A Review of Defensive Strategies for Market Success

Grend, Miebaka David, Nwiepe, Naata Micheal & Kpunee, Henry Neeka
Lecturers, Marketing Department,
Ken Saro-Wiwa Polytechnic,
Bori, Rivers State,
Nigeria
nwiepemichael@yahoo.com, grenddavid@gmail.com,
mchenro70@gmail.com

Abstract
In industries in which there is strategic interaction among competing firms, companies are continuously involved in defensive strategies. In this paper we discuss several defensive strategies that managers can you for market success. Defensive strategies are divided into pre-entry and post-entry strategies. Marketing managers should attempt to discourage would be entrants before entry has occurred. They can achieve this goal by engaging in pre-entry strategies. After entry is occurred it is more difficult to persuade new entrants to exit the industry. For this reason, marketing managers should use different defensive strategies for defending their positions in pre-entry and post-entry situations.

Key words: *Defensive strategies, pre-entry strategies, post-entry strategies*

1. Introduction

Competition forces companies to constantly engage in defensive marketing strategies. Rivalry occurs because one or more competitors either feels the pressure or sees an opportunity to enter an industry or to improve its position within an industry. In most cases, competitive moves by one firm have noticeable effects on its competitors and, thus, may invite retaliation or efforts to counter the move (Porter 1980). Companies respond to competitor challenges by counterattacking with increasing advertising expenditures, cutting prices, increasing innovation, and introducing new products, or even accommodating the entrant by doing nothing or decreasing the level of marketing effort Firms grow by taking market share from rivals or creating new markets. (Karakaya and Yannopoulos, 2011., Scherer, 1980).

The incumbents' objective is to defend their market share and strengthen their position by making it harder for companies to enter or for existing firms to challenge them. Incumbent firms may also attack in an attempt to enter a new market, reposition themselves, or improve their market position. Markets are dynamic arenas where firms try to expand into their industries or reposition themselves in other segments within the industry. As firms attempt to improve their position, they engage in competitive battles and adopt offensive strategies. Successful use of offensive strategies can help a firm improve its competitive position, gain market share, and increase profits. In this paper we discuss both defensive and offensive marketing strategies. We, first, discuss the pre-entry and post-entry defensive marketing strategies, and, then, a number of offensive marketing strategies.

Activities that concentrate on post-purchase activities aimed at satisfying and maintaining firm's existing customer objected to profitability, {Morgan and Hunt, 1994;

Johnson and Selene's, 2004}.

2.0 Defensive Strategies

Because of ongoing rivalry, established firms need to engage in defensive strategies to fend off the various challengers. The primary purpose of defensive strategy is to make a possible attack unattractive and discourage potential challengers from attacking another firm. Incumbents try to shape the challenger's expectations about the industry's profitability and convince them that the return on their investment will be so low that it does not warrant making an investment in that industry. Defensive strategies work better when they take place before the challenger makes an investment in the industry, or if they enter the industry before exit barriers are raised, making it difficult for the challenger to leave the industry. For this reason, an incumbent needs to take timely action to discourage a challenger from making any substantial commitment, because once the commitment is made, it is more difficult to dissuade the challenger from following through with the attack especially if exit barriers are high. If an attack has already begun, a defending firm may attempt to lower its intensity and potential for harm, by directing the attack to areas where the firm is less vulnerable, or in areas which are less desirable to the attacker (Porter, 1985). Or they should initiate actions designed to make the entrant's life difficult after entry has occurred. This may convince the entrant that its calculations were too optimistic and its early experience in the industry is so negative that it does not warrant continuing the entry effort. (Karakaya and Yannopoulos, 2011., Scherer, 1980).

Defensive Strategy definition activities that concentrate on post-purchase activities aimed at satisfying and maintaining firm's existing customer objected to profitability (Fornel & Wernerfelt, 1987, 1988; Morgan & Hunt, 1994; Johnson & Selnes, 2004)

Over the years, marketing managers and business strategists have developed a number of defensive marketing strategies to defend their position and maintain their sales and profitability. There are two types of defensive marketing strategies. Pre-entry strategies are actions taken by incumbents before they are attacked by challengers. Defensive marketing strategies may also take the form of post-entry actions that are initiated after the challenger has entered the market.

2.1 Pre-Entry Defensive Strategies

Pre-entry defensive strategies are actions taken by firms intended to persuade potential entrants to believe that market entry would be difficult or unprofitable. Such actions include signaling, fortify and defend, covering all bases, continuous improvement, and capacity expansion.

