathic bond following a rupture.

The section discusses various consumer and brand interactions, focusing on positive and negative high-affect dynamics. It explores how these dynamics can lead to either escalating negative affect and behavior or increased positive affect and behavior. It's important to note that the literature also includes instances of positive, high-affect consumer experiences from the start. For example, Evard and Aurier (1994) studied the impact of emotions on satisfaction in the context of movie consumption, highlighting the role of narrative surprise. Kumar et al. (2002) also delved into instances of consumer delight, some of which involved surprise elements. Additionally, creative writing editors have documented their emotional responses to unfolding narratives, particularly moments when a story feels surprising yet inevitable. Another contributor noted that skilled creative writers invest significant time in crafting passages to evoke specific emotional qualities. Overall, the CS/D&CB literature offers valuable insights into a wide range of high-affect consumer experiences, encompassing both negative and positive dynamics.

DISCUSSION

Our study combines aspects of a scoping review with a personal perspective piece to explore various marketing subfields in relation to CS/D&CB. We focus on entrepreneurial consumer behavior, commercial entrepreneurial marketing, marketing approaches typical of effectual entrepreneurs, marketing in the context of social entrepreneurship, and psychosocial consumer behavior. We believe that Hunt's early contribution to entrepreneurial marketing, especially his articulation of entrepreneurial consumer behavior, is more relevant today than when he introduced it in the late 1980s. Hunt's conceptual label, comprising the terms "entrepreneurial," "consumer," and "behavior," remains pertinent to entrepreneurship, consumption, and human behavior.

There are several noteworthy aspects to consider when considering Hunt's pioneering contribution to entrepreneurial marketing. Initially involved at its inception, Hunt shifted his research focus to other interests, primarily CS/D&CB. However, research at the marketing and entrepreneurship interface has expanded since Hills, Hunt, and its other co-founders established the domain in 1987. Like CS/D&CB, entrepreneurial marketing emerged in the late 1980s and has since grown. The 38th GRCME will convene in August 2025 (Eggers, 2024), symbolizing the continued growth. Using Erikson's stages of psychosocial development as a metaphor, both CS/D&CB and entrepreneurial marketing have successfully navigated their early adulthoods and are on the cusp of middle adulthood.

"Previously, discussions of entrepreneurship and marketing have mainly focused on the seller side of the interaction. On the buyer side, there has been a focus on personal consumers and business buyers" (Hunt et al., 1988). This observation by Hunt remains relevant today, with a growing interest among entrepreneurial marketing researchers in the buyer side of the interaction, particularly in entrepreneur/consumer co-creation. Alqahtani and Uslay's (2022) findings suggest that Hunt's entrepreneurial consumer behavior construct is relevant to many important entrepreneurial marketing research goals, including assessing entrepreneurial marketing's impact on the consumer experience and identifying key differences between entrepreneurial marketing in business-to-business and business-to-consumer contexts (Alqahtani & Uslay, 2022, p. 414).

The entrepreneurial consumer behavior coding schema developed by Hunt et al. (1990) is included in Table 1 and is relevant to consumer behavior and entrepreneurial marketing researchers. Hunt et al. (1990) found that some entrepreneurial consumers engage in concurrent and overlapping lifestyle ventures, which is particularly interesting. For example, Kevin, a student-participant studied by Hunt, bought, used, and sold secondhand vintage clothing. Hunt's search did not uncover entrepreneurial consumers whose ventures evolved into highly profitable or scaled enterprises. Similarly, our Fall 2023 Consumer Behavior course convenience sample survey did not identify any entrepreneurial consumers who launched scaled ventures. Given the contemporary interest in lifestyle ventures, the gig economy, craftsperson makers, and social entrepreneurship, it is important to continue searching for entrepreneurial consumers who launch overlapping ventures, regardless of whether they scale or not.

Roundy (2017) noted that social entrepreneurs must create organizations that provide value for beneficiaries and customers. With the growing interest in social entrepreneurship and ecological sustainability, it's important to highlight Hunt's finding that some entrepreneurial consumers, like Kevin, start lifestyle ventures with positive social and/or ecological impacts. Saebi et al. (2019) also observed that having separate beneficiaries and customers can lead to conflicting institutional goals and tensions between social and economic activities. This dual mission can create tensions that may lead to one mission undermining the other.

