



Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics

What differentiates successful strategic marketing among manufacturers in an emerging versus developed market?

Roger Brooksbank, Zahed Subhan, Steven Miller,

Article information:

To cite this document:

Roger Brooksbank, Zahed Subhan, Steven Miller, "What differentiates successful strategic marketing among manufacturers in an emerging versus developed market?", Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, <https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-12-2016-0251>

Permanent link to this document:

<https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-12-2016-0251>

Downloaded on: 25 February 2018, At: 20:50 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 0 other documents.

To copy this document: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

The fulltext of this document has been downloaded 3 times since 2018*

Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by emerald-srm:409465 []

For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit www.emeraldinsight.com/authors for more information.

About Emerald www.emeraldinsight.com

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

*Related content and download information correct at time of download.

What Differentiates Successful Strategic Marketing among Manufacturers in an Emerging versus Developed Market?

Abstract

Purpose:

Emerging markets present strategists with a unique set of challenges that result from a business environment that is quite different from that which characterises developed markets. Yet, little is known about marketing's contribution to successful strategic decision-making in emerging markets. Thus, this paper examines the usage of conventional strategic marketing practice, as it relates to developed markets, within groups of higher- and lower- performing manufacturers in the emerging market of India; comparing it against that of their counterparts in the developed market of the United States.

Design/methodology/approach:

The study is based on separate web-hosted questionnaire surveys conducted in India and the United States, yielding samples of 71 and 84 self-reported manufacturing companies, respectively. Data analyses were conducted using independent sample t-tests and logistic multiple regression and sought to compare and contrast successful strategic marketing decision-making in each country.

Findings:

The results confirm that conventional strategic marketing plays a vital role in facilitating the competitive success of manufacturers in India. However, they also suggest that differences in the strategic environments faced by manufacturers in both countries necessitate quite

different priorities for success at each stage of the strategic marketing decision-making process.

Research limitations/implications:

Due to relatively low response rates, the extent to which the study samples are representative of the population under scrutiny remains unknown. Also, differences in the respondents' interpretation of certain questions and some of the marketing vocabulary and terminology used cannot be ruled out.

Practical Implications:

The research highlights the important contribution that conventional strategic marketing makes to the achievement of competitive success of manufacturers in India. However, it also identifies several specific practices that differentiate higher firm performance in the two countries, drawing into question the direct applicability of the conventional model of strategic marketing within an emerging market.

Originality/value:

As far as is known for the first time, the applicability of the conventional model of successful strategic marketing within an emerging market is assessed. As a result, a new model is forwarded.

Keywords: Strategic Marketing, Manufacturers, India, Emerging Markets, United States

What Differentiates Successful Strategic Marketing among Manufacturers in an Emerging versus Developed Market?

Introduction

Emerging markets, especially those in the so-called BRIC countries of Brazil, Russia, India and China (Wilson and Purushothaman, 2003), are predicted to comprehensively transform the balance of economic power worldwide by mid-century (Dobbs et al., 2012). As such, for some time now they have attracted a good deal of attention among researchers from throughout the field of business management (Khanna and Palepu, 2010). However, over recent years, due to their unique, strategically relevant situational characteristics, scholarly attention has become increasingly focused on organisational strategy, as evidenced by a substantial rise in the number of studies on this topic that have been published in the top business strategy journals (Bang, Joshi, and Singh, 2016).

Marketing is considered integral to effective business-level strategic decision-making (Walker *et al.*, 2015). It helps firms determine which market should be targeted, and how best to build superior customer value and competitive advantage over the longer-term (Hooley *et al.*, 2017). The term 'strategic marketing' has long been synonymous with an ongoing multi-stage planning process that enables the firm to adjust its decision-making so as to adapt to a changing business environment (Brooksbank et al., 2015). The normative model of the strategic marketing planning process encompasses five stages: situation analysis, objective-setting, strategy formulation, organisational design, and control procedures (Tybout and Calder, 2010).

Interest in strategic marketing peaked in the early-mid 1980s when there was an explosion of literature on the subject (Romano and Ratnatunga, 1995). Since then numerous ‘success’ studies (almost exclusively carried out in developed markets) have illustrated an appreciation of marketing’s contribution to firm performance as a strategic discipline. This body of work includes research that examines different types and sizes of firms operating in different markets and from differing research perspectives or ‘genres’ (Brooksbank, Garland and Taylor, 2010). Of the differing ‘research genres’ employed, arguably the most readily measurable from a scholar’s perspective is the ‘strategic marketing practices’ genre (Brooksbank, Garland and Taylor, 2008). Here, the focus is on assessing organisational decision-making as it relates to various tasks within each of the five stages of the normative model of the strategic marketing planning process. Accordingly, a comprehensive literature review (see below) revealed a total of 18 of the most commonly reported successful strategic marketing practices (SMPs) relating to these five stages.

Set against this background, the paper will next proceed to explain the purpose and objectives of the current study. It then goes on to provide contextual information regarding the manufacturing sectors and strategic environments found within the emerging market of India and the developed market of the United States, followed by a review of the marketing literature that led to the identification of the study’s 18 research hypotheses. Following an exposition of the research methodology employed, the study’s results are then presented and discussed. The penultimate section of the paper provides an understanding of the research limitations and the final section concludes by addressing its theoretical and managerial implications.

Purpose and Objectives

It is generally believed that corporates in emerging markets are adopting conventional, developed-world, marketing methods. Yet, relatively little is known about the full extent of this uptake (Huan *et al.*, 2008). It is also widely recognised that emerging markets present strategists with a unique set of challenges that result from a business environment that is quite different from that which is found in developed markets (Bang, Joshi, and Singh, 2016). Yet, the literature review below reveals a paucity of empirical research that has looked at the strategic role played by marketing despite some scholars having long advocated a need to better understand its relevance to emerging markets (Koku, 2005; Steenkamp, 2005; Sheth, 2011). Moreover, our literature review reveals that previous research has not sought to examine the theoretical or practical implications these unique situational characteristics might have for strategic marketing decision-making. Thus, set within the context of the ‘strategic marketing practices’ research genre, the purpose of this study is to address these deficiencies. For the first time (as far as is known) it assesses the applicability of the conventional model of successful strategic marketing (i.e., that which relates to developed markets) within an emerging market, with a view towards developing grounded theory in this domain. This is achieved by examining the usage of 18 SMPs within groups of higher- and lower-performing manufacturing firms in India – one of the world’s fastest growing emerging markets – benchmarked against that of their counterparts in the established and developed market of the United States. Specifically, its objectives are threefold:

(i) To determine which SMPs are associated with the higher-performing manufacturers in India as opposed to their counterparts in the United States. *To what extent do conventional*

strategic marketing practices contribute to the competitive success of manufacturers operating in the emerging market of India?

(ii) To identify, and compare across each sample, which SMPs are the strongest predictors or 'key drivers' of competitive success in relation to each of the five stages of the strategic marketing planning process. *What are the key priorities for successful strategic marketing planning among manufacturers in the emerging market of India?*

(iii) To detect any differences in strategic approach that might be more relevant and appropriate for manufacturers in India due to the uniqueness of the business environment in which they operate. *How applicable is the conventional model of strategic marketing planning to manufacturers operating in the emerging market of India?*

Literature Review

Research context

In India, the last two decades have seen an increasingly open and deregulated economy which has forced a significant shift in the culture of Indian businesses, propelling them into becoming more competitive than ever before (MacAskill, 2011; Aggarwal, 2009). Indeed, the acquisition of a commercial imperative has provided the impetus for the development of a booming domestic economy (MacAskill, 2011) with a GDP growth forecast to be second only to China's in the period 2012-17 (Chen et al., 2012; Einhorn, 2014). Moreover, it has led to India's emergence as a global economic power with a domestic manufacturing sector ranked ninth in the world and with an expectation that growth will continue to accelerate (Spencer and Schellenberg, 2010). To underscore this point, it is notable that at the recent

‘Make in India’ summit, the Indian Government laid out its ambition to increase the sector’s contribution to India’s GDP to 25 percent by 2022 – creating 100 million jobs in the process (McKinsey, 2016).

Meanwhile, in the United States, the manufacturing sector has long been recognised as a worldwide powerhouse of industrial output. Although, in the wake of the global financial crisis, it was recently overtaken by China in the world rankings, it is poised to regain the top spot by 2020 (Matthews, 2016). As one of the most important sectors of the United States domestic economy, it produces more than three-quarters of all it consumes (Sirkin, Rose and Zinser, 2012) and is responsible for more than two-thirds of all business spending on research and development (Foroohar and Saporito, 2013).

Regarding the strategic environments faced by marketers in India and the United States, there are five commonly cited strategically relevant differentiating characteristics between emerging markets and those of the developed world. These are summarised in Table I which relates them directly to each country. The first and most frequently-quoted defining characteristic concerns the buoyancy of the prevailing economic conditions (Arnold and Quelch, 1998; Khanna and Palepu, 2010). In the case of India, a period of sustained growth far exceeding that of the United States (i.e. 7% versus 1% annual growth) has now been apparent for some years.