Table 1: Defensive Strategies

Defensive strategies

Pre-entry strategies
- Signaling
- Fortify and defend
- Cover all bases
- Continuous improvement
- Capacity expansion

Post-entry strategies
- Defend position before entrant becomes established.
- Introduce fighting brands
- Engage in cross-parry

2.11 Signaling

Companies often use signaling to announce their intention to take an action. Announcements can be made through interviews with the press, press releases, speeches, trade journals, newspapers and other means. Such announcements may serve different objectives which are not necessarily mutually exclusive. They could signal commitment to the industry and therefore try to preempt or deter competitors. A defending firm can effectively keep potential entrants out of the industry by using the threat of retaliation. The higher the perceived probability of retaliation and its degree of severity, the lower the probability of attack by a challenger. Firms enhance their reputation for rigorous retaliation by the way they responded to past attacks, which signals their commitment to defend their market share. Other times, companies announce their intention to undersell their competitors. Future Shop, a large chain of consumer electronics in Canada, has publicly stated that it will not be undercut by competitors and that it will meet their prices. Announcements may be used to issue a threat that action will be taken if a competitor makes a certain move. For example, firms can announce that they will match a rival's prices, rebates, credit, or any other terms offered.

2.12 Fortify and Defend

This strategy attempts to build barriers to entry for competitors. The purpose of defensive marketing strategies is to lower the inducement to attack. Firms frequently enter an industry because existing firms earn high profits. The higher the profits earned by incumbent firms, the higher the motivation to enter. Thus, the inducement to attack can be lowered by reducing the profit expectations of the entrant. This can be achieved by raising barriers to entry for new competitors. Erecting barriers usually hinders entry by new competitors because they will have to incur costs not born by existing competitors. The most common barriers to entry include economies of scale, product differentiation, capital requirements, switching costs, experience curve cost reductions, proprietary technology or patents. Access to raw materials and other inputs, access to distribution channels, and location (Yannopoulos. 2007). Industries in which there are significant barriers to entry include the automobile, aerospace, and shipbuilding industries. Because of high barriers, entry is notoriously difficult in these industries.

2.13 Cover All Bases

Covering all bases, also called product proliferation, entails introducing new products to ensure a full product line or to fill gaps in the market. Covering all bases may involve introducing multiple versions of a product in terms of models or product types. Many firms carry full product lines to block access to the industry by new entrants. For example, the leading ready-to-eat cereal companies compete with a full-line, making it very difficult for other companies to enter and threaten their position.

This strategy is also used by chain stores when they rush to expand rapidly and keep competitors Out of the market. A firm that floods the market avoids being outflanked by competitors. It is also a way to tie up distribution channels and shelf space. For example, Procter & Gamble, a master practitioner of this strategy, dominates retail shelf space with products such as Ivory Soap, Crest, Tide, Pantene Pro-V and many others. A firm that is trying to cover all bases may face one or more of the following difficulties. First, some firms, especially the small ones, may not have the resources to offer a full product line. Second, product proliferation may cause a firm to spread its resources too thinly, violating the principle of concentration of forces at the decisive point. Covering too many markets and overextending itself leaves a firm vulnerable to competitor attacks, as it makes for an easy target. Third, this strategy cannot fully protect a company from attacks by other competitors who wish to enter the industry. Even if a firm was able to cover the major segments, it is impossible to cover every possible niche in the market. This allows small companies to enter the market and occupy these niches. These niches, although small and unattractive at the time, often explode into large segments posing a threat to established firms.

A special case of the cover-all-bases strategy is the introduction of a blocking brand. Blocking brands are used by incumbent firms to block access to the market by potential entrants. The firm introduces a brand designed to fill a niche in the market that could be used as a point of entry by a competitor. The intent of introducing a blocking brand often is to protect an existing profitable brand by precluding competitors from entering the market and stealing market share by undercutting the price of the existing product.

2.14 Continuous Improvement

A continuous improvement strategy calls for a relentless pursuit of improvements in costs, product quality, new product development, manufacturing processes, and distribution. The choice of areas to improve depends on the value proposition of the organization. A low cost competitor continuously tries to find ways of decreasing costs through economies of scale, cutting costs and introducing new production methods. A differentiated company looks for ways to maintain its competitive advantage through innovation, quality improvements, and new features among others. The continuous improvement strategy also involves innovation arid improvement in the firm’s marketing mix. Product innovation may involve offering superior features or benefits. Price innovation could include offering better sales terms and other incentives. Distribution could become more effective by looking for new channels; making existing channels more effective, and seeking strategic alliances. Promotion can become more effective by improving positioning, execution, using different media, and increasing emphasis on public relations and publicity. The sales promotion function could be examined to see if improvements could be made in the way the firm uses free samples, coupons, bonus packs, frequent buyer programs, and refunds.

