Entrepreneurial marketing: A conceptual exploration and a link to performance

1. Introduction

Both academics and practitioners agree that marketing implemented by small firms is distinct from that employed by larger firms. Expanding on this idea, the kind of marketing behaviour observed on an individual entrepreneurial firm deviates from what is stereotyped in mainstream marketing (Gilmore, 2010). Some authors have worked on these differences (i.e. Siu and Kirby, 1998; Hultman, 1999; Stokes, 2000; Gaddefors and Anderson, 2008). Summing up, “the process of managing entrepreneurial marketing differs from the process of managing regular approaches to marketing” (Collinson and Shaw, 2001, p.6), “Research at the MEI [marketing entrepreneurship interface] is alive and well, [and] it has taken large strides in the last 25 years” (Gilmore 2010, p.11) (e.g. Uslay and Teach, 2008).

Entrepreneurial marketing (EM) is a growing area of study. For that reason, it is important to develop its own branch, yet it is advisable not to lose track of where it comes from. Marketing and entrepreneurship must be regarded as solid mainstreams from which EM can supply concepts and ideas to evolve. Precisely, the present article expands on such mainstreams. Marketing and entrepreneurship have been recognised as having significant interrelations, and to get potentiated when jointly implemented (Morris and Paul, 1987; Athuahene-Gima and Ko, 2001; Bhuian et al., 2005). A whole branch of literature is attempting to specify the synergistic effects and to prove it useful for all types of firms. Most of the advantages that EM provides are to be found in SMEs and in turbulent environments (Siu and Kirby, 1998; Davis et al., 1991), that is why, in some cases EM is applied in its constrained form; being, the EM definition, a not resolved issue (Hills and Hultman, 2006; Hills et al., 2010). Nevertheless, EM may be used by all sorts of firms in all kinds of contexts. Deriving from there, three lines of interest are outlined; namely marketable entrepreneurship (ME), entrepreneurial marketing (EM) and entrepreneurial marketing orientation (EMO). The former two refer to operative functions, such as those of new product development or marketing mix; while the latter describes a strategic extension that implies the intertwined effects of market (MO) and entrepreneurial orientations (EO).

This article addresses such concerns with the objective of reviewing the topic’s state of art. It explores the main definitions of EM to date, points out the conceptual backgrounds they stress, and extends on the operational ME and EM and the strategic EMO conducting a revision of the existent literature, using ISI database (see table 1 for sample criteria).

Broadly, the review clarifies the differences between operational EM and strategic EMO, (being operational those articles that treat functional areas separately; and strategic those that concern interrelations of capabilities throughout the entire organisation), and between marketing and entrepreneurship-based EM literature (being marketing-based those that focus on innovative, creative or proactive marketing; and entrepreneurially-based those that treat research, R&D feedback, or open and collaborative innovation). Overall, this article argues about the benefits of implementing EO and MO altogether in turbulent and complex contexts.

A more detailed review shows that positive effects on entrepreneurship success rates should be expected from the interrelations of EMO, so that ME is likely to improve performance. Similarly, marketing success rates are supposed to ameliorate with the adoption of EMO, thus EM would positively affect performance too. Consequently, EMO synergies are thought to improve the overall performance of a firm. And along with some reviewed articles (e.g. Webb et al., 2011), EMO is supposed to be more efficient in dynamic environments.

The analysis is meant to be of particular relevance to marketing and entrepreneurial marketing scholars; both for the bridges between fields and the research opportunities. The article provides some interesting insights, which may help industry to gain some awareness and consciousness, and hopefully presents a clear overview of the field, while trying to line
up the existing literature towards a more structured and delineated investigation. Still much remains unstudied in EM research; generalisations and applicability are still weak, thus the area is not mature enough, nor has the sufficient robustness, to be normative.

The next section reviews EM definition; then, some seminal papers are classified according to their backgrounds; afterwards key issues in ME, EM and EMO are commented, and some propositions are drawn; and, finally, conclusions are presented.

