Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

Procedia Economics and Finance 34 (2015) 622 – 629

Procedia Economics and Finance

www.elsevier.com/locate/procedia

Business Economics and Management 2015 Conference, BEM2015

Effect of Marketing Orientation on Business Performance: A Study from Slovak Foodstuff Industry

Simona Šályová[a],Janka Táborecká-Petrovičová[a]*, Gabriela Nedelová[a], Jaroslav Ďaďo[a]

[a]*Faculty of Economics Matej Bel University,Tajovského 10, 97401 Banská Bystrica, Slovakia*

Abstract

In theory, marketing orientation represents established concept using a wide spectrum of approaches, methods and tools and it may be considered as a strategy for achieving sustainable competitive advantage. Although this concept has been thoroughly examined in various studies there is a research gap regarding Slovak context. The aim of this paper is to examine and evaluate the degree of marketing orientation in businesses from foodstuff industry in Slovakia and to identify relationships between their marketing orientation and business performance. We applied behavioral perspective for marketing orientation measurement using MARKOR scales as a base. Results of the research should confirm hypothesis about dependence between marketing orientation of businesses and their success on the market via chosen business performance indicators, where we assume that businesses with higher degree of marketing orientation will exhibit better financial, economic, respectively market results. These findings will help business identify beneficial elements of marketing orientation that could be implemented with the intention to improve business performance and position on the market.

Peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of BEM2015

Keywords: marketing orientation; business performance; MARKOR scale; financial and non-financial indicators

1. Introduction

Marketing orientation has become a center of attention of many authors for over 30 years (Parasuraman, 1983; Whyte, 1985; Greenley, Matcham, 1986; Naidu and Narayana, 1991). The importance of marketing orientation in affecting businesses′ profitability is well documented in marketing literature (Narver and Slater, 1990; Ruekert, 1992; Ngai and Ellis, 1998). Many of these studies report results from samples of assorted businesses across

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +421-48-446-2732.
E-mail address: janka.taborecka@umb.sk

2212-5671
Peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of BEM2015
doi:10.1016/S2212-5671(15)01677-9

industrial sectors (Pulendran et al, 2003; Kara et al, 2005) or from one industrial sector (Zaman et al., 2012; Merlo and Auh, 2009; Nwokah, 2008; Shin, 2012): e.g. Kajalo (2015) applied research on Finnish non-food small retailers; Rojas-Méndez (2012) measured marketing orientation of Chilean wine producers; Hammond et al. (2006) studied this concept with the implications for universities. Outperforming of other businesses should be a consequence of implementation of marketing activities (Day and Nedungadi, 1994). The aim of this paper is to examine and evaluate the degree of marketing orientation in businesses from foodstuff industry in Slovakia and to identify relationships between their marketing orientation and business performance.

2. Material and Methods

1.1. Marketing orientation

The term marketing orientation can be defined various ways: as a set of beliefs that shapes particular attitudes and culture of business (Hooley et al., 1990, In: Avlonitis and Gounaris, 1997, p. 385) or as an implementation of marketing concept (McCarthy and Perreault, 1990). In scientific literature, the term of marketing orientation is frequently confronted with the term of market orientation. Some authors equate these two terms, others prefer one of them. Hunt and Morgan (1995) differentiate terms market orientation and marketing orientation, on the other hand Avlonitis and Gounaris (1999) consider them as synonyms. However, they prefer the term marketing orientation because of its wide utilization, while linguistically it refers to the marketing concept (Schwamm et al., 2009, p. 260). Marketing orientation could be understood from both behavioral and cultural perspective (Kirca, Jayachandran and Bearden, 2005). Narver and Slater (1990) support cultural approach in relation to basic characteristics of an organization. They identified the marketing orientation through the inclusion of three basic components, namely the customer orientation, the orientation on competition and the inter-functional coordination representing the importance of coordinating activities in all departments of an organization and also the coordinated utilization of resources for the purpose of creating greater value for customers (In: Panayides, 2004, p. 46-47). On the other hand, Kohli and Jaworski (1990) define marketing orientation from the behavioral perspective defining activities for the marketing oriented business, which are gaining information about market regarding current and future needs of customers, disseminating this information across all departments of an organization and organization´s ability to respond this information. Kohli and Jaworski (1993) predominantly see the consequences of marketing orientation in customer satisfaction, employee´s loyalty and the financial performance of business. Waris (2005) revealed proportional relationship between employee´s commitment and marketing orientation and explain that their loyalty acts as an incentive for employees to be aware of customer needs and actions of competitors. Although some studies suggest a negative or non-significant relationship between market orientation and business performance Han et al., 1998), most findings indicate a positive relationship between market orientation and business performance (e.g. Deshpandé and Farley, 1998; Matsuno et al., 2000; Slater and Narver, 2000).

