

On Market Orientation:

Development and empirical validation of two symmetric
component measures of market orientation

November 2005

by Hans Ege Sørensen

Department of Marketing & Management
University of Southern Denmark

Extended abstract

The main contributions of this study are a refined market orientation construct, two symmetric component measures of market orientation – customer orientation and competitor orientation, and a three-step respecification procedure for establishing unidimensionality and *a posteriori* content validity in multi-indicator measures. Furthermore, empirical evidence reveals that while competitor orientation is positively related to firms' market share, a customer orientation is detrimental to firms' return on assets for manufacturing firms in less competitive environments.

Market orientation is positioned as marketing's contribution to business strategy (Hunt & Lambe, 2000) and is considered an important strategic orientation (e.g. Gatignon & Xuereb, 1997). Stoelhorst and van Raaij (2004) position market orientation as marketing's explanation of performance differentials between firms. These advantages of market orientation are generally agreed to be a consequence of improved market-sensing capabilities and thus improved market responsiveness, particularly in more hostile and unpredictable environments (Day, 1999; Jaworski & Kohli, 1993). Kohli and Jaworski (1990) emphasize that market orientation and other orientations come at a cost. For this reason, it is essential that the bottom-line consequences of firms' market orientation are critically assessed and evaluated (Day, 1994). But what is market orientation?

On the basis of a review of the market orientation literature, it becomes evident that a multitude of definitions of the market orientation construct co-exist. Moreover, the literature review reveals that the empirical research investigating market orientation is based on different measures of market orientation, both in terms of the measures' factorial structure as well as the distribution of indicators across the factors. For these reasons, this study is designed to determine the salient dimensions of the market orientation construct and to develop and empirically test measures that correspond to these dimensions. Furthermore, the study is designed to investigate the influence of an improved measure of market orientation on the empirical assessment of the relationship between market orientation and firm performance

Market orientation is an organizational culture dedicated to delivering superior customer value (Narver & Slater, 1990; Homburg & Pflesser, 2000; Day, 1999). A market-oriented culture is manifested in the activities and processes of the firm (Slater & Narver, 1998, see also Slater & Narver, 1995). The market-oriented activities and processes of firms are organizationwide generation and dissemination of intelligence pertaining to customers and competitors, and action taken on the basis of the intelligence (Kohli & Jaworski, 1990; Narver & Slater, 1990). Subsequently, the working definition of market orientation consists of six theoretically distinct components. The six theoretical components form two symmetric and more general components, customer orientation and competitor orientation. The working definition of market orientation provides the basis for the operationalization of measures presented in more detail below.

The refined market orientation construct comprising six theoretically distinct components provided the basis for a theoretical assessment of existing measures of market orientation (Narver & Slater, 1990; Kohli et al. 1993; Deshpandé & Farley, 1998; Matsuno & Mentzer, 2000) in terms of the degree to which they achieve *a priori* content validity (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The existing measures of market orientation do not achieve *a priori* content validity as they are construct deficient – particularly with respect to tapping competitor-oriented activities. The necessary indicators required to achieve *a priori* construct validity are obtained from Professor Slater (personal correspondence, 2003).

The distinction between *a priori* content validity (before data collection) and *a posteriori* content validity (after measure respecification based on data) is emphasized in this study. The logic for this

distinction is: it is equally important to have sufficient indicators in one's questionnaire prior to the data collection as it is to have sufficient indicators in one's respecified measures. The sufficient amount of indicators is determined by two things: the definition and theoretical dimensionality of the underlying construct and the minimum number of indicators required to tap a given theoretical component. Traditional respecification procedures based on the establishment of unidimensionality by eliminating indicators with low indicator-to-total correlation tend to involve atheoretical elimination of indicators. The possible consequence of atheoretical elimination of indicators is unidimensional but construct deficient and therefore *a posteriori* content invalid measures.

This observation gives rise to the development of a novel three-step respecification procedure for establishing unidimensionality and *a posteriori* content validity in multi-indicator measures. In relation to this study, the novel three-step procedure avoids the elimination of two indicators critical to *a posteriori* content validity on the measures of customer orientation and competitor orientation. The three-step procedure also captures many potentially problematic sources of measurement error as well as procedural sources of content validity that otherwise would have been neglected. Unidimensionality is established by means of the measures' composite reliability and average variance extracted (Fornell and Larcker, 1981; Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). Other aspects assessing measures' construct validity applied in the study are convergent validity, discriminant validity, and nomological validity (Fornell and Larcker, 1981; Anderson & Gerbing, 1988, see also Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

The empirical foundation of the study is a survey of Danish manufacturing and R&D-based firms. 308 CEOs have provided useful responses to a questionnaire assessing firms' market orientation, market share as well as the standard control variables on firms' performance. This data is supported by census data containing firms' return on assets. Given the six theoretical components of the refined market orientation construct, nineteen theoretical meaningful factorial structures (setup as measurement models in AMOS 5.0) are tested with confirmatory factor analysis in order to establish a valid measure of market orientation. These measurement models include the factorial structures suggested by Narver and Slater (1990) and Kohli et al. (1993). As indicated above, the best fitting measurement model to the underlying data is composed by two symmetric component measures of market orientation – a measure of customer orientation and a measure of competitor orientation.

The two improved component measures of market orientation are then investigated, together with the original Narver and Slater (1990) global measure of market orientation, with respect to their influence on aspects of firms' performance in different environmental conditions. On the basis of the sample data, empirical evidence reveals the negative relationship between customer orientation and return on assets for manufacturing firms in less competitive environments. Furthermore, the results indicate no relationship between firms' competitor orientation and return on assets and customer orientation has no relationship with return on assets in highly competitive environments. Firms' market share is explained by competitor orientation, but not by customer orientation. The study's results also indicate that the improved component measures of customer orientation and competitor orientation provide much more nuanced and applicable information about the important aspects of firms' market orientation in relation to performance in different competitive environments.

The influence of competitor orientation and particularly customer orientation on firms' return of assets in different environmental conditions is provocative. While the present study cannot disconfirm the general argument that being market-oriented never can be a negative (Slater and Narver, 1994), it can refine it by arguing that a customer orientation apparently can be a negative. The apparent conclusion is that firm' activities pertaining to understanding and anticipating changes in their markets do not generate superior customer value. A puzzling result is the detrimental effect of customer orientation in less competitive environments. Evidence from the majority of international studies on market orientation indicate that marketing activities and capabilities are indeed beneficial, but that marketing activities need focus and must be implemented by a profitable purpose and not just blindly executed.

The present data do not provide information about the possible underlying reasons for these results. However, the findings give rise to some general speculations of managerial relevance. Since marketing and market-oriented activities require allocation of resources, the cost/benefit ratio of these activities must be considered on a continuous basis to ensure their high quality and effectiveness. The findings indicate, however, that the quality and effectiveness of market-oriented activities in Danish manufacturing industries may need improvement. The results of the present study therefore call for a stronger managerial emphasis on effective implementation and control of marketing and market-oriented activities.

As a concluding remark, much improvement is apparently still needed for Danish manufacturing and R&D-based firms to achieve the positive effects of market orientation on firm performance as is observed abroad. The general requirements to meet this objective are a more efficient organization of market-oriented activities in parallel with an efficient execution of business strategies based on the intelligence provided by firms' market orientation.



References

- Anderson, J. C. & Gerbing, D. W. (1988), "Structural Equation Modeling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-Step Approach", *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3), 411-423.
- Bagozzi, R.P. & Yi, Y. (1988), "On the Evaluation of Structural Equation Models." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16, pp. 74-94.
- Day, George S. (1994), "The Capabilities of Market-Driven Organizations". *Journal of Marketing*, 58(October), pp. 37-52.
- Day, George S. (1999), *The Market Driven Organization - Understanding, attracting, and keeping valuable customers*, The Free Press.
- Deshpande, R. & Farley, J. U. (1998). Measuring Market Orientation: Generalization and Synthesis. *Journal of Market-Focused Management*, 2(3), 213-232.
- Fornell, C. & Larcker, D.F. (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(February), pp. 39-50.
- Gatignon, Hubert & Xuereb, Jean-Marc (1997), "Strategic Orientation of the Firm and New Product Performance", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34 (February), pp. 77-90.
- Homburg, C. & Pflesser, C. (2000), "A Multiple-Layer Model of Market-Oriented Organizational Culture: Measurement Issues and Performance Outcomes", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 37(11), pp. 449-462.
- Hunt, S. D. & Lambe, C. J. (2000). "Marketing's contribution to business strategy: market orientation, relationship marketing and resource-advantage theory". *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 2(1), pp. 17-43.

Jaworski, B. J. & Kohli, A. K. (1993). "Market Orientation: Antecedents and Consequences". *Journal of Marketing*, 57(July), pp. 53-70.

Kohli, A. K. & Jaworski, B. J. (1990). Market Orientation: The Construct, Research Propositions, and Managerial Implications. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(April), pp. 1-18.

Kohli, A. K., Jaworski, B. J., & Kumar, A. (1993). "MARKOR: A Measurement of Market Orientation". *Journal of Marketing Research*, XXX(November), pp. 467-477.

Matsuno, K. & Mentzer, J. T. (2000), "The Effects of Strategy Type on the Market Orientation-Performance Relationship", *Journal of Marketing*, 64 (October), pp. 1-16.