Hunt's idea of entrepreneurial consumer behavior originated in the field of entrepreneurial marketing. However, because the concept focuses on consumer behavior, it is also important for CS/D&CB researchers. Before discussing our study's limitations and suggesting potential future research directions, we want to express our excitement about the relevance of high-affect CS/D&CB research to entrepreneurial marketing researchers. Remember the criticism by Morris et al. (2002) that entrepreneurial marketing research has largely overlooked investigating emotional connections with the firm's customer base. Aron incorporated insights from clinical psychodynamic literature into his conceptual model, which was well-received by his CS/D&CB research colleagues. Entrepreneurial marketing researchers who incorporate psychodynamic insights from clinical literature have a good chance of addressing the "visceral relationships" issue identified by Morris et al. (2002).

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Although a scoping review allows for a quick mapping process to give an overview of a topic (Nowak et al., 2023, p. 128), we acknowledge that there are several limitations in our project. Similarly, the retrospective personal perspective part of our paper is inherently anecdotal. The main limitation of our current paper is the exclusion of certain information. We intentionally left out important literature due to length constraints—the known knowns. Additionally, there are likely many insights in existing literature that we are unaware of, which could have enriched our paper—the unknown (to us) knowns. It's also possible that there are insights yet to be discovered that could have benefited our research—the unknown unknowns.

We acknowledge a significant limitation of our current paper: we have mainly focused on the United States. Apart from our passing observations and those of Hunt et al. (1990, p. 231) regarding international "save-on-net spree-shopping" by Americans as a form of entrepreneurial consumer behavior, we have not explicitly addressed dynamics that involve markets outside the U.S. In the future, researchers are encouraged to examine whether the dynamics we have explored apply outside the U.S.

Researchers are encouraged to update, expand on, and refine Hunt et al.'s (1990) initial entrepreneurial consumer behavior framework, shown in Table 1. They should also consider including digital and hybrid digital/physical examples, such as those identified in our Fall 2023 Consumer Behavior course convenience-sample survey. Additionally, researchers might want to elaborate on and improve specific subcategories of entrepreneurial consumer behavior, as presented in column 3 of Table 1.

Research could also address the following questions:

- To what extent and under what circumstances do traditional commercial and social entrepreneurs incorporate aspects of CS/D&CB during their new product/service development processes?
- To what extent do the psychosocial motives and other personal attributes that drive commercial entrepreneurs differ from the motives and other personal attributes that drive social entrepreneurs?

- To what extent do the motives and other personal attributes that drive unconscientious consumers differ from the motives and other personal attributes that drive conscientious consumers?
- How might Erik Erikson's stages of psychosocial development framework be applied to generate insights regarding consumer behavior?
- How might psychosocial consumer behavior-informed approaches to social entrepreneurship research differ from psychosocial consumer behavior approaches to commercial entrepreneurship research?
- To what extent and in what ways might all value recipients of a given entrepreneurial initiative be fruitfully thought of as consumers and/or beneficiaries (and what might be lost in pursuing such an approach)?
- How might product and service co-creation—involving customers and/or other stakeholders outside the entrepreneurial firm—drive innovation?
- What are the key differences between entrepreneurial marketing in business-to-business contexts versus business-to-consumer contexts?
- How might entrepreneurial marketing—including entrepreneurial consumer behavior—drive sustainability and positive social impact?

The simultaneous emergence of the service recovery paradox concept in marketing literature and the therapeutically beneficial rupture-and-repair concept in clinical literature raises an interesting question: What other similarities exist across these fields, and what insights can be transferred between them? In the future, researchers may also search through the JCS/D&CB and the Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship archives for examples of entrepreneurial consumer behavior and related activities when conducting a meta-analysis on entrepreneurial consumer behavior.

CONCLUSION

Our review found that Hunt's concept of entrepreneurial consumer behavior has implications for all the sub-literatures we reviewed. The tendency of commercial effectual entrepreneurs to interact with and co-create value with prospects is similar to the tendency of entrepreneurial consumers to do the same, albeit on a smaller scale. Understandably, Hunt did not emphasize potential links between social or environmental impact and entrepreneurial consumer behavior, as social entrepreneurship was not as prominent when the concept was introduced. The potential overlap between some forms of entrepreneurial consumer behavior and social entrepreneurship is promising but relatively unexplored. The psychodynamic and psychosocial insights in the CS/D&CB literature are important for understanding Hunt's consumer behavior concept and entrepreneurial marketing more broadly, especially concerning the emotional dimensions of entrepreneurial marketing.