Through a continuous improvement strategy, firms try to stay one step ahead of their competitors and help protect their competitive position from hostile challengers. Firms following this strategy are often required to even make their own products obsolete by replacing them with new versions. Intel is a prime example of a company that follows the continuous improvement strategy. Its strategy is to introduce new and more powerful generations of its microprocessors at regular intervals, intended to satisfy the never-ending appetite for increases in processing power for personal and corporate computer users. Each successive version of its microchip makes its existing version obsolete in the span of a few months.

2.15 Capacity Expansion

Manufacturing firms may build excess capacity as an entry deterrent strategy. When a potential entrant realizes that the industry has excess capacity and its own entry will only add to the volume of unutilized industry capacity, it will be reluctant to enter. Capacity expansion is a credible deterrent strategy if capacity costs are very high. Otherwise, if the cost of adding capacity is low or capacity can be utilized for other purposes, it would be relatively easy for rivals to enter.

DuPont used capacity expansion to increase its market share in the titanium dioxide market. In 1970, DuPont had been using limonite in the production of titanium dioxide. This proved advantageous since the price of rutile ore, the raw material used primarily by its competitors, sharply increased, giving DuPont a significant cost advantage over its competitors, In order to maximize this cost advantage, DuPont developed a growth strategy of rapidly expanding capacity to satisfy all of the future increases in demand and deter entry or expansion by existing competitors. At the time DuPont adopted this strategy, in 1972, its market share was 30%. By 1985, its market share was over 50% and five of its major rivals had exited the market (Cabral, 2000).

As a defensive strategy, capacity expansion is not as powerful as other entry deterrents such as barriers to entry. In general, a decision to use capacity expansion for entry deterring reasons should take into account the size of barriers to entry. If entry barriers are high, then capacity expansion should not nominally be used as a deterrent. On the other hand, if entry barriers are low, incumbents should consider using capacity expansion as an entry-deterring device, taking into account the cost of additional capacity and its reversibility.

2.2 Post-Entry Defensive Strategies

Post-entry defensive strategies are actions taken by firms intended to protect their market position from companies that have already entered the market or incumbents that are threatening to take away market share. Such actions include defending position before competitors become established, introducing fighting brands, and adopting cross-parry strategies.

2.21 Defend Position Before Entrant Becomes Established

When a company enters an existing market its objective usually is to get established first in its chosen market segment, consolidate its position, and then start expanding into other market segments. Upstarts are especially dangerous if they enter the market by breaking the rules of the game with radically new products, or innovations in pricing, distribution, delivery, service, and positioning. New entrants entering markets with radically new products usually come from markets unrelated to that which they are invading (Markides, 2000). For example, the personal computer industry was not invented by IBM but by companies such as Apple and Microsoft - unrelated to the existing mainframe or mini-computer business. Established firms need to defend their position while their newly entered opponents are small and venerable rather than waiting until they become strong and a serious threat. Market leaders, by consistently and swiftly meeting any moves intended to challenge their position, send out a clear message to would-be-challengers that aggressive behaviour, such as price cutting or entering core segments, will not be tolerated and that it will be met with a rigorous and painful retaliation. Therefore, such actions would not pay off and would probably make the challenger worse off. In an effort to limit losses, such counter-attacks often are not broadly based, but involve only a market segment of the defending company.

Incumbents often defend themselves by embracing and improving the intruder’s technology, attacking the upstart’s reputation as a product reliable source of supply, and hiring some of the best people of the attacking firm. Some of these tactics were used by Microsoft in 1995 in fighting the challenge of Borland Delphi, a rapid development visual computer language that was by far a superior alternative to Microsoft’s Visual Basic language. When Borland International introduced its Delphi computer language, many people predicted the demise of Visual Basic, the language that had dominated the industry since it was introduced a few years earlier.

Although the clear superiority of the Delphi programming environment encouraged a large number of programmers including some Visual Basic programmers to switch, this prediction never materialized. By sensing the threat coming from the intruder, Microsoft went on the counter-attack by hiring some of Borland Delphi's best programmers, and spending large resources on upgrading and improving Visual Basic, including providing a faster compiler, thus neutralizing one of Delphi's major advantages. Microsoft also criticized Borland Delphi as a non-mainstream language and the lack of enough Delphi programmers. Visual Basic not only survived, but it increased its stranglehold on the market, forcing Borland Delphi into an also-ran status.