{Table I about here}

The second is a relatively low level of product-category market penetration (Sunge and Civi, 2008) compared with the peak or near-peak levels typically found in more developed

economies like the United States (Kotler and Keller, 2007); a characteristic which, in large measure, is also symptomatic of India (Bang, Joshi and Singh, 2016). A third relates to the sheer size of the emerging economy's domestic market (Bang, Joshi, and Singh, 2016). Here, when India and the United States are compared based on population figures, it is notable that the two countries are separated by about one billion potential customers. A fourth differentiating characteristic relates to substantial differences in the prevalence of unbranded competition in emerging markets when compared with their counterparts in the developed world (Sheth, 2011). Lastly, in emerging markets there is a generally underdeveloped and largely inadequate 'marketing infrastructure', totally unlike that which is typically encountered in a developed economy like the United States (Burgess and Steenkamp, 2006; Miller, 1998). Here, the phrase 'marketing infrastructure' refers to the availability and sophistication of resources such as distribution channels, promotional media, marketing services agencies, and the like.

Research Hypotheses

To meet this study's objectives, 18 specific hypotheses relating to the expected differences between the SMPs of higher- and lower-performing companies were identified based on a review of both the prescriptive and the empirical literature (i.e., that relating to markets in the developed world) over the last three decades; the aim being to identify those 'evergreen' and discrete success practices which have been most commonly prescribed or reported. As such, they demonstrate high face- and research-based validity, respectively. Indeed, it should be noted that over recent years, many of these practices have been previously employed as the basis for several similar enquires (see for example, Siu *et al.*, 2004; Huan *et al.*, 2008; Brooksbank *et al.*, 2015). The hypotheses are presented below within the framework of the strategic marketing planning process.

Stage 1: Hypotheses relating to undertaking a strategic situation analysis (H1-4)

In keeping with the prescriptive works of writers such as Loyle and Breidenach (2011) and MacDonald (2006), researchers such as Pitta (2008), Putendran, Speed and Widing (2003), and Lyonski and Pecotich (1992) have concluded that higher-performing firms tend to execute their situation analyses in a more formalised and systematic manner so that one can be compared against another over time to better discern situation dynamics. This gives rise to *H1: Higher-performing manufacturers in India and the United States (HPMs) are more formal marketing planning oriented than lower-performing manufacturers (LPMs).*

The prescriptive literature stresses the importance of conducting a comprehensive strategic situation analysis involving an (internal) analysis of the firm's capabilities in the light of a wide-ranging set of (external) analyses covering: markets, customers, competitors, and the wider business environment (e.g. Aaker, 2009; Piercy, 2000). Researchers comparing the strategic marketing activities of higher- and lower-performing firms, including Cocks (2009), Siu and Liu (2005) and Brooksbank, Kirby and Wright (1992), provide overwhelming support for the wisdom of such efforts. Accordingly, *H2: HPMs conduct a more comprehensive strategic situation analysis than LPMs.*

An effective strategic situation analysis necessitates the adoption of a future-focused approach whereby the firm seeks to project future scenarios with the aim of planning to make one of them happen. Such an approach is implicit within many prescriptive works (see for example Yu *et al.*, 2010), and it is commonly found to be associated with the planning activities of successful firms (Huan *et al.*, 2008; Doyle and Wong, 1998; Lai *et al.*, 1992;

Hooley and Jobber, 1986). Thus, *H3: HPMs adopt a more pro-active approach to the future than LPMs.*

Many prescriptive writings assert that long-term competitive success depends upon research-based strategic decision-making (Chaston and Mangle, 2002). Accordingly, studies by Kontinen (2011), Panayides (2004), Joseph et al., (2001) and Baker, Hart and Black (1988) indicate that successful firms make extensive use of market research in their planning activities. This leads to *H4: HPMs make greater use of market research for planning purposes than LPMs.*

Stage 2: Hypotheses relating to setting strategic marketing objectives (H5&6)

Virtually all strategic marketing textbooks, including Hooley *et al.*, (2017), emphasise that a winning strategy requires a long-term time horizon. Accordingly, research by Cocks (2009), Siu and Liu (2005), Baker and Leidecker (2001), Siu (2000), Shaw (1995), and Doyle, Saunders and Wong (1985) shows that successful companies set longer-term strategic objectives (i.e. short-run profits are not sought at the expense of longer-run strategic objectives). Therefore, *H5: HPMs set longer-term marketing objectives than LPMs.*

The setting of more aggressive strategic objectives, as opposed to adopting a more defensive competitive stance, is widely communicated throughout the prescriptive literature as likely to be a distinguishing characteristic of most higher-performing firms (Doyle, 2002). Research by Brooksbank, Garland and Taylor (2010), Siu and Liu (2005), Siu (2000), and Hooley and

Lynch (1985) indicates likewise. Accordingly, *H6: HPMs set more aggressive strategic objectives than LPMs.*

Stage 3: Hypotheses relating to formulating marketing strategy (H7-12)

In relation to strategy formulation, Doyle (2002) espouses the conventional wisdom that marketing strategists should set a ‘strategic focus’ for each of a firm’s offerings: seeking to cultivate profitability either by focusing upon increasing sales or securing productivity improvements. However, most empirical studies consistently show that, at least in their main market, successful firms tend to accord a higher priority to raising sales volume (Brooksbank *et al.*, 2015; Huan *et al.*, 2008; Doyle, Saunders and Wong, 1985). This gives rise to *H7: HPMs adopt a strategic focus based more on raising volume than LPMs.*

The careful selection of one or more target market segment(s) is viewed as critical for achieving differential advantage within a competitive marketplace. This wisdom is widespread, with both prescriptive works (Simkin and Dibb, 2012; Slater *et al.*, 2007), and empirical studies such as those by Quinn (2009) and Keltner and Finegold (1999), asserting that successful companies typically target selected market segments rather than adopting an undifferentiated, whole market approach. Hence, *H8: HPMs put a greater emphasis on targeting selected market segment(s) than LPMs.*

In drawing an analogy between marketing and military strategy, many authors recommend the most effective strategy is either to avoid head-on competition altogether or to in some way circumvent other players in the market by offering something different (Kolar and Toporistic, 2007; Ries and Trout, 1986). Evidence for such approaches are provided by numerous empirical studies, including those undertaken by Brooksbank, Garland and Werder

(2012) and Coughlan (1985). As a result, *H9: HPMs put a greater emphasis on avoiding head-on competition than LPMs.*

Alongside most prescriptive writing (such as Hooley *et al.*, 2017, and McDonald and Wilson, 2011), studies by Reijonen and Komppula (2010), Pitta (2008), Siu (2000), Hooley and Beracs (1997) and Hooley and Jobber (1986) similarly indicate that most higher-performing companies compete on the basis of providing superior customer value, rather than price alone. Such observations lead to *H10: HPMs compete more on the basis of offering superior value-to-the-customer than LPMs.*

Many prescriptive works (e.g. Ray and Ray, 2011; Cravens and Piercy, 2009; Hamel and Prahalad, 1991) see innovation as essential to long-term business success. Additionally, research by Huan *et al.*, (2008), Siu, Fang and Lin (2004), Berry (1996) and Hooley and Lynch (1985) identifies higher-performing firms as being more innovative than their lower performing counterparts. Notably, these findings generally refer to the importance of both product innovation as well as an ability to lead the market in developing new ways of doing business. Consequently, *H11: HPMs innovate more frequently than LPMs.*

In alignment with the prescriptions of writers such as Mellat-Parast (2015) and Seuring (2009), researchers such as Dodourova (2009) and Agusa and Hassan (2008) also indicate that an effective strategy and/or route to market, particularly within an industrial context (Gould, Liu and Yu, 2016), invariably incorporates some form of ‘enabling’ strategic relationship, partnership or alliance with other firms in the network. Therefore, *H12: HPMs make more use of strategic collaboration than LPMs.*

Stage 4: Hypotheses relating to designing the marketing organisation (H13-15)

Most prescriptions for effective strategy implementation recommend some measure of organisational flexibility (Hooley *et al.*, 2017; Davis and Manrodt, 1996; Webster, 1992; Peters and Waterman, 1982). Accordingly, studies conducted by O'Dwyer, Gilmore and Carson (2011), Siu, Fang and Lin (2004) and Hooley and Jobber (1986) emphasise the importance of employing various types of temporary forms of organisation such as outsourcing, and the cultivation of job overlap (Brooksbank, Kirby and Wright, 1992). Hence, *H13: HPMs cultivate greater marketing organisational flexibility than LPMs.*

According to Kotler (2011), and Webster (1992), when senior marketing executives maintain first hand connections with key players in their marketplace, it helps to ensure that strategic planning does not lose touch with operating reality. The research findings of Brooksbank (2007), Chaganti, Cook and Smeltz (2002), Peng and Shekshnia (2001) and Peters and Waterman (1982) add weight to this assertion, concluding that a 'hands-on' management style is an important ingredient in the mix of factors that influence a company's success. As a result, *H14: HPMs have senior marketing executives who maintain closer links with customers than LPMs.*

Successful companies are often identified as being extensively focused on employee training, both upon initial hire and over time (Subhan *et al.*, 2014; Storey, 2002; Knoke and Kalleberg, 1994). Such training relates to enabling the acquisition of marketing skills not just among marketing staff but also those working in other areas of the business (Brooksbank *et al.*, 2015; Morhart, Herzog and Tomczak, 2009; Whiting, 2007). This leads to *H15: HPMs pay more attention to employee training than LPMs.*

Stage 5: Hypotheses relating to conducting strategic marketing control (H16-18)

The wisdom of conducting regular performance analyses against key indicators is omnipresent throughout the prescriptive marketing literature (Clark and Ambler, 2011). Practical benefits are further highlighted by a multitude of studies such as those undertaken by, for example, Homburg, Artz and Wieseke (2012), and Kee-hung, Yeung and Cheng (2012). Consequently, *H16: HPMs analyse their performance more closely than LPMs.*

