

**LITERATURE REVIEW ON INFLUENCE OF ENTREPRENEURIAL MARKETING ORIENTATION ON COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE AMONG MOBILE SERVICE PROVIDERS IN KENYA**

**Geoffrey Gitau**

Kabarak University Business School, Kenya

**Elegwa Mukulu**

Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya

**John Kihoro**

Cooperative University College of Kenya, Kenya

**CITATION:** Gitau, G., Mukulu, E. & Kihoro, J. (2014). Literature review on influence of entrepreneurial marketing orientation on competitive advantage among mobile service providers in Kenya. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Entrepreneurship*, 1 (13), 300-322.

**ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this paper is to critically review literature on entrepreneurial marketing (EM) as an organizational function and a set of processes for creating, communicating and delivering value to customers. The objective of this review is to develop a suitable conceptual framework to study the influence of EM on competitive advantage (CA) among mobile service providers (MSPs) in Kenya. The methodology used involves online search of literature, selection of articles, and critical evaluation and synthesis of empirical literature so as to identify consistent evidence, contradictions, relationships, and research gaps. Linkages are established between EM and CA by use of a proposed integrative conceptual framework model that includes a number of key factors surrounding the phenomenon of EM. Seven core dimensions of EM are identified and explored. Insights are synthesized from various literatures, including the work on entrepreneurial orientation, market orientation, strategic orientation and resource leveraging. The review found that, although many researchers have adopted different EM models; innovation, risk taking, pro-activeness, customer intensity, value creation and resource leveraging were the commonly adopted dimensions of EM. Priorities are proposed for continuing research, and implications are drawn for theory development, teaching, and managerial practice.

**Key Words:** *Entrepreneurship, Marketing, Entrepreneurial marketing, Kenya*

**Introduction**

New competitive landscape is a fact that companies must constantly contend with. The contemporary business environment can be characterized in terms of increased risk, decreased ability to forecast, fluid firm and industry boundaries, a managerial mindset that must unlearn traditional management principles, and new structural forms that not only allow for change but also help create it (Morris, Schindehutte and LaForge, 2002).

Entrepreneurial marketing is an organizational function and a set of processes for creating, communicating and delivering value to customers and for managing customer relationships in ways that benefit the organization and its stakeholders, and that is characterized by innovativeness, risk-taking, pro-activeness, and may be performed without resources currently controlled (Kraus, Harms & Fink, 2009). The central part of the study focuses on influence of entrepreneurial marketing strategies on competitive advantage of a firm. Miles & Darroch (2006) suggested that the ability to effectively and efficiently harness entrepreneurship to create superior value offerings for customers determines which firms succeed in the marketplace.

### **Global perspective on EM**

Kraus et al., (2009) discussed an alternative conceptualization of EM that can be understood as “marketing with an entrepreneurial mindset”. They combined the definition of marketing of the with two conceptualizations of entrepreneurship (entrepreneurial orientation and entrepreneurial management) to arrive at a definition of EM as the organizational function of marketing by taking into account innovativeness, risk taking, pro-activeness and the pursuit of opportunities without regard for the resources currently controlled. Large firms leverage entrepreneurial marketing processes to gain advantage (Miles & Darroch, 2006). Their findings suggested that, in free and open markets, entrepreneurial marketing processes can be strategically employed to create superior value for the firm’s customers and owners.

In a research paper entitled “Entrepreneurial Marketing as a Coping Strategy within an Economic Crisis”, Hatak, Schmid and Roessl (2013) found that EM was a general success factor for SMEs that coped with global financial crisis successfully in the Austrian economy. While some SMEs coped with the global financial crisis successfully, others faced existential problems, leading to the question as to what strategies helped the successful enterprises find their way out of the crisis. Hatak et al. (2013) used pro-activeness, risk-taking, innovativeness, customer intimacy, customer value, market driving and resource leveraging as the explanatory variables in the research problem. Using a sample size 560 SMEs in the Turkish manufacturing industry Hacioglu, Eren, Eren and Celikkan (2012) analyzed results revealed that pro-activeness, innovativeness, customer intensity, resource leveraging dimensions of entrepreneurial marketing are positively related with innovative performance. Therefore, Hatak et al. (2013) findings that EM contributed to success of the enterprise also supported Hacioglu et al. (2012) findings and the conceptual framework by Morris et al. (2002).

### **Local perspective on EM**

In Kenya the subject of EM is still at its infancy as compared to the attention given to firm competitive advantage. Gathenya (2012) and Otieno, Bwisa and Kihoro (2012) found that if a firm has a superior market position, or competitive advantage, it will generate superior financial returns over its competitors. Namusonge (2014) found that firms in Kenya differed among

themselves (by sector type) with respect to their competitive strategies. The mobile phone industry is very competitive and for an enterprise to survive, aggressive marketing should be undertaken (Rumba, 2008). Marketing capabilities have been found to contribute significantly to the Mobile Service Providers (MSP) intermediary organizations' performance in Kenya (Karanja, Muathe & Thuo, 2014). Nasution, Mavondo, Matanda & Ndubisi (2011) proposed a model to measures of product, process and administrative innovation capability for a firm.

The Mobiles Services Sector in Kenya has been a great success story. By the end of the first quarter of the 2012/13 financial year, there were a total of 30.4 million subscriptions. In the period under review, the population that had access to mobile telephony services continued to record positive growth. Mobile penetration increased to 77.2 per 100 inhabitants up from 75.4 per 100 inhabitants recorded during the previous quarter. This growth in the mobile services sector is a remarkable achievement given the fact that total fixed lines were recorded as 248,300 during the quarter down from 262,711 subscriptions in the previous quarter, posting a decline of 30.2 percent (CCK, 2012).

Regardless of the success depicted by CCK (2012) report, the country's four mobile service providers had mixed performance. Safaricom enjoyed a subscriber marker share of 63%, followed by Airtel at 17%, Yu at 10%, and Orange at 10%. Over and above that Safaricom recorded 77.5% of all calls, 93.7% of SMS market, and 72.6% of data market share. This shows that although 35.5% claimed to subscribe to other mobile networks they mostly used Safaricom services handing it a pre-tax profit of USD 300 million with a return on investment of 0.3125 (Safaricom, 2013). These statistics point to the sheer dominance of Safaricom. The key question is why this un-paralleled superior position in contrast to its competitors. Do customers perceive higher customer value in Safaricom or why do they subscribe to it more?

Schumpeter (1934) identified innovation as the critical dimension of economic change. He argued that economic change revolves around innovation, entrepreneurial activities, and market power. Further, he also attempted to prove that innovation-originated market power could provide better results than the invisible hand and price competition (Saylor Foundation, 2012). In view of this background the mobile services sector needs to embrace entrepreneurial marketing strategies based on innovation to sustain demand and offer attractive customer value. This is the focus of this study to review how entrepreneurship can be applied in this sector through entrepreneurial marketing strategies for achieving higher customer value.