Narver, J. C. & Slater, S. F. (1990). "The Effect of a Market Orientation on Business Profitability". *Journal of Marketing*, 54(4), pp. 20-35.

Nunnally, J.C. & Bernstein, I.H. (1994) *Psychometric Theory* (3rd ed.) McGraw Hill, Inc.

Slater, Stanley F. & Narver, John. C. (1994). "Does Competitive Environment Moderate the Market Orientation-Performance Relationship?" *Journal of Marketing*, 58(1), pp. 46-55.

Slater, Stanley F. & Narver, John. C. (1995). "Market Orientation and the Learning Organization". *Journal of Marketing*, 59(3), pp. 63-74.

Slater, Stanley F. & Narver, John. C. (1998). "Customer-led and market-oriented: let's not confuse the two". *Strategic Management Journal*, 19(10), pp. 1001-1006.

4 The Effects of Market Orientation^{*} on Product Innovation^{*}

Ljiljana Božić^{**}

Abstract

In the literature, market orientation is defined as a business culture or behaviour that leads to business success. Its influence on product innovation is one way to enhance business performance. The goal of this paper is to analyse the impact of behavioural components of market orientation on the introduction of product innovation regarding its novelty. Research of this type was the subject of the Lukas and Ferell (2000) study. Following their approach, but hypothesising different relationships, research on the impact of the behavioural components of market orientation on product innovation in Croatian companies was conducted. The intensity of the market orientation components is measured using the MKTOR scale developed by Narver and Slater (1990), whose approach to market orientation is accepted in this paper.

Keywords: customer orientation, competitor orientation, interfunctional coordination, product innovation, MKTOR

JEL classification: M31

^{*} *This paper was originally published in Privredna kretanja i ekonomska politika (Economic Trends and Economic Policy), No. 107, 2006, pp. 46-65.*

^{**} *Ljiljana Božić, Research Assistant, The Institute of Economics, Zagreb.*

1 Introduction

Companies make great efforts in their attempt to be more successful in meeting the needs of their consumers than their competitors, consequently to achieve a better position in the market and better business performance. The needs of consumers and the activities of competitors often stimulate companies to introduce to the market either quite modified or new products, or to supplement their product line by new products. It is by innovation that companies try to improve their business performance and their market share.

Market orientation in a company contributes to an improved understanding of the market. The philosophical background of market orientation is the concept of marketing, the basic assumption upon which it is founded. The systematic study of market orientation began at the beginning of the 1990s. In this respect important are the works of Kohli and Jaworski (1990) and Narver and Slater (1990) who began to study market orientation through a number of activities related to the marketing concept in business. The authors view market orientation from different angles. Kohli and Jaworski (1990) define market orientation in terms of organisational behaviour, or activities relating to business, according to marketing principles, whereas Narver and Slater (1990) study it in terms of organisational culture. In line with this, Kohli and Jaworski (1990) point out three groups of activities which characterise orientation: (1) generation of market intelligence relating to present and future customers' needs, (2) dissemination of intelligence across departments within the organisation and (3) the organisational responsiveness. Narver and Slater (1990) view market orientation as a unidimensional construct made up of three behavioural components: customer orientation, competitor orientation and interfunctional coordination and two decision making criteria: long-term focus and profit focus.

In addition to the above mentioned authors the concept of market orientation has been addressed by a number of others (Day, 1993; Deshpandé and Farley, 1998; Deshpandé and Webster, 1989) who in their studies, to a varying extent, advocated the basic assumptions of the above mentioned approaches. Lafferty and Hult (1999) singled out four characteristics often cited in literature which are all

independent of approach. They are as follows: customer orientation, the importance of intelligence dissemination, interfunctional coordination of market activities, and responsiveness to market activities by undertaking appropriate actions.

It is worth mentioning that the mentioned approaches are not quite opposite or contradictory. As construed by Kohli and Jaworski, market orientation as an element of organisational behaviour (1990) means the thorough operationalisation of the marketing concept. This concept is grounded on the key activities of a company which operates according to the market concept principles. On the other hand, Narver and Slater (1990) integrate the essence of market concept in a better way by including under the market orientation concept all the attributes of the marketing concept and by pointing out the long-term perspective of profit making. According to them, marketing orientation constitutes an element of business culture, the acceptance of which leads to positive results in business. Viewed from this perspective, Narver and Slater's approach may be considered more coherent. This approach has been adopted in this paper as the theoretical basis for studying the impact of components of market orientation on product innovation.

The two main approaches provide two methods of measuring market orientation: MKTOR (Narver and Slater, 1990) and MARKOR (Kohli, Jaworski and Kumar, 1993). These methods were used as a starting point for a number of other procedures developed to measure market orientation (Ruckert, 1992; Deng and Dart, 1994; Narver, Slater and MacLachan, 2004).

In the studies addressing the influence of market orientation on business performance, the view prevails that the relationship between these two variables is positive (Greenley, 1995; Hooley et al., 2000; Langerak, 2001; Kahn, 2001; Cano, Carrillant and Jamarillo, 2004; Zhou et al., 2005.; Gainer and Padanyi, 2005.; Kara, Spillan and DeShields, 2005; Bhuian, Menguc and Bell, 2005; Hult, Ketchen and Slater, 2005; Ó. González-Benito and J. González-Benito, 2005). Most of the studies dealing with market orientation impact were founded on research carried out in developed countries, especially in the USA. The positive impact of market orientation on the business performance of firms in transition countries has been proved in Hooley et al. (2000). According to the results of that study, the adoption

of market orientation by firms in the countries in transition has shown positive impact. Further, the authors point out that market orientation in transition economies seems particularly useful for achieving good business performance in view of the market turbulence in these countries.

In respect to market orientation in Croatian firms, the results have revealed that the highest level of market orientation is present in small and medium size enterprises (SMEs) in the manufacturing sector (Rajh and Božić, 2005). In addition, it was noted that companies which are more market oriented derive a higher proportion of their income from exports and also a higher proportion of income from innovation.

As product innovation is considered to be a prime determinant of company growth and a factor that enhances its performance, a question arises as to how market orientation impacts new product development. A literature review shows a difference of opinion as to this linkage. Quite a number of studies reveal a positive influence of market orientation on new product introduction (Kohli and Jaworsky, 1990; Ruckert, 1992; Deshpandé, Farley and Webster, 1993; Slater and Narver, 1994; Atuahene-Gima, 1996; Gatignon and Xuereb, 1997). On the other hand, there are studies that reveal an opposite effect of market orientation, on the basis that noticeable market orientation leads to imitation and makes discontinuous innovation development more difficult (Bennett and Cooper 1979; Lawton and Parasuraman, 1980), or that consumer orientation makes commercialisation of new products more difficult (Christensen and Bower, 1996; Leonard-Barton and Doyle, 1996).

In order to establish the impact of market orientation on product innovation Lukas and Ferell (2000) break down the overall concept into behavioural components (as specified by Narver and Slater, 1990) and analyse their impact on the introduction of individual product innovation with regard to the degree of novelty. The results of their study suggest that consumer orientation increases the number of discontinuous innovations and decreases the number of continuous innovations, thus contesting consumer orientation as being the cause of incremental innovations. Contrary to expectations, Lukas and Ferell (2000) revealed that interfunctional coordination does not lead to the creation of radical

innovation. Strongly emphasised interfunctional coordination favours the introduction of new products as extensions to present product lines and decreases the imitation of competitors' products; however, it does not enhance radical innovations.

This study also addresses the influence of components of market orientation on the introduction of innovation of a different degree of novelty in Croatian companies. Bearing in mind that different kinds of product innovation may contribute to business performance in different ways, the importance of market orientation on business performance may indirectly be explained by the influence of market orientation components on the introduction of a product of a specific degree of novelty. However, the focus of this study is exclusively on the relationship between market orientation and innovation and we do not want to suggest that any type of product innovation is superior in respect to its contribution to the overall business performance. We believe that giving preference to any type of product innovation does not necessarily lead to superior business performance. Just introducing an imitation of a competing product with some slight modifications can hardly lead to an extraordinary advantage over competitors and high profit. On the other hand, focusing only on the development of exclusively discontinuous innovations would hardly lead to a high profit. Such a focus would actually lead to the creation of products that competitors will imitate and with minimal investment realise the highest benefits at the moment when accepted by consumers.

The relations among variables as suggested in the study differ from those emphasised in the literature. The reason is that the aim is to point out that market orientation does not necessarily lead to the same performance regardless of company specificities and the market where they operate, and in this way to emphasise its complexity and the importance of the way in which it is construed and applied. The complexity of innovation activities, the outcome which is often quite uncertain, should also be noted.

The study is structured as follows: the empirical study is explained in Chapter 2, the results of the analysis are specified in Chapter 3, while in Chapter 4 basic conclusions are presented.

2 Empirical Research

The approach of Narver and Slater on market orientation has been adopted. Consequently, market orientation is defined in terms of business culture consisting of three behavioural components: consumer orientation, competitor orientation and interfunctional coordination. Consumer orientation as defined by Narver and Slater (1990) includes current and future customer needs in the target market so that a firm is able to continuously deliver products and services of superior customer value. Competitor orientation relates to monitoring and understanding of competitors' short-term strengths and weaknesses and their long-term capabilities and strategies. Interfunctional coordination refers to the coordinated use of all available resources of a firm in the process of creating superior values for target customers (Narver and Slater, 1990).

