

From Frameworks to Foundations: A Critical Look at the 4Ps-to-4Es Transition in Hotel Marketing

Vanessa Britt*

Engineer Research and Development Center,
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Concord, MA,
USA

***Corresponding author:**

Vanessa Britt, Engineer Research and
Development Center, U.S. Army Corps
of Engineers, Concord, MA, USA. E-mail:
vanessa.britt2@gmail.com

Received: June 09, 2025; **Accepted:** June 20,
2025; **Published:** June 26, 2025

Citation: Britt V. From Frameworks to
Foundations: A Critical Look at the 4Ps-to-
4Es Transition in Hotel Marketing. Asian
Journal of Management Sciences. 2025, 13
No. 1: 105

Copyright: © 2025 Britt V. This is an open-
access article distributed under the terms of
the Creative Commons Attribution License,
which permits unrestricted use, distribution,
and reproduction in any medium, provided
the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

The conceptual review "Reconceptualizing the Hotel Marketing Mix: Balancing the Transition from the Traditional 4Ps to the Customer-Centric 4Es" makes a timely and welcome contribution to hospitality marketing scholarship. Its central claim that hotels need not abandon the classical 4Ps (Product, Price, Place, Promotion) in favor of the customer-centric 4Es (Experience, Exchange, Everyplace, Evangelism) but should instead integrate the two is intuitively appealing and reflects a broader trend in marketing theory toward hybrid, rather than replacement, models. As a post-publication commentary, this piece aims to critically examine the paper's conceptual architecture, evaluate the strength of its theoretical claims, and identify areas where the argument would benefit from sharper definition, empirical grounding, and engagement with adjacent literatures.

SUMMARIZING THE CORE ARGUMENT

The reviewed paper positions the 4Es a framework most closely associated with Brian Solis's work on experiential and social marketing as a natural evolution of the marketing mix in response to digital disruption and shifting guest expectations. Rather than treating Experience, Exchange, Everyplace, and Evangelism as a wholesale replacement for the 4Ps, the authors argue for a "balanced" integration: hotels should retain operational disciplines around product design, pricing, distribution, and promotion, while layering in experiential design, value-based exchange, omnichannel presence, and guest-driven advocacy. The paper supports this argument with illustrative examples of "innovative hospitality initiatives," and concludes that this integrated approach reduces strategic risk while enhancing guest satisfaction, loyalty, and competitiveness [1,2].

This is a reasonable and defensible thesis. However, several aspects of the argument merit closer scrutiny.

Where the Framework Integration Is Underspecified

The paper's greatest strengths call for balance rather than replacement is also its greatest analytical weakness, because "balance" is asserted rather than operationalized. Marketing mix frameworks are valuable to practitioners largely because they specify decision variables: a hotel manager can act on price, adjust distribution channels, or redesign a loyalty program. The 4Es, by contrast, describe *outcomes and orientations* experience is something a guest has, evangelism is something a guest does,

exchange is a value proposition rather than a lever. Mapping the 4Ps onto the 4Es without clarifying which is causally upstream (does Product design produce Experience, or does Experience redefine what counts as Product?) leaves the "integration" more rhetorical than structural [2].

A more useful reconceptualization would specify the mechanism of integration explicitly for instance, treating each E as a lens through which each P is redesigned (e.g., "Product filtered through Experience becomes guest journey design"; "Price filtered through Exchange becomes perceived value equity"). Without this kind of mapping, hotel managers are left with two parallel vocabularies rather than one decision-making framework [3].

The Evidentiary Basis Is Thin

As a conceptual review, the paper is not obligated to present primary empirical data, but its claims about guest satisfaction, loyalty, and competitiveness are outcome claims that invite empirical scrutiny. The reliance on "illustrative examples of

innovative hospitality initiatives" is common in conceptual marketing papers, but illustrative cases function as existence proofs, not as evidence of generalizable causal effects. It remains unclear from the abstract whether the initiatives cited were evaluated against a comparison condition (e.g., hotels that did not adopt experiential or omnichannel strategies), whether the guest satisfaction and loyalty outcomes were measured with validated instruments, or whether effects were sustained over time rather than reflecting short-term novelty.

Given that hospitality marketing already has a reasonably mature empirical literature on experience co-creation, servicescape design, and guest engagement (e.g., work building on Pine and Gilmore's experience economy and on service-dominant logic), the paper would be considerably strengthened by situating its integrated 4Ps–4Es model against this existing empirical base, and by proposing testable propositions rather than resting on descriptive plausibility [4].