### **Statement of the problem**

The landscape of mobile service providers in Kenya exhibits an extreme variance where one provider seems to be enjoys unparalleled market lead with over 63% market share and over 80% business volume and the other three providers sharing the rest (Moraa & Mwangi, 2012; Croft, 2010). This state of affairs has persisted over a number of years despite the fact the

Communications Commissions of Kenya (CCK) has tried different interventions in an attempt to restore equilibrium in this sector (CCK, 2012). The effect of this problem is what UNCTAD (2011) calls “walled garden” mobile operators, where they charge their own users much less and exorbitant rates across other providers. For example, the leading provider charges up to 7.5 times more to send the same amount of money to a user on another mobile network compared to sending it within the Safaricom’s M-PESA (mobile money transfer system) network. Through their dominant position the market leader continues reporting the highest profits in the region year to year while the competitors are struggling to remain profitable. But despite this, the provider has a captive market of many users by the fact that even after CCK introduced number portability where users could move to another provider while retaining their allocated mobile number, the intervention also failed to bring any significant change (Kagwathi, Njau & Kagiira, 2013). This phenomenal competitive advantage, where the customer is persistently locked in by one competitor while the competitor is locked out almost indefinitely, needs to be unraveled.

### **General objective**

The general objective of this study is to determine the influence of entrepreneurial marketing on competitive advantage among mobile service providers in Kenya.

### **Specific objectives**

1. To determine the influence of mobile service provider’s entrepreneurial orientation on competitive advantage among mobile service providers in Kenya.
2. To observe how market orientation influenced competitive advantage among mobile service providers in Kenya.
3. To establish how strategic orientation influenced competitive advantage among mobile service providers in Kenya.
4. To determine influence of resource leveraging on competitive advantage among mobile service providers in Kenya.

### **Literature Review**

#### **Theoretical framework**

This theoretical framework provides a lens to view the perplexing the phenomenon of skewed competitive advantage of one mobile service provider in Kenya against waning performance of the other three MSPs. Theories advancing entrepreneurial marketing emphasize on entrepreneurship and marketing interface paradigm to explore how well existing marketing models fit their environment and depict processes found in entrepreneurial organizations (Hills & La Forge, 1992; Omar & Idris, 2010). The central focus of the entrepreneurial marketing is the marketing orientation interfaced with entrepreneurial proclivity. This overlap represents an

integrative concept that brings in creative approaches to risk management, resource leveraging, and value creation for the customer (Morris et al. 2002, Miles & Darroch, 2006; Hacıoglu et al., 2012; Hatak et al., 2013).

### **Theory on Competitive Advantage**

The outcome dependent variable of the study was competitive advantage of the firm. Competitive advantage can be defined as a positional superiority, based on the provision of superior customer value or the achievement of lower relative costs. To gain competitive advantage, companies can adopt two strategies, either differentiation of their products or cost leadership so as to develop higher quality product and service or by satisfying customer's needs at a lower cost (Porter, 1985; Gathenya, 2012; Otieno et al., 2012). Strong emphasis on service differentiation has been found to lead to higher quality of service (Gebauer, Gustafsson, & Witell, 2011). However, for the most part, consumers are unaware of the true cost of production for the products they buy. Instead, they simply have an internal feeling for how much certain products are worth to them. Therefore, it is this customer's perceived value of a good or service that ultimately affects the price that he or she is willing to pay for it. A customer value is measured by the ratio of benefits the customer gets versus the burden they endure (Ulaga, 2001). Therefore, quality of service and customer perceived value can adequately drive competitive advantage of a firm. When customer value drives strategy, firms can grow faster, generate higher profits and deliver better shareholder value. A customer value proposition delivers a combination of values; economic value, functional value, emotional value and symbolic (social) value to the customer (Sweeney & Soutar, 2001; Rintamaki, Kuusela & Mitronen, 2007).

### **Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO) theory**

The question of how much MSPs entrepreneurial orientation influence competitive advantage among mobile service providers in Kenya can be explained from the EO theory. The term "entrepreneurial orientation" has been used to refer to the strategy-making processes and styles of firms that engage in entrepreneurial activities (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001). Miller (1983) characterized an entrepreneurial firm as "one that engages in product - market innovation, undertakes somewhat risky ventures, and is first to come up with "proactive" innovations, beating competitors to the punch". He used the dimensions of innovation, pro-activeness, and risk-taking to measure entrepreneurship. These three dimensions have been adopted by most previous studies (Covin & Slevin, 1991; Gathenya, 2012). Although the term entrepreneurial orientation has been used to widely refer to the set of personal psychological traits, values, attributes, and attitudes strongly associated with a motivation to engage in entrepreneurial activities (McClelland, 1961; Timmons, 2000), entrepreneurial orientation is also a firm-level construct is closely linked to strategic management and the strategic decision making process (Covin & Slevin, 1991; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Lumpkin & Dess, 2001; Zellweger & Sieger, 2010).

Extant literature on entrepreneurship state that there is close relationship between innovation and market structure. Schumpeter (1942, cited in Kraus et al., 2009) stressed the innovative role of the entrepreneur – creating new combinations, doing new things by recombining parts of what is already being done. Further innovation creates a monopoly position and the defense of which brings further innovation to maintain virtuous circle. Once a company, through innovation, achieves a monopoly position it then tends to reinforce this position, controlling and extending the period of benefit due to agreements with partners on innovation and patents (Fagerberg, 2009; Laino, 2011). Continued innovation creates a string of the so-called Schumpeterian rents based on temporary monopolies and the extent of how long these competitive advantages can be enjoyed is determined by the speed of imitability by competitors (Rothaermel, 2008).

Within the firm there are three types of strategic risk: venturing into the unknown, committing a relatively large portion of assets, borrowing heavily (Baird & Thomas, 1985). The degree to which managers are willing to make large and risky resource commitments - those which have a reasonable chance of costly failures can typify a firm risk-taking behavior, such as incurring heavy debt or making large resource commitments, in the interest of obtaining high returns by seizing opportunities in the marketplace (Miller & Friesen, 1978; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Arbaugh, Cox & Camp, 2009). Operationalizing firm-level risk taking remains an area for future development but presently the accepted and widely used scale is based on Miller (1983) to Entrepreneurial Orientation which measures risk taking at the firm level by asking managers about the firm's liking to engage in risky projects and managers' preferences for bold versus cautious acts to achieve firm objectives.

Pro-activeness is an opportunity-seeking, forward-looking perspective involving introducing new products or services ahead of the competition and acting in anticipation of future demand to create change and shape the environment (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001; Gathenya, 2012). By exploiting asymmetries in the marketplace, the first mover can capture unusually high profits and get into leadership on establishing brand recognition. Thus, taking initiative by anticipating and pursuing new opportunities and by participating in emerging markets also has become associated with entrepreneurship. A proactive firm is a leader rather than a follower, because it has the will, with competitive aggressiveness and foresight, to seize new opportunities - even if it is not always the first to do so (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Lumpkin & Dess, 2001).