2. The evolution of entrepreneurial marketing

The EM concept “has been used in various ways, and often somewhat loosely” (Morris et al., 2002, p.4). Its intriguing confusion relies on that each term can be interpreted differently. Hence, various interrelations can be brought up, deviating greatly from author to author, and throughout time. They can be combined as marketing for entrepreneurs (i.e. new ventures marketing (Siu and Kirby, 1998)); entrepreneurship for marketing (i.e. innovative marketing (Morris et al. 2002)); or marketing for entrepreneurial firms (i.e. aimed at growth and innovation (Atuahene-Gima and Ko, 2001)). Also, it is been treated as marketing in emerging or turbulent markets, although this particular link to has left aside as part of other disciplines.

Definitions on table 2 may be classified by two main approaches: EM as strategy and EM as tactics. Strategy is concerned with how the firm will compete in its chosen businesses, being strategic those articles that highline the competing process of entrepreneurial or market-oriented firms in order to achieve a competitive advantage based on customer value (Duus, 1997; Morris et al., 2002; Bäckbrö and Nyström, 2006; Miles and Darroch, 2006; Webb et al., 2011), effects on performance (Kocak and Abimbola, 2009) or firm’s orientation (Athuahene-Gima and Ko, 2001); while tactics deal with the design and implementation of entrepreneurial marketing mix, being tactical those that stress the psychological traits of the entrepreneur and their personal networks and characteristics (Hill and Wright, 2000; Collinson and Shaw, 2001; Bjerke and Hultman, 2002; Carson, 2010), networks (Shaw, 2004), word of mouth (Stokes, 2000; Stokes and Lomax, 2002). Also, some try to merge both approaches (Hills and Hultman, 2006; Hills et al., 2008; Kraus et al., 2010; and Hills et al., 2010).

The evolution of the field must be taken into account, given that more intricate definitions, or at least more complex, are to be found in recent years (i.e. the basic concepts get established and some satellite meanings start colliding into it, augmenting its rigorousness). For example, EM was thought to be related to market orientation, in the sense of meeting customers’ demand; went through entrepreneurship orientation, being then the discovery and exploitation of an opportunity the most relevant point; and afterwards started to appropriate of other related constructs, innovation played a role, and so did relationship theories and psychological and behavioural ones, and more recently strategic processes, orientations and socio-cultural theories came to stage. Nowadays, EM still lacks of an accepted definition; instead the field faces multiple conceptualisations with slightly distinct emphasis from which to choose. This represents both an opportunity for research and a constraint for further studies.

2.1. Definitions

Entrepreneurship denotes innovativeness, proactiveness and risk taking (Miller, 1983), thus, an entrepreneurial firm “engages in product-market innovation, undertakes somewhat risky ventures, and is first to come up with “proactive” innovations, heating competitors to the punch”, and a “non entrepreneurial firm [...] innovates very little, is highly risk averse, and imitates the moves of competitors instead of leading the way” (Miller, 1983); while marketing is defined by the American Marketing Association as 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” (Keefe, 2004, p. 17). Entrepreneurial marketing (EM) in this article refers, therefore, to an entrepreneurial approach to marketing functions, that is to say, it denotes the innovative,
proactive and risk taking approach to the processes of creating, communicating and delivering value to customers. While marketable entrepreneurship (ME) refers to a marketing approach to entrepreneurial functions, that is to say, it denotes the customer and competitor oriented, interfunctionally coordinated, intelligence generating and disseminating, and responsive approach to the processes of engaging in product-market innovation, undertake somewhat risky ventures and come up with proactive innovation.

EMO is the synergy between EO and MO; so it encompasses both orientations and their interactive effect. EO is defined as “the interactions and actions of a firm pursuing new market opportunities and the renewal of existing operations [...]”; while MO is] the implementation of the marketing concept and the philosophy that satisfying customer current and latent needs as the ultimate purpose of the firm.”(Luo et al., 2005, p.55). Entrepreneurial marketing orientation (EMO) refers to the interactions and actions of a firm pursuing new market opportunities in order to add value to the customer that may satisfy its needs.

3. Backgrounds for entrepreneurial marketing

The area of research may lack of a widely accepted definition, yet its basics are clear: EM is thought to develop from the interaction of both fields of entrepreneurship and marketing. Table 3 classifies some relevant EM articles by its background and figure 1 shows it more visually, highlighting the level of implementation within the firm.