Fans of The Godfather (Puzo & Coppola, 1971) may notice that the line "It's not business, Sonny—it's strictly personal" is actually a variation of the original line from the film: "It's not personal, Sonny—it's strictly business" (Puzo & Coppola, 1971, p. 55). According to Jones (2021), the line in the Puzo and Coppola screenplay was itself adapted from the dialogue in Puzo's novel (1969). In the novel, the personal versus business dialogue has a different tone, with Michael directly asserting himself within the family by challenging the notion that it's "just business."

Michael responds to Tom Hagen, his interlocutor in the novel, by saying, "It's all personal, every bit of business. Every piece of s*** every man has to eat every day of his life is personal. They call it business. OK. But it's personal as hell" (Jones, 2021, p. 114, quoting Puzo, 1969).

This inversion of business and personal once again brings to light what is hidden in the screenplay version, as Freud might say. However, Coppola and Puzo deserve praise for adapting Michael's interaction in the screenplay. Many moviegoers enjoy contemplating Michael's ambiguous motivations in this scene and throughout The Godfather franchise. Therefore, the time and effort invested in crafting such moments to "capture exactly the intended emotional qualities" (Durgee, 1999, p. 56) was time well spent and greatly benefited movie consumers.

“Just as with Freud all things are sexual, so with some business scholars all things are business” (Huefner & Hunt, 1994, p. 62). We understand Huefner and Hunt to suggest that just as it's a common but incorrect belief that Freud was only interested in psychosexual dynamics, some business scholars narrowly focus on business matters and may overlook important contextual factors that are crucial for gaining a comprehensive understanding. Psychoanalyst and occasional business consultant Prudence Leib Gourguechon reminds us that everyone has a unique mindset that influences all aspects of their life, including personal and business relationships (Gourguechon, 2021, p. 35). Our research indicates that scholars in the fields of CS/D&CB, entrepreneurial marketing, social entrepreneurship, and effectual entrepreneurship produce some of the most valuable and insightful work in the overall marketing discipline. This is largely due to their ability to incorporate contextual evidence from non-business domains.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:
Linden Dalecki, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Marketing
Kelce Undergraduate School of Business
Pittsburg State University
211 Kelce Center
Pittsburg, KS 66762 USA
E-mail: ldalecki@pittstate.edu, dalecki@hotmail.com
Phone: +1-620-235-4547

Submitted: 17 February 2023
Revised: 24 September 2024

REFERENCES

Alqahtani, N. & Uslay, C. (2022), Marketing/Entrepreneurship Interface Research Priorities (2023–2026), *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, *24*(2) 405-419. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRME-11-2021-0151

Anabranch. (2023). In *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Anabranch&oldid=1146142198 Anonymized Anonymized Consumer Behavior Student “1,” (2023). November 7 convenience sample respondent in authors’ Consumer Behavior class.

Anonymized Consumer Behavior Student “2,” (2023). November 7 convenience sample respondent in authors’ Consumer Behavior class.

Anonymized Goodwill Employees (2023). November 20, face-to-face interviews by authors at a Goodwill retail store in the US Midwest.

Aron, D. (2001). Consumer Grudgeholding: Toward a Conceptual Model and Research Agenda, *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*. https://jcsdcb.com/index.php/JCSDCB/article/view/108

Billabong. (2023). In *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Billabong&oldid=1175355568

Cárdenas, J.C. (2012). Use and Disposition of a Gift and the Recipient's Feedback in a Collectivist Environment, *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*. https://jcsdcb.com/index.php/JCSDCB/article/view/232

Cardoni, V. (2009, September 8). *Goodwill's History*. Goodwill Industries International. https://www.goodwill.org/about-us/goodwills-history/

Cohn. D.Y. (2016). Thanks, I Guess: What Consumers Complain About When They Complain About Gifts, *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*. https://jcsdcb.com/index.php/JCSDCB/article/view/225

Cyrill, C. (2005). Turning a Story [Fiction Editors.]. *Australian Author*, *37*(2), 20–22. Dalecki, L. (2023) Ecotton: Rebranding a Substantiable, Sustainable Ingredient Brand, *Journal of Brand Strategy*, *12*(3). https://www.henrystewartpublications.com/jbs/v12

Durgee, J. F. (1999). Deep, Soulful Satisfaction. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, https://jcsdcb.com/index.php/JCSDCB/article/view/169

Egan, L. & Aron, D. (2022). H. Keith Hunt on Consumer Behavior: Understanding His Contribution, *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, https://jcsdcb.com/index.php/JCSDCB/article/view/776

Eggers, F. (2024). Email to the authors on August 19.