### **Marketing orientation (MO) theory**

Influence of MO in an organization competitive advantage has a matter of research enquiry many years. It is an organization's response to the external the environment – how the firm deals with customers and competitors (Kumar, Jones, Venkatesan & Leone, 1998). Hills, Hultman and Miles (2008) found that marketing processes in entrepreneurial marketing did not follow traditional marketing mix variables of price, place, promotion, and product. Instead entrepreneurial marketers “live” continuously with the market, their vision and customers’

preferences present in their minds, constantly thinking of how to improve customer value. When they recognize a way to use marketing to gain competitive advantage they tend not to be constrained by their previous conceptualization of strategy, but quickly adapt their strategy to the new set of opportunities.

Distinct but complementary views of MO have emerged in the literature namely: MO as a corporate culture that puts customers' interests first (Deshpande & Farley, 1998), MO as a combination of customer orientation and competitor orientation (Day & Wensley, 1988; Narver & Slater, 1990) and MO as the generation and dissemination of, and responsiveness to, market intelligence/information (Kohli & Jaworski 1990; Jaworski & Kohli, 1993). Market orientation is seen as an organizational behavior that develops capabilities to acquiring market intelligence, disseminating them within the company, and responding by developing products that fulfill market needs, all of which can result in a firm's competitive advantage (Tajudin, Musa & Musa, 2012). An additional view is system-based perspective. It conceptualizes MO in terms of different organizational activities. The management system is divided into five subsystems: organization, information, planning, controlling, and human resource. The researcher has chosen to adopt the cultural perspective of MO by Narver & Slater (1990) since the study focuses on competitive advantage of the firm through the customer perception of the firm's offerings.

Unlike production orientation and sales orientation, MO balances customer intensity, product quality and aggressive promotion. A firm practicing MO will exhibit three behavioral components: a customer orientation, a competitor orientation, and inter-functional coordination along with two decision criteria a long-term focus and profitability (Narver & Slater, 1990). Customer orientation is the sufficient understanding of one's target buyers to be able to create superior value for them continuously. It requires that a seller understand a buyer's entire value chain (Day & Wensley, 1988). Competitor orientation on the other hand requires that the organization must consider not only how well its products suit customer needs but how well it performs relative to its competitors (Hsieh, Chiu & Hsu, 2008). Companies must gather intelligence on the short and long-term strengths, weaknesses, capabilities and strategies of both the key current and the key potential competitors (Hsieh et al., 2008; Narver & Slater, 1990). The analysis of competitors' long-term capabilities, strengths and weaknesses is a key factor in determining MO and culture. Employees from every department in a market-driven organization share information about competitors because this information can be used to build a competitive advantage.

Finally, inter-functional coordination is the coordinated utilization of company resources in creating superior value for target customers. Organizational resources often have conflicting perspectives, priorities, and strategies (Nakata & Sivakumar, 2001). Academics and practitioners have long argued that synergy among organizational members is needed so value for customers is continuously created (Day, 1994; Jaworski & Kohli, 1993, Alhakimi & Baharun, 2009). A

culture of integrating all functions toward creating customer value should lead to MO within the organization and successful implementation of the marketing concept (Harrison & Shaw, 2004).

### **Porter's Strategic Management Theory**

The influence of strategic orientation (SO) on a firm's competitive advantage involves a dialogue of how strategic management can catalyze a firm's competitive advantage. In reference to Porter (1980) there are three generic business level strategies that firms use to compete in an industry: the low-cost strategy, the differentiation strategy and the focus strategy. The low-cost leadership occurs when a firm seeks to be the lowest cost provider to most customer segments so as to remain competitive in the market Kumar et al., 2011. Differentiation strategy on the other hand is where a company seeks to develop products that offer unique attributes that are valued by customers. Normally this will allow the company to charge a premium price that will more than cover the extra costs incurred thereby increasing margins and profits. Differentiation can be achieved in a number of ways for example by offering superior quality or performance, unusual or unique features, more responsive customer service, and rapid product innovation (Porter, 2008).

A firm pursuing the focus strategy concentrates on a particular group of customers, geographical markets, or product line segments. The focuser selects a segment or a group of segments in the industry and tailors its strategy to serving them to the exclusion of others. Typically the target segment has buyers with unusual needs from that of other industry segments. By optimizing its strategy for the target segments, the focuser seeks to achieve a competitive advantage in its target segments. Porter's idea of a focus strategy is basically to reduce the scope of the intended audience for product or service. It is a niche strategy used to reach a market segment whose needs are different from those of the larger market (Namusonge, 2014). In his original work Porter argued that companies must choose between low cost or differentiation or they ran the risk of being "stuck in the middle". He argues that rather than choose between the two strategies companies should look to create greater value by using different sets of activities (Porter, 1996). Michael Porter's strategic management theory provides a suitable framework to construct the conceptual framework for the study. Its classical view of firm strategy approach can map into the mobile service providers strategies exemplified by their products and services configurations. Customers may perceive these strategies differently so the instruments presented for data collection shall allow collection of data on how the customers perceive each of the service providers in view of their strategic orientation (Porter, 2008).

### **Resource Based View (RBV) Theory**

Resource leveraging as a factor that can contribute to a firm's competitive advantage attempts to explain how a firm can use even resources it does not own to gain competitive advantage. According to a wide literature the RBV theory can explain the variances in performance between



firms (Gaya, Struwig & Smith, 2013). This theory attributes competitive advantage to the ownership and control of unique bundles of competitive resources. The origin of RBV has been traced to the work of Penrose (1959) who described a firm as a “bundle of resources” the disposal of which between different uses and over time is determined by management decision making (Wernerfelt, 1984; Amit & Shoemaker, 1993; Gaya et al., 2013). However, it is Wernerfelt (1984) who coined and introduced the term, “resource-based view” and argued that the difficulty facing a firm in owning a resource is comparable to difficulties facing the firm when entering an industry. As a result, the resource-based view developed as an explanation of performance differences between firms in the strategic management literature (Thompson, Peteraf, Gamble & Strickland, 2012). The resource-based view is used to determine whether the firm’s initial bundle of resources and subsequent resource configurations are the sources of a particular firm’s competitive advantage (Thompson et al., 2012) and to what extent the process of customer value creation is resource dependent (Gaya et al. 2013). Customer value creation processes involves how a firm combines core competencies or recombine activities of a firm with the competitive resources to create value for the customer through process and service differentiation, low cost structure and superior customer focus through superior customer responsiveness.