Overall, both entrepreneurial and marketing fields have been studied in relation to EM. The use of marketing techniques to improve entrepreneurship outcomes has been quite explored, and so has been the adaptation of entrepreneurial techniques to ameliorate marketing results. Yet, while these are present in the literature, still little is known about the synergistic effects of both techniques. The issue here lies on the gradation weights of each mainstream discipline, so EM would be recognised as ME, EM or EMO.

3.1. Marketable entrepreneurship (ME)

According to previous research, firms that are market-oriented are likely to serve their customers in a better, more fitted way than their competitors by using the information they collected (Kohli et al., 1993). Consequently, market-oriented firms are expected to grow at higher rates than their competitors (Gotteland and Boule, 2006).

Through marketable innovation, entrepreneurship was meant to override resource constraints and provide a significant amount of turnover on its behalf (Fillis, 2004). Therefore, firms with entrepreneurial processes (R&D) connected with market research (e.g. marketplace scanning, customer feedbacks, or product pre-tests) should be expected to receive higher amount of turnover from new product launching than others without these interactions. Also, being responsive to market needs (e.g. flexibility of adaptation, or speed of trends absorption) would facilitate an early seizing of opportunities, minimizing losses to a certain extent and, consequently, increasing the efficiency of product development budgets.

The main idea in either case is the need of adaptation to the environment; i.e. taking into account the institutional context (Webb et al., 2011), turbulent economies (Davis et al., 1991), or emerging markets and technologies (Thukral et al., 2008). In contexts where issues such as turbulent markets, transitional economies, accelerated life-cycles or incremental technology play a role, the firm’s capacity of market adaptation makes a difference in its outcomes. Thus:

**Proposition 1:** Market-oriented firms will perform better.

**Proposition 1A:** Having a highly marketable entrepreneurship in complex contexts affects positively the performance of a firm.

**Proposition 1B:** Firms exhibiting high levels of MO will score higher on the level of marketable entrepreneurship.

3.2. Entrepreneurial marketing (EM)
According to previous research, entrepreneurially-oriented firms will be able to determine business opportunities better and faster than their competitors (e.g., Lee et al., 2001). Not only that, but they will be willing to seize opportunities. This mental advantage will help these firms by being more agile to capitalise on business opportunities; consequently, they are expected to grow faster than their competitors.

Entrepreneurial firms approach marketing in a distinctive manner too; stressing innovation, creativity and proactiveness, give marketing the push that it needs. Perhaps for this reason, some talk about aggressiveness on the way to compete within the market, formal and informal networking (Shaw, 2004) and public relations (Stokes and Lomax, 2002), positive thinking (Fillis, 2004), or market-driving behaviour (Schindehutte et al., 2008). Thus:

**Proposition 2:** Entrepreneurially-oriented firms will perform better.

**Proposition 2A:** Having a highly entrepreneurial marketing in complex contexts affects positively the performance of a firm.

**Proposition 2B:** Firms exhibiting high levels of EO will score higher on the level of entrepreneurial marketing.

### 3.3. Entrepreneurial market orientation (EMO)

EMO-based articles assess topics as performance levels given a specific firm orientation (e.g. González-Benito et al. 2009), the simultaneous adoption of entrepreneurship and market orientation (Morris and Paul, 1987), the best gradation of either orientation (e.g. Athuahene-Gima and Ko, 2001; Bhuian et al., 2005), the competitive advantage achieved (Miles and Darroch, 2006), the internationalisation (Kocak and Abimbola, 2009). All these issues are concerned with how oriented-specific capabilities may combine in order to create synapses and potentiate crossed-effects. Therefore, developing interrelations and joint adaptation of existing capabilities, may help the firm seize all potential of each resource, diminishing extra efforts and augmenting efficiency. Innovation applied strategically would refer to a new combination of orientations, so to the involvement of different capabilities, originally ascribed at MO or EO, onto other orientations (e.g. Jones and Rowley, 2009; Jones and Rowley, 2011).