1.2. Measuring scales

Two of the most extensively used measures of market orientation are the “MARKOR” scale developed by Kohli, Jaworski, and Kumar (1993) and the “MKTOR” scale developed by Narver and Slater (1990). Jaworski and Kohli (1993) developed MARKOR scale in which individual statements are predominantly evaluated by using the Likert scale (Caruana, 1999, p. 248). The MARKOR scale includes three components – generation of market information, dissemination of information and responsiveness capacity. The MARKOR scale appears to be able to gain information about specific behavioral reactions of business on critical aspects of a market such as competition, customers, regulation, social and macroeconomic forces (Day and Wensley, 1988; Jaworski and Kohli, 1996; Kohli et al., 1993). On the other hand, the MKTOR scale is less process oriented, and is operationalized in purely behavioral manner. It is characterized a method of measuring marketing orientation based on average scores from the three measured sections, namely customer orientation, orientation on competition and inter-functional coordination (Slater and Narver, 1994, In: Rojas-Méndez, Rod, 2013, p. 29-30). For the purpose of measuring marketing orientation by this method, it is used the Likert scale capturing attitudes of respondents towards activities of business (O´Sullivan and Butler, 2009, p. 1352). Many scholars (Deshpandé and Farley, 1998; Dobni and

Luffman, 2000; Langerak, 2001) also used modified scales or their combination in their studies. Both methods argue that the degree to which a business demonstrates its marketing orientation influences effectiveness with which the marketing concept is implemented in a business and at the same time the degree by which business performance is affected (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990; Narver and Slater, 1990, Reukert, 1992).

1.3. Business performance

Authors have different approach towards measuring business performance. Firstly, in researches there were used different financial and non-financial indicators as criteria for evaluating business performance. Also, authors differ in the investigation of these indicators. There are applied essentially two basic approaches of business performance measurement: by subjective (self-reported) and objective measures where the distinction between them is blurred by the human element. Although most objective measures are based on financial data, the reporting of financial information may be subjectively constructed. The difficulty in obtaining objective data contributes to the wide use of subjective measures (Cano et al., 2004, p. 184). Hooley et al. (2003, p. 96) argue that such a method of investigation values of performance indicators is preferred if it is necessary to obtain the values of indicators from a wide range of businesses. Managers are usually very busy and there is a risk that such questions will not be answered and managers may be reluctant to give precise numerical values of surveyed indicators. The absolute numerical values of indicators also make it impossible for a comparison between businesses of different sizes, operating in different industries, using different accounting standards and defining their markets in different ways. Avlonitis and Gounaris (1997) conclude that studies which used both objective and subjective measures of performance (Venkatraman and Ramanujam, 1986; Child, 1986), have found strong correlation between them.