2.22 Introduce Fighting Brands

Fighting brands are introduced by organizations to fight a competitor's brand that threatens one of their major brands. Competing brands are typically lower priced versions of the firm's premium brands that claim equal quality at a much lower price. Introducing fighting brands can be an appealing strategy because they help fight off a price-cutting brand that is threatening the core brand of the firm while preserving its premium image and profit margins. Heublein used a fighting brand strategy successfully to defend its Smirnoff vodka brand. When a smaller rival attacked its Smirnoff vodka, a core brand, by offering its brand at a dollar less than Smirnoff, Heublein increased the price of Smirnoff by one dollar and introduced a new fighting brand at a price below the competitor's brand. This enabled Heublein to fight the intruder without jeopardizing its core brand's profitability and image. Fighting brands can also take the form of a secret weapon that exists to wreak havoc against competitors. Like other fighting brands, their strategic goal is to defend the premium brand and to prevent competitors from making inroads against it. Companies using fighter brands as secret weapons usually try to maintain their distance from them and conceal their connections to them. For this reason they often use names of defunct companies or companies that they purchase for the sole intent of producing fighting brands.

There are risks associated with fighting brands however. There is the risk of cannibalization as the fighting brand may take sales away from other company brands. Also, the cost of producing and marketing the fighting brand may be too high, making it a losing proposition. For example, British Airways after it lost about 10 percent of its market share to the discount airlines, launched its own discount carrier, Go, in an attempt to combat EasyJet and other discount carriers. Unfortunately, Go had higher operating costs than the other discount carriers because it recognized union contracts. Three years into its Go experiment, British Airways sold the discount carrier.

2.23 Engage in Cross-Parry

Many companies compete with other companies in more than one market. The degree of multimarket contact between two firms affects the intensity of rivalry and the extent of retaliation amongst these firms. Competitors interacting in multiple markets are less motivated to compete aggressively because of the possibility of retaliation across various markets (Edwards, 1955). On the contrary, competitors have an incentive to cooperate since they stand to gain if they allow their rivals to dominate certain markets in exchange for similar treatment in the markets in which they are dominant. If multimarket contact is low, firms have an incentive to enter the market segment of their rivals to gain the ability to engage in multi market retaliation, should they come under attack (Karnani and Wernerfelt, 1985). For this reason, firms prefer to stay in certain markets to maintain the threat of multi market retaliation. Also, as multi market contact increases, firms may avoid entering new markets that are already occupied to avoid provoking any multi-market retaliation and to honor any tacit agreements that they may have made with their competitors (Baum and Korn, 1996).

Cross-parry is used when a firm that is challenged by a competitor in one area chooses to challenge this competitor in another area. For example, if a company is attacked in one of its core markets or products, instead of retaliating at the point of attack, it counter-attacks in the challenger's area of strength. In a sense, the cross- parry strategy says, "If you hurt me I will hurt you where it hurts most." By attacking the challenger in its core area, the defending firm diverts attention from its own core area and attacks the challenger where it hurts most. The objective of a cross-parry strategy is often to avoid involving the core brand in a price war. The larger firm stands to lose more than the smaller firm. In addition, such a price war not only leads to lower profit margins but it could permanently tarnish a premium brand's image. Cross parrying may be also used to send a signal to the challenging firm that it will suffer more than the cross-parrying firm. For instance, how should a company enjoying a large market share and profit margins respond when a competitor lowers its price in an effort to take market share away from the large market share firm? The natural response would be to go on the counter-attack and attack the challenger with a similar or even greater price reduction. Such a move could be quite costly for the large share firm since it would mean lower margins on a large volume just to recover the small market share lost to the challenger.
If the challenger operates in another market segment that is important to its business, but not to its competitor, a smarter move would be to attack the challenger by cutting the price in that segment.