Evrard, Y., and Aurier, P. (1994). The Influence of Emotions on Satisfaction with Movie Consumption. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, https://jcsdcb.com/index.php/JCSDCB/article/view/583

File, K.M., Judd, B.B., & Moriya, F.E. (1988). "Marketing and Social Entrepreneurship," in *Research at the Marketing/Entrepreneurship Interface: Proceedings of the UIC Symposium on Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, Ed. by Gerald Hills, Raymond W. LaForge and Beverly J. Parker. pp. 185-196.

FitzPatrick, M., Friend, L., & Costley, C. (2004). Dissatisfaction and Distrust, *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, https://jcsdcb.com/index.php/JCSDCB/article/view/66

Francis, S.K., & Butler, S.L. (1994). Consumer Satisfaction with Clothing Disposition, *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, https://jcsdcb.com/index.php/JCSDCB/article/view/589

Folkes, V.S. & Kotsos, B. (1986). Buyer's and Sellers' Explanations for Product Failure: Who Done It? *Journal of Marketing*, *50*(2). 74-80.

Freud, S. (1905). Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Works of Sigmund Freud*. 8: pp. 1–247.

Friedman, L. (1986). Kohut's Testament. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, *6*(3). 321–347.

Gilmore, A. (2011). Entrepreneurial and SME Marketing. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, *13* (2), 137–145, https://doi.org/10.1108/14715201111176426

Gourguecon, P. L. (2021). *Uncommon Perspectives on the Psychology of Leadership: Leader Assessment and Development: A Unique Approach Marrying Insights from Psychoanalysis and the US Army*. Invantage Advising.

GRCME (2024). Global Research Conference on Marketing and Entrepreneurship link. Retrieved March 14, from http://www.marketing-entrepreneurship.org/2024.html

Hills, G. (1987). "Marketing and Entrepreneurship Research Issues: Scholarly Justification?" in *Research at the Marketing/Entrepreneurship Interface: Proceedings of the UIC Symposium on Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, Ed. by Gerald Hills, pp. 3-15.

Hornik, J. and Rachamim, I.M. (2023). Torn Between Online Marketing Stories: Trait Ambivalence's Influence on Schadenfreude. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, https://jcsdcb.com/index.php/JCSDCB/article/view/952

Huefner, J. C. (2022). H. Keith Hunt: Mentor and Friend. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, https://jcsdcb.com/index.php/JCSDCB/article/view/815

Huefner, J. C., and Hunt, H. K. (1994). Broadening the Concept of Entrepreneurship: Comparing Business and Consumer Entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice. 18*(3), 61-75. https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879401800305

Hunt, H. K. (1987). "Marketing and Entrepreneurship" in *Research at the Marketing/Entrepreneurship Interface: Proceedings of the UIC Symposium on Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, Ed. by G. Hills, pp. 95–100.

Hunt, H.K., Hunt, D.H., & Hunt, T.C. (1988). Consumer Grudge. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, https://jcsdcb.com/index.php/JCSDCB/article/view/754

Hunt, H.K., Huefner, J.C., & Robinson, P.B. (1990). "The Entrepreneurial Consumer: Additional Insights," in *Research at the Marketing/Entrepreneurship Interface: Proceedings of the UIC Symposium on Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, Ed. by G. Hills, R.W. LaForge, and H.P. Welsch. pp. 227–235.

Hunt, H.K., Huefner, J.C., Voegele, C., & Robinson, P.B. (1988). "The Entrepreneurial Consumer," in *Research at the Marketing/Entrepreneurship Interface: Proceedings of the UIC Symposium on Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, Ed. by G. Hills, R.W. LaForge and B.J. Parker. pp. 175-184.

Hunt, S. D. (1976). *Marketing Theory: Conceptual Foundations of Research in Marketing.* Grid.

Hunt, S. D. (2011). On the Founding of the Journal of Macromarketing. *Journal of Macromarketing. 31*(2), 199-214. https://doi.org/10.1177/0276146710383283

Jones, J. M., and Coppola, F. F. (2021). *The Annotated Godfather (50th Anniversary Edition): The Complete Screenplay, Commentary on Every Scene, Interviews, and Little-Known Facts*. Black Dog & Leventhal.

Jones, R., & Rowley, J. (2011). Entrepreneurial Marketing in Small Businesses: A Conceptual Exploration. *International Small Business Journal*, *29*(1), 25–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242610369743

Kotler, P., Kartajaya, H., Huan, H. D., and Mussry, J. (2023). *Entrepreneurial Marketing: Beyond Professionalism to Creativity, Leadership, and Sustainability*. Wiley.