In line with the accepted approach, market orientation has been measured by the MKTOR scale developed by Narver and Slater (1990). Another reason for its use here is that its applicability for measuring market orientation has been proved in very different and heterogeneous markets (Hooley, 2000), making it also appropriate for measuring market orientation in the markets of transition countries such as Croatia. The intensity of market orientation components has been measured on a five point Likert scale.

Firm innovation has been measured by the number of new products introduced by Croatian firms during the period from 2001 to 2003. Both continuous and discontinuous innovations are included in this analysis. Continuous innovations are new products with only slight or no technological modifications, which are minor improvements, imitations or supplements to a current product line (de Brentani, 2001). On the other hand, discontinuous or radical modifications represent real novelties and unique technological solutions, involving the development and application of new technologies and state of the art in technology and product categories. To better clarify the types of innovations the questionnaire included questions relating to the number of line extensions, products new to the company (both are continuous innovations), and to discontinuous innovations.

2.1 Research Hypotheses

Consumer orientation as a component of market orientation means continuously identifying wants and needs of customers and trying to meet them in order to achieve good business performance. Customer needs change over time and needs for different forms of product arise. Companies, by continuously determining needs, come to better know customers and their needs, thus identifying new forms of products which are missing in current lines. In line therewith, hypothesis 1 of the research is as follows:

H1: Consumer orientation enhances the introduction of new products into existent product lines.

Market oriented firms are considered to imitate competitors exactly because of competitor orientation which focuses on discovering the activities of current and potential competitors and comparison of one's own position with the competitor's position. Hence competitor orientation is often accused of fostering the imitation of competitors and consequently of hampering creativity and innovation in a firm. This is the situation if a firm is a follower and is reluctant to change such a position. However, seeking to deduce a competitor's activities does not need to be done only to imitate them. It may also be used to identify competitive opportunities which help the firm to adequately prepare the launching of a product into a market, as well as a stimulus to capture a leading position. It is not necessarily useful to use competitor information only to undertake exactly the same activities as the competition: rather, it may be better to do just the opposite – pursue different strategies and activities. Thus hypothesis 2:

H2: Competitor orientation enhances introduction of discontinuous innovation.

Interfunctional coordination enhances unimpeded information circulation within a firm, communication between departments and employees and making common efforts in achieving the firm's goals. In this respect it creates an environment which lends itself to the creation and exchange of ideas firmwide which may result in new products. Such a situation in the firm can contribute to innovative

development of any degree of novelty. Based on the above said it may be construed that:

H3: *Interfunctional coordination positively impacts product innovation.*

2.2 Methodology

Data collection was conducted in the framework of the project “Statistics of innovation in the Republic of Croatia as a basis for defining scientific and technological policies and evaluation of Croatian company competitiveness” (Community Innovation Survey - CIS3). The research includes production and service sector companies having 10 or more employees.

The selection of sample units was randomised using the Croatia business database. The data collection was conducted by a mail survey accompanied by telephone prompts. The sample consists of 567 Croatian companies from the production and service sectors employing 10 or more employees. The sample included both sectors because of the fact that market orientation is applicable in all firms regardless of whether they are engaged in production of tangible products or in the provision of services. In the sample service companies prevail to a slight degree. Service companies account for 55 percent while production sector companies being 45 percent. With regard to the sample structure related to company size, small and medium size enterprises prevail. Small enterprises constitute 75.6 percent, medium ones 18.8 percent, and 5.7 percent of enterprises in the sample are large enterprises.

The hypotheses were tested using the regression analysis. The regression analysis results are presented in the text that follows.

3 Analysis Findings

Table 1 presents the regression analysis results relating to the impact of market orientation components on the introduction of product innovations of a certain degree of novelty. In general, all three models of multiple regression show a high level of statistical significance, thus indicating that the relationships obtained as measured for the sample population are highly probable.

The coefficient value of multiple determination and adjusted coefficients of multiple determination in all three regression models demonstrate that the regression models have explained only a few of the variations. The first model relating to the impact of market orientation component on new products in existent lines has explained only 6.95 percent of variations; the second model has explained 3.83 percent, while the last one has explained 9.07 percent of variations. Since the coefficient of multiple correlation is a monotone non-decreasing function of the number of independent variables, its value can be increased by adding more variables, thus making a model more representative (Šošić, 2004, p. 452). In this study the representativeness of the model has not been increased by adding new independent variables because of the objectives and the very distinct focus of the study on the impact of market orientation components on company innovation.

To establish the quality of the regression models, the extent of multicollinearity was analysed in the models. Multicollinearity in a regression model measures the existence of any narrow linear correlation of independent variables or their approximate linear combination (Šošić, 2004, p. 517). To establish whether the insignificance of individual variables is a consequence of the fact that several variables explain the same part of the dependent variable, analysis of the existence of multicollinearity between independent variables was conducted. To establish in a more precise manner the existence of multicollinearity in model variances, inflation factors, and tolerances (which are actually equivalent measures) have been used, as is usually the case.

Table 1 Regression Analysis Results Relating to the Impact of Market Orientation Components on the Introduction of Product Innovations

	Line extensions			Product new to a firm but not to the market			Discontinuous innovation		
	Beta coefficient	Standard error	Significance level (p)	Beta coefficient	Standard error	Significance level (p)	Beta coefficient	Standard error	Significance level (p)
Consumer orientation	0.139	0.063	0.028695	0.087	0.054	0.104254	0.078	0.057	0.175694
Competitor orientation	0.253	0.071	0.000420	0.225	0.053	0.000025	0.412	0.073	0.000000
Interfunctional coordination	-0.295	0.065	0.000007	-0.270	0.062	0.000018	-0.323	0.075	0.000020
Model significance	0.00000			0.00002			0.00000		
Correlation coefficient (R)	0.264			0.196			0.301		
Coefficient of multiple determination (R ²)	0.069			0.038			0.090		
Adjusted coefficient of multiple determination	0.063			0.034			0.083		

Variance inflation factor values as well as tolerance values in all models and for all independent variables clearly demonstrate that there is no multicollinearity between the independent variables. Specifically, in no case does the variance inflation factor exceed 5 or 10, nor is the tolerance lower than 0.2 or 0.1. This means that the same part of the dependent variable is not explained by two or all three independent variables, in other words the fact that the variable “consumer orientation” significantly impacts (at the level of 5 percent) the introduction of products new to a firm, but not the market nor it impacts discontinuous innovation, is not the consequence of multicollinearity.

Table 2 Variance Inflation and Tolerance Factors in Regression Models						
	Line extensions		Product new to a firm but not to the market		Discontinuous innovation	
	Variance inflation factor	Tolerance	Variance inflation factor	Tolerance	Variance inflation factor	Tolerance
Consumer orientation	1.830	0.546	1.866	0.536	1.334	0.749
Competitor orientation	2.313	0.432	1.799	0.556	2.164	0.462
Interfunctional coordination	1.929	0.518	2.498	0.400	2.272	0.440

The results of multiple regression on the influence of market orientation components on the introduction of certain kinds of innovation indicate a significant and positive influence ($\beta = 0.139$, $p = 0.029$) of consumer orientation on the introduction of new products in existent product lines. Its influence on the remaining two kinds of innovation is not significant. This finding supports the hypothesis that consumer orientation encourages the introduction of new products in existent product lines. However, one should bear in mind that competitor orientation also positively influences the introduction of the same kind of innovation and that its impact is stronger than the consumer orientation ($\beta = 0.253$, $p = 0.0004$). It follows that consumer orientation is not the sole and only principal precursor of the introduction of new products to existent lines. Companies that demonstrate a stronger intensity of consumer orientation simply are more inclined to introduce this specific kind of innovation.

Competitor orientation positively impacts the introduction of all kinds of innovation; however, the intensity of this impact is the strongest with discontinuous innovation ($\beta = 0.412$; $p < 0.001$). The above observation supports hypothesis H2, that discontinuous innovation is encouraged by competitor orientation. As competitor orientation positively impacts the introduction of both types of continuous innovation, one should bear in mind that monitoring of competitor activities, their strengths and weaknesses leads to competition imitation. However, the better companies know their competitors, the better the opportunity to develop products which exceed significantly other products offered in the market either by competitors or by the company itself.

The third market orientation component, interfunctional coordination, has a significantly negative impact on the introduction of all three types of innovation. In other words, the higher the intensity of interfunctional coordination, the lower the introduction of any type of product innovation by the company. This is the only market orientation component whose beta coefficient shows a negative relationship. The beta coefficient value does not show significant oscillations in the intensity of impact for different types of innovation ($\beta = -0.295$ for line extensions, $\beta = -0.270$ for product new to a firm and $\beta = -0.323$ for discontinuous innovation). This finding is in contrast to the initial assumption of a positive impact from interfunctional coordination on the introduction of product innovation. Hence hypothesis H3 is entirely rejected.

4 Conclusion

The research in this study focused on establishing the impact of each and every individual market orientation component on the development of a specific type of product innovation. According to the findings, the higher the consumer orientation intensity, the more a company is inclined to supplement existing product lines with new products. This finding is in contrast to the research findings obtained by Lukas and Ferrell (2000), according to which consumer orientation encourages introduction of discontinuous innovation and reduces the number of innovations which are not new to the market.