Goodyear's response to Michelin's challenge illustrates the use of cross parry as a defensive strategy. Several years ago Michelin - using its strong European base - decided to increase its market share of the North American tire market by significantly lowering the price of its tires. Michelin's managers thought that such a price move would attract mostly new customers. They also calculated that Michelin's chief rival Goodyear would be unlikely to respond due to the significant cost such a move would imply give Goodyear's dominant market share. Michelin's calculations were partly correct, however, because Goodyear didn't match Michelin's lower price. What Michelin failed to anticipate was that Goodyear could respond with a price cut in another market. Goodyear could fight back by reducing prices in North America, or offering dealers better margins or increasing advertising spending. Such a strategy would fail because Michelin had only a small part of its worldwide business and it would lose very little by Goodyear's retaliation. Goodyear, on the other hand, stood to lose a lot because it would cut its margins in its largest market. Goodyear's response was to lower its prices in Michelin's core European markets where Michelin makes large profits. Goodyear's price reduction in Europe caused significant losses and forced Michelin to restore prices to the previous levels in North America after it incurred a significant drop in profits without raising market share appreciably. Goodyear's move slowed the pace of Michelin's expansion and made it rethink the cost of gaining market share in North America.

Personal Communication
(Sorce & Edwards, 2004; Sin et al., 2002, Morgan & Hunt, 1994): formal and informal sharing of meaningful and timely information between seller and buyer. Communication also acts as glue that holds them together. The following are item measurement for personal communication

1. We communicate personally to our customers.
2. Customer can show discontent through communication
3. We can communicate openly/honestly
4. We allocate time to communicate with our customer

5. We have dedicated line to communicate with customer

Firm-customer's Trust Development

(Berry, 1983; Berry & Parasuraman, 1991; Morgan & Hunt 1994) defined as a willingness to rely on an exchange partner in whom one has confident.

The following are item measurement for firm-customer's trust development

1. We try to trust each other
2. Our customer gives reliable inputs
3. According to our past relationship, my company try to think our customers are trustworthy

Firm-customer's Bonding Development

Defined as the dimension of a business relationship that result in two parties; the buyer and seller acting in unified manner toward a desired goal (Cross & Smith, 1995; Callaghan, 1995; Tse etal., 2004). The following are item measurement for firm-customer's bonding development

1. We rely on each other to reach our objectives
2. We both try to establish a long-term relationship
3. We work in close co- operation

Customer Complaint Management

Defined as firm's specific function to manage the dissatisfied customer in such manner that its negative and harmful effects on firm are minimized (Fornel & Wernerfelt, 1987, 1988):

The following are item measurement for customer complaint management

1. Firm provide customer service department
2. Firm add customer complaint function in the formal organization's structure
3. Firm train employee to deal with customer complaint
4. Firm provide compensation for customer who's claimed is constructive

References

Agung, I G. N. (2003), Statistika: *Penerapan Metode Analisis untuk Tabulasi Sempurna dan* Tak Sempurna, Jakarta, Raja Grafindo Persada.

Atuahene-Gima, Kwaku and Janet Y. Muray (2004), *Antecedents and Outcomes of Marketing Strategy Comprehensiveness*, *Journal of Marketing*, (68) (33-46).

Bagozzi, Richard P. (1975), Social Exchange in Marketing, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, (3) (314-327).

Bagozzi, Richard P. (1975), Marketing as Exchange, *Journal of Marketing*, (39) (32-39).

Berry, Leonard L., (1983), Relationship Marketing, in Pels, Jaqueline, (1999), Exchange Relationship in Consumer Market? *European Journal of Marketing*, (33) (19).

Berry, Leonard L., and A. Parasuraman (1991), Marketing Services: *Competing Through Quality*, Free Press, New York, NY.

Boyd, D. Eric (1996), Defensive Marketing's Use of Post-Purchase Telecommunications to Create Competitive Advantages: A Strategic Analysis, *The Journal of Consumer Marketing*

Burke, Marian C. (1984), Strategic Choice and Marketing Managers: An Examination of Business- Level Marketing Objectives, *Journal of Marketing Research*, (13) (26) (345).

Callaghan, M., McPhail J., and Oliver .H.M. Yau (1995), Dimension of Relationship Marketing Orientation, in Sin, Leo Y.M., Alan C.B. Tse,

Oliver H.M. Yau and Jenny S.Y. Lee (2002), The Effect of Relationship Marketing

Orientation on Business Performance in a Service-Oriented Economy, *Journal of Services Marketing*, (16) (656).

Christopher, M., Payne &, D. Ballantyne (1991), *Relationship Marketing*, Oxford Butterworth- Heinemann.

Churchil, Jr, Gilbert A. (1979), A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Constructs, *Journal of Marketing Research*, (64-73).

Cross, Richard, and Janet Smith (1995), *Customer Bonding; Pathway to Lasting Customer Loyalty*, Illinois, NTC Business Book.