CONCEPTUAL OVERLAP WITH EXISTING MARKETING THEORY

A further concern is that several of the 4Es dimensions substantially overlap with frameworks already well established in services and relationship marketing, raising the question of what unique theoretical leverage the 4Es add. "Exchange," for instance, closely tracks value-based pricing and perceived value constructs already embedded in services marketing. "Everyplace" largely restates omnichannel and multichannel distribution research, which itself already sits comfortably under an expanded notion of "Place." "Evangelism" overlaps considerably with word-of-mouth, advocacy, and net promoter constructs long studied under loyalty and relationship marketing. Only "Experience" arguably introduces genuinely new theoretical content relative to the 4Ps, and even there, the experience economy literature predates the 4Es framework by roughly a decade [5].

This is not a fatal flaw frameworks can have value as organizing heuristics even without introducing wholly novel constructs, but the paper would benefit from explicitly acknowledging this overlap and clarifying whether the 4Es' contribution is primarily *terminological* (repackaging known constructs for practitioner accessibility) or *structural* (offering a genuinely new decision architecture). The abstract, as presented, implies the latter but substantiates closer to the former.

An Alternative Reading: Complementary Layers, not a New Mix

Building on the paper's own instinct toward balance rather than replacement, a stronger theoretical move might be to abandon the "4Ps vs. 4Es" framing altogether and instead treat the 4Es as a *guest-experience overlay* that sits on top of, rather than parallel to, the operational marketing mix. Under this reframing, hotels would not be asked to manage eight variables in tension, but rather to ask for each of the four operational decisions (Product, Price, Place, Promotion), how that decision is perceived, co-created, and shared by the guest. This preserves the practical clarity of the 4Ps for internal resource allocation while incorporating the

paper's legitimate insight that modern guests evaluate hotels experientially and relationally rather than transactionally [6].

This reframing also resolves a subtler issue in the original paper: by presenting 4Ps and 4Es as separate frameworks to be "balanced," the paper implicitly suggests hotels might over-invest in one at the expense of the other, creating a zero-sum framing the authors do not intend. An overlay model removes that implication entirely.

Practical and Managerial Implications

For practitioners, the reviewed paper's core message does not discard operational marketing fundamentals in the pursuit of experiential trends is sound advice, particularly for small and mid-sized hotel operators who may lack the resources to fully digitize guest engagement while neglecting pricing discipline or distribution efficiency. However, managers seeking to apply the framework would benefit from clearer guidance on sequencing and prioritization: should experiential investment precede or follow optimization of the traditional 4Ps? The paper's abstract does not address resource-constrained decision-making, which is arguably the most pressing question independent hoteliers face when evaluating this kind of framework [7].

CONCLUSION

The transition from the 4Ps to the 4Es offers a useful opportunity to reconsider hotel marketing, but its value depends on conceptual clarity rather than new terminology. Product, Price, Place and Promotion remain practical tools for allocating resources, while Experience, Exchange, Everyplace and Evangelism can guide how those decisions respond to guest expectations. Treating the 4Es as complementary perspectives may therefore provide greater managerial clarity than presenting two competing marketing mixes. However, claims that integration improves satisfaction, loyalty or competitiveness require empirical testing across different hotel categories and operating conditions. Future research should define the relationships between operational decisions and guest outcomes, distinguish overlapping constructs, and assess whether the proposed framework adds explanatory value beyond established services and relationship marketing theories. For practitioners, implementation should begin with identifiable guest needs, operational weaknesses and available resources. A coherent hotel marketing strategy emerges when experiential ambitions are supported by reliable service delivery, appropriate pricing, accessible distribution and credible communication.

REFERENCES

1. Constantinides, E. (2006). The marketing mixes revisited: Towards the 21st century marketing. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 22(3–4), 407–438.
2. Grönroos, C. (1994). From marketing mix to relationship marketing: Towards a paradigm shift in marketing. *Management Decision*, 32(2), 4–20.

3. Lemon, K. N., & Verhoef, P. C. (2016). Understanding customer experience throughout the customer journey. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), 69–96.
4. Oh, H., Fiore, A. M., & Jeoung, M. (2007). Measuring experience economy concepts: Tourism applications. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(2), 119–132.
5. Verhoef, P. C., Kannan, P. K., & Inman, J. J. (2015). From multi-channel retailing to omni-channel retailing: Introduction to the special issue on multi-channel retailing. *Journal of Retailing*, 91(2), 174–181.
6. Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1), 1–17.
7. So, K. K. F., King, C., Sparks, B. A., & Wang, Y. (2016). The role of customer engagement in building consumer loyalty to tourism brands. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(1), 64–78.