Resources, which are the basic unit of analysis for RBV, can be defined as those assets that are tied semi-permanently to the firm (Wernerfelt, 1984). It includes financial, physical, human, commercial, technological, and organizational assets used by firms to develop, manufacture, and deliver products and services to its customers (Barney, 1991, Gaya et al. 2013). To be sustainable, a firm resource must be valuable, rare, and imperfectly imitable and non-substitutable in order to be source of a sustained competitive advantage (Barney, 1991; Day, 1994; Qureshi, Mian & Oswego, 2010). In view of this proposed study the RBV theory provides a suitable framework for constructs formation to measure the effect of firm’s resource leveraging on the firm’s competitive advantage. This RBV theory has been adopted by numerous researches’ constructs on entrepreneurial marketing (Hisrich, 1989; Morris et al., 2002; Hatak et al., 2013).

### **Conceptual Framework**

This literature review has already provided an overview of theories that the researcher will adopt to explain the problem of skewed competitive advantage among mobile services providers in Kenya. It has detailed the concepts that are presented as explanatory to this problem.

### **Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO)**

Entrepreneurial orientation in an enterprise refers to conceptualizations of enterprise’s opportunity recognition and exploitation as an innovative, risk-taking, proactive area of

managerial responsibility (Morris et al., 2002; Thomas et al., 2013). It assumes that the pursuit of opportunities will lead to new practices enhancing future success and wealth creation.

### **Innovation**

Innovation involves the ability at an organizational level to maintain a flow of internally and externally motivated new ideas that are translatable into new products, services, processes, technology applications, and/or markets. Thus, the entrepreneurs/managers continually champion new approaches to segmentation, pricing, use of the brand, packaging, customer relationship management, customer credit, logistics, customer communication, and service levels, among other operational activities. Consequently, entrepreneurial marketing encourages innovation and creates and renews competitive advantage through customer value propositions in current and new markets (Achrol & Kotler, 2001; Gathenya, 2012; Thomas et al., 2013). This parameter shall be measured by customers' observable innovations for products, markets, process and raw materials that the firm is utilizing.

### **Risk-taking**

Risk-taking reflects on the propensity to devote resources to projects that pose a substantial possibility of failure, along with chances of high returns. (Venkatraman, 1989a; Qureshi et al., 2010). Risk-taking entrepreneurial orientation is accomplished with a wide range of devices, including intelligence gathering efforts, test markets, working with lead customers, staged product launches, outsourcing of various activities tied to a new product or service, borrowing or sharing resources, and partnerships with suppliers, distributors and competitors. The risks are not extreme and uncontrollable but instead are moderate, calculated, and manageable (Morris et al., 2002; Gathenya, 2012). The parameter shall be measured by the customers' observations of the initiatives the firm has taken.

### **Pro-activeness**

As presented in the literature review earlier, pro-activeness has been argued as an initiative of entrepreneurial managers to provide the vision and imagination necessary to engage in opportunistic expansion (Penrose, 1959, Kraus et al., 2009). A proactive firm is a leader rather than a follower, because it has the will, with competitive aggressiveness and foresight, to seize new opportunities - even if it is not always the first to do so (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). The parameter shall be measured by customer's perception on whether their service provider frequently introduces new products and brands ahead of competition and characteristic of frequent and extensive technological and product innovation (Miller & Camp, 1985; Covin & Slevin, 1991; Gathenya, 2012).

### **Market orientation**

EM perceives marketing to be a fully integrated element of the entrepreneurial process. It is a dialogue where expectations are being created and recreated; value proposition of the tangible product is dominated by the value accruing to the consumer of intangible services (Gaddefors & Anderson, 2008). Market orientation therefore involves a focus on the external business environment in creating, communicating and delivering value to customers beyond the traditional marketing mix of product, price, placement and promotion (Kraus et al., 2009). It is the organization culture that most effectively and efficiently creates the necessary behavior for the creation of superior value for buyers and, thus, continuous superior performance for the business (Narver & Slater, 1990). This variable shall be measured by customer orientation (customer intensity and value creation) and competitor orientation. Customer intensity measures the extent to which a firm is focused on dealing with existing customer needs while customer value creation is measured by proclivity of the firm in discovering, understanding and fulfilling of latent customer needs. These two shall be measured by a scale used by Narver, Slater, & MacLachlan (2004). In contrast to Morris et al. (2002), Narver et al. (2004) labeled customer intensity as responsive market orientation (RMO) and proactive market orientation (PMO).

### **Strategic orientation**

Based on findings of Morris et al (2002) a firm should have strategic flexibility - the ability to quickly recognize changing market needs or conditions, customize products, and serve different markets in different ways by continuously rethinking and making adjustments to the firm's strategies, action plans, and resource allocations, as well as to company structure, culture, and managerial systems. Firms must strike a balance in their innovation activities between pioneering initiatives that lead the market and quick, creative adaptation to changes in market circumstances. However, Porter (1980) posited that there are three generic business level strategies that firms use to compete in an industry: the low-cost strategy, the differentiation strategy and the focus strategy. The low-cost leadership strategy occurs when a firm strives to be the lowest cost provider to most customer segments so as to remain competitive in the market Kumar et al., (2011). The differentiators on the other hand strive to create unique products/services at reasonable costs; while the focusers strive to reduce the scope of their intended audience for the product/service by serving a market segment whose needs are different from those of the larger market (Namusonge, 2014). The researcher shall measure which strategic orientation has the firm adopted as perceived by the customers.

### **Resource leveraging**

Resource leveraging involves skillful approaches to utilization of financial resources, human capital, technology, strategic partnerships and alliances so as to achieve more with little such as effective incorporation of new and emerging technologies to fulfill customer orders accurately and swiftly (Kraus et al., 2008). Where a company's ambition forever outpaces resources

entrepreneurial marketers can overcome resource constraints in a number of different ways: stretching resources much farther than others have done in the past; getting uses out of resources that others are unable to realize; using other people's (or firm's) resources to accomplish one's own purpose; complementing one resource with another to create higher combined value; and using certain resources to obtain other resources (Morris et al., 2002). In this case one should recognize a resource that is not being used completely, see how the resource could be used in a non-conventional way, get team members to work extra hours, convince departments to perform activities they normally do not perform, or put together unique sets of resources that, when blended, are synergistic (Hitak et al., 2013). To measure this variable the researcher shall determine how the customers view the firm's ability to use resources such as financial position, partnerships and technological resources.

**Competitive Advantage**

Company can only gain competitive advantage over its rivals by either performing at a lower costs or performing in a way, that leads to differentiation (Porter & Millar, 1985), which creates superior customer value (Huber, Herrmann & Morgan, 2001). Types of customer perceived value (PERVAL) include economic value, functional value, emotional value and symbolic (social) value to the customer (Sweeney & Soutar, 2001; Rintamaki et al., 2007).