1.4. Hypotheses development

As a starting point for the implementation of research we have studied a large amount of secondary researches that examined the marketing orientation and its effects on business performance in different countries and on different samples of businesses. We carried out primary research and collected data via online questionnaire from the responses of businesses. We have addressed manufacturing and food processing and trade companies of all sizes that mediate the sale of these products to next companies or final consumers. We applied quota sampling based on predetermined characters where we drew data from the publicly available resources (e. g. www.registeruz.sk, www.edb.sk) and create database of companies. Although some authors (Jaworski and Kohli, 1993; Avlonitis and Gounaris, 1999) in their studies deal with the antecedents and determinants of marketing orientation such as top management, interdepartmental factors, organizational systems and environmental changes in our research we focused only on measuring of marketing orientation and business performance without researching internal and external factors (Pitt, 1996; Panayides, 2004). For measuring of marketing orientation we applied modified MARKOR scale (based on the results of pilot questioning and feedback from business′ representatives). In all areas examined through statements we used the 7-degree Likert scale (1=absolutely disagree, 7=absolutely agree). We have measured business performance through the non-financial indicators, specifically employee commitment to the organization and customer satisfaction and through the financial indicators. According to the studies of other scholars (Narver and Slater, 1990; Kohli and Jaworski, 1993) we have chosen these financial indicators: overall performance, sales, profit, return on investments ROI, return on assets ROA and return on sales ROS. We also measure business performance via market share which is non-financial indicator but it is measured according to the original scale the same way as financial ones. According to the studies of other scholars (Pitt et al., 1996, Puledran et al., 2003; Kara et al., 2005) we have decided to use subjective measures of performance. In our questionnaire research we addressed 1 115 businesses for answering the questions. After completion of data collection, we received 62 questionnaires. The rate of return was 6.19%. Our sample consists of 33 industrial businesses, 16 wholesales and 13 retailers containing14 businesses with 1 – 9 employees, 18 businesses with 10 – 49 employees, 18 businesses with 50 - 249 employees and 12 businesses with more than 250 employees. Respondents were marketing managers, owners of businesses, heads of departments or units or employees at relevant positions. We addressed businesses from different district of Slovakia and in most businesses there is only Slovak form of ownership.

In relation to the main aim of the research we formulated the main hypothesis *H: There is a correlation between marketing orientation and business performance* and consequently these partial hypotheses for further testing:

H1: There is a correlation between marketing orientation and employees' commitment.
H2: There is a correlation between marketing orientation and customer satisfaction.
H3: There is a correlation between marketing orientation and overall business performance.
H4: There is a correlation between marketing orientation and market share of business.
H5: There is a correlation between marketing orientation and sales of business.
H6: There is a correlation between marketing orientation and profit of business.
H7: There is a correlation between marketing orientation and return on investment (ROI).
H8: There is a correlation between marketing orientation and return on assets (ROA).
H9: There is a correlation between marketing orientation and return on sales (ROS).

3. Results

We addressed representatives of business with items as shown in Table 1 and calculated mean of the answers of respondents for every item. We divided businesses into 5 categories according to the average score they achieved in questionnaire. These 5 categories are very low level of marketing orientation, low level of marketing orientation, average level of marketing orientation, high level of marketing orientation and very high level of marketing orientation. According to research we found out that most businesses (29 businesses, 47 %) have a high degree of marketing orientation. 19 businesses, based on our findings are very highly marketing-oriented, representing 31% of all businesses. 12 businesses are average marketing-oriented and two businesses have a low level of marketing orientation. There are no businesses that have a very low level of marketing orientation.

Next, we proceeded to the statistical verification of hypotheses. We set the significance level at $\alpha = 0.1$. H-hypothesis, which assumed that there is a relationship between marketing orientation and business performance, has been verified using regression analysis and Spearman correlation coefficient. Marketing orientation should have the effect of improving business performance. Business performance was measured through several indicators. We assessed business performance through the commitment and loyalty of employees to the organization, which represent non-financial indicators. Independent variable was the average value of question focused on measuring the level marketing orientation. Dependent variable was the average value of question focused on *commitment to the organization*. According to the regression analysis, we found that there is a relationship between these two variables. The value of Spearman correlation coefficient was 0.486 what means moderately strong dependence between marketing orientation and commitment of employees. We repeated the previous test and we have confirmed also the relationship between marketing orientation and business performance expressed through *customer satisfaction*. The value of Spearman rank correlation coefficient was 0.576 what also means moderately strong dependence between marketing orientation and customer satisfaction.