Regardless of the fact that the research findings demonstrate that consumer orientation does not impact the introduction of discontinuous innovation, consumer orientation need not necessarily be the main and the only factor to blame for making innovation and creativity in the development of new products more difficult, as asserted in the literature. It is more than logical that a consumer oriented company, to better and more completely meet its needs, will keep modifying its products and keep supplementing existing lines with new products. This is supported by the sign and the level of significance of the β coefficient for the “consumer orientation” variable in the regression model.

It is of paramount importance to know what market is in question and what consumers are to be targeted by innovation activities and from whom information will be collected, because this will determine the information we will get. Information collected from consumers or buyers with whom a company cooperates successfully probably is not very likely to stimulate complex innovation departing to a large extent from existing products in the market.

Contrary to the prevailing views that competitor orientation leads to innovation activities being reduced to imitating competitors, the study started from the assumption that this is exactly the market orientation component that encourages development and introduction of discontinuous innovation. The results obtained supported the starting hypothesis. Competitor orientation also encourages the introduction of both types of continuous innovation; however, its intensity is higher for the introduction of discontinuous innovation. This finding clearly indicates the importance of the interpretation and use of information obtained by monitoring competitors. Finding out about competitors' behaviour and about the activities they perform may be used for their immediate imitation, which is a very simple “response” to their activities. If it is in the interest of a firm to be a follower in the market, then decisions on the introduction of new products, which are only an imitation of what competitors already offer in the market, will be made on the basis of information relating to competitors' activities. However, based on the same information, a firm can decide to undertake activities quite different from those undertaken by competitors. In such a way it will achieve or maintain the position of a market leader.

Consumer orientation may function in a very similar way. The study findings demonstrate that the greater the intensity of consumer orientation, the greater is the introduction of new products in existing lines, so that consumer orientation may lead to different effects, as demonstrated by Lukas and Ferrell (2000). If this market orientation component is focused on the identification and meeting of latent needs, then it may be a trigger for the introduction of discontinuous innovation. The effects depend on what the firm or its managers and employees consider a consumer orientation or a competitor orientation. In this case, the views of managers or employees, respectively, about the situation in the market are also important as they are often considered in business decision making.

In contrast to the initial hypothesis of a positive influence of interfunctional coordination on the introduction of product innovation of any degree of novelty, the regression analysis findings demonstrate a significant negative influence. Interfunctional orientation refers to the dissemination of intelligence across a company fostering common efforts by all company departments and all employees to achieve objectives. These activities should certainly contribute to company innovation. However, the higher the degree of interfunctional coordination, the lower the degree of a company's innovation.

Such a finding may indicate that a company is having serious problems relating to the development of new products. Dissemination of information and knowledge is very often definitely not directed towards innovation activities. Interfunctional coordination may contribute to the improvement of business performance, but in Croatian companies this is not achieved by innovation activities. In the specific case of interfunctional coordination, it is essential to assess how the intelligence is used within the company. In Croatian companies intelligence dissemination and common efforts of all departments throughout the company obviously are not focused on the development of new products.

The cause of the problem may be either the domination of individuals who hamper innovation or the resistance of certain managers to accept market orientation or to develop innovation. Both behaviours in line with market orientation principles and innovativeness are values to be introduced at the company level. This in other words means that these values need to be accepted

uniformly across all departments and by all employees. In actual business operation this is not always the case because of the quite frequent resistance of certain individuals. When such individuals are in a position to impose their own values and patterns of behaviour, the effects may be far from the desired ones.

The research in this study is based on a heterogeneous sample which includes companies from the service and production sectors. Companies engaged in various activities have been included as market orientation is deemed to be a concept applicable in companies from all sectors and all activities. However, such an approach may to a certain extent make conclusions relating to specific effects in a specific type of a company rather difficult. For a more profound explanation of the effects of market orientation and related components it is necessary in the analysis to take into account the specificity of a company and the market in which it operates. A follow up study will examine the conditions required for certain effects to be achieved and the reasons for the successful achievement thereof.

Regardless of the extent of the applicability of market orientation, conclusions about the primary manner in which it operates are hard to generalise. There is always a question as to what effects will be achieved, bearing in mind other business factors and why just these effects have been achieved. On the one hand, there are the consumers, market participants whose behaviour depends on a number of social, psychological and cultural factors. Identifying the wants and needs of such market participants is carried out in a continuous fashion, along with monitoring of competitor activities. For the market information to be usable and able to contribute to business performance, employees should be encouraged to work together in order to achieve company objectives. All this evidence shows the complexity of introducing and applying a market orientation into a company's operation. However, benefits arising from its application are worth the effort.

Literature

- Atuahene-Gima, K., 1996, "Market Orientation and Innovation", *Journal of Business Research*, 35, pp. 93-103.
- Bennett, R. C. and R. G. Cooper, 1979, "Beyond the Marketing Concept", *Business Horizons*, 24, pp. 76-83.
- Bennett, R. C. and R. G. Cooper, 1981, "The Misuse of Marketing: An American Tragedy", *Business Horizons*, 24(6), pp. 51-61.
- Bhuian, S. N., B. Menguc and S. J. Bell, 2005, "Just Entrepreneurial Enough: the Moderating Effect of Entrepreneurship on the Relationship between Market Orientation and Performance", *Journal of Business Research*, 58, pp. 9-17.
- Cano, C. R., F. A. Carrillat, and F. Jaramillo, 2004, "A Meta-analysis of the Relationship between Market Orientation and Business Performance: Evidence from Five Continents", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 21, pp. 179-100.
- Christensen C. M. and J. L. Bower, 1996, "Customer Power, Strategic Investment, and Failure of Leading Firms", *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, pp. 197-218.
- Day, G. S., 1994, "The Capabilities of Market-Driven Organizations", *Journal of Marketing*, 58, pp. 37-52.
- de Brentani, U., 2001, "Innovative versus incremental new business services: Different keys for achieving success", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 18, pp. 169-187.
- Deng, S. and J. Dart, 1994, "Measuring Market Orientation: a Multi-factor, Multi-item approach", *Journal of Marketing Management*, 10(8), pp. 725-742.
- Deshpandé, R. and J. U. Farley, 1998, "Measuring Market Orientation: Generalization and Synthesis", *Journal of Market-Focused Management*, 2, pp. 213-232.
- Deshpande, R. and F. E. Webster, 1989, "Organizational culture and marketing: Defining the research agenda", *Journal of Marketing*, 53, pp. 3-15.

Gainer, B. and P. Padanyi, 2005, "The relationship between market-oriented activities and market-oriented culture: implications for the development of market orientation in non-profit service organizations", *Journal of Business Research*, 58, pp. 854-862.

Gatignon, H. and J. Xuereb, 1997, "Strategic Orientation of the Firm and New Product Performance", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34, pp. 77-90.

González-Benito, Ó. and J. González-Benito, 2005, Cultural vs. Operational Market Orientation and Objective vs. Subjective Performance: Perspective of Production and Operations, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 24, pp. 797-829.

Greenley G. E., 1995, "Market orientation and company performance: Empirical evidence from UK companies", *British Journal of Management*, 6, pp. 1-13.

Hooley, G., T. Cox, J. Fahy, D. Shipley, J. Beracs, K. Fonfara and B. Snoj, 2000, "Market Orientation in the Transition Economies of Central Europe: Test of the Narver and Slater Market Orientation Scales", *Journal of Business Research*, 50, pp. 273-285.

Hult, G. T., D. J. Ketchen, and S. E. Slater, 2005, "Market Orientation and Performance: An Integration of Disparate Approaches", *Strategic Management Journal*, 26, pp. 1173-1181.

Jaworsky, B. J. and A. Kohli, 1993, "Market Orientation: Antecedents and Consequences", *Journal of Marketing*, 57, pp. 53-70.

Kara, A., J. E. Spillan, and O. W. DeShields Jr., 2005, "The Effect of a Market Orientation on Business Performance: A Study of Small-Sized Service Retailers Using MARKOR Scale", *Journal of Small Business Management*, 43(2), pp. 105-118.

Kohli, A. and B. J. Jaworsky, 1990, "Market Orientation: The Construct, Research Propositions, and Managerial Implications", *Journal of Marketing*, 54, pp. 1-8.

Kohli, A. K., B. J. Jaworski and A. Kumar, 1990, "MARKOR: A Measure of Market Orientation", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30, pp. 467-477.

Langerak F., 2001, "Effects of Market Orientation on the Behaviours of Salespersons and Purchasers, Channel Relationship, and the Performance of Manufacturers", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 18, pp. 221-234.

Lawton, L. and A. Parasuraman, 1980, "The Impact of the Marketing Concept on New Product Planning", *Journal of Marketing*, 44, pp. 19-25.

Leonard-Barton, D. and J. L. Doyle, 1996, "Commercializing Technology: Imaginative Understanding of User Needs" in R. S. Rosenbloom i W. J. Spencer (ed.), *Engines of Innovation*, Harvard Business School press, pp. 177-207.

Lukas, B. A. and O. C. Ferrell, 2000, "The Effect of Market Orientation on Product Innovation", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(2), pp. 239-247.

Narver, J. C. and S. F. Slater, 1991, "Becoming More Market Oriented: An Exploratory Study of the Programmatic and Market-Back Approaches", Marketing Science Institute Working Paper.

Narver, J. C. and S. Slater, 1990, "The Effect of a Market Orientation on Business Profitability", *Journal of Marketing*, 62, pp. 20-35.