Kumar, A., Olshavsky, R. W., and King, M. F. (2001). Exploring Alternative Antecedents of Customer Delight. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, https://jcsdcb.com/index.php/JCSDCB/article/view/102

Lee, D.H. & Thorelli, H.B. (1989). A Study on the Consumer Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction with the Bus System in The People's Republic of China, *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, https://jcsdcb.com/index.php/JCSDCB/article/view/732

Levy, S.J. (1985). Dreams, Fairy Tales, Animals, and Cars, *Psychology & Marketing, 2*(2), 67-81.

Menninger, W.C. (1943). Characterological and Symptomatic Expressions Related to the Anal Phase of Psychosexual Development. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, *12*(2), 161-193.

Menninger, W.W. (2004). Contributions of Dr. William C. Menninger to Military Psychiatry. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, *68*(4), 277-296.

Merriam-Webster (2023). *Definition of ANABRANCH*. Retrieved November 24, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/anabranch

Morris, M. H., Schindehutte, M., & LaForge, R. W. (2002). Entrepreneurial Marketing: A Construct for Integrating Emerging Entrepreneurship and Marketing Perspectives. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, *10*(4), 1-19, https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2002.11501922

Naylor, G.S. (2016). Complaining, Complimenting and Word-of-Mouth in the Digital Age: Typology and Terms, *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, https://jcsdcb.com/index.php/JCSDCB/article/view/237

Nowak, D.P, Dahl, A.J., and Peltier, J.W. (2023). Mapping the Service Failure-Recovery Literature: A Scoping Review. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, https://jcsdcb.com/index.php/JCSDCB/article/view/852

Oliver, R. L. (1980). A Cognitive Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Satisfaction Decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *17*(4), 460-469, https://doi.org/10.2307/3150499

Puzo, M. (1969). *The Godfather*. G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Puzo, M., and Coppola, F.F. (1971). *The Godfather.* Screenplay based on the novel of the same title by Puzo, M. (1969). https://www.public.asu.edu/~srbeatty/394/Godfather.pdf

Read, S., Dew, N., Sarasvathy, S. D., Song, M., and Wiltbank, R. (2009). Marketing under Uncertainty: The Logic of an Effectual Approach. *Journal of Marketing*, *73*(3), 1-18, https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.73.3.001

Rindova, V., Barry, D., & Ketchen, D. J. (2009). Entrepreneuring as Emancipation. *Academy of Management Review*, *34*(3), 477–491. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2009.40632647

Roland, A. (1996). The Influence of Culture on the Self and Selfobject Relationships: An Asian-North American Comparison. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, *6*(4), 461-475, https://doi.org/10.1080/10481889609539131

Rook, D. W. & Levy, S.J. (1983), Psychosocial Themes in Consumer Grooming Rituals. *Advances in Consumer Research*, *10*, Eds. Bagozzi, R.P. and Tybout, A.M., Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 329–333.

Roundy, P. T. (2017). "Doing Good" While Serving Customers: Charting the Social Entrepreneurship and Marketing Interface. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*. *19*(2), 105-124, https://doi.org/10.1108/JRME-03-2017-0009

Saebi, T., Foss, N. J., and Linder, S. (2019). Social Entrepreneurship Research: Past Achievements and Future Promises. *Journal of Management, 45* (1), 70-95, https://doi.org.10.1177/0149206318793196

Sarasvathy, S. D. (2008). *What Makes Entrepreneurs Entrepreneurial?* (SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 909038). Social Science Research Network, https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=909038

Stokes, D. (2000). Putting Entrepreneurship into Marketing: The Processes of Entrepreneurial Marketing. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, *2*(1), 1-16, https://doi.org/10.1108/14715200080001536

Thorelli, H. B. (1967). Organizational Theory: An Ecological View. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, *1967* (1), 66–84, https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.1967.4980650

Warnecke, T. (2023). Phone conversation with the authors on November 21, followed by clarification via email on November 25.

Wixen, B. N. (1971). Grudges: A Psychoanalytic Study. *Psychoanalytic Review*, *58*(3), 333–344, https://www.proquest.com/docview/1310153898?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true&sourcetype=Scholarly%20Journals

Wright, N.D., Larsen, V. & Higgs, R. (1995). Consumer Satisfaction and the Marketing of Voluntarism: The Case of Appalachian Mountain Housing, *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, https://jcsdcb.com/index.php/JCSDCB/article/view/563