**Table 1: PERVAL parameters: Source Sweeney & Soutar (2001).**

<b>PERVAL Parameters</b>	<b>Items</b>
<p><b>Quality/Performance (functional value):</b> The utility derived from the perceived quality and expected performance of the Product</p>	<p>has consistent quality is well made has an acceptable standard of quality has poor workmanship (*) would <i>not</i> last a long time (*) would perform consistently</p>
<p><b>Price/value for money (functional value):</b> The utility derived from the product due to the reduction of its perceived short term and longer term costs</p>	<p>is reasonably priced offers value for money is a good product for the price would be economical</p>
<p><b>Social value (enhancement of social self-concept):</b> The utility derived from the product's ability to enhance social self-Concept</p>	<p>would help me to feel acceptable would improve the way I am perceived would make a good impression on other People would give its owner social approval</p>
<p><b>Emotional value:</b> The utility derived from the feelings or affective states that a product Generates</p>	<p>is one that I would enjoy would make me want to use it is one that I would feel relaxed about using would make me feel good would give me pleasure</p>

(\*) reverse scored.

Auka (2012) found that service quality (SERVQUAL) plays a critical part in shaping customers experiences and how the experiences effect on overall organizations competitive advantage. SERVQUAL model, views service quality as the gap between the expected level of service and customer perceptions of the level received Zeithaml (2008) are the creators of this instrument which is used for the measurement of customer perceptions of service quality. If what is perceived exceeds the expectations then customers think quality to be high and if what is perceived below the expectation then customers think quality to be low. The researchers developed ten general dimensions namely: tangibles, reliability responsiveness, competence, courtesy, credibility, security, access, communications, and understanding which are evaluated in SERVQUAL. This model was revised later by Parasuraman (1997) based on the result of an empirical study on five service companies, including a telecommunication company too. They noticed that some of the ten dimensions were correlated and refined the model to five dimensions: reliability, responsiveness assurance, empathy, and tangibles. Many researches quoted these five elements to be the most important dimensions to the buyers and these are the parameters that shall be used by this study.

- a. Tangibles: This is the appearance of physical facilities, equipment, personnel, and communication material of an organization (Kotler, 2001; Zeithaml, 2008). Customers also look for quality in the equipment, facilities, and communication materials used to provide the service (Islam, 2012).
- b. Reliability: This is the ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately is the reliability (Kotler, 2001; Zeithaml, 2008). Customers also want performance to be consistent and dependable (Islam 2012).
- c. Responsiveness: The willingness to help customers and provide prompt service (Kotler, 2001; Zeithaml, 2008). Customer must also see service provider as ready and willing to perform (Islam 2012).
- d. Assurance: The knowledge and courtesy of employees and their ability to convey trust and confidence (Kotler, 2001; Zeithaml, 2008).
- e. Empathy: The provision of caring, individualized attention to the customer (Kotler, 2001; Zeithaml, 2008).

### **Empirical review**

In the recent times entrepreneurial marketing has become a contemporary area of study on application of entrepreneurship in marketing and also application of marketing in entrepreneurship. The researcher has selected a number of empirical studies that have demonstrated significant contribution in entrepreneurial marketing. This empirical literature is summarized in the table that follows:

**Table 2: Summary of empirical review variables adopted by different researchers**

Author/ reviewed	Factors	Entrepreneurial orientation	Market orientation	Others
Morris et al., 2002		Opportunity focus, Pro-activeness, Risk-taking, Innovativeness,	Customer intensity, value creation	Resource leveraging
Miles & Darroch, 2006		Risk management, Pro-activeness, Opportunity driven, Innovation	Customer intensity, value creation	Resource leveraging
Hacioglu et al., 2012		Pro-activeness, Risk-taking, Innovativeness, Opportunity focus	Customer intensity, value creation	Resource leveraging
Hatak et al., 2013		Pro-activeness, Risk-taking, Innovativeness	Customer intimacy, Customer value, Market driving	Resource leveraging

While conducting a study on the emergence of Entrepreneurial Marketing: Nature and Meaning; Morris et al. (2002) critically examined the concept of entrepreneurial marketing. Morris et al. (2002) identified seven EM dimensions (opportunity focus, pro-activeness, innovation-focused, customer intensity, risk management, resource leveraging, and value creation) to measure EM. Whereas pro-activeness, risk management, innovation-focused and opportunity-driven arises from the entrepreneurial orientation literature (EO), customer intensity and value creation arise from the market orientation literature (MO). Morris et al. (2002) extend these dimensions by resource leveraging, without providing a measurement suggestion.

In a research paper by Miles & Darroch (2006) the process of how large firms might leverage entrepreneurial marketing processes to gain and renew competitive advantage was explored. The paper applied past research on entrepreneurial marketing and entrepreneurship with examples from a long-term case study of firms in New Zealand, Sweden, the UK, and the USA to illustrate how entrepreneurial marketing processes can be strategically employed by large firms to create or discover, assess, and exploit entrepreneurial opportunities more effectively and efficiently. They adopted risk management, pro-activeness, opportunity driven, innovation, customer intensity, value creation, and resource leveraging as the explanatory variables that contributed to this competitive advantage. Their findings gave insights into how large firms leverage entrepreneurial marketing processes to gain advantage. The findings suggested that, in free and open markets, entrepreneurial marketing processes can be strategically employed to create superior value for the firm’s customers and owners.

Hacioglu et al. (2012) developed hypotheses concerning the effects of dimensions of entrepreneurial marketing on SME's innovative performance and tested seven hypothesis on data collected from a sample of 560 manufacturing SMEs in Turkey using convenient sampling technique via a structured questionnaire derived from previous literature (Kreiser, Marino & Weaver, 2002). The hypothesis included; H1: Pro-activeness will be positively related to innovative performance; H2: Opportunity focus will be positively related to innovative performance; H3: Calculated risk taking will be positively related to innovative performance; H4: Innovativeness will be positively related to innovative performance; H5: Customer intensity will be positively related to innovative performance; H6: Resource leveraging will be positively related to innovative performance; H7: Value creation will be positively related to innovative performance.