Morris and Paul (1987) found that more entrepreneurial firms are also more market oriented, although, apart from them, some authors have tried to identify the best gradation of integration building on 2x2 matrices and not all found the same results (e.g. Bhuian et al., 2005; Athuahene-Gima and Ko, 2001). Synergies and complementarities led the discussion towards competitive advantage and to the learning processes of firms (i.e. capabilities generation rather than acquisition). EO potentiates positively MO and vice versa, hence:

**Proposition 3:** Firms exhibiting both EO and MO will perform better.

**Proposition 3A:** Adopting an EMO in complex contexts improves the performance of a firm.

**Proposition 3B:** Firms exhibiting high levels of both MO and EO will be more likely to develop synergies between orientations, hence scoring high on the level of EMO adoption.

Finally, and pointing out a recurring issue in some of the reviewed articles, both EMO planning and ME/EM implementation are to positively affect firm’s performance when it operates in a turbulent or changing or uncertain environment. Therefore:

**Proposition 4:** ME, EM and EMO level of impact on performance will depend upon the context where the firm operates.

**Proposition 4A:** ME and EM level of impact on performance will depend upon the context where the firm operates.

**Proposition 4B:** EMO level of impact on performance will depend upon the context where the firm operates.

### 3.4. Propositions summary

In addition to the EO and MO’s positive effect on performance (P1 and P2 separately and P3 together), EMO positively affect a firm’s performance (P3A) when it operates in a turbulent, changing or uncertain environment (P4, P4A and P4B). The distinction of either
type of EM is important because they delineate different ways to do so (P1B and P2B). EMO approach supposes an increase in both ME and EM effectiveness, which in turn imply an increase in performance, yet achieved differently. Their effect is on different performance indicators because of the nature of the variables these concepts refer to; i.e. ME refer to entrepreneurship outcomes, so the efficiency achieved through EMO synergies would impact on new product development success rates; similarly, EM defines marketing outcomes, so its efficiency gained through EMO implementation would impact on marketing initiatives success rates. (P1A and P2A). Figure 2 illustrates these relations.

4. Conclusions

While the analysis of marketing in new and small ventures is important, as shown in previous sections, it is argued that EM surpasses these boundaries: “it can also describe marketing activities with an entrepreneurial mindset, irrespective of firm size or age” (Kraus et al., 2010: p.2); all sized and industry-specific firms can implement it, even non-profit, services and “social enterprises do engage in entrepreneurial marketing” (Shaw, 2004, p.194).

The first objective of the paper was to explore the main definitions of EM. To date, there is still no agreed one, EM associations are blurred and dispersed. It is time to adopt a common definition (even if provisional) that allows the field to expand and encourage its scholars to engage in more empirically complex methods. An operationalisation scale should include both functional and strategic parts, and represent the widest boundaries (i.e. items such as firm size should not appear on the overall definition).

The second objective was to point out the conceptual EM backgrounds. To that respect, EM field is related to various mainstreams; beginning with EO and MO as the basic ones from which it is formed initially, and expanding on some other areas. For example, the idea of inner firm ambient links particularly well with a dynamic capabilities approach; being the static capabilities each of the MO or EO dimensions, and the dynamic ones those that arise from its combinations. Also, the inclusion of evolution, adaptability and learning adjusts quite well with the institutional theory: what does the firm need to adapt to, evolve with and learn from? Including internal context (resource-based view) and external one (competitive forces model, strategic conflict approach); and controlling for regulatory, normative and cognitive institutions. This article opens a link with many adjacent theories that future studies may want to work on. EM field of research calls for multidisciplinary approaches, and cross-theoretical analysis; perhaps this complexity is what is pushing EM forward.

Also, the last objective was to extend on the operational ME/EM and the strategic EMO. Future insights on ME and EM would develop from studies able to capture the nature and processes utilised in building specific interconnections of capabilities. E.g. how can a firm create new contact points with the customer?, to provide them with newer and more intuitive/ comfortable/ fun ways of buying?, to build brand enthusiasts?, to arise prescriptive behaviours?, to generate publicity?, to get clients involved in the firm’s open innovation?