Fornell, Claes and B. Wenerfelt, (1987), Defensive Marketing Strategy by Customer Complaint Management: A Theoretical Analysis, *Journal of Marketing Research*, (24) (337).

Fornell, Claes and B. Wernerfelt (1988), A Model for Customer Complaint Management, Marketing Science, (287).

Gibbons, Patrick, Rosemary Kennealy and Geraldine Lavin (2003), *Adaptability and Performance Effect of Business Level Strategies: An Empirical Test*, *Irish Marketing Review*, (16) 57.

Hambrick, Donald C., (1983), Some Test of the Effectiveness and Functional Attributes of Miles and Snow's Strategic Type, *Academy of Management Journal*, (26) (5).

Hamsal, Mohammad (2006), *The Effect of Paradoxical Strategies on Firm Performance: An Empirical Study of Indonesian Banking Industry*, Unpublished Dissertation.

Hauser, J. R., and S.M. Shugan (1983). *Defensive Marketing Strategy*, *Marketing Science*, (2) (319-360).

Hooley, Graham, John Sauders and Nigel Piercy (2004) *Marketing Management and Competitive Positioning*, 3rd Edition, Great Britain, Prentice Hall.

Johnson, Michael D. and Fred Selnes. (2004), Customer Portfolio Management: Toward a Dynamic Theory of Exchange Relationship, *Journal of Marketing*, (66) (1-17).

Karakaya, Fahri and Telfic Dalgic (1999), Defensive Marketing and Entry Deterrence Strategy Framework in Global Market, *American Marketing Association*, *Conference Preceding.*

Keegan, Warren J. and Hugh Davidson (2003), Offensive Marketing, UK, Elsevier, Butterworth- Heinemann. (250).

Kotler, Philip and Ravi Singh (1981), Marketing Warfare, Journal of Business Strategy, Vol.1, Kuntjoro-Jakti, Dorodjatun, Wawan Suwarman and Samsul Arifin (2007), Identifikasi Sektor Perekonomian Utama Propinsi DKI Jakarta, Working Paper.

Lambe, Jay C., Robert Spekman & Shelby D Hunt (2000), Interimistic Relational Exchange: Conceptualization and Propositional Development, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, (28) (2) (212-225).

Miles, Raymond E & Charles C. Snow, (2003), *Organizational Strategy*, *Structure and Process*, Stanford Business Classic, California, Stanford University Press,

Morgan and Hunt, (1994), The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing, *Journal of Marketing*, (58) (20-38).

Narver, John C. and Stanley F. Slater (1990), *The Effect of Market Orientation on Business Profitability*, *Journal of Marketing*, (54) (20).

Roberson, Eliashberg and Rymon (1995), New Product announcement Signals and Incumbent Reaction, *Journal of Marketing*, (59) (1).

Segev, Eli., (1987), *Strategy, Strategy Making, and Performance. An Empirical Investigation*, *Management Science*, (33) (258).

Sheth, J.H. & Parvatiyar, A. (1995), The Evolution of Relationship Marketing, International Business Review, (4) (4) (397-419).

Slater, Stanley F. and John C. Narver (1994); Does Competitive Environment Moderate the

Market Orientation Performance Relationship?, *Journal of Marketing*, (58) (46).

Sorce, Patricia and Kimberly Edwards (2004), Defining Business-to-Consumer Relationships: The Consumer's Perspective, *Journal of Database Marketing & Consumer Strategy Management*, (24)(35-54)

Steenkamp, Jan-Benedict E. M., Vincent R. Nijs, Dominique M. Hanssens and Marnik G. Dekimpe (2005), Competitive Reactions to Advertising and Promotion Attacks, *Journal of Marketing Science*, (24) (35–54).

Schwarz, C.J. (2006), Sampling, Regression, Experimental Design and Analysis for Scientist, Biologist and Resource Manager, Simon Fraser University.

Tse, Alan C.B., Leo Y.M. Sin, Oliver H.M. Yau, Jenny S.Y. Lee, and Raymind Chow (2004), A firm's Role in the Market Place and the Relative Importance of Market Orientation and Relationship Marketing Orientation, *European Journal of Marketing*, (38) (1158).

Venkatesan, Rajkumar and V. Kumar. (2004), A Customer Lifetime Value Framework for Customer Selection and Resources Allocation Strategy, *Journal of Marketing*, (68) (106-125).

Vorhies, Douglas, W. and Michael Harker (2000), The Capabilities and Performance Advantage of Market-Driven Firms: An Empirical Investigation, *Australian Journal of Management*, (22) (467) 145.