Narver, J. C., S. F. Slater and D. L. MacLachlan, 2004, "Responsive and proactive market orientation and new-product success", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 21, pp. 334-347.

Rajh, E. and Lj. Božić, 2005, "Market Orientation of Enterprises in Croatia", in I. Teodorović, I. R. Grinberg, S. Glinkina and Ž. Lovrinčević (ed.) *Proceedings of the International Round Table Conference: Comparative Analysis of Economic Transition - Russian Federation, Croatia and the CEE Countries*, The Institute of Economics, Zagreb, pp. 175-186.

Ruckert, R. W., 1992, "Developing a Market Orientation: An Organizational Strategy Perspective", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 9, pp. 225-245

Zhou, K. Z., C. K. Yim and D. K. Tse, 2005, "The effects of strategic orientations on technology- and market-based breakthrough innovations", *Journal of Marketing*, 69, pp. 42-60.

MARKOR PLUS:

Suatu Pendekatan Baru Untuk Pengkayaan Konsep Orientasi Pasar

Indrianty Sudirman

Abstract

Market orientation is an implementation of marketing concept. Despite market orientation concept can be approached through market driven and driving market approaches, the constructs develop the concepts still reflect the market driven. This article tries to synergize market orientation concept (Kohli & Jaworski, 1990) to customer learning in order to make the operationalization more effective. Customer learning is synthesized result of market driven and driving market approaches, learning theory, and perception as precursor of behavior.

Key words: Market orientation, intelligence generation, intelligence dissemination, intelligence responsiveness, customer learning.

PENDAHULUAN

Pengertian pemasaran dapat dipandang sebagai falsafah, disiplin, dan keahlian. Sebagai falsafah, esensi pemasaran berwujud cita-cita, pernyataan kebijaksanaan, visi, orientasi, atau pedoman penggerak tindakan organisasi baik laba maupun nirlaba. Sebagai keahlian,

pemasaran berwujud proses manajemen pemasaran yang bertujuan mengubah pemasaran dari tingkat falsafah menjadi terapan (Pawitra, 1993). Sebagian besar pengajaran dan literatur pemasaran yang digunakan pada perguruan tinggi di Makassar mencurahkan perhatian pada konsep pemasaran sebagai fondasi dari disiplin pemasaran, tetapi sangat sedikit perhatian yang diberikan pada implementasinya.

Pengkajian terhadap sejumlah literatur pemasaran menunjukkan variasi definisi yang berbeda mengenai konsep pemasaran. Dari berbagai konsep yang dikemukakan para guru pemasaran seperti Felton (1959, p.55), Mc. Namara (1972, p.51) qf Kohli & Jaworski (1990b), dan beberapa varian dari gagasan kedua guru tersebut seperti yang didefinisikan oleh Lavidge (1966), Levitt (1969), Konopa & Calabro (1971), Bell & Emory (1971), Stampf (1978) qf Kohli & Jaworski (1990b, p.5) sampai kepada pandangan yang relatif baru seperti Kotler (1994, p. 6, 2000, p.8;) dan Gummesson

(1999, p. 1), pada intinya menunjukkan bahwa terdapat lima tema inti yang membentuk konsep pemasaran yaitu fokus pada pasar, orientasi pelanggan, pemasaran terkoordinasi, hubungan jangka panjang, dan profitabilitas.

Konsep pemasaran sebagai falsafah memiliki nilai praktis terbatas. Agar dapat bermanfaat dalam praktek, maka konsep

pemasaran perlu dijabarkan oleh suatu pengertian operasional (Barksdale & Darden, 1971 qf Kohli & Jaworski, 1990b). Pengertian operasional yang merupakan implementasi dari falsafah pemasaran adalah pelaksanaan orientasi pasar oleh manajemen perusahaan (Mc. Carthy & Perreault, 1990). Implementasi dari sebuah filosofi tercermin pada perilaku dan aktivitas perusahaan. Oleh karena orientasi pasar merupakan implementasi dari konsep pemasaran maka dapat disimpulkan bahwa perusahaan yang berorientasi pasar adalah perusahaan yang tindakan-tindakannya konsisten dengan konsep pemasaran.

Konsisten dengan pemikiran tersebut mengimplikasikan bahwa tujuan orientasi pasar sama dengan tujuan pemasaran. Tujuan pemasaran adalah menghasilkan *shareholder value* melalui penyajian nilai unggul bagi pelanggan (Pawitra, 2001). Penalarannya adalah sebagaimana disajikan pada skema berikut.

Perusahaan

Customer Value (Superior Customer Value – SCV)

Customer Satisfaction (CS)

Sustainable Competitive Advantage (SCA)

Customer Loyalty (Creating & retaining customer)



Gambar 1. Hirarki Tujuan Generik Pemasaran

Penalaran hirarki tujuan generik pemasaran diperkuat oleh sejumlah besar penelitian yang membuktikan adanya hubungan positif antara orientasi pasar dengan kinerja (antara lain Narver & Slater, 1990; Greenley, 1995; Kohli & Jaworski, 1990a; Bhuian & Sahid, 1997, Matsuno & Mentzer, 2000).

PENGERTIAN, KONSTRUK, DINAMIKA, dan BERBAGAI PERSPEKTIF KONSEP ORIENTASI PASAR

1. Pengertian dan Konstruk Orientasi Pasar

Meskipun terdapat berbagai pengertian yang dikembangkan mengenai orientasi pasar, tetapi empat orang yang memberikan kontribusi penting bagi pengembangan konsep tersebut adalah Kohli & Jaworski dan Narver & Slater.

Menurut Kohli & Jaworski (1990a, p. 6) orientas pasar adalah :

Organizationwide generation of market intelligence pertaining to current and future customer needs, dissemination of the intelligence across departments, and organizationwide responsiveness to it.

Definisi dari Kohli & Jaworski (1990a) diinspirasi dari konsep pemasaran Felton (1959, p. 55). Konsep tersebut merupakan pandangan operasional terhadap dua dari lima tema inti pemasaran yang dijelaskan di atas yaitu fokus pada **pelanggan** dan **pem**terkoordinasi. Barksdale & Draden (1971), Mc. Namara (1972) qf Grewal & Tansuhaj (2001), dan Pawitra (1993) menegaskan bahwa orientasi pasar merupakan implementasi dari konsep

pemasaran.

Berdasarkan pengertian tersebut, maka Kohli et al. (1993) mengembangkan pengukuran terhadap orientasi pasar yang dikenal dengan

MARKOR (*market orientation*). Komponen utama MARKOR—sesuai definisi yang mendasarinya—terdiri dari *intelligence generation*, *intelligence dissemination*, dan *intelligence responsiveness*. Ketiga komponen tersebut diukur oleh 32 item pengukuran. MARKOR dikembangkan secara terus menerus, hingga pada tahun 2000 Matsuno et al. mengembangkan pengukuran tersebut menjadi 44 item pengukuran.

Adapun Narver & Slater (1990, p. 21) menyatakan bahwa orientasi pasar terdiri atas tiga komponen perilaku -- orientasi **pelanggan**, orientasi pesaing, dan koordinasi interfungsional -- dan dua kriteria pengambilan keputusan --fokus jangka panjang dan kemampulabaan.

Pengertian Narver & Slater (1990) konsisten dengan pengertian dari Kohli & Jaworski (1990a). Orientasi pelanggan dan pesaing meliputi seluruh aktivitas dalam upaya perolehan informasi mengenai **pelanggan** dan pesaing pada pasar sasaran. Selanjutnya informasi tersebut disosialisasikan ke seluruh organisasi. Koordinasi interfungsional berbasis pada informasi yang diperoleh dari pesaing dan **pelanggan** mencerminkan upaya terkoordinir dari seluruh organisasi untuk menyajikan nilai unggul bagi **pelanggan**. Dengan demikian dapat disimpulkan bahwa komponen perilaku pada

pengertian Narver & Slater (1990) konsisten dengan pengertian orientasi pasar dari Kohli & Jaworski (1990a).

Mavondo & Farell (2000) juga

menyimpulkan bahwa terdapat kesamaan antara definisi orientasi pasar dari Kohli & Jaworski (1990a) dengan Narver & Slater (1990) yaitu : (a) keduanya menitik beratkan pada **pelanggan** pada fokus pada peran **pelanggan** dalam manifestasi orientasi pasar, (b) keduanya mengandung orientasi eksternal, (c) keduanya menyadari pentingnya respon pada tingkat organisasi, dan (d) disadari bahwa kepentingan *stakeholder* dan atau kekuatan lainnya membentuk keinginan dan ekspektasi **pelanggan**.

Pengukuran terhadap pengertian orientasi pasar berdasarkan definisi dari Narver & Slater (1990) adalah MKTOR (*market orientation*). Dimensi MKTOR terdiri atas 21 item pengukuran. Menurut Pelham (1993) qf Farrell & Oczkowski (1997), memiliki struktur yang lebih sederhana disbanding MARKOR.

2. Dinamika Perkembangan Konsep Orientasi Pasar

Penelitian mengenai orientasi pasar dilakukan secara terus menerus dari tahun ke tahun untuk mengembangkan elemen-elemen yang membentuknya, agar lebih baik dalam menjabarkan konsep pemasaran. Tabel berikut menyajikan berbagai penelitian yang relevan dengan hal tersebut.