Further, Hacioglu et al. (2012) used five-point Likert scales ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree on items for measuring Entrepreneurial Marketing adopted from Becherer, Haynes & Helms (2008). This scale consisted of seven dimensions, namely Pro-activeness (3 items), Opportunity Focus (3 items), Calculated Risk Taking (3 items), Innovativeness (3 items), Customer Intensity (3 items), Resource Leveraging (4 items), Value Creation (7 items). To measure a firm's innovative performance, its position was compared to competitors and was measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1= much worse to 5=much better. The hypothesized relationships were tested with data collected through structured questionnaires administered face-to-face to managers of firms located in Turkey. To examine the suitability of the data for factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was used, which was 0.794, indicating that the data were suitable for factor analysis. Eigenvalue was used to determine the number of factors, and only factors with Eigenvalues over 1 were selected. Results of the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) were that four items were deleted because they showed a weak loading or loaded two different factors. In overall, 29 items using 5 Likert-type scale were used to measure entrepreneurial marketing and firm innovative performance. To examine the reliability of the scales used in the study, internal consistency coefficients were used, which varied between 0.61 and 0.83. All scales had reliability figures over 0.60, indicating that the scales used were reliable. The study had the adjusted R<sup>2</sup> of 15.7 and entrepreneurial marketing explained the 15.7 percent of the variance of the innovative performance and also the four dimensions of the entrepreneurial marketing had significant effect on innovative performance. Pro-activeness ( $\beta= 0.174$ ;  $p= 0.000$ ), innovativeness ( $\beta=0.166$ , 0.000), customer intensity ( $\beta=0.108$ , 0.021) and resource leveraging ( $\beta=0.110$ ;  $p=0.016$ ) have significant relationship to innovative performance. Regression analysis results supported H1, H4, H5 and H6 hypotheses. On the other hand H2, H3 and H7 hypothesis were not supported.

In a research paper entitled "Entrepreneurial Marketing as a Coping Strategy within an Economic Crisis" Hatak et al. (2013) found that EM was a general success factor for SMEs that coped with global financial crisis successfully in the Austrian economy. While some SMEs coped with the global financial crisis successfully, others faced existential problems, leading to

the question as to what strategies helped the successful enterprises find their way out of the crisis. The literature discusses EM as a general success factor in a quantitative study (n=352), companies with a strong degree of EM are compared to those with a weak degree. The empirical findings show that EM correlates strongly positively with the ability of SMEs to cope with a crisis. Hatak et al. (2013) used pro-activeness, risk-taking, innovativeness, customer intimacy, customer value, market driving and resource leveraging as the explanatory variables in the research problem. Comparing their results with the literature, they raised the question whether cultural differences affect the way in which business owners apply EM, thus leading to the question whether the operationalization of EM has to be contextualized in the dominant environmental culture. They further suggested that integration of entrepreneurial marketing must be reinforced both in the field of entrepreneurship education and in the area of vocational training.

### **Research Methodology**

The methodology used involved online search of literature, selection of articles, and critical evaluation and synthesis of empirical literature so as to identify consistent evidence, contradictions, relationships, and research gaps. This methodology has also been used in a number of studies on literature review (Cronin, P., Ryan, F. & Coughlan, M., 2008). Online open access literature and Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology subscribed journals searches were conducted in an iterative manner during April–August 2014 to retrieve articles related to EM and CA, and competitiveness among MSPs in global and local perspective. Search terms included “entrepreneurial marketing”, “competitive advantage”, “entrepreneurial orientation”, “market orientation”, “strategic orientation”, “resource leveraging”, “performance of mobile service providers”, and “influence of entrepreneurial marketing on competitive advantage”. Journal articles were retrieved from diverse fields of study: entrepreneurship, marketing, and strategic management. Statistical reports by CCK on MSPs were analyzed to obtain critical data on the performance of the four MSPs in Kenya (CCK, 2012).

To address the goal of understanding of EM, the items searched were qualitatively analyzed to determine common definitions and dimensions of EM as presented by a number of researchers. Empirical literature was reviewed to determine the findings of EM on performance of the firm especially on the firm’s competitive advantage. Extant literature on the subject of CA, MSPs, and customer value and service quality measurement were also reviewed. Information gathered from the literature provided a foundation for thinking about influence of EM on CA among MSPs in Kenya.

Upon reviewing the literature, the findings were reported, discussed and conclusion made on the suitable conceptual framework to study the phenomenon of influence of EM on CA among MSPs in Kenya. The study concluded that the major themes of reviewed literature both similar and divergent. However, entrepreneurial orientation (innovativeness, pro-activeness, risk taking),



market orientation (customer orientation and competitor orientation), strategic orientation (differentiation, cost-leadership and focus), and resource leveraging were suitable explanatory factors to adopt in a construct on influence of EM on CA. CA was measured using customer perceived value and customers' perceived service quality. These two measures were consistent with majority of the literature reviewed that attempted to measure CA as superior value perceived by customers.

## **Discussion**

This study on literature review on EM and CA has found that it is consistent to argue that EM can contribute to CA (Morris et al., 2002; Kraus et al., 2009; Hatak et al., 2013). It found that value creation and appropriation within the market is the node of the relationship between entrepreneurship and market-driven management (Vallini, & Simoni, 2009). Customer perceived value and perceived service quality were consistent measurements for competitive advantage (Sweeney & Soutar, 2001; Rintamaki et al., 2007, Auka, 2012). Therefore, the reviewed literature points to the need for integration of entrepreneurship theories with strategic management and marketing theories. This holistic construct integrates the entrepreneur, the firm's strategic management and the customer focus. When this construct is applied in this study of the mobile sector in Kenya, the problem of skewed competition is likely to point out whether this is a problem of entrepreneurship practice or the firm itself or a problem of customer focus. The study also found that EM represents a different approach to envisioning the business itself, its relationship with the marketplace, and the role of the marketing function within the firm. The business is viewed as an "innovation factory", where all departments and functions are defined in terms of an internal value chain and have an ongoing responsibility for identifying new sources of customer value (Morris et al., 2002). With regard to the marketplace, the firm seeks to lead customers as opposed to reacting to following them, and attention is devoted to the creation of new markets rather than better serving existing markets. Therefore, an improved construct that includes entrepreneurial orientation, market orientation, strategic orientation and firm's resources is recommended to replace other narrow views and constructs. While advancing on this new perspective view of entrepreneurship, Vallini, & Simoni (2009) argued that the adoption of a holistic perspective induces us to suggest that the firm is in competition not only on the markets to which it delivers its products or services but also on all the markets from which it acquires value and to which it delivers value.

## **Conclusion and Recommendations**

This chapter has extensively explored underlying theories that seem to explain the phenomenon that can create a skewed market competition by reflecting on the customer perception of the interactions of the services provided and the firm. Three independent variables have been posited as explanatory to the influence of the customer value perception and hence to explain this skew in the distribution of market share of the mobile service providers in Kenya. Research findings

on the interrelation between marketing and entrepreneurship explored were very fragmented so the study will attempt to contribute to the theory building of entrepreneurial marketing and entrepreneurship practice within the firm. The conceptual framework used attempts to create a holistic view of the business to include the entrepreneurial orientation, market orientation, strategic orientation and their influence on the firm's competitive advantage measured by customer perceived value and perceived service quality.

The conclusion then is that the entrepreneurial process should focus on creation (acquisition and combination) and distribution of value; while strategic orientation confronts competitors and sometimes create alliances with them to obtain better conditions for exploiting financial resources, employees, material inputs, machineries, and others. While the firm must overcome its competitors in its capability to absorb and combine these resources and competencies in order to be able to deliver superior customer value but major focus should be value creation for the customer. An "extended" market-driven approach that drives entrepreneurial management to supremacy in an extended competition space, on all of the firm markets is therefore proposed a way to increase a competitive wedge.