While there are indeed some authors dealing with these issues, not many clear rationales are thrown on the arena, especially for the strategic approach. There are lots of openings in the literature; most worth enough to be attained. The EMO synergies are still not very clear, nor have they been robustly tested; thus, it would be nice to delimitate which orientations are interrelated and which are not, whether there is an optimal gradation, which are the processes and paths of this merging?, is EMO a planned orientation or is it emergent?, how can these capabilities be dynamised to serve all areas of the firm simultaneously?, which activities are implemented if adopting EMO?, is EMO achieved bottom-up or top-down?
6. Appendices

Table 1
Sample criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Retrieved articles</th>
<th>Selected articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISI</td>
<td>“entrepreneurial marketing” topic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“entrepreneurship” + “marketing” title</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note some articles may be included in more than one category or criterion. Also, extra papers were reviewed if relevant on one of the retrieved articles. Source: self elaboration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>Conceptual background</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hills and Laforge (1992), p.34 and 53</td>
<td>Marketing Consumer behaviour</td>
<td>“Marketing management is the process of scanning the environment, analyzing market opportunities, designing marketing strategies, and then effectively implementing and controlling marketing practices (Cravens, Hills and Woodruff, 1987). To operationalize the interface of marketing and entrepreneurship, we will primarily use this last definition” (p.34) “[…] there is an opportunity in the entrepreneurship field to develop middle-range theories analogous to developments in the marketing discipline, paralleling those in consumer behavior […]” (p.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duus (1997), p.297</td>
<td>Market orientation</td>
<td>“The distinguishing feature of this new interpretation, which is essentially a market-oriented inside-out perspective, could be the development of the specific competencies of the firm by entrepreneurial action with a view to serving future customers’ latent demand for products that do not yet exist. […] this can be called “the entrepreneurial marketing concept.””</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill and Wright (2000), p. 25</td>
<td>Psychological theories Marketing</td>
<td>“A new stream of research describes the marketing orientation of small firms as ‘entrepreneurial marketing’. This means a style of marketing behavior that is driven and shaped by the owner manager’s personality.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokes (2000), p. 2 and 13</td>
<td>Innovation orientation Market orientation</td>
<td>“marketing carried out by entrepreneurs or owner-managers of entrepreneurial ventures” (p. 2) “The entrepreneurial marketing concept is focused on innovations and the development of ideas in line with an intuitive understanding of market needs; […].” (p.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collinson and Shaw (2001), p.2 and 8</td>
<td>Traits theory Psychological theories Market orientation</td>
<td>EM takes into account the characteristics of the entrepreneur. There are “[…] three key areas of the marketing/entrepreneurship interface as being change focused, opportunistic in nature and innovative in management approach” (p.2) “Entrepreneurial marketing is characterised by a responsiveness to the marketplace and a seemingly intuitive ability to anticipate changes in customer demands.” (p.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris et al. (2002), p. 2, 4 and 5</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship Value creation Informal / intuitive</td>
<td>“the proactive identification and exploitation of opportunities for acquiring and retaining profitable customers through innovative approaches to risk management, resource leveraging and value creation.” (p. 5) “EM synthesizes critical aspects of marketing and entrepreneurship into a comprehensive conceptualization where marketing becomes a process that firms use to act entrepreneurially.” (p. 2) “the unplanned, non-linear, visionary marketing actions of the entrepreneur.” (p. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bjerke and Hultman (2002), p.15</td>
<td>SMEs marketing</td>
<td>“EM is the “marketing of small firms growing through entrepreneurship.””</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw (2004),</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>“[…] four themes relevant to understanding entrepreneurial marketing within a social enterprise context emerged: opportunity recognition (OR); entrepreneurial effort (EE); an entrepreneurial organizational culture (EOC); and networks and networking (N&amp;N).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.197</td>
<td>Socio-cultural theories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship theories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bäckbrö and</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>“Entrepreneurial marketing is the overlapping aspects between entrepreneurship and marketing; therefore it is the behavior shown by any individual and/or organization that attempts to establish and promote market ideas, while developing new ones in order to create value.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyström (2006),</td>
<td>Marketing Value creation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles and</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>“[…] we suggest that large firms can, and must, effectively leverage EMPs [entrepreneurial marketing processes] for competitive advantage” (p.488)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darroch (2006),</td>
<td>Strategic processes</td>
<td>“[…] firms adopting EMPs will engage in marketing processes emphasizing opportunity creation and/or discovery, evaluation and exploitation.” (p.488)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.488-489</td>
<td></td>
<td>“[…] a firm adopting EMPs must strategically trade off investment in the profitable business of better meeting current customer needs with costly and risky investments in developing future marketing mixes and strategies to meet anticipated and latent needs” (p.489)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills and Hultman (2006),</td>
<td>Innovation Relationship theories</td>
<td>“[…] [the authors] describe EM characteristics which reflect such activities as “a flexible, customization approach to market” and “innovation in products, services and strategies”. (in Jones and Rowley, 2011, p. 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.222</td>
<td></td>
<td>“[…] tactics often two ways for customers, and marketing decisions based on daily contacts and networks.” (in Jones and Rowley, 2011, p. 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills et al.,</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial SMEs Strategy</td>
<td>“[…] financially successful, entrepreneurial SMEs may use marketing as a path to create competitive advantage, based on differentiating their marketing program by leveraging their superior knowledge of customers, markets and technologies.” (p.100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2008), p.100</td>
<td>Leverage superior knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraus et al.</td>
<td>Function and process Marketing</td>
<td>“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, proactiveness, and may be performed without resources currently controlled.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2010), p.9</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic theories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills et al.</td>
<td>Psychological theories Attitudes and motivation</td>
<td>“EM is a spirit, an orientation as well as a process of pursuing opportunities and launching and growing ventures that create perceived customer value through relationships, especially by employing innovativeness, creativity, selling, market immersion, networking or flexibility”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2010), p.6</td>
<td>Marketing orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrepreneurship orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic theories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship theories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson (2010),</td>
<td>SMEs marketing</td>
<td>“[…] interface researchers have been “blinded” by the “widening” of entrepreneurial dominance that the true interface between marketing and entrepreneurship has been lost. Thus, I hope, indeed propose that future interface research is defined by the parameter SB [small businesses] marketing and entrepreneurship” (p.9-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones and Rowley (2011),</td>
<td>Customer orientation Innovation orientation</td>
<td>“[…] any concept of EM […] must embrace aspects of behaviours that have traditionally been researched in the entrepreneurship, innovation, and customer engagement and relationship fields.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.30</td>
<td>Market orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrepreneurship orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Webb et al., (2011), p.545 | Marketing Entrepreneurship Institutional theory | “Marketing activities represent a set of means that facilitate firms’ ability to exploit opportunities and satisfy customer needs. [...] (F)irms can recognize and exploit opportunities to more efficiently or effectively serve customer needs through the innovation of marketing activities.”