Tabel 1. Penelitian Orientasi Pasar dari Tahun ke Tahun

Peneliti	Contoh & Negara	Tipe Industri	Elemen MARKOR
Narver & Slater, 1990	113 SBU, USA	Industri produk-produk kehutanan, dist. komoditas khusus, eksportir	Orientasi konsumen, orientasi pesaing, koordinasi interfungsional, fokus pada profit jangka panjang
Hooley et.al, 1990	1010 Chief Marketing executives, UK	Lintas Industri	Peran dan fungsi pemasaran
Ruekert, 1992	5 SBU pada satu perusahaan (400 data : manajer dan tenaga penjual)	Industri berteknologi tinggi	Menggunakan sub skala informasi, pengembangan strategi orientasi pasar, implementasi strategi berorientasi pasar

Peneliti	Contoh & Negara	Tipe Industri	Elemen MARKOR
Doyle & Hooley, 1992	1380 perusahaan, UK (Chief Marketing Executives)	Lintas Industri	Pendekatan terhadap pemasaran, sikap CEO terhadap pemasaran, peran pemasaran dalam perusahaan, hubungan kerja antar bagian fungsional
Kohli et. al., 1993	229 SBU, USA	Lintas Industri (Informan pemasaran dan non pemasaran)	<i>Intelligence generation, intelligence dissemination, intelligence responsiveness</i>
Jaworski and Kohli, 1993	222 SBU, USA	Lintas Industri	<i>Intelligence generation, intelligence dissemination, intelligence responsiveness, response implementation</i>
Diamantopoulos and Hart, 1993	87 perusahaan, UK	Perusahaan manufaktur	Persepsi konsep pemasaran (4 dimensi) : tujuan pemasaran, fokus pemasaran, sentralisasi pemasaran, orientasi pasar (versi Kohli and Jaworski).
Selnes et. al., 1996	198 SBU di USA dan 237 SBU di Scandinavia	Lintas industri	Replikasi dari Kohli and Jaworski
Bhuiyan and Gader, 1997	237 rumah sakit di USA	Rumah sakit	<i>Intelligence generation, intelligence dissemination, intelligence responsiveness</i>
Peltham, 1997	160 perusahaan, USA	Lintas industri kecil	Orientasi pemahaman pelanggan, orientasi kepuasan pelanggan, orientasi pesaing
Langerak et. al., 1997	483 perusahaan industri, Nederland	Lintas Industri	Orientasi pelanggan, orientasi pesaing, orientasi pemasok, koordinasi interfunksional
Cadogan et. al., 1997	198 perusahaan dari UK dan 103 perusahaan dari Belanda	Perusahaan eksportir	<i>Export intelligence generation, export intelligence dissemination, export intelligence responsiveness, co-ordinating mechanism</i>
Gounaris and Avlonitis, 1997	444 perusahaan dari Yunani	Lintas Industri (10 % jasa)	Orientasi pasar sebagai sikap dan sebagai perilaku (versi Kohli and Jaworski)
Liu and Davies, 1997	115 perusahaan	Ritel	<i>Market intelligence, responsiveness, competitor orientation, coordination of business operation</i>
Caruana et.al., 1998	84 perguruan tinggi di New Zealand	Perguruan Tinggi	Diadaptasi dari skala Kohli and Jaworski
Kumar et. al., 1998	159 rumah sakit di USA	Rumah Sakit	Diadaptasi dari skala Narver and Slater

Peneliti	Contoh & Negara	Tipe Industri	Elemen MARKOR
Lado et. al., 1998	34 perusahaan di Belgia, dan 32 perusahaan di Spanyol	Industri Asuransi	Analisa klien, analisa dis-tributor, analisa pesaing, analisa lingkungan, koordi-nasi interfungsional, tindakan strategik pada pelanggan , tindakan strategik pada pesaing, tindakan strategik pada lingkungan makro
Van Egreen and O'Connor, 1998	67 perusahaan dan 289 tim manajemen puncak secara individu, USA	Lintas Industri Jasa	Orientasi pelanggan , orientasi pesaing, koordinasi interfungsional
Chang and Chen, 1998	150 perusahaan di taiwan Broker Saham		Orientasi pelanggan , orientasi pesaing, koordinasi interfungsional, dan orientasi profit
Gray et. Al, 1998	374 Senior Executives di New Zealand	Lintas Industri	Orientasi pelanggan , orientasi pesaing, koordinasi interfungsional, respon, dan penekanan pada profit
Han et.al., 1998	134 perusahaan di USA	Bank	Orientasi pelanggan , orientasi pesaing, koordinasi interfungsional
Vorhies et.al., 1999	87 perusahaan di Australia	Lintas Industri	<i>Intelligence generation, intelligence dissemina-tion, intelligence respon-siveness</i>
Harris and Piercy, 1999	107 manijer toko, UK	Ritel	Orientasi pelanggan , orientasi pesaing, koordinasi interfungsional
Grewal and Tansuhaj, 2001	132 perusahaan di Thailand	Lintas industri	<i>Information generation, information dissemination, response design, response implementation</i>

Sumber : Bhuaiian & Gader (1997), Dawes (1999), Grewal & Tansuhaj (2001), Soehadi (2001)

Sebagaimana ditunjukkan pada tabel, dari berbagai penelitian yang dilakukan untuk mengembangkan konsep orientasi pasar, kesemuanya berakar pada satu hal yang harus diperhatikan perusahaan yaitu mengidentifikasi dan menyajikan nilai unggul bagi **pelanggan**.

3. Berbagai Perspektif Terhadap Konsep Orientasi Pasar

Berbagai studi telah dilakukan untuk merumuskan orientasi pasar. Studi-studi tersebut

telah menghasilkan berbagai definisi, cara pandang, dan elemen-elemen untuk membangun konstruk orientasi pasar. Dari hasil studi tersebut definisi orientasi pasar dapat disimpulkan sebagai berikut (Soehadi, 2001) :

- Sebagai filosofi bisnis (Cespedes, 1990; Lichtental and Wilson, 1992; Hooley et. al., 1998).
- Sebagai bentuk budaya dan sikap (Gounaris and Avlonitis, 1997; Day and Wensley, 1988; Verhees, 1998; Narver and Slater, 1990).
- Sebagai keyakinan dan nilai dalam organisasi

- (Payne, 1988; Webster, 1988; Desphande et al., 1993).
- d. Sebagai perilaku (Avlonitis and Gournaris, 1997; Langerak and Commandeur, 1998; Narver and Slater, 1990).
 - e. Sebagai aktivitas atau proses (Saphiro, 1988; Day, 1994; Hunt and Morgan, 1995; Cadogan et al., 1997; Kohli and Jaworski, 1990; Ruekert, 1992)

Studi selanjutnya mencoba menggunakan beberapa konsep yang berhubungan diantara konstruk-construct orientasi pasar, misalnya :

- a. Pengolahan informasi pasar (Jaworski and Kohli, 1996; Tuominen and Moller, 1996).
- b. **Pembelajaran** organisasi (Slater and Narver, 1995; Tuominen and Moller, 1996).
- c. Kriteria pengambilan keputusan (Narver and Slater, 1990; Deng and Dart, 1994; Gray, Matear and Matheson, 1998).
- d. Integrasi interfunksional (Shapiro, 1988; Narver and Slater, 1990; Cadogan and Diamontopoulos, 1995).
- e. Orientasi Pemasok (Langgerak et al, 1997; Parkinson and Chambers, 1998) atau
- f. Orientasi Kualitas (Fritz, 1996; Parkinson and Chambers, 1998).

Dari berbagai definisi yang ada, pada intinya orientasi pasar dapat didekati dari dua sudut pandang yaitu sebagai nilai bersama dan budaya, dan sebagai perilaku yang diejawantahkan dari konsep pemasaran. Sebagai suatu budaya, orientasi pasar mengandung pedoman yang mengarahkan perilaku individu dalam organisasi. Day (1999) menyatakan budaya dan kapabilitas memiliki hubungan yang simbiotik. Kapabilitas merupakan sekumpulan keterampilan yang terintegrasi, teknologi, dan akumulasi **pembelajaran** yang dilatih melalui proses keorganisasian.

PERKEMBANGAN dari CUSTOMER DRIVEN, MARKET DRIVEN, dan DRIVING MARKET

Pada era 1960 sampai 1990, perusahaan berusaha untuk memuaskan kebutuhan dan keinginan konsumen melalui pemahaman yang mendalam mengenai konsumen (Keegan,...). Karenanya perusahaan diharapkan untuk menjadi *customer oriented* atau *customer driven*. Namun, berorientasi hanya kepada konsumen saja belum cukup. Perusahaan seyogyanya memuaskan

kebutuhan dan keinginan konsumen secara lebih baik daripada pesaingnya. E dimasukkannya unsur pesaing mengimplikasikan perlunya orientasi pasar karena mencakup konsumen dan pesaing (Day, 1998; Cravens, 2000).

Jaworski et al. (2000) menyatakan bahwa ada dua pendekatan yang dapat dilakukan untuk berorientasi pasar, yaitu pendekatan *market driven* dan pendekatan *driving market*. *Market driven* merujuk pada orientasi bisnis yang berdasarkan pada pemahaman dan reaksi terhadap pilihan-pilihan dan perilaku pemain di struktur pasar yang ada. Strategi tradisional berfokus pada konsumen dimana diasumsikan bahwa konsumen mengetahui apa yang mereka inginkan. Implikasi dari hal tersebut adalah *the rules of the competitive game* dibentuk oleh pembeli (Carpenters et al., 2001 qf Iacobucci, 2001). Sedangkan pendekatan *driving market* mengimplikasikan pengaruh terhadap struktur pasar dan atau perilaku pasar dengan tujuan meningkatkan posisi persaingan.