We applied regression and correlation analysis (Table 2) for examination of relationship between marketing orientation and business performance expressed through the financial indicators and one market indicator. We tested dependence between marketing orientation and every indicator individually. *Overall performance* is correlated to the marketing orientation, while Spearman rank correlation coefficient is 0.303. There is not significantly correlation between marketing orientation and *market share* (p-value = 0.122). Spearman correlation coefficient between marketing orientation and *sales* is 0.283. Spearman correlation coefficient between marketing orientation and *profit* is 0.325. There is a correlation between marketing orientation and *ROI* (Spearman correlation coefficient = 0.401), marketing orientation and *ROA* (Spearman correlation coefficient = 0.434), marketing orientation and *ROS*(Spearman correlation coefficient = 0.406). On the basis of regression we supported the hypothesis that there is a correlation between marketing orientation and business performance expressed via financial and non-financial indicator excluding market share. According to the Spearman's rho we can assess an intensity of correlation between variables. The strongest correlation is between marketing orientation and customer satisfaction while value of Spearman's rho is 0.576 what means moderately strong correlation. We rank correlations from the strongest above of the table to the weakest beneath.

Table 1. Measuring scale for marketing orientation and business performance

Intelligence Generation, Intelligence Dissemination, Responsiveness	**Mean**
In our business unit, we meet with customers at least once a year to find out what products or services they will need in the future.	5.790
In our business unit, we do in-house market research.	5.565
We are slow to detect changes in our customers' product/service preferences.	4.387
We survey end-users to assess the quality of our product and service offerings.	5.629
We are slow to detect fundamental shifts and trends in our industry such as competition, technology, and regulation.	4.548
We periodically review the likely effects of changes in our business environment, such as regulations and technology, on customers.	5.742
Marketing personnel in our business unit spend time discussing customers future needs with other functional departments.	5.115
We have interdepartmental meetings to discuss market trends and developments.	4.839
When something important happens to our major customer market, the whole business unit knows about it within a short period.	5.483
Data on customer satisfaction are disseminated at all levels in this business unit on regular basis.	5.387
When one department finds out something important about competitors, it is slow to alert other departments.	4.629
It takes us forever to decide how to respond to our competitor price changes.	4.885
For one reason or another we tend to ignore changes in our customers product/service needs.	6.017
We periodically review our product development efforts to ensure that they are in line with what customers want.	6.136
Several departments get together periodically to plan a response to changes taking place in our business environment.	5.242
If a major competitor were to lunch an intensive campaign targeted at our customers, we would implement a response immediately.	5.705
The activities of the different departments in this business unit are well coordinated.	5.311
Customer complaints fall on deaf ears in this business unit.	6.065
Even if we came up with a great marketing plan, we probably would not be able to implement it in a timely fashion.	4.855
When we find out that customers are unhappy with quality of our service, we take corrective action immediately.	6.311
Employees commitment	
The relations between the company and their employees are weak.	5.387
In general employees are proud of working in your company.	5.048
Employees work beyond their duties to ensure the prosperity of the company.	4.806
It is obvious that employees like this company.	5.129
People in our company are worried about needs and problems of their colleagues.	3.661
Team spirit dominates in our company.	4.935
Working for this company is such a being a part of a big family.	5.016
Customer satisfaction	
Our customers are satisfied with the quality of our products/service.	5.823
Our customers are satisfied with the pricing of our products.	5.516
We rarely receive complaints from our customers.	5.823
It is easy for us to gain new customers.	3.532
We serve a lot of same customer that we had served in past.	5.656
Our customers often return to us.	5.855
We have more regular customers than competitors.	4.968
Business performance	
Overall performance of our business unit has increased in last three years.	5.557
Market share of our business unit has increased in last three years.	5.492
Sales of our business unit have increased in last three years.	5.492
The profit of our business unit has increased in last three years.	5.279
Return on investments (ROI) has increased in last three years.	5.356
Return on assets (ROA) has increased in last three years.	5.310
Return on sales (ROS) has increased in last three years.	5.304