## References

- Achrol, R.S., & Kotler, P. (1999). Marketing in the network economy. *Journal of Marketing*, 55(4), 77-93.
- Alhakimi, W. & Baharun, R. (2009). A synthesis model of market orientation constructs toward building customer value: A theoretical perspective. *African Journal of Marketing Management*, 1(2), 043- 049.
- Amit, R., & Shoemaker, P. (1993). Strategic assets and organizational rent. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(1), 33-46.
- Arbaugh, J. B., Cox, L., W. & Camp, S. M. (2009). Is Entrepreneurial Orientation a Global Construct? A Multi-Country Study of Entrepreneurial Orientation, Growth Strategy, and Performance. *Journal of Business Inquiry*, 8(1), 12–25
- Auka, D.O. (2012). Service quality, satisfaction, perceived value and loyalty among customers in commercial banking in Nakuru Municipality, Kenya. *African Journal of Marketing Management* , 4(5), 185-203
- Baird, I. S., & Thomas, H. (1985). Toward a contingency model of strategic risk taking. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 230-243.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
- Becherer, R. C., Haynes, P. J., & Helms, M. M. (2008). An Exploratory Investigation of Entrepreneurial Marketing. *Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship*, 20(1), 44-64.
- CCK, (2012). *Quarterly Sector Statistics Report First Quarter of the Financial Year 2012/13 (July-September 2012)*. Nairobi: CCK.
- Covin, J. G., & Slevin D. P. (1991). A Conceptual Model of Entrepreneurship as Firm Behaviour, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(1), 7-25.

- Croft, W. (2010). *Wireless Intelligence*. Retrieved from <https://wirelessintelligence.com/files/analysis/?file=100114.pdf>. On April 2, 2013.
- Cronin, P., Ryan, F. & Coughlan, M. (2008). Undertaking a literature review: a step-by-step approach. *British Journal of Nursing*, 17(1), 38-43.
- Day, G. S. (1994). The Capabilities of Market-Driven Organization, *Journal of Marketing*, 58(4), 37-52.
- Day, G. S. & Wensley, R. (1988). Assessing advantage: A framework for diagnosing competitive superiority. *Journal of Marketing*, 52 (2), 1-20.
- Deshpande, R. & Farley, J., U. (1998). Measuring Market Orientation: Generalization and Synthesis. *Journal of Market-Focused Management*, 2 (September), 213-32.
- Fagerberg, J. (2009). *A Guide to Schumpeter*. Centre for Technology, Innovation and Culture (TIK), University of Oslo, Norway.
- Gaddefors, J., & Anderson, A.R. (2008). Market creation: the epitome of entrepreneurial marketing practices. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, 10(1), 19-39.
- Gathenya, J.W. (2012). *Entrepreneurial strategic Planning Practices and Firm Performance among Women-Based Small and Medium Enterprises in Kenya*. Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Unpublished PhD Thesis.
- Gaya, H.J., Struwig, M. & Smith, E.E. (2013). Creating a sustainable competitive advantage at a high performing firm in Kenya. *African Journal of Business Management*, 7(21), 2049-2058.
- Gebauer, H., Gustafsson, A. & Witell, L. (2011). Competitive advantage through service differentiation by manufacturing companies. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(12), 1270-1280.
- Ghobakhloo, M., Sabouri, M.S., Hong, T.S., & Zulkifli, M. (2011). Information Technology Adoption in Small and Medium-sized Enterprises; An Appraisal of Two Decades Literature. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business*, 1(7), 53-80.
- Guercini, S. (2012). New approaches to heuristic processes and entrepreneurial cognition of the market. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, 14(2), 199-213.
- Habtay, S.R., & Holmen, M. (2009). *From Disruptive Technology to Disruptive Business Model Innovation: In Need for an Integrated Conceptual Framework*. Witwatersrand: University of Witwatersrand.
- Hacioglu, G., Eren, S. S., Eren, M. S. & Celikkan, H. (2012). The effect of entrepreneurial marketing on firms' innovative performance in Turkish SMEs. *Procedia-Social And Behavioral Sciences*, 58 (12), 871-878.
- Hatak, I., Schmid, J. & Roessl, D. (2013). *Entrepreneurial Marketing as a Coping Strategy within an Economic Crisis*. Retrieved from <http://sbaer.uca.edu/research/ICSB/2013/6.pdf> on August 22, 2014 at 4.45pm.
- Hill, J., & Wright, L.T. (2000). Defining the scope of entrepreneurial marketing: a qualitative approach. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 8(1), 23-46.
- Hills, G., & La Forge, R.W. (1992). Research at the Marketing Interface to Advance, Entrepreneurship Theory. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16 (3), 33-59.
- Hills, G.E., Hultman, C.M., & Miles, M.P. (2008). The evolution and development of Entrepreneurial marketing. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 46 (1), 99-112.

- Hisrich, R. D. (1989). *Marketing and Entrepreneurship Research Interface: in Research at the Marketing/ Entrepreneurship Interface*. Ed. G. Hills, R. W. LaForge, and B. J. Parker. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois, 3–17.
- Hsieh, Y., Chiu, H., & Hsu, Y. (2008). Supplier market orientation and accommodation of the customer in different relationship phases. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 37(1), 380–393.
- Huber, F., Herrmann, A. & Morgan, R.E. (2001). Gaining Competitive Advantage through Customer Value Oriented Management. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 18(1), 41-53.
- Islam, R. (2012). Application of SERVQUAL Model in Customer Service of Mobile Operators: A Study from the Context of Bangladesh. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 4(1), 47-54
- Jaworski, B. J. & Kohli, A. K. (1993). Market Orientation: Antecedents and Consequences. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(July), 53-70.
- Jaworski, B.J. & Kohli, A.K. (1993). Market Orientation: Antecedents and Consequences, *Journal of Marketing*, 57 (July), 53–70.
- Kagwathi, S.G., Kamau, J.N., Njau, M.M. & Kagiira, E.N. (2013). *Factors Influencing Mobile Number Portability in Kenya: The Case of Africa Nazarene University*. Paper Presented at 1st Annual International Interdisciplinary Conference, AIIC 2013, April 24-26. Azores, Portugal: 263-275.
- Karanja, S.C., Muathe, S.M.A. & Thuo, J. K. (2014). Marketing Capability and the Performance of Mobile Service Provider Intermediary Organizations in Nairobi County, Kenya. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2(5), 499 – 512.
- Kohli, A. K. & Jaworski, B. J. (1990). Market orientation: The construct, research propositions, and managerial implications. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(2), 1-18.
- Kotler, P. (2001). *A Framework for Marketing Management*. Princeton, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Kraus, S., Harms, R. & Fink, M. (2009). Entrepreneurial marketing: moving beyond marketing in new ventures. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, 11(1), 19-34.
- Kreiser, P.M., Marino, L.D. & Weaver, K.M. (2002). Assessing the Psychometric Properties of the Entrepreneurial Orientation Scale: A Multi-Country Analysis. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 26(4), 71-94.
- Kumar, V., Jones, E., Venkatesan, R. & Leone, R.P. (2011). Is Market Orientation a Source of Sustainable Competitive Advantage or Simply the Cost of Competing? *Journal of Marketing*, 75(1), 16-30.
- Laino, A. (2011). *Innovation and monopoly: The position of Schumpeter*. MPRA Paper No. 35321. Retrieved from <http://mpa.ub.uni-muenchen.de/35321> on March 28, 2013.
- Lumpkin, G. I., & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the Entrepreneurial Orientation Construct and Linking It to Performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 135-172.
- Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (2001). Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: The moderating role of environment and industry life cycle. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5), 429–451.
- Manica, L., & Vescovi, M. (2011). *Mobile Telephony in Kenya ... is it "Making the life better"?* Trento: University of Trento.