Market driving dapat dilakukan dengan tiga pendekatan yaitu dekonstruksi, konstruksi, dan modifikasi fungsional. Pendekatan dekonstruksi dilakukan dengan mengeliminir pemain pada pasar. Sebaliknya pendekatan konstruksi berupaya membangun atau memodifikasi pemain baru pada pasar. Pendekatan modifikasi fungsional meliputi perubahan fungsi yang diunjukkan para pemain di pasar yang ada. Baik pendekatan *market driven* dan *driving market*, sama-sama berfokus pada konsumen, pesaing, dan kondisi pasar secara umum.

PEMBELAJARAN PELANGGAN SEBAGAI KOMPONEN SINERGI YANG MEMBENTUK MARKOR PLUS

Meskipun diyakini bahwa orientasi pasar dapat meningkatkan kinerja, namun orientasi pasar masih memiliki beberapa kelemahan dalam prakteknya. Beberapa penelitian menunjukkan bahawa orientasi kepada **pelanggan** secara berlebihan dapat merusak organisasi (Bennet & Cooper, 1979; Frosch, 1996; Mac Donald, 1995; qf Grewal & Tansuhaj, 2001). Sebutlah misalnya Christensen & Bower (1996, menyimpulkan dari analisisnya pada industri hard disk drive bahwa "perusahaan tersebut kehilangan posisinya sebagai pem

industri... karena mereka terlalu mendengarkan pelanggannya.

Selain itu, masih terdapat beberapa kelemahan orientasi pasar untuk pencapaian tujuan organisasi melalui penyajian nilai unggul bagi **pelanggan** (SCV) dan penciptaan keunggulan berdaya saing berkelanjutan (SCA). Kelemahan-kelemahan tersebut antara lain :

a. **Pelanggan** tidak selalu menyadari kebutuhannya, terutama kebutuhan di waktu yang akan datang sehingga perusahaan perlu mengarahkannya, sebelum perusahaan lain melakukannya. Gibson (1997) menyatakan bahwa perusahaan yang akan menjadi pemenang adalah mereka yang berada di depan kurva perubahan.

b. Meskipun kebutuhan tersebut dapat diidentifikasi oleh **pelanggan**, mereka sendiri tidak mampu menentukan cara terbaik untuk memenuhinya (Kaldor, 1971 qf Gabel, 1995). Dua kondisi diatas mengimplikasikan bahwa orientasi **pelanggan** tidak akan menghasilkan suatu inovasi yang mampu membedakan suatu perusahaan dengan perusahaan lainnya, sehingga mengurangi SCA.

c. Pandangan tersebut diperkuat oleh Hammel & Prahalad (1994) yang menganggap **pelanggan** sebagai orang yang kurang wawasan, oleh karena itu orientasi **pelanggan** merupakan tirani bagi konsep orientasi pasar.

Berdasarkan beberapa pertimbangan tersebut, penulis mengajukan **pembelajaran pelanggan** sebagai komponen suplemen terhadap konsep orientasi pasar agar mampu menghasilkan efek sinergis yang menjadikan operasionalisasi konsep tersebut lebih efektif. Penambahan komponen **pembelajaran pelanggan** sebagai suplemen konsep orientasi pasar terinspirasi dari dan sekaligus merupakan hasil sintesa dari dua pendekatan terhadap orientasi pasar yaitu *market driven* dan *driving market*, teori **pembelajaran**, dan persepsi sebagai penggerak perilaku.

Namun demikian, konteks *driving market* yang dimaksudkan penulis, berbeda dengan konteks dari Jaworski, Kohli, dan Sahay (2000) yang merupakan para penginisiasi kedua pendekatan tersebut. Pendekatan *driving market* yang dimaksudkan Jaworski et al (2000) adalah upaya merestrukturisasi pasar dengan tujuan untuk meningkatkan posisi persaingan perusahaan. Sebaliknya penulis memadukan

implikasi dari kata "pengaruh" dengan **pembelajaran** kepada **pelanggan** agar mampu menilai jenis, kualitas, dan diferensiasi dari suatu produk.

Pada artikel ini, komponen orientasi pasar yang disintesa bersumber dari pengertian dan pengukuran dari Kohli & Jaworski (1990a, 1990b). Konsep tersebut diperkaya dengan komponen **pembelajaran pelanggan**. Oleh sebab itu penulis menamakannya MARKOR Plus.

Selanjutnya, pengertian orientasi dikembangkan menjadi upaya penggalian informasi pasar, mendiseminasikannya ke seluruh organisasi, berespon berdasar intelijen pasar tersebut, dan memberikan **pembelajaran** kepada **pelanggan** agar **pelanggan** mampu memahami dan menilai diferensiasi penawaran organisasi. Konsekuensi logis dari pengembangan konsep orientasi pasar tersebut adalah perlunya menyertakan pengukuran **pembelajaran pelanggan** pada pengukuran orientasi pasar (skala MARKOR) sehingga menjadi MARKOR Plus.

Pembelajaran pelanggan membentuk pemahaman, persepsi, logika, dan preferensi terhadap produk dan merk. Dalam situasi persaingan yang tajam, keunggulan merk dapat dikembangkan melalui **pembelajaran** pelanggan. Strategi keunggulan merk akan menciptakan keunggulan berdaya saing berkelanjutan bagi perusahaan.

Situasi ini sangat nyata ketika konsumen diperkenalkan kepada produk yang sama sekali baru seperti penyaji jasa internet atau kulka yang mampu mengorganisir persediaan bahan makanan. Konsumen sama sekali tidak memiliki pengetahuan mengenai produk, konsep nilai tentang produk tersebut, dan pengalaman untuk mampu memilih diantara tawaran yang tersedia. Produk/merk yang sukses biasanya adalah milik para pionir. Pekerjaan utama pionir adalah (Carpenter, 2001 qf Iacobucci, 2001) :

- Mengajari konsumen mengenai aspek-aspek penting dari produk tersebut (membentuk persepsi)
- Menciptakan konsep nilai terhadap produk (membentuk preferensi konsumen untuk menyukai produk)
- Membantu konsumen menciptakan logika untuk memilih diantara merk para pionir (mengembangkan strategi merk).

Nilai yang mampu diha

pembelajaran pelanggan tidak terbatas pada inovasi teknologi. **Pembelajaran pelanggan** mampu menghasilkan inovasi nilai baik melalui inovasi teknologi maupun terobosan strategi. Terobosan strategi dapat dilakukan melalui pemahaman yang baik dan respon yang sesuai dengan karakteristik pasar. Contoh kasus adalah kopi, yang merupakan salah satu komoditas tertua di dunia. Ritual minum kopi telah membentuk persepsi dan preferensi konsumen tentang kopi. Di Indonesia, kopi umumnya diminum oleh pria atau masyarakat setengah baya. Beberapa dekade lalu kopi adalah minuman yang dipersepsikan murah dan kurang bergengsi bagi remaja, pemuda, dan wanita profesional. Di sisi lain, perkembangan sosial menempatkan kafe sebagai tempat yang representatif untuk mengekspresikan gaya hidup. Melalui konsep kafe, Excelsio menyajikan kopi dengan gaya Itali kemudian berhasil membentuk citra yang berbeda mengenai ritual minum kopi. Saat ini setiap sore dengan mudah dijumpai, remaja baik pria maupun wanita berkumpul di kafe menikmati kopi sebagai manifestasi gaya hidup modern. Mereka menggugurkan konsep lama mengenai kopi sebagai minuman murah yang lebih tepat untuk pria.

Melalui **pembelajaran** dapat dilakukan reposisi ataupun penguatan terhadap kultur lama, yang selanjutnya mampu menghasilkan inovasi nilai. Konsisten dengan pandangan tersebut, Carpenter et al (2001) qf Iacobucci (2001) menyatakan bahwa melalui **pembelajaran pelanggan** perusahaan akan menciptakan keunggulan *by shaping the rules of the game to the advantage of one player over another*. Oleh karena itu, pensintesaan **pembelajaran pelanggan** terhadap konsep orientasi pasar, akan menghasilkan perpaduan sinergis yang mampu menjadikan operasionalisasi konsep orientasi pasar menjadi lebih efektif.

Beberapa pendapat, antara lain Slater (2000) menyatakan bahwa orientasi pasar merupakan **pembelajaran** organisasi. Sebagai **pembelajaran**, maka orientasi pasar merupakan faktor pendahulu (*antecedent*) terhadap inovasi (Hurley & Hult, 1998). Dalam hubungan antara pengaruh orientasi pasar terhadap kinerja, Han et al. (1998) menyatakan bahwa inovasi adalah mata rantai yang menghubungkan antara orientasi pasar dengan kinerja. Dari berbagai studi yang dilakukan misalnya Damanpour &

Evan (1984), Damanpour et al. (1989), Khan & Manopichewatana (1989), Zahra de Belardino & Boxx (1988) qf Han et al. (1998), Lukas & Ferrell (2000) membuktikan hubungan positif antara inovasi dengan kinerja. Bahkan Grounhag & Kauffman (1988) qf Han et al (1998) menyatakan inovasi penting untuk *survival* bukan hanya untuk pertumbuhan.