Table 2. Results of regression and correlation analysis

	Standardized Coefficient	Sig.	Spearman's rho	Test result
H1: Marketing orientation → employees commitment	0.538	0.000	0.486	Supported
H2: Marketing orientation → customer satisfaction	0.676	0.000	0.576	Supported
H3: Marketing orientation → overall business performance	0.319	0.012	0.303	Supported
H4: Marketing orientation → market share	0.130	0.318	0.200	Not supported
H5: Marketing orientation → sales	0.217	0.093	0.283	Supported
H6: Marketing orientation → profit	0.249	0.053	0.325	Supported
H7: Marketing orientation → return on investment (ROI)	0.338	0.009	0.401	Supported
H8: Marketing orientation → return on assets (ROA)	0.346	0.008	0.434	Supported
H9: Marketing orientation → return on sales (ROS)	0.322	0.015	0.406	Supported

According to results of correlation analysis (Table 3) we can conclude that marketing orientation has the strongest effect on customer satisfaction. However customer satisfaction is non-financial indicator of business performance and it is impossible to express it through the accounting. Marketing orientation has moderately strong effect on financial indicator return on assets (ROA). Market share is non-financial indicator but it is measured like financial ones – we addressed market share′ growth in last three years. The correlation between marketing orientation and market share was not supported. Marketing orientation is best predictor of non-financial indicators such as customer satisfaction and employees' commitment and financial indicators such as return on assets, return on sales and return on investments.

Table 3. Rank of correlation strength results

	Sig.	Spearman's rho	Test result	Correlation Strength
H2: Marketing orientation → customer satisfaction	0.000	0.576	Supported	Moderate
H1: Marketing orientation → employees commitment	0.000	0.486	Supported	Moderate
H8: Marketing orientation → return on assets (ROA)	0.001	0.434	Supported	Moderate
H9: Marketing orientation → return on sales (ROS)	0.002	0.406	Supported	Moderate
H7: Marketing orientation → return on investment (ROI)	0.002	0.401	Supported	Moderate
H6: Marketing orientation → profit	0.011	0.325	Supported	Weak
H3: Marketing orientation → overall business performance	0.018	0.303	Supported	Weak
H5: Marketing orientation → sales	0.027	0.283	Supported	Weak
H4: Marketing orientation → market share	0.122	0.200	Not supported	None

4. Discussion

On the basis of results obtained by evaluation of the conducted research on the sample of companies engaged in the segment of foodstuff segment we have confirmed the existence of relationship between marketing orientation and performance of company. Existence of this relationship is proven decades by results of various international researches implemented in different countries around the world, on companies of different sizes operating in different sectors of economy. These researches are mainly focused on examination of relationship of marketing orientation and performance of companies, while some of them are dealing with effect internal or external factors. Researchers applying several scales for measuring the marketing orientation and examining various financial and non-financial performance indicators slightly differentiate these researches and simultaneously bring new perspective on this issue. Methodology of our research is mainly based on the methodology of original authors, while we deliver new perspective due to chosen sample of companies and a new country context. The positive effect of marketing orientation on selected performance indicators was confirmed in all performance indicators except non-financial indicator of market share. This result could be caused by the fact, that growth on the market share is the result of effect of marketing orientation within longer period of time, longer than three years that we had followed in our research. Also, marketing strategies of individual companies could be focused differently, while their priority goal has not to be increasing the market share. It is therefore questionable, whether this indicator is suitable as a result of marketing orientation in such short period of time, especially on rather saturated market. In case of other performance indicators positive impact of marketing orientation on selected indicators was confirmed. Moreover, to find out suitability of the chosen subjective (self-reported) measurement of business performance indicators, we analyzed 22 businesses about which we got also objective measures of financial indicators. We conducted a simple comparison of these measures and found out that in majority of cases subjective and objective measures were in accordance what is also in conformity with the theoretical basis and results of international researches which support the relationship between stated subjective and objective variables. Even if we have reduced some items of original MARKOR scale, the relationship between marketing orientation and business performance was supported.