- Martin, D.M. (2009). The entrepreneurial marketing mix. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 12(4), 391-403.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- Miles, M.P. & Darroch, J. (2006). Large firms, entrepreneurial marketing processes, and the cycle of competitive advantage. *European Journal of Marketing*, 40 (5/6), 485-501.
- Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, 29(7), 770–791.
- Miller, A., & Camp, B. (1985). Exploring determinants of success in corporate ventures. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 1(2), 87-105.
- Miller, D., & Friesen, P. (1978). Archetypes of strategy formulation. *Management Science*, 24(1), 921-933.
- Moraa, H., & Mwangi, W. (2012). *The Impact of ICT Hubs on African Entrepreneurs: A Case Study of iHub (Nairobi)*. Nairobi: iHub Research.
- Morris, M.H., Schindehutte, M., & LaForge, R.W. (2002). Entrepreneurial marketing: a construct for integrating emerging entrepreneurship and marketing perspectives. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*. 10(4), 1-19.
- Namusonge, M.J. (2014). Linking competencies with strategies: the case of small and medium-sized exporting firms in Kenya. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Entrepreneurship*, 1(11), 1-21.
- Narver, J.C., & Slater, S.F. (1990). The effect of market orientation on business profitability. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(4), 20-35.
- Narver, J. C., Slater, S. F. & MacLachlan, D. L. (2004). Responsive and Proactive Market Orientation and New-Product Success. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 21(5), 334-347.
- Nasution, H.N., Mavondo, F.T., Matanda, M.J., & Ndubisi, N.O. (2011). Entrepreneurship: Its relationship with market orientation and learning orientation and as antecedents to innovation and customer value. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40(3), 336-345.
- Omar C.M.Z.C., & Idris, S. (2010). A Theoretical Investigation into Entrepreneurship and Organizational Innovation-Based Competitive Strategy in Malaysia. *The Journal of International Management Studies*, 5(12), 12-20.
- Otieno, S., Bwisa, H.M. & Kihoro, J.M. (2012). Influence of strategic orientation on performance of Kenya's manufacturing firms operating under East African regional integration. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3 (5), 46-55.
- Parasuraman, A. (1997). Reflections on Gaining Competitive Advantage through Customer Value. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 25(2), 154-161.
- Penrose, E. (1959). *The Theory of Growth of the Firm*, New York, John Wiley & Sons.
- Porter M.E. (2008). The Five Competitive Forces That Shape Strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, Jan. 2008, 86–87.
- Porter, M. E. (1996). What is a strategy? *Harvard Business Review*. November-December, 61-78.
- Porter, M. & Millar, V.E. (1985). How Information Gives You Competitive Advantage. *Harvard Business Review*, 63(4), 149-160.
- Porter, M.E. (1980). *Competitive strategy*. New York: The Free Press

- Qureshi, S., Mian, S.A., & Oswego, S. (2010). Antecedents and Outcomes of Entrepreneurial Firms Marketing Capabilities: An Empirical investigation of Small Technology Based Firms. *Journal of Strategic Innovation and Sustainability*, 6(4), 28-45.
- Rintamaki, T., Kuusela, H., & Mitronen, L. (2007). Identifying competitive customer value propositions in retailing. *Managing Service Quality*, 17(6), 621–634.
- Rothaermel, F.T. (2013). *Strategic Management: Concepts & Cases*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rumba, C.K. (2008). *Strategic Responses by Mobile Phone Companies in Kenya to Environmental Changes*. University of Nairobi, Unpublished MBA Thesis.
- Safaricom. (2013). *Safaricom Full Year Results for Year Ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013*. Nairobi, Safaricom.
- Saylor Foundation. (2012). *Joseph Alois Schumpeter Biography*. <http://saylor.org/site/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/JosephSchumpeter.pdf>. Retrieved on: March 5, 2013.
- Schumpeter, J. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sweeney, J.C. & Soutar, G.N. (2001). Consumer perceived value: The development of a multiple item scale. *Journal of Retailing*, 77(2), 203-220.
- Tajudin, M.M., Musa, O. & Musa, N.C. (2012). Effects of Organizational Culture, Market Orientation, and Innovativeness toward New Product Performance amongst Malaysian SMEs. *International Journal Of Innovation And Business Strategy*. 1(Dec, 2012).
- Thompson, A.A., Peteraf, M.A., Gamble, J.E. & Strickland, A.J. (2012). *Crafting and Executing Strategy: Concepts and Cases*. McGraw-Hill Irwin. New York.
- Thomas, L.C., Painbe'ni, S., & Barton, H. (2013). Entrepreneurial marketing within the French wine industry. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 19(2), 238-260.
- Timmons, J. (2000). *New Venture Creation: Entrepreneurship in the 21st Century*, Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin Publishing.
- Ulaga, W. (2001). Customer Value in Business Markets. An Agenda for Enquiry. *Journal of Industrial Marketing Management*, 30(1), 315–319.
- UNCTAD (2011). *Information Economy Report 2011: ICTs as an Enabler for Private Sector Development*, Geneva, United Nations.
- Vallini, C., & Simoni, C. (2009). Market-Driven Management as Entrepreneurial Approach. *Emerging Issues in Management*, 1(1), 26-39.
- Venkatraman, N. (1989a). Strategic Orientation of Business Enterprises: The Construct, Dimensionality and Measurement. *Management Science*. 35 (August), 942- 962.
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(1), 171–180.
- Zeithaml, V. (2008). Consumer Perceptions of Price, Quality and Value: A Means-End Model and Synthesis of Evidence, *Journal of Marketing*, 52 (July), 2-22.
- Zellweger, T. & Sieger, T. (2010). *Entrepreneurial orientation in long-lived family firms*. DOI 10.1007/s11187-010-9267-6