Dalam konteks **pembelajaran** organisasi, Baker & Sinkula (1999) menyatakan bahwa orientasi pasar yang disertai **pembelajaran** akan menghasilkan inovasi. Sedangkan orientasi pasar tanpa **pembelajaran** akan menghasilkan imitasi. Dari perspektif yang berbeda penulis menyatakan bahwa orientasi pasar yang disertai **pembelajaran pelanggan** akan mendorong perusahaan menjadi pemimpin pasar. Sedangkan orientasi pasar tanpa **pembelajaran pelanggan** hanya menjadikan perusahaan sebagai pengikut pasar.

PENUTUP

Akselerasi perubahan **pembelajaran** perusahaan untuk lebih memperhitungkan faktor-faktor eksternal disain mempersiapkan faktor internal agar dapat bergerak proaktif dan memposisikan diri secara lebih efektif di tengah-tengah arena yang kompetitif (Hunt & Morgan, 1995). Analisis yang cermat terhadap faktor eksternal tercermin pada penerapan orientasi pasar perusahaan. Melalui orientasi pasar atau dengan menjadi *market driven*, perusahaan akan memperoleh informasi pasar yang aktual, akurat, dan berorientasi tindakan sebagai upaya untuk menghasilkan SCA melalui penyajian SCV (Mc Daniel & Kolari, 1987; Day, 1990; Swartz, 1990; Kumar et al., 1997; Loubeau et al., 1997; 1998; Woodruff, 1998; Day, 1999; Pulendran et al., 2000; Carpenter et al, 2001 qf Iacobucci, 2001).

Konstruk yang membangun orientasi pasar dari Kohli & Jaworski (1990) belum cukup kuat untuk mencerminkan suatu gerakan proaktif yang dibutuhkan dalam lingkungan yang semakin dinamis. Penulis menges **pembelajaran pelanggan** sebagai kombinasi antara pendekatan *market driven* dan *driving market*. **Pembelajaran pelanggan** disintesa dari kedua pendekatan tersebut, te **pembelajaran**, dan persepsi sebagai penggerak perilaku. Dengan demikian diharapkan terjal

hubungan yang sinergis antara perusahaan dengan pelanggan. Hubungan demikian berpotensi bertahan dalam jangka waktu panjang sebab berdasarkan asas saling manfaat dan saling percaya.

Oleh karena itu, MARKOR Plus merupakan aksi yang konsisten dengan konsep pemasaran baik dari segi paradigma yang mendasarinya maupun pencapaian sasaran pemasaran.

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Baker, William E. & James M. Sinkula (1999). "The Synergistic Effect of Market Orientation and Learning Orientation on Organizational Performance", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 27, No. 4, p. 411-427.
- Bhuian, Shahid N. & Mohsin Habib (2000). "Enterpreneurship and Market Orientation : Direct Relationship and Their Impact on Performance", *Marketing in a Global Economy Proceedings*.
- _____ & Abdallah Abdul-Gader (1997). "Market Orientation in the Hospital Industry", *Marketing Health Services*, Winter, p. 37-45.
- Cadogan, J.W. , A. Diamantopoulos, & C.P. de Mortanges (1997). "Developing a Measure of Export Market Orientation : Scale Construction and Cross-Cultural Validation", Warwick Business School.
- Cravens, David W. (2000). *Strategic Marketing*, 6th ed., McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., Boston.
- Dawes, John (1999). "The Relationship between Subjective and Objective Company Performance Measures in Market Orientation Research : Further Empirical Evidence", *Marketing Bulletin*, Vol. 10, p. 65-75.
- Day & Prakash Nedungadi (1994), "Managerial Representations of Competitive Advantage", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 58, p. 31-44.
- _____ (1990). *Market Driven Strategy : Processes For Creating Value*, The Free Press, A Division of Simon & Schuster, Inc., New York.
- _____ (1999). *The Market Driven Organization : Understanding, Attracting, and Keeping Valuable Customers*, The Free Press, A Division of Simon & Schuster, Inc., New York.
- _____, George & Liam Fahey (1988), "Valuing Market Strategies", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 52, p. 45-57.
- Farrell, Mark A. & Edward Oczkowski (1997). "An Analysis of the MKTOR and MARKOR Measures of Orientation : An Australian Perspective", *Marketing Bulletin*, Vol. 8, p. 30-40.
- Gabel, Terrance G. (1995). "Market Orientation : Theoretical and Methodologic Concerns", *American Marketing Association*, Summer, p. 368-375.
- Greenley, G.E (1995), "Market Orientation and Company Performance : Empirical Evidence from UK Companies", *British Journal of Management*, No. 6, p. 1 - 13.
- Grewal, Rajdeep & Patriya Tansuhaj (2001). "Building Organizational Capabilities for Managing Economic Crisis : The Role of Market Orientation and Strategic Flexibility", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 65, p. 67-80.
- Gummesson, Evert (1999). *Total Relationship Marketing : Rethinking Marketing Management, From 4Ps to 30Rs*, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
- Hamel G. & C.K. Prahalad (1994). *Competing for the Future*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston.
- Han, Jin K., Namwoon Kim, & Rajendra K. Srivastava (1998). "Market Orientation and Organizational Performance : Is Innovation a Missing Link ?", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 62, p. 30-45.
- Hurley, Robert F. & G. Thomas M. Hult (1998). "Innovation, Market Orientation, and Organizational Learning : An Integration and Empirical Examination", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 62, p. 42-54.

- Iacobucci, Dawn (2001). *Kellogg on Marketing*, John Wiley and Sons, USA.
- Jaworski, Bernard, Ajay K. Kohli & Arvind Sahay (2000). "Market – Driven Versus Driving Markets", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 28, No. 1, p. 45-54.
- Keegan, Warren J. (1995). *Manajemen Pemasaran Global*, Edisi Bahasa Indonesia, Jilid 2, Prenhallindo, Jakarta.
- Kohli, Ajay K. & Bernard J. Jaworski (1990a). "Market Orientation : The Construct, Research Propositions, and Managerial Implications", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54, p. 1-18.
- _____, _____, & Ajith Kumar (1990b). *Market Orientation : The Construct, Research Propositions, and Managerial Implications*, Marketing Science Institute, Massachusetts.
- _____, _____, & _____ (1993). "MARKOR : A Measure of Market Orientation", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. XXX, p.467-477.
- Kotler, Philip (1994). *Marketing Management : Analysis, Planning, Implementation, and Control*, 8th ed., Prentice-Hall International, Inc., New Jersey.
- _____, _____ (2000). *Marketing Management*, The Millennium ed., Prentice-Hall International, Inc., New Jersey.
- Kumar, Kamalesh & Ram Subramanian (2000). "Navigating the External Environment Through a Market Orientation", *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, Winter, p.16-30.
- Loubeau, Patricia & Robert Jantzen (1998). "Marketing Research Activities in Hospitals", *Marketing Health Services*, Spring, p. 13-17.
- _____, _____ (1998). "The Effect of Managed Care on Hospital Marketing Orientation", *Journal of Healthcare Management*, Vol. 43, p. 230-241.
- Lukas, Bryan A. & O. C. Ferrell (2000). "The Effect of Market Orientation on Product Innovation", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 28, No. 2, p. 239-247.
- Matsuno, Ken, John T. Mentzer, & Joseph O. Rentz (2000). "A Refinement and Validation of the MARKOR Scale", *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 28, No.4, p.527-539.
- Mavondo, Felix T. & Mark A. Farrell (2000). "Measuring Market Orientation : Are There Differences Between Business Marketer's and Consumers Marketer's", *Australian Journal of Management*, September, p.223-244.
- McCarthy, Jerome E & William D. Perreault, Jr. (1990). *Basic Marketing, A Managerial Approach*, 10th ed., Homewood, IL : Ir.
- McDaniel, Stephen W. & James W. Kolari (1987). "Marketing Strategy Implications of the Miles and Snow Strategic Typology", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 51, p.19-30.
- Narver, John C. & Stanley F. Slater (1990). "The Effect of Market Orientation on Business Profitability", *Journal of Marketing*, October, p. 20-35.
- Pavitra, Teddy (1993). *Pemasaran : Dimensi Falsafah, Disiplin, dan Keahlian*, Sekolah Tinggi Manajemen Prasetia Mulya, Jakarta.
- _____, _____ (2001). *Hirarki Tujuan Generik Pemasaran*, Bahan Kuliah Pemasaran S3 Manajemen Program Pascasarjana Universitas Indone-
- Pulendran, Sue, Richard Speed & Robert E. Widing (2000). "The Antecedents and Consequences of Market Orientation in Australia", *Australian Journal of Management*, Vol. 25, No. 2, p. 119-143.
- Slater, Stanley F. & John C. Narver (2000). "Intelligence Generation and Superior Customer Value", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 28, No. 1, p. 120-127.

Soehadi, Agus W. (2001). *The Relationship between Market Orientation, Supplier Partnership, Environmental Factors, and Firm Performance in Indonesian Retail Firms*, University of Strathclyde Glasgow, UK.

Swartz, Gordon S. (1990). "Organizing to Become Market-Driven", *Marketing*

Science Institute, Camb
Massachusetts, Report No. 90-123.

Woodruff, Robert B. (1997). "Customer Value : The Next Source for Competitive Advantage", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 139-153.