Source: self elaboration.
* Extended from Kraus et al. 2010 Table 1.
Figure 1
Proposed model of EM backgrounds.

Source: self depiction.
Table 3  
Selected articles classified by EM conceptual backgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual background</th>
<th>Theoretical rationales (Author, Year)</th>
<th>Empirical evidence (Author, Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Day et al., 1998; Fillis, 2004; Webb et al., 2011; Li et al., 2006; Knight, 2000.</td>
<td>Fillis, 2004; Nasution et al., 2011; Davis et al., 1991; Thukral et al., 2008; Li et al., 2006; Sakar et al., 2001; Morris et al., 1988.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Schindehutte et al., 2008; Miles and Darroch, 2008; Styles and Seymour, 2006.</td>
<td>Schindehutte et al., 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial marketing</td>
<td>Hills et al., 2008; Hoy, 2008; Jones and Rowley, 2011.</td>
<td>Morris and Paul, 1987; Athuahene-Gima and Ko, 2001; Bhuian et al., 2005; González-Benito et al., 2009; Nasution et al., 2011; Miles and Darroch, 2006; Kocak and Abimbola, 2009.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note some articles may be in more than one box.  
Source: self elaboration.
Figure 2
Causal model of EM backgrounds.

Source: self depiction.
EO: entrepreneurial orientation, MO: market orientation, EMO: entrepreneurial market orientation, ME: marketable entrepreneurship, EM: entrepreneurial marketing, P: performance, ➔ synergetic effects, ➙ other effects.
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