Despite positive results our study is subject to several limitations. It was used quite small sample consisting of 62 businesses in our research from just one industry and one country. In our opinion with larger sample we could gain more reliable results with better generalizability. Regarding further developments, in future research we could involve also examination of internal and external factors that influence the degree of marketing orientation, incorporate also other new business performance indicators (e.g. EVA), study particular elements of marketing orientation in details and identify the most beneficial, compare companies with different sizes, from different industries or countries or utilize cultural approach in marketing orientation measurement and compare it with the behavioral one.

5. Conclusion

However, based on our results we may formulate also some managerial implications. Marketing orientation is understood as efficient generation of information, disseminations of information and responsiveness to gained information. These three activities are mainly related with the information about customer, competition and market. Based on the results of research, managers should focus on the stated fields. The essence of implementing this concept into practice of the companies is to set the customer into the center of company´s attention and ensure satisfaction of its customers. Obtaining of information is also related with the competition, while company should monitor their marketing activities, strategies and offered products. Within the marketing orientation enterprise should obtain and collect information about the market in which it operates. Company should monitor new trends in their business environment and should suppose their effect on customer. Responding to new market trends companies can gain the competitive advantage over the competitors. Essential information about customers, competition and new market trends is necessary to distribute around all departments of company, e.g. through the meetings. During these meeting employees can analyze obtained information and negotiate the ways in which the company will respond at this information. Obtaining and sharing marketing information within the company is indeed an important activity, but if the company could not use this information in favor of creating the value for customer, these processes become ineffective. The inevitable respond should be to implement the corrective measures. In the field of competition is necessary to flexibly respond to the intensive campaigns of the competitors. Marketing specialist should be prepared to respond adequately and in time, while they should adjust their action marketing plans according the situation on the market. For efficient using of information is needed appropriate coordination of the individual activities of departments. Moreover is necessary to ensure timely implementation of own marketing plans, that should reflect the market situation and continue to the current market trends.

References

Appiah-Adu, K. 1997. Market Orientation and Performance: Do the Findings Established in Large Firms Hold in the Small Business Sector? In Journal of Euro-Marketing, Vol.6, No.3. pp. 1-26.

Avlonitis, G. J., Gounaris, S. P. 1997. Marketing Orientation and Company Performance: Industrial vs. Consumer Goods Companies. In Industrial Marketing Management,Vol. 26, No. 5, pp. 385-402.

Avlonitis, G. J., Gounaris, S. P. 1999. Marketing Orientation and Its Determinants: An Empirical Studies. In European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 33, No. 11/12 , pp. 1003-1037.

Cano, C. R., Carrillat, F. A., Jaramillo, F. 2004. A Meta-analysis of the Relationship Between Marketing Orientation and Business Performance: Evidence From Five Continents. In International Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp.179-200.

Cant, M. C., Strydom, J. W., Jooste, C. J., Du Plessis, P. J. 2006. Marketing Management. Cape Town :Juta&Co, 2006. 614 p. ISBN 978-0-70217-188-8.

Caruana, A. 1999.An Assessment of the Dimensions and the Stability of Items in the MARKOR Scale. In Marketing Intelligence & Planning, Vol. 17, No. 5, pp. 248-253.

Day, G., Nedungadi, P. 1994. Managerial Representations of Competitive Advantage. In Journal of Marketinf, 58 (April), pp. 31-44.