As a strategic function of on-going business operations, marketing research is undertaken for the purpose of providing feedback on various dynamics that enable customer satisfaction levels to be maintained and enhanced over time (McDonald and Wilson, 2011). Companies leveraging research in this way are generally found to compete more successfully (Bee and Madrigal, 2012; Pancras and Sudhir, 2007; Brooksbank, Kirby and Wright, 1992). Such observations give rise to *H17: HPMs make greater use of marketing research for control purposes than LPMs.*

Marketing intelligence-gathering systems draw upon a variety of information sources which, collectively, enable the firm to monitor on-going developments in and around its marketplace (Damirchi and Shafai, 2011; Le Meunier-FitzHugh and Piercy, 2006; Maltz and Kohli, 1996). Research indicates the deployment of such systems contributes to sustained competitive success (Hamadu, Obaji and Oghojafor, 2012; Lewis, 2006; Kuga, 1990). Accordingly, *H18: HPMs make more use of ongoing marketing intelligence-gathering systems than LPMs.*

Methodology

Findings reported are based on separate web-hosted questionnaire surveys conducted in India and the United States. The questionnaire was previously developed for a number of similar, subsequently published, research projects (for further details see Brooksbank *et al.*, 2015), and was deemed appropriate for the purposes of investigating the 18 SMPs forming the basis of this study. However, to ensure the questionnaire would be entirely meaningful to target recipients in India (i.e. to test for literal understanding and the appropriateness of questions) it was piloted with senior marketing executives: four India-based, and two who were with United States-based firms.

In late 2013, an invitation to participate was emailed to lists of 1,200 India- and 1,200 United States- based manufacturers with more than 100 employees. Both lists were purchased from specialist commercial data companies that randomly generated each one from a larger sampling frame that was advertised as being commensurate with the entire population of manufacturers in each country. The target recipient of the emails was ‘The Managing Director’ and a free summary of findings was offered as an incentive to participate. Subsequently, in India, a total of 73 were immediately returned by the system as undeliverable. Following six reminder letters that were sent out at one-week intervals, nine fully completed returns self-reported that their firm’s primary activity was something other than ‘manufacturing’, with a further 71 fully completed returns from firms indicating their primary activity was indeed ‘manufacturing’. Thus, the effective mail out was to 1000 Indian manufacturers, yielding a response rate of 7.1 per cent. In the United States, a total of 47 were initially returned as undeliverable. After another six reminder letters, 12 fully completed returns indicated a primary activity other than ‘manufacturing’, whilst a further 84 were fully completed returns from manufacturing firms. Thus, the effective mail out was to 1009 United States manufacturers, yielding an effective response rate of 8.3 per cent.

Low response rates necessitated a check for non-response bias. However, when telephone responses to three selected questions from the questionnaire (i.e. regarding the importance attached to conducting aspects of a comprehensive strategic situation analysis) were obtained from 29 Indian and 27 United States non-responding companies from each mailing list and these answers were compared with those given by respondents in each study sample, no statistical differences emerged. Similarly, no significant differences emerged between responses received 'early' versus 'late' (Armstrong and Overton, 1977).

To address the first research objective, as with previous research based on the same questionnaire (see Brooksbank et al., 2015), a comparison of means based on independent-sample t-tests was undertaken. This mechanic offered a straightforward procedure for testing the 18 research hypotheses within each sample in relation to all the corresponding practice-specific questions featured in the questionnaire (N.B. for the purposes of aiding readability, full details are given as an integral part of the 'Results and Discussion' section). Mean response values for each question are given in the tables, along with the *p*-values for each test. In keeping with similar studies in this research genre, *p*-values less than 0.1 are reported upon. For this study's purposes, the dependent variable of performance was defined according to four self-reported measures relative to competitors (i.e. profit, sales volume, market share and return on investment); an approach previously employed by Hooley and Lynch, (1985), Law, Wong and Mobley, (1998) and Huan et al. (2008), among others. Although self-reported measures of relative performance have the potential to contain bias and other inaccuracies, these and other authors contend that in the absence of objective criteria they can be both appropriate and reliable (Dess and Robinson, 1984; Powell, 1992; Matear, Garrett and Gray, 2004). Hence, in the questionnaire, respondents were asked to report

how their company had performed in their last financial year (i.e. “better”, “the same”, “worse”, or “don’t know”) relative to its major competitors on each measure, allowing the following classification:

- Higher-performing manufacturers (HPMs) performed “better” than their major competitors on all four indicators (35% of the Indian sample and 26% of the United States sample).
- Lower-performing manufacturers (LPMs) performed variously across all other indicators (65% of the Indian sample and 74% of the United States sample).

To examine the second research objective, that of identifying which ‘key drivers’ (SMPs) are the strongest predictors of higher performance at each stage of the strategic marketing decision-making process, logistic multiple regression (Cox, 1958; McCullagh and Nelder, 1990) was undertaken. As with previous research sharing similar objectives (see Brooksbank, *et al.*, 2015), separate regression analyses were conducted for each sample, with a higher performing company as the category of interest. The probability of a company being a higher performer was transformed via the logit link function, and this was modelled as a linear combination of the independent variables (i.e. the strategic marketing practices). Positive coefficients for strategic marketing practices indicate higher values being associated with high performance; negative coefficients indicate lower values being associated with high performance. Models were fitted with the glm function in the R statistical software, version 3.2.2 (R Core Team, 2015), and null and residual deviances together with degrees of freedom are reported for each model in the tables, to enable an assessment of model fit.

To facilitate an examination of the third study objective, for the purpose of theory development, the results arising from the t-tests and regression analyses are interpreted and discussed in light of the differences in the business environments faced in the two countries (as detailed in Table I).

Sample Characteristics

As shown in Table II, respondent companies from both India and USA are similarly split between those manufacturing consumer goods (58% and 68% respectively) compared with industrial goods (42% and 32% respectively). However, there is a notable difference between the two samples regarding average company size and scale of operations. Given that India is a far more populous country, it is remarkable that its average manufacturer is somewhat dwarfed by its United States counterpart in terms of the average number of its employees (4,450 compared with 5,511), and its average annual sales (270m US\$ compared with 2.3b US\$). Interestingly nonetheless, the average Indian firm reported that the proportion of its entire workforce working in a ‘marketing role’ to be double that of its counterpart in the United States (22% and 11% respectively). However, roughly equal proportions of respondents in India and the United States reported local ownership (78% and 70% respectively). In addition, a similar proportion of respondents classified their firm as being either fully independent or, if part of a larger group of companies, at least autonomous in terms of its strategic marketing decision-making responsibilities (94% of the Indian sample and 90% of the United States sample).

{Table II about here}

Results and Discussion

Undertaking a strategic situation analysis (H1 – 4)

To examine the use of a formal planning approach (*H1*) respondents were asked whether their marketing planning was annual or longer-term, limited to annual budgeting, or restricted to little or none. As shown in Table III, in support of the hypothesis in India, a positive relationship exists between the extent of planning and higher performance (at the 1% level). However, the hypothesis is not supported in the United States. Thus, an underlying orientation towards formal strategic marketing planning is clearly well developed within the higher-performing Indian manufacturers, although it is notable that the mean scores in the United States sample indicate a generally high usage across both performance groups.

{Table III about here}

To test the hypothesis that HPMs conduct a more comprehensive situation analysis (*H2*), respondents were asked to report the degree of importance their company attached to carrying out five separate types of analyses: (i) internal company, (ii) competitor, (iii) market, (iv) customer, and (v) wider business environment. As Table III indicates, in partial support of the hypothesis in India, significant differences (at the 1% level) emerged between HPMs and the importance attached to two types of analysis; a customer, and a wider business environment analysis. In the United States, however, no such relationships arose. Whilst this finding is arguably related to the greater need among India's HPMs to recognise and understand the multiplicity of options afforded by their more buoyant prevailing strategic environment, and especially with regard to rapidly changing customer requirements and a dynamic wider business environment, it should be noted that the level of sophistication with

which such analyses are actually carried out remains unknown. Indeed, on this very point, it is interesting that Table III shows that whereas there is no support in India for the hypothesis that HPMs adopt a more pro-active approach to the future when carrying out their situation analyses (*H3*), this hypothesis is supported in the United States (at the 5% level). Unlike in the ultra-competitive, zero-sum markets of the United States where it is difficult to find new 'competitive space', perhaps an ability to project future scenarios and second guess competitors' moves provide a level of sophistication that is unnecessary within the fast-growing markets of India.

In addressing the hypothesis that HPMs make greater use of market research-based strategic decision-making (*H4*), respondents were asked about their frequency of use of two types of research: (i) self-generated, and (ii) commissioned. Here, as shown in Table III, across both types, no significant difference in the response profiles of the performance groups in either sample emerged, and thus *H4* is rejected. It is notable, nonetheless, that while the mean scores indicated a moderate level of self-generated research occurring across both samples, in India they indicate a particularly low overall level of usage for commissioned research when compared against the same score for their United States counterparts. Perhaps this combination of findings reflects a paucity of available research agencies in India (Burgess and Steenkamp, 2006; Miller, 1998), although it seems their high economic growth over recent years offers a more likely explanation since, potentially, it may well foster a degree of complacency about the need to devote resources to market research at all.

Table IV identifies the 'key drivers' of performance derived in relation to practices involved with undertaking a strategic situation analysis. Here, although only one practice shows up as being a potential predictor of success within each sample, they are very different. Moreover,

at least superficially, they can be readily explained by differences in the environments faced. For example, in the emerging markets of India, it is entirely understandable that in order to maximise ongoing operational efficiencies it would be necessary for strategists to be ‘information-led’ - prioritising an ability to analyse and track the rapidly unfolding political, social, economic and technological landscapes that surround them. On the other hand, in the more developed, ultra-competitive and zero-sum markets of the United States it seems equally reasonable to theorise that it would be more important to put the emphasis on acquiring ‘strategic insight’ via adopting a more future-focused and proactive analytical approach centred on predicting future ‘competitive scenarios’ with a view towards planning to make the most attractive scenario happen.

{Table IV about here}

Setting strategic marketing objectives (H5&6)

To assess the relationship between performance and setting longer-term objectives (*H5*), respondents were asked to indicate the time horizons against which their firm geared its objectives in relation to five criteria: profit, sales, market share, cash flow and return on investment (ROI). Table V reveals that although no significant differences emerged across both samples in relation to setting longer profitability objectives, it also shows that in support of the hypothesis in India, in all other cases, a positive relationship exists (at the 5% level or better). No doubt underlying market growth together with sheer market size in India facilitates an ability for strategists to plan with greater certainty over longer periods than their counterparts in the United States, where shortening time horizons might be symptomatic of persistent economic uncertainties during the post-global financial crisis era. Such explanations would certainly be borne out by the survey findings with regard to another

aspect of objective-setting; that which concerns the aggressiveness of the marketing objectives pursued in the respondent companies' 'main market' (*H6*). Here, whereas Table V reveals the hypothesis is rejected in India - suggesting that their HPMs adopt a stance designed to maintain their firms' market share, apparently, content to ride the wave of generic growth within their markets; by contrast, *H6* is confirmed in the United States (at the 5% level) in favour of their HPMs being more likely to pursue the aggressive objectives that align with conventional marketing wisdom.

{Table V about here}

With regard to the pattern of 'key drivers' shown in Table VI, it is perhaps unsurprising that in both India and the United States HPMs prioritise the realisation of long-term ROI objectives. Otherwise, the table exhibits a very different pattern of priorities for each sample. On the one hand, in the growing markets of India, a twin focus on the attainment of both long-term market share gains and cash flow targets is doubtless indicative of a need to pursue a balance between achieving a steady growth trajectory relative to competitors but without becoming starved of enough cash to make it happen. On the other hand, in the sluggish and ultra-competitive markets of the United States, competitive success appears to necessitate a different focus; that of maximising long term sales opportunities, in all probability by seeking to increase the firm's volume of repeat business within its existing customer base.

{Table VI about here}

Formulating marketing strategy (H7 - 12)

Survey respondents were requested to respond to questions about their strategy in relation to their 'main market'. As Table VII shows, no positive statistical relationships emerged across either sample regarding: the adoption of a strategic focus to raise volume (H7); a differentiated market approach based on serving one or more specific segment(s) or individual large customer(s) rather than the whole market (H8), and; the adoption of a strategy based on the provision of superior customer value rather than price alone (H10). Thus, each of these hypotheses are rejected, although in accordance with conventional prescriptions, in all cases the mean scores indicated a generally high level of adoption for each of these practices. Indeed, it is particularly noteworthy that the vast majority of firms in both countries apparently understand the wisdom of two practices that are at the very heart of conventional strategic marketing doctrine: focusing limited resources on serving one or more specific target market(s), and seeking to compete in those markets by offering superior value-to-the-customer.

{Table VII about here}

To assess the relationship between performance and the pursuit of a strategy that avoids head-on competition (H9), Table VII indicates no significant differences in the response profiles of either sample. This hypothesis is therefore rejected. Here, however, the mean scores do suggest considerably larger proportions of all Indian manufacturers adopting this stance when compared to their counterparts – no doubt a reflection of the far greater scope for their strategists to identify and occupy a unique market position afforded by an opportunity-rich strategic environment. Regarding innovation (H11), survey respondents were asked about two types: (i) their firm's approach to developing and marketing new products, and (ii) their approach to developing and introducing new ways of doing business. Interestingly, Table VII

shows this hypothesis is supported on both counts in India (at the 1% and 5% level, respectively) but not in the United States, where no such relationships exist. This combination of findings is perhaps somewhat surprising, and particularly with regard to new product development (NPD). Given differences in the ‘marketing heritage’ of the two countries along with the fact that NPD is traditionally considered to be a fundamental responsibility of marketing that necessitates quite sophisticated companywide structures and processes (de Jong, Marston and Roth, 2015), one could be forgiven for assuming that it would less likely be a key differentiator of performance in India.

To test for a positive relationship between performance and strategic collaboration (*H12*), respondents were asked about their firm’s extent of collaboration with: (i) distributors, (ii) suppliers. As shown in Table VII, in partial support of the hypothesis, a relationship exists between HPMs and collaboration with distributors in both India and the United States (at the 5% and 10% level, respectively). Although the detailed nature of reported collaborations remains unknown due to research instrument limitations, at the very least these findings clearly reflect the central importance to all manufacturers of being able to secure access to their markets via building strong relationships, of one sort another, with key distributors in the channel.

Table VIII identifies the ‘key drivers’ derived in relation to practices related to strategy formulation. Here, two such drivers have been found to be unique to HPMs in India: targeting selected markets, and developing new ways to do business. A third, which is also a predictor of performance among their counterparts in the United States, is the practice of collaborating with distributors for the purpose of securing maximum target market(s) access. This third practice can therefore be viewed as an important priority for both sets of manufacturers,

irrespective of the nature of their business environment. Otherwise, despite a prevailing strategic environment characterised by few branded goods and the availability of large untapped markets, HPMs in India are clearly convinced of the merits of target marketing. By targeting several selected markets, secure in the knowledge that any costs normally associated with branding will not (at least initially) be incurred, full advantage can be taken of being able to 'ride the wave' of generic sales growth in those markets. No doubt large-base effects effectively enhance the underlying logic of its appropriateness. Moreover, in the emerging market of India it is understandably important to prioritise finding new and innovative ways to do business since this can be a relatively inexpensive approach to differentiating an offer and adding value whilst simultaneously building new competences and expertise.

{Table VIII about here}

Designing the marketing organisation (H13-15)

To test for a positive relationship between performance and organisational flexibility (*H13*), four dimensions of flexibility were examined: the extent of use of temporary project teams, the extent of job overlap both within marketing and between marketing and other business functions, and the use of outsourcing (advertising, publicity, and direct marketing). Table IX reveals no significant results in all cases and across both samples, apart from India's HPMs exhibiting a greater amount of job overlap between marketing and the other business functions. Thus, while *H13* is only partially accepted in India, it is entirely rejected in the United States. Perhaps the practice of cultivating job overlap (both within marketing and between marketing and other functions) is symptomatic of higher-performing companies in emerging markets because they are constantly extending themselves, and are unable to easily fill various new job roles due to skill shortages in the labour market.

{Table IX about here}

In addressing the hypothesis that senior marketers with HPMS maintain closer links with customers (*H14*), Table IX reveals that this dynamic varies little by competitive performance for either sample. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected. However, in looking at the mean scores across both samples regarding the frequency of senior managers' contact with customers, it seems this type of 'hands on' management style is, nonetheless, reasonably commonplace. Regarding training (*H15*), survey respondents were asked about the importance attached to two types: (i) marketing skills training for marketing staff, and (ii) the training of managers in business skills outside their main area of functional responsibility. As shown in Table IX, in India, a positive relationship exists between the importance attached to marketing training and performance (at the 5% level) but not in any other cases. Therefore, while the hypothesis is only partially supported within the Indian sample, within the United States sample it is entirely rejected. Clearly, in an opportunity-rich emerging market, ensuring that a firm's marketing staff are sufficiently skilled to take best advantage of those opportunities is paramount. However, it should be noted that the mean scores do suggest a generally high level of importance attached to both types of training across both samples.

As Table X shows, while no specific practice examined in relation to organisational decision-making was found to be predictive of competitive success for manufacturers operating in the developed market of the United States – where perhaps organisational development has generally reached such a high level of sophistication that it leaves little scope for differentiation; there were several 'key drivers' that emerged within the Indian sample. Interestingly, these relate to marketing job role specification: the extent to which job overlap

is cultivated both within marketing and between marketing and other business functions, and the importance of ensuring that marketing staff are skilled. Thus, it seems reasonable to posit that unlike in a developed economy, the lesser-developed 'marketing infrastructure' found in emerging markets (Burgess and Steenkamp, 2006; Miller, 1998) extends to shortages of specialist marketing personnel, thereby necessitating a greater priority to be placed on cultivating job versatility, and especially when a company is growing. Perhaps for similar reasons Table X also identifies a priority to outsource advertising, although it is more likely that (as with most original equipment manufacturers that do not sell directly to end consumers), any advertising efforts will be on a modest scale, and no doubt here represents an attempt to begin the process of building an internationally recognised company brand in anticipation of their markets becoming increasingly competitive.

{Table X about here}

Conducting strategic marketing control (H16-18)

To determine whether HPMs analyse their performance more closely (*H15*), survey participants were asked to report the frequency with which their firm carried out three types of analysis relative to: (i) planned objectives, (ii) the contribution of each product in the range, (iii) marketing costs. In overwhelming support of the hypothesis in India, Table XI indicates all three types are positively associated with competitive success (at the 5%, 1% and 1% level, respectively). However, although the table shows *H15* is rejected across the board in the United States, it is noteworthy that the mean scores indicate that all three types are carried out on a reasonably frequent basis. For fast-growing HPMs in India, there is arguably a stronger imperative among strategists to maintain tight control of their firms' performance

as a means of ensuring they are at least keeping pace with the wave of large-scale generic growth that characterises their markets.

{Table XI about here}

Regarding the use of marketing research for control purposes (*H16*), respondents were requested to report the extent to which their firms undertook three types: (i) customer satisfaction surveys, (ii) investigations into customer complaints and warranty claims, and (iii) follow-up analyses into lost orders/business. Here, while Table XI reveals no significant differences between the performance groups with respect to following-up lost orders/business in either sample, the findings with respect to the other two types provide at least partial support for *H16* in both countries. However, whereas in India (and unlike in the United States), HPMs carry out customer satisfaction surveys to a greater extent than LPMs - ensuring that over time they are empowered to keep on satisfying customers (significant at the 5% level); the reverse is true regarding investigations into customer complaints in the United States (at the same level of significance) – perhaps unsurprising given the greater need for firms in a tightly competitive market, with limited growth options, to focus on retaining their existing customer base.

In addressing the hypothesis that HPMs make more use of an ongoing marketing intelligence-gathering system (*H18*), respondents were asked to report the extent to which their company used a system to monitor developments in four areas: (i) customer behaviour, (ii) competitor behaviour, (iii) technological change, and (iv) business and economic trends. Perhaps it is unremarkable that Table X1 shows the only area in which the hypothesis holds in both India and the United States is in relation to monitoring changes in technology (at the 5% and 10%

level, respectively), since capitalising upon technological advancements is surely an inescapable reality germane to manufacturing. What is surprising however, is that with respect to virtually all other areas of intelligence-gathering, *H18* is only supported in India. This might well echo a greater need among India's strategists to, as time goes by, pay greater attention to interpreting and understanding their faster-changing market environments; unlike their United States counterparts whose environments are more slow-moving.

In Table XII the regression results indicate that only one practice in each sample can be considered a 'key driver' of decision-making in relation to marketing control. Amidst the fast-moving, emerging market of India, it is understandable that a top priority for strategists would be to exercise tight financial control over their expanding operations - ensuring that their strategies and plans are viable. By contrast, amidst the intense rivalry that characterises the mature markets of the United States, where market penetration strategies based on winning competitors' customers is difficult and potentially expensive, it is equally understandable that a basic priority would be to retain existing customers; seeing any complaints as an opportunity to better satisfy them and build loyalty.

{Table XII about here}

Limitations

Whilst this study is based on a tried and tested questionnaire using SMPs, analytical techniques and measures of firm performance that typify its research genre, findings nonetheless remain speculative in light of several methodological limitations. First, relatively low survey response rates renders questionable the extent to which the study samples can be considered representative of each country's population of manufacturers. Second, in relation to these response rates, a potential lack of statistical power might mean that some

relationships were overlooked in the analyses. [N.B. for the *t*-tests, a power analysis suggested that a difference between the performance group means of 0.58 or higher on average would be detected with 90% power. For the logistic regressions, a simulation study concluded there was greater than 90% power to detect questions that multiplied the odds of belonging to a particular performance group by a factor of approximately 1.6 or greater, within each study sample.] Third, despite attempts to pilot the survey instrument for its clarity and comprehension amongst marketing executives, some variability in the respondents' interpretation of its wording, phrasing and terminology cannot be ruled out. Fourth, in a similar vein, despite efforts to check for non-response bias it is conceivable that only motivated 'marketing savvy' respondents and/or those that wanted to send 'signals of professionalism' might have been keen to complete the questionnaire. Fifth, along with most survey-based studies in this research genre, the contribution that strategic marketing practices make to competitive success is, for a variety of reasons, handicapped by the relatively low levels of explanation typically afforded by statistical analyses (Bass, 1974, Brooksbank *et al.*, 2015). Sixth, data interpretations in relation to each sample's business environment are made purely on the basis of conjecture.

Conclusions

With respect to this study's first objective, the evidence shows that among India's HPMs, many conventional practices are being vigorously embraced, and that they are making a difference. Of the 18 hypotheses tested a total of 10 were either entirely or partially supported in India – spanning variously across all five stages of the normative model of the planning process. Indeed, this compares with only five hypotheses being similarly supported in the United States. This is not to say that the practices relating to the balance of the

hypotheses in either country were otherwise of little relevance (in fact, the mean scores indicated a reasonably substantial uptake in both countries, especially in the United States); but it does mean that only two specific practices differentiated both sets of higher-performers, namely: collaborating with distributors, and monitoring technological change. Clearly then, these two practices are important for all manufacturers, irrespective of the strategic environment faced (for reasons already discussed). Conversely, however, it also means there are a number of hypotheses supported in India alone, indicating that, at least currently, the following approaches may well be uniquely relevant to HPMs within the context of an emerging market: being more formal marketing planning oriented; conducting a more comprehensive situation analysis; setting longer-term objectives; being more innovative; cultivating greater organisational flexibility; paying more attention to training, and; analysing business performance more closely. Certainly, it has been established that within the Indian manufacturing sector, embracing strategic marketing planning is a worthwhile and potentially beneficial pursuit.

With respect to this study's second objective, findings derived from the regression analyses of practices relating to each stage of the strategic marketing planning process further suggest that there are indeed quite different priorities for success depending on the nature of the strategic environment faced. In fact, except for the strategy formulation phase stage (where the practice of collaborating closely with distributors emerged as a common predictor of higher performance across both samples), and the organisational decision-making stage (where no specific practice emerged as a predictor of higher performance in the United States), in all other cases the patterns of results contrasted quite sharply. In addition, it is fascinating to see that in large measure, at each stage of the planning process, the regression results effectively served to reinforce the importance of most of the success practices

delineated by the t-tests. Thus, at each stage of the process (in order, respectively), those practices identified as being both a ‘key driver’ as well as being found to be significantly associated with HPMs, are as follows: conducting a thorough wider business environment analysis in India, versus adopting a proactive analytical approach in the United States; setting longer-term market share and cash-flow objectives in India, versus setting longer term sales objectives and more aggressive objectives in the United States; innovating new ways to do business and collaborating with distributors in India, versus collaborating with distributors (alone) in the United States; cultivating job overlap and marketing training in India (versus none in this category for the United States), and; analysing costs in India, versus investigating customer complaints in the United States.

With respect to this study’s third objective, overall, the study findings draw into question the direct applicability of the conventional model of strategic marketing planning to the case of manufacturers operating in the emerging market of India, in that they point toward very different sets of guidelines for success in each country, as summarised in the model shown in Figure I. Although various (unknown) forces might well have played their part in shaping the guidelines highlighted in the model being forwarded, it is theorised that the differing environments faced (Table I) offers by far the most compelling, albeit the most obvious, explanation. As such, Figure I represents a tentative (given the study’s limitations) ‘blueprint’ for successful strategic marketing in an emerging versus developed market.

{Figure I about here}

For marketers, the model’s main implications revolve around a number of contrasting priorities worthy of close consideration when making strategic marketing decisions. These are as follows: whereas in an emerging market a firm’s situation analyses should be focussed on gaining sufficient information to facilitate an understanding of what is currently happening

within their rapidly unfolding market environment; in a developed environment where it is difficult to locate new 'competitive space', the analytical approach should be more future-focussed and 'insight-led'. Regarding objective-setting: whereas the underlying market growth and sheer size of emerging markets both enables and necessitates a long-term focus on market share; in an ultra-competitive mature market the emphasis should be on maximising sales, and especially via repeat purchases within the firm's existing customer-base. Differing priorities for strategy formulation are also recommended: whereas in an opportunity-rich emerging market, strategists should aim to grow by entering several carefully selected target markets with new offerings, and then expand those markets by attracting non-users; in the zero-sum markets of a mature environment the emphasis should be on protecting and reinforcing the firm's existing position and seeking to penetrate the market through winning competitors' customers. Regarding organisational issues, whereas the lesser developed 'marketing infrastructure' of emerging markets necessitates that firms focus on building organisational flexibility through prioritising relationships with distributors and emphasising companywide marketing training and job overlap - so that staff are sufficiently skilled to take advantage of the firm's many marketing opportunities; in a developed environment, securing maximum access to existing markets through fostering strong relationships with distributors should be a key focus. Finally, regarding marketing control: whereas in dynamic emerging markets the growing company should prioritise an ability to exercise tight control over a range of key business performance indicators and particularly in relation to costs; in a developed market the focus should be on customer retention, taking every opportunity to better satisfy customers and build loyalty.

Looking ahead, marketing scholars have a part to play in seeking to better understand strategic marketing decision-making within this important yet under-researched domain. To

this end this study provides a starting point for further research that could usefully focus on testing the model shown in Figure I in relation to the emerging market environments of one or more of the other BRIC countries. Furthermore, another type of follow-up study could usefully employ a more ‘involving’ qualitative research methodology – going beyond an assessment of what SMPs are being undertaken in order to find out more about any differences in how they are actually being implemented.

References

- Aaker, D.A. (2009), *Strategic Marketing Management*, Wiley, New York.
- Aggarwal, R. (2009), "Economic development, business strategy, and corporate restructuring in India," *Journal of Indian Business Research*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 14-25.
- Agusa, A. and Hassan, Z. (2008), "The strategic supplier partnership in supply chain management with quality and business performance", *International Journal of Business and Management Science*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 129-145.
- Alvarez, L.S., Casielles, R.V. and Martin, A.M.D. (2011), "Analysis of the role of complaint management in the context of relationship marketing", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 27 No. 1/2, pp. 143-64.
- Armstrong, J. S. and Overton, T. S. (1977), "Estimating nonresponse bias in mail surveys", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 14 No. 3 pp. 396-402.
- Arnold, J. D. and Quelch, A. J. (1998), "New strategies in emerging markets", *Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 40, pp. 7-28.
- Bass, F. M. (1974), "The theory of stochastic preference and brand switching", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol 11 No. 1, pp. 1-20.
- Baker, G.A. and Leidecker, J.K. (2001), "Does it pay to plan? Strategic planning and financial performance", *Agribusiness*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 355-64.
- Baker, M.J., Hart, S.J. and Black, C.D. (1988), "The competitiveness of British Industry: what really makes the difference?" *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol 17 No. 2, pp.70-85.
- Bang, V.V., Joshi, S. L. and Singh, (2016), "Marketing Strategy in Emerging Markets", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol 24 No. 2, pp. 104-17.
- Bee, C.C. and Madrigal, R. (2012), "It's not whether you win or lose; it's how the game is played", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 41 No. 1, pp. 47-58.
- Berry, M. (1996), "Technical entrepreneurship, strategic awareness and corporate transformation in small high-tech firms", *Technovation*, Vol. 16 No. 9, pp. 187-98.
- Brooksbank, R. (2007), "Ways that high performing UK manufacturers build a marketing-led company culture", *Innovative Marketing*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 93-101.
- Brooksbank, R., Garland, R., and Taylor, D. (2008), "Strategic marketing practices: Their contribution to the competitive success of medium-sized manufacturing firms in New Zealand", *Small Enterprise Research*, Vol 16 No. 2, pp. 8-20.
- Brooksbank, R., Garland, R., and Taylor, D. (2010), "Strategic marketing in New Zealand companies", *Journal of Global Marketing*, Vol 23 No. 2, pp. 33-44.
- Brooksbank, R., Garland, R. and Taylor, D. (2010), "Strategic marketing in New Zealand companies", *Journal of Global Marketing*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 33-44.
- Brooksbank, R., Garland, R. and Werder, W. (2012), "Strategic marketing practices as drivers of successful business performance in British, Australian and New Zealand golf clubs", *European Sport Management Quarterly*, Vol 12 No. 5, pp. 457-75.
- Brooksbank, R., Kirby, D.A. and Wright, G. (1992), "Marketing and company performance: An examination of medium sized manufacturing firms in Britain", *Small Business Economics*, Vol 4 No. 3, pp. 221-36.
- Brooksbank, R., Subhan, Z., Garland, R. and Rader, S. (2015), "Strategic marketing in times of recession versus growth: New Zealand manufacturers", *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, Vol 27 No. 4, pp. 600-627.
- Burgess, S. M. and Steenkamp, J.E.M. (2006), "Marketing renaissance; How research in emerging markets advances marketing science and practice", *International journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 23, pp. 337-56.
- Chaganti, R., Cook, R.G. and Smeltz, W.J. (2002), "Effect of styles, strategies and systems on the growth of small businesses", *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 175-94.
- Chaston, I. and Mangles, T. (2002), *Small Business Marketing*, Palgrave Publishing, Basingstoke, UK.

- Chen, V., Cheng, B., Levonson, G. and van Ark, B. (2012), "Projecting economic growth with growth accounting techniques: The conference board global economic outlook 2012 sources and methods," *Economics Program Working Paper Series*.
- Clark, B. and Ambler, T. (2011), "Managing the marketing metrics portfolio", *Marketing Management*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 16-21.
- Cocks, G. (2009), "High performers down under: Lessons from Australia's winning companies", *Journal of Business Strategy*, Vol 30 No. 4, pp. 17-22.
- Coughlan, A.T. (1985), "Competition and cooperation in marketing channel choice: Theory and application", *Marketing Science*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 110-29.
- Cravens, D. and Piercy, N. (2009), *Strategic Marketing*, (9th edition) McGraw Hill, New York.
- Damirchi, G.V. and Shafai, J. (2011), "A framework to innovation in marketing management by utilizing business intelligence", *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 1643-53.
- Davis, F. and Manrodt, K. (1996), *Customer Responsive Management: The Flexible Advantage*, Wiley, New York.
- de Jong, M., Marston, N. and Roth, E. (2015), "The eight essentials of innovation", *McKinsey Quarterly*, April.
- Desai, S.S. (2013), "An analysis of the competitive marketing strategies of the hospitality industry in the UAE", *The IUP Journal of Management Research*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 22-32.
- Dess, G. and Robinson, J.R.B. (1984), "Measuring organizational performance in the absence of objective measures; the case of privately held firms and conglomerate business units", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 265-73.
- Dobbs, R., Remes, J., Manyika, J., Roxburgh, C., Smit, S. and Schaer F. (2012), "Urban World: Cities and the rise of the consuming class", Retrieved from www.mckinsey.co/insights/mgi/research-it/urbanization/urban_world_cities_and_the_rise_of_the_consuming_class
- Dodourova, M. (2009), "Alliances as strategic tools: A cross industry study of partnership planning, formation and success", *Management Decision*, Vol 47 No. 5, pp. 831-44.
- Doyle, P. (2002), *Marketing Management and Strategy*, Financial Times / Prentice-Hall, London.
- Doyle, P., Saunders, J. and Wong, V. (1985), *A comparative investigation of Japanese marketing strategies in the British market*. Report to the Economic and Scientific Research Council, Ref: F20023203, January.
- Doyle, P. and Wong, V. (1998), "Marketing and competitive performance: an empirical study", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 32 No. 5, pp. 514-35.
- Einhorn, B. (2014), "India v. China: The battle for global manufacturing", *Bloomberg Business Week*, Vol 32. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2014-11-06/india-vs-dot-china-the-battle-for-global-manufacturing>
- Foroohar, R. and Saporito, B. (2013), "Made in the USA", *Time Magazine*, Vol. 181, No. 15, pp. 22-9.
- Gould, A. N., Liu, A. H. and Yu, Y. (2016), "Opportunities and opportunism with high-status B2B partners in emerging economies", *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 31 No. 5, pp. 684-94.
- Hamadu, D., Obaji, R. and Oghojafor, B. (2012), "Intelligence information generation, dissemination, and responsiveness in the performance of insurance business in Nigeria", *Journal of Marketing Development and Competitiveness*, Vol. 5 No. 7, pp. 53-62.
- Hamel, G. and Prahalad, C.K. (1991), "Corporate imagination and expeditionary marketing", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 69 No. 4, pp. 87-92.
- Homburg, C., Artz, M. and Wieseke, J. (2012), "Marketing performance measurement systems: Does comprehensiveness really improve performance?", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 76 No. 3, pp. 56-77.
- Hooley, G.J. and Beracs, J. (1997), "Marketing strategies for the 21st Century: Lessons from top Hungarian companies", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 143-65.

- Hooley, G.J. and Jobber, D. (1986), "Five common factors in top performing industrial firms", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 89-96.
- Hooley, G.J. and Lynch, J.E. (1985), "Marketing lessons from the UK's high-flying companies", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol 1 No. 1, pp. 65-74.
- Hooley, G.J., Piercy, N.F., Nicoulaud, B. and Rudd, J.M. (2017), *Marketing Strategy and Competitive Positioning (6th ed.)*, Pearson Education Limited, United Kingdom.
- Huan, G., Brooksbank, R., Babbis, P. and Taylor, D. (2008), "Strategic marketing in Chinese manufacturing companies", *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 276-88.
- Joseph, M., Joseph, B., Poon, S. and Brooksbank, R. (2001), "Strategic marketing processes of Australian companies: A preliminary investigation", *European Business Review*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 234-40.
- Kee-hung, L., Yeung, A.C.L. and Cheng, T.C.E. (2012), "Configuring quality management and marketing implementation and the performance implications for industrial marketers", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 41 No.8, pp. 1284-97.
- Keltner, B. and Finegold, D. (1999), "Market segmentation strategies and service sector productivity", *California Management Review*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 88-102.
- Khannu, T. and Palepu, K. (2010), *Winning in Emerging Markets: A road map for strategy and execution*, Harvard Business Press: U.S.A.
- Knoke, D. and Kalleberg, A.L. (1994), "Job training in U.S. Organizations", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 59 No. 4, pp. 537-46.
- Koku, P.S. (2005), "Towards an integrated marketing strategy for developing markets", *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 8-22.
- Kolar, A. and Toporišic, A. (2007), "Marketing as warfare, revisited", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 203-16.
- Kontinen, T. (2011), "Succeeding in the French market: Recommendations for small businesses", *Journal of Business Strategy*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 15-25.
- Kotler, P. (2011), *Marketing Management*, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Kotler, P. and Keller, K. L. (2007), *Marketing Management (12th Edition)*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.
- Kuga, M. (1990), "Kao's marketing strategy and marketing intelligence system", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 20-25.
- Lai, W.B., Huang, J.Y., Hooley, G., Lynch, J. and Yau, O. (1992), "Effective marketing in Taiwan: Profiles of the top performers", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 5-17.
- Law, K.S., Wong, C. and Mobley, W.H. (1998), "Toward a taxonomy of multidimensional constructs", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 741-55.
- Le Meunier-FitzHugh, K. and Piercy, N.F. (2006), "Integrating marketing intelligence sources", *International Journal of Market Research*, Vol. 48 No. 6, pp. 699-716.
- Lewis, D. (2006), "Marketing masterclass: Harnessing intelligence for competitive advantage", *Journal of Medical Marketing*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 276-81.
- Loyle, H.D. and Breidenach, A.J. (2011), "Strategic planning for financial results", *Franchising World*, Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 24-26.
- Lysonski, S. and Pecotich, A. (1992), "Strategic marketing planning, environmental uncertainty and performance", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 247-55.
- MacAskill, E. (2011), *Down to the Wire: Taking the world's economic temperature*. The New Zealand Herald, 1 August, A12.
- Maltz, E. and Kohli, A.K. (1996), "Market intelligence dissemination across functional boundaries", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 47-61.
- Matear, S.M., Garrett, T. and Gray, B.J. (2004) "Market orientation, brand investment, new service development, market position, and performance for service organisation" *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol.15 No. 3, pp. 284-301.
- Mattews, C. (2016), "The US will surpass China as the No. 1 country for manufacturing by 2020", *Fortune Magazine(Online)*, March 31.

- McCullagh, P., and Nelder, J. A. (1989), *Generalized linear models* (Vol. 37). CRC press.
- McDonald, M. (2006), "Strategic marketing planning: Theory and practice", *The Marketing Review*, Vol. 6, pp. 375-418.
- McDonald, M. and Wilson, H. (2011), *Marketing Plans: How to Prepare Them, How to Use Them*, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ.
- McKinsey (2016), Helping Make in India, retrieved 15/03/2016 from: www.mckinsey.com/about-us/new-at-mckinsey-blog/helping-make-in-india
- Mellat-Parast, M. (2015), "An institutional theory of quality outcomes in strategic supply chain partnership", *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 346-61.
- Miller, R. R. (1998), *Selling to Newly Emerging Markets*. New York, NY: Quorum Books.
- Morhart, F.M., Herzog, W. and Tomczak, T. (2009), "Brand-specific leadership: Turning employees into brand champions", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 73 No. 5, pp. 122-42.
- O'Dwyer, M., Gilmore, A. and Carson, D. (2011), "Strategic alliances as an element of innovative marketing in SMEs", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 91-104.
- Panayides, P.M. (2004), "Marketing in Asia-Pacific logistics companies: A discriminant analysis between marketing orientation and performance", *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, Vol 16 No. 1, pp. 42-68.
- Pancras, J. and Sudhir, K. (2007), "Optimal marketing strategies for a customer data intermediary", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 44 No. 4, pp. 560-78.
- Peng, M.W. and Shekshnia, S.V. (2001), "How entrepreneurs create wealth in transition economies-executive commentary", *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol.15 No.1, pp. 95-110.
- Peters, T.J. and Waterman, R.H. (1982), *In Search of Excellence*, Harper & Row, New York.
- Piercy, N.F. (2000), *Market-Led Strategic Change* (2nd edition), Butterworth Heinemann, London.
- Pitta, D.A. (2008), "Product innovation and management in a small enterprise", *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, Vol. 17 No. 6, pp. 416-19.
- Powell, T.C. (1992), "Organizational alignment as competitive advantage", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp.119-134.
- Putendran, S., Speed, R. and Widing II, R.E. (2003), "Marketing planning, marketing orientation and business performance", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 476-97.
- Quinn, L. (2009), "Market segmentation in managerial practice: A qualitative examination", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 25 No. 3/4, pp. 253-72.
- Ray, S. and Ray, P. (2011), "Production innovation for the people's car in an emerging economy", *Technovation*, Vol. 31 No. 5/6, pp. 206-17.
- R Core Team (2015), *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Reijonen, H. and Komppula, R. (2010), "The adoption of marketing orientation in SMEs: Required capabilities and relation to success", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 18 No.1, pp. 19-37.
- Ries, A. and Trout, J. (1986), "Marketing warfare", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 77-82.
- Romano, C. and Ratnatunga, J. (1995), "The role of marketing: its impact on small enterprise research", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 29 No. 7, pp. 9-30.
- Saunders, J. and Wong, V. (1985), "In search of excellence in the UK", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 119-37.
- Seuring, S. (2009), "The product-relationship matrix as a framework for strategic supply chain design based on operations theory", *International Journal of Production Economics*, Vol. 120 No. 1, pp. 221-32.
- Shaw, V. (1995), "Successful marketing strategies: a study of British and German companies in the machine tool industry", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 329-39.
- Sheth, J. N. (2011), "Impact of emerging markets on marketing: Rethinking existing perspectives and practices", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 75: pp. 166-182.

- Simkin, L. and Dibb, S. (2012), "Leadership teams rediscover market analysis in seeking competitive advantage and growth during economic uncertainty", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 45-54.
- Sirkin, H. L., Rose, J. and Zinser, M. (2012), "The US manufacturing renaissance: How shifting global economics are creating an American comeback". VOOK.
- Siu, W.S. (2000), "Marketing and company performance of Chinese small firms in Hong Kong", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 18 No. 5, pp. 292-30.
- Siu, W.S., Fang, W. and Lin, T. (2004), "Strategic marketing practices and the performance of Chinese small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in Taiwan", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* Vol 16 No. 2, pp. 161-78.
- Siu, W.S. and Liu, Z. (2005), "Marketing in Chinese small and medium enterprises (SMEs): the state of the art in a Chinese socialist economy", *Small Business Economics* Vol 25, pp. 333-346.
- Slater, S.F., Hult, G., Tomas, M. and Olson, E.M. (2007), "On the importance of matching strategic behavior and target market selection to business strategy in high-tech markets", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 5-17.
- Slater, S., Olson, E. and Finnegan, C. (2011), "Business strategy, marketing organization culture, and performance", *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 227-42.
- Spencer, C. and Schellenberg, S. (2010), *Trends in global manufacturing, goods movement and consumption, and their effect on the growth of United States ports and distribution*, Webster, Texas: NAIOP Research Foundation.
- Steenkamp, J. B. E.M. (2005), "Moving out of the U.S. silo: A call to arms for conducting international marketing research", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 69, pp. 6-8.
- Storey, D.J. (2002), "Education, training and development policies and practices in medium-sized companies in the UK: Do they really influence firm performance?", *Omega*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 249-64.
- Subhan, Z., Brooksbank, R., Rader, S., Steel, D., and Mackey, K. (2014), "Running an effective induction programme for new sales recruits: lessons from the financial services industry", *Journal of Selling*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 20-33.
- Sunge, A. and Civi. E. (2008), Emerging markets: A review of conceptual frameworks. *Proceedings of 1st international symposium on business administration: challenges for business administrators in the new millennium*, Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Silesian University, Gokceade Canakkale: Turkey, pp 203-16.
- Thongsodsang, C. and Ussahawanitchakit, P. (2011), "Dynamic marketing capability, marketing outcomes and marketing growth: Evidence from foods and beverages businesses in Thailand", *International Journal of Business Strategy*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 49-66.
- Walker, A., Mullins, J. W., Gountas, J., I., Avondo, F. T., Kriz, A. and Osborne, C. (2015), *Marketing Strategy: A Decision-Focused Approach*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Webster, F.E. (1992), "The changing role of marketing in the corporation", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 56 No. 4, p. 1.
- Whitling, I. (2007), "How to maximise staff potential", *Marketing Week*, Vol. 30 No. 34, pp. 27-28.
- Wilson, D. and Purushothamanan, R. (2003). Dreaming with BRICs: The path to 2050. Global Economics. Paper No. 99. Goldman Sachs. New York.
- Yu, W., Yang, J., Tseng, J., Liu, S. and Wu, J. (2010), "Proactive problem-solver for construction", *International Research Journal*, Vol. 19 No. 6, pp. 808-16.

What Differentiates Successful Strategic Marketing among Manufacturers in an Emerging versus Developed Market?

Table I. Overview of Strategic Marketing Environments

Key Characteristics	India	United States
1. Economic growth rates (over the period 2008 - 2013)	c.7.0% p.a.	c.0.75% p.a.
2. Product-category market penetration levels	Early stages	Peak/near-peak
3. Approximate population/total market size	1. 325 billion	325 million
4. Extent of unbranded competition	High	Low
5. Marketing-related infrastructure	Under developed	Fully developed

Table II. Sample Characteristics

Key Characteristics	India	United States
Average number of full-time employees	4,450	5,511
Average number of full-time employees working in a marketing role	1,000 (22% of total)	636 (11% of total)
Average sales turnover in the last financial year	US\$ 270m*	US\$ 2.3b
Type of goods manufactured:		
Consumer	58% of total	68% of total
Industrial	42% of total	32% of total
Principal ownership	India =78 %	USA=70%
Status/ autonomy:		
Independent/autonomous	94%	90%
Controlled by larger group	6%	10%

* Translated from local currency into US\$ for comparative purposes.

Table III. Strategic Analysis: Performance Related to Marketing Practices

Hypotheses tested by mean scores: strategic analysis	India			United States		
	Low (46)	High (25)	<i>p</i> <	Low (62)	High (22)	<i>p</i> <
H1: Extent of formal planning	2.84	3.56	0.001	2.98	3.23	0.35
H2: Extent of internal analysis	1.83	1.64	0.30	1.82	1.82	0.99
H2: Extent of competitor analysis	1.98	1.76	0.30	2.05	2.32	0.26
H2: Extent of market analysis	1.87	1.76	0.60	1.94	1.77	0.42
H2: Extent of customer analysis	2.17	1.64	0.01	1.97	1.77	0.41
H2: Extent of wider business analysis	2.74	2.04	0.01	2.58	2.68	0.68
H3: Extent of proactive planning	2.11	2.00	0.58	1.81	2.14	0.05
H4: Amount of internal (DIY) marketing research	1.67	1.54	0.48	1.35	1.45	0.58
H4: Amount of external marketing research	2.54	2.24	0.24	2.13	2.14	0.98

Table IV. Strategic Analysis: Key drivers of performance

Independent Variables	India		United States	
	Beta	Signif.	Beta	Signif.
H2: Extent of internal analysis	0.148	0.74	0.073	0.84
H2: Extent of competitor analysis	-0.627	0.25	0.688	0.11
H2: Extent of market analysis	0.871	0.14	-0.703	0.14
H2: Extent of customer analysis	-0.667	0.16	-0.323	0.38
H2: Extent of wider business analysis	-0.985	0.02	0.120	0.77
H3: Extent of proactive planning	0.010	0.99	0.801	0.07
H4: Amount of internal (DIY) marketing research	-0.206	0.62	0.258	0.53
H4: Amount of external marketing research	0.297	0.45	0.263	0.49
India: Null deviance = 89.2 (68 d.f.), Residual deviance = 75.9 (60 d.f.)				
US: Null deviance = 96.6 (83 d.f.), Residual deviance = 86.4 (75 d.f.)				

Table V. Marketing Objectives: Performance Related to Marketing Practices

Hypotheses tested by mean scores: marketing objectives' time horizons for:	India			United States		
	Low	High	<i>p</i> <	Low	High	<i>p</i> <
	(46)	(25)		(62)	(22)	
H5: Profitability objectives	1.67	1.48	0.23	2.26	2.23	0.89
H5: Sales objectives	2.00	1.56	0.03	2.35	1.95	0.05
H5: Market share objectives	2.13	1.48	0.001	1.97	1.82	0.50
H5: Cash flow objectives	2.30	1.76	0.01	2.58	2.55	0.85
H5: ROI objectives	2.18	1.44	0.001	2.05	2.32	0.25
H6: Objective to be more aggressive	5.00	5.32	0.23	5.00	5.59	0.03

Table VI. Marketing Objectives: Key Drivers of Performance

Independent Variables	India		United States	
	Beta	Signif.	Beta	Signif.
H5: Long-term profitability objectives	1.035	0.15	0.301	0.51
H5: Long-term sales objectives	0.396	0.46	-0.949	0.05
H5: Long-term market share gain objectives	-1.409	0.02	-0.175	0.66
H5: Long-term cash flow objectives	-1.274	0.06	-0.630	0.19
H5: Long-term ROI objectives	-1.116	0.03	1.102	0.03
H6: More aggressive marketing objectives	-0.258	0.42	0.894	0.03
India: Null deviance = 90.4 (68 d.f.), Residual deviance = 65.3 (62 d.f.) US: Null deviance = 95.4 (81 d.f.), Residual deviance = 79.5 (75 d.f.)				

Table VII. Marketing Strategy: Performance Related to Marketing Practices

Hypotheses tested by mean scores: marketing strategy	India			United States		
	Low	High	<i>p</i> <	Low	High	<i>p</i> <
	(46)	(25)		(62)	(22)	
H7: Expanding demand versus reducing costs	2.58	2.56	0.94	2.64	2.28	0.15
H8: Whole market versus segmented approach	2.39	2.60	0.47	2.48	2.27	0.32
H9: Avoidance of competition	2.44	2.22	0.12	2.00	2.05	0.69
H10: Offering superior value	1.80	1.80	0.97	1.97	1.95	0.80
H11: Approach to developing new products	2.61	2.88	0.02	2.85	2.95	0.13
H11: Approach to developing new ways to do business	2.35	2.80	0.01	2.34	2.64	0.12
H12: Extent of strategic collaboration with distributors	2.07	1.64	0.04	2.07	1.77	0.10
H12: Extent of strategic collaboration with suppliers	1.89	1.88	0.96	1.92	1.73	0.21

Table VIII. Marketing Strategy: Key Drivers of Performance

Independent Variables	India		United States	
	Beta	Signif.	Beta	Signif.
H7: Expanding demand versus reducing costs	-0.060	0.86	-0.347	0.28
H8: Whole market versus segmented approach	0.587	0.10	0.004	1.00
H9: Avoidance of competition	-1.054	0.14	-0.256	0.79
H10: Offering superior value	0.057	0.95	0.656	0.67
H11: Approach to dev. new products	1.522	0.14	0.685	0.58
H11: Approach to dev. new ways to do bus.	1.775	0.03	0.122	0.78
H12: Extent of strat. collaboration:distributors	-1.325	0.02	-0.952	0.10
H12: Extent of strat. collaboration: suppliers	0.867	0.17	-0.281	0.63
India: Null deviance = 85.3 (65 d.f.), Residual deviance = 58.7 (57 d.f.) US: Null deviance = 83.2 (75 d.f.), Residual deviance = 74.1 (67 d.f.)				

Table IX. Marketing Organisation: Performance Related to Marketing Practices

Hypotheses tested by mean scores: marketing organisation	India			United States		
	Low	High	<i>p</i> <	Low	High	<i>p</i> <
	(46)	(25)		(62)	(22)	
H13: Use of temporary teams	2.07	2.12	0.84	1.79	1.68	0.64
H13: Extent of job overlap within marketing	1.70	2.16	0.01	1.94	1.86	0.65
H13: Extent of job overlap between functions	2.13	2.12	0.96	1.90	1.91	0.97
H13: Extent use outside Ad agencies	1.67	1.56	0.57	1.84	2.00	0.55
H13: Extent use outside PR agencies	2.04	2.24	0.44	2.16	2.14	0.93
H13: Extent use outside DM agencies	2.48	2.6	0.65	2.45	2.14	0.26
H14: Extent senior mktrs 1 st hand contact with customers	2.00	1.72	0.28	1.42	1.36	0.71
H15: Importance: marketing training	2.00	1.52	0.03	2.40	2.18	0.32
H15: Importance: cross-functional training	1.96	1.68	0.16	2.40	2.09	0.13

Table X. Marketing Organisation: Key Drivers of Performance

Independent Variables	India		United States	
	Beta	Signif.	Beta	Signif.
H13: Extent of use of temporary project teams	0.350	0.36	0.056	0.88
H13: Extent of overlap within marketing	2.062	0.01	-0.236	0.68
H13: Extent of overlap between functions	-1.069	0.07	0.126	0.82
H13: Extent use of outside Ad agencies	-0.932	0.08	0.490	0.19
H13: Extent use of outside PR agencies	0.061	0.88	-0.205	0.54
H13: Extent use of outside DM agencies	0.242	0.48	-0.408	0.16
H14: Extent snr. mkters 1st hand cust.contact	-0.377	0.30	-0.031	0.95
H15: Importance of marketing training	-0.862	0.08	0.038	0.94
H15: Importance of cross-functional training	-0.251	0.62	-0.707	0.13
India: Null deviance = 92.1 (70 d.f.), Residual deviance = 68.6 (61 d.f.) US: Null deviance = 96.6 (83 d.f.), Residual deviance = 89.9 (74 d.f.)				

Table XI. Marketing Control: Performance Related to Marketing Practices

Hypothesis tested by mean scores: marketing control	India			United States		
	Low	High	<i>p</i> <	Low	High	<i>p</i> <
	(46)	(25)		(62)	(22)	
H16: Frequency of analysis against...planned objectives	1.59	1.24	0.05	1.61	1.36	0.22
H16: ... against contribution of individual products	1.83	1.32	0.01	1.68	1.50	0.37
H16: ... against marketing costs	1.83	1.16	0.001	1.79	1.73	0.78
H17: Extent of use of ... formal cust. satisfaction surveys	1.91	1.52	0.03	2.13	1.86	0.24
H17: ... investigations into customer complaints	1.73	1.56	0.43	1.48	1.18	0.03
H17: ... follow-up analysis of lost orders/lost business	2.04	1.76	0.19	1.98	1.95	0.89
H18: Monitoring of changes ... in competitor behaviour	1.91	1.64	0.22	2.19	2.00	0.35
H18: ... in customer behaviour	1.93	1.30	0.01	2.11	1.82	0.18
H18: ... in technology	1.77	1.36	0.03	2.19	1.82	0.10
H18: ...in business/econ trends	1.76	1.24	0.001	2.00	1.77	0.25

Table XII. Marketing Control: Key Drivers of Performance

Independent Variables	India		United States	
	Beta	Signif.	Beta	Signif.
H16: Frequency of analysis against planned objectives	0.022	0.97	-0.439	0.48
H16: Frequency of analysis against cont. of products	-0.413	0.61	-0.089	0.89
H16: Frequency of analysis against marketing costs	-1.283	0.07	-0.008	0.99
H17: Extent use formal customer satisfaction surveys	-0.531	0.37	-0.158	0.68
H17: Extent of investigations into cust. complaints	0.212	0.79	-0.999	0.10
H18: Extent of follow-up analysis of lost orders/bus.	0.134	0.84	0.672	0.14
H18: Monitoring changes in competitor behaviour	0.110	0.82	0.202	0.66
H18: Monitoring changes in customer behaviour	0.070	0.92	-0.069	0.90
H18: Monitoring of changes in technology	-0.931	0.19	-0.605	0.20
H18: Monitoring of changes in bus./economic trends	-0.238	0.76	0.091	0.84
India: Null deviance = 85.3 (65 d.f.), Residual deviance = 64.7 (55 d.f.) US: Null deviance = 96.6 (83 d.f.), Residual deviance = 87.3 (73 d.f.)				

**Figure I:
Guidelines for Successful Strategic Marketing Planning: India v. U.S.**