Day, G., Wensley, R. 1988. Assessing Advantage: A Framework for Diagnosing Competitive Superiority. In Journal of Marketing, 52 (April) pp.1-20.

Deshpandé, R., Farley, J. U. (1998). Measuring Market Orientation: Generalization and Synthesis. Journal of Market Focused Management, 2(3), 213-198.

Dobni, C. B., &Luffman, G. (2000). Market Orientation and Market Strategy Profiling: An Empirical Test of Environment – Behaviour – Action Coalignment and its Performance Implications. Management Decision, 38(8), 503– 519.

Ferrell, O. C., Gonzalez-Padron, T. L., Hult, G. T. M., Maignan, I. 2010.From Market Orientation to Stakeholder Orientation.In Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 93-96.

Greenlay, G. E., Matcham, A. S. 1986. Marketing Orientation in the Service of Incoming Tourism.In European Journal of Marketing, 20 (7). pp. 64-73.

Hammond, K. L., Webster, R. L., Harmon, H. A. 2006. Market Orientation, Top Management Emphasis, and Performance within University Schools of Business: Implications for Universities. In Journal of marketing Theory and Practice, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 69-85.

Han, J. K., Kim, N., &Srivastava, R. K. (1998). Market Orientation and Organizational Performance: Is Innovation a Missing Link? Journal of Marketing, 62(4), 30– 45.

Hendl, J. 2004. Přehledstatistickýchmetodzpracování dat. 1.vyd. Praha :Portál, 2004. 584 p. ISBN 80-7178-820-1.

Hooley, G., Fahy, J., Greenley, G., Beracs, J., Fonfara, K., Snoj, B. 2003. Market Orientation in the Service Sector of the Transition Economies of the Central Europe.In European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 37, No. 1/2, pp. 86-106.

Hunt, S. D., Morgan, R. M. 1995. The Comparative Advantage Theory of Competition.In Journal of Marketing, 59, April, 1-15.

Jaworski, B. J., Kohli, A. K. 1993. Market Orientation: Antecedents and Consequences. In Journal of Marketing, Vol. 57, No. 3, pp. 53-70.

Kajalo, S., Lindblom, A. (2015),"Market Orientation, Entrepreneurial Orientation and Business Performance Among Small Retailers", International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management, Vol. 43 Iss 7 pp. 580 – 596.

Kara, A., Spillan, J. E., Deshields, O. W. Jr. 2005. The Effect of a Market Orientation on Business Performance: A Study of Small-Sized Service Retailers Using MARKOR Scale. In Journal of Small Business Management, Vol. 43, No. 2, pp.105-118

Kazmi, S. H. H. 2007. Marketing Management. New Delhi : Excel books, 2007. 694 p. ISBN 81-7446-542-1.

Kirca, A. H., Hult, G. T. M. 2009. Intra-Organizational Factors and Market Orientation: Effects of National Culture. In International Marketing Review, Vol. 26, No. 6, pp. 633-650

Kirca, A. H., Jayachandran, S., Bearden, W. O. 2005. Market Orientation: A Meta-Analytic Review and Assessments of Its Antecendents and Impact on Performance. In Journal of Marketing, Vol. 69, No. 2, pp. 24-41

Kohli, A. K., Jaworski, B. J. 1993. Market Orientation: The Construct, Propositions, and Managerial Implications, In Journal of Marketing, 54, pp. 1-18.

Kohli, A. K., Jaworski, B. J., & Kumar, B. (1993). MARKOR: a measure of market orientation. Journal of Marketing Research, 30(2), 467-771.

Kohli, A. K., Jaworski, B. J. 1996. Market Orientation: Review, Refinement, and Roadmap, In Journal of Market-Focused Management, Vol. 1, pp. 119-135.

Langerak, F. (2001).Effects of Market Orientation on the Behaviours of Salespersons and Purchasers, Channel Relationships, and Performance of Manufacturers.International Journal of Research in Marketing, 18(3), 221– 234.

Matsuno, K., Mentzer, J. T., Rentz, J. O. 2000. A Refinement and Validation of the MARKOR Scale. In Academy of Marketing Science Journal, Vol. 28, No. 4, pp. 527-539.

McCarthy, J. E., Perreault, W. D. Jr. (1990), Basic Marketing – A Managerial Approach, Tenth Rdition, Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Merlo, O., Auh, S. 2009. The Effects of Entrepreneurial orientation, Market Orientation, and Marketing Subunit Influence on Firm Performance.In Springer Science + Business Media.

Naidu, G.M., Narayana, C. L. 1991. How Marketing Oriented Are Hospitals in a Declining Market? In Journal of Health Care Marketing, 11 (March). pp. 23-30.

Narver, J. C., Slater, S. F. 1990. The Effect of a Market Orientation on Business Profitability.In Journal of Marketing, Vol. 54, No. 4, pp. 20-35.

Ngai, J. C. H., Ellis, P. (1998),"Market Orientation and Business Performance: Some Evidence From Hong Kong", International Marketing Review, Vol. 15 Iss 2 pp. 119 – 139.

Nwokah, N. G. (2008),"Strategic market orientation and business performance", European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 42 Iss 3/4 pp. 279-286.

O´Sullivan, D., Butler, P. 2009. Market Orientation and Enterprise Policy. In European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 43, No. 11/12, pp.1349-1364

Panayides, P. M. 2004. Marketing in Asia-Pacific Logistics Companies: A Discriminant Analysis Between Marketing Orientation and Performance. In Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 42-68.

Parasuraman, A. 1983. Marketing-Orientation of Industrial vs. Consumer Goods Firms, In Akron Business And Economic Review, 14(Summer), pp. 41-44.

Pitt, L., Caruana, A., Berthon, P. R. 1996. Market Orientation and Business Performance: Some European Evidence. In International Marketing Review, Vol. 13, No.1, pp. 5-18

Pulendran, S., Speed, R., Widing II, R. E. 2003.Marketing Planning, Market Orientation and Business Performance. In European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 37, No. 3/4, pp. 476-497

Rojas-Méndez, J. I., Rod, M. 2012. Chilean Wine Producer Market Orientation: Comparing MKTOR versus MARKOR. In International Journal of Wine Business Research, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 27-49.

Ruekert, R. W. 1992. Developing a Market Orientation: AN Organizational Strategy Perspective.In International Journal of Research in Marketing, 9, pp. 225-245.

Schwamm, H., Stephens, D., Cleeve, M. 2009. Marketing Orientation of National Libraries. In Libri: International Journal of Libraries& Information Services, Vol. 59, No. 4, pp. 259-274.

Shin, S. 2012. Decomposed Approach of market Orientation and Marketing Mix Capability: Research on Their Relationships with Firm Performance in the Korean Context. In International Business Research, Vol. 5.No. 1. pp. 23-33.

Slater, S. F., &Narver, J. C. (2000).Intelligence generation and superior customer value. Academy of Marketing Science.Journal,28(1), 120-127.

Vieira, V. A. 2010. Antecedents and Consequences of Market Orientation: a Brazilian Meta-Analysis and An International Meta-analysis. In Brazilian Administration Review, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 40-55.

Waris, R.G. (2005). An examination of organizational culture, employee attitudes, and organizational citizenship behaviors: a path analysis approach (unpublished submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy). University of Missouri-Kansas City, MO.

Whyte, E. G. 1985. A Multivariate Analysis of the Marketing Background and Marketing Orientation of Community Mental Health Center Chief Executive Officers and og Community Mental Health Center Marketing Programs, Dissertation, University of Mississippi.

Zaman, K., Javaid, N., Arshad, A., Bibi, S. 2012.Impact of Internal Marketing on Market Orientation and Business Performance. In Interantional Journal of Business and Social Science, Vol. 3, No. 12, pp